

Introduction

Deacon Martin is a public figure, Deacon at Our Lady of the Highways, Thomasville, NC parish. Parishes that we go to, whether Roman Catholic, Baptist, or anywhere, put up deceptive impression of publicity. The podium, microphone, and contact info, such as email and telephone numbers are just deceptions. Most anything you will hear from these clergy workers, all of them I met in my life are not willing to converse, give their clear position or opinion, or investigate the truths together with anyone willing. **They fear and avoid the conversations. They just want to produce monologues, make you hear what they say, but not interested to hear back anything.** I came to realize this flaw that became as norm at some point in my life. The Church role is to monitor people's lives. John 21: 15--19 "Peter, do you love me? x3... Feed my lambs, Take care of my sheep, [finally again] Feed my sheep." The Church and all parishes care about giving mass, giving communion (Eucharist), take collection (the care most), and send them all home (make them all go away), and keep their mouths shut! The true role of the Church (the parishes) is to get involved with parishioners' everyday lives! The Church, the priests, the deacons, and the clergy workers are to lead and teach them. Not ask for money constantly, take some cut from the collections, and claim to give to the poor. In fact, the charity work (giving to the poor) is NOT the number one responsibility of the Church. **Because these leaders cannot lead, and the teachers cannot teach, there are poor people.**

The story below is a "simple" question: Is forgiveness supposed to be auto executed? This is the misleading devil's lie that is spreading in the world against Christians and turning them into liars. If someone sins against someone, by no mean the victim is obliged to forgive the transgressor automatically. The summary in the deacon's reply is an ambiguity. There is no answer to the question. The deacon borrowed all kinds of stories and quotes, make it a huge confusion, and burden to read them all, but dodged the question, take no position, and make no answer. I am a master of clarifying all the lies existing within cheap ambiguities. Despite me giving enough times waiting for the email reply, I reminded twice in person, no answer received. I saw the same outcome from previous priests, deacons, and clergy workers I met in my life. They don't know the answers and they are not strong and honest people to lead and teach. They are pathetic liars... To be a real truthful public figure take a lot of strength, intelligent, and true devotion. They are on the Church payroll to be able to devote all their times and energies to sincere interactions from the people. What are they doing? Read my email reply to his reply to my question above.

3/30/2022

Deacon Martin,

Thanks for email reply and the document. Did you write it all out just to discuss/answer the issue I expressed? Was this document already available to you from old time so you can conveniently just attach it?

I want to remind the topic or the question: **Is the act forgiveness automatic (or should it be automatic) without requiring the sinner to apologize, 'confess', or do spiritual act of 'reconciliation'?**

Here is the act of reconciliation, confession, or apology in the Gospel that many priests, teachers (or deacons like you), or other lost Christians omit and caused great confusion and problems to be able to apply Catholic Church teaching to everyday life. I NEVER once heard that from all the masses I ever attended in my life! Is the Church secretly but intentionally hiding it?

Matthew 18: 15-20.

Matthew 18:15-20 New International Version (NIV)

“If your brother or sister sins, go and point out their fault, just between the two of you. If they listen to you, you have won them over. But if they will not listen, take one or two others along, so that ‘every matter may be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses.’ If they still refuse to listen, tell it to the church; and if they refuse to listen even to the church, treat them as you would a pagan or a tax collector. “Truly I tell you, whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven. “Again, truly I tell you that if two of you on earth agree about anything they ask for, it will be done for them by my Father in heaven. For where two or three gather in my name, there am I with them.”

You can see it came right before that Mt 18:21-35 quotes, which you borrowed but omitted the important leading verses (15-20). If sinners can go along with that publicized apology 77 times or however long they want to repeat, we can all do it. I see **it's not possible (socially) to go beyond about 5 times anyway**. You can see the degree of seriousness in “apology” gets more intense. In real world, I see real evil people can't/won't do even one apology but are expecting auto forgiveness. Many of them let the time go by to make someone forget their sins instead of them confessing/apologizing. On the other hand, some more potent evil liars understand this concept and they fake the act of apology several times. They are able to do so because modern priests don't want to be involved with that practice above (Matthew 18: 15-20), which also require the whole congregation to be involved. If any bold sinner willing to go for 77 times with whatever sin forgiveness is at stake, that person will have no place left in the world to run and hide...

Gospel

Mt 18:21-35

Peter approached Jesus and asked him,

“Lord, if my brother sins against me,

how often must I forgive him?

As many as seven times?”

Jesus answered, “I say to you, not seven times but seventy-seven times.

The case below you typed is an irrelevant case. This is a case about a hypocritical liar. He begs, meaning he asks for forgiveness, so the master forgives him. Just that he is being a hypocrite and not willing to forgive someone else when he's in a position. We are talking about AUTO forgiveness. The master doesn't AUTO forgive in the case. This is more like a case for a liar and a hypocrite, not relevant to our discussion of AUTO FORGIVENESS. The master punishes him finally anyway at the second meeting. Logically thinking, most likely that hypocrite guy in the

story would apologize again or say something, but he no longer is forgiven. In short, that story is a bad example to reference about our topic!

That is why the Kingdom of heaven may be likened to a king who decided to settle accounts with his servants.

When he began the accounting, a debtor was brought before him who owed him a huge amount.

Since he had no way of paying it back, his master ordered him to be sold, along with his wife, his children, and all his property, in payment of the debt.

At that, the servant fell down, did him homage, and said, 'Be patient with me, and I will pay you back in full.'

Moved with compassion the master of that servant let him go and forgave him the loan.

When that servant had left, he found one of his fellow servants who owed him a much smaller amount.

He seized him and started to choke him, demanding, 'Pay back what you owe.'

Falling to his knees, his fellow servant begged him, 'Be patient with me, and I will pay you back.'

But he refused.

Instead, he had him put in prison until he paid back the debt.

Now when his fellow servants saw what had happened, they were deeply disturbed, and went to their master and reported the whole affair.

His master summoned him and said to him, 'You wicked servant!

I forgave you your entire debt because you begged me to.

Should you not have had pity on your fellow servant, as I had pity on you?'

Then in anger his master handed him over to the torturers

until he should pay back the whole debt.

So will my heavenly Father do to you,
unless each of you forgives your brother from your heart.”

The case below is a generalization that is not applicable to apply relevant factor in the description about AUTO FORGIVENESS. It does NOT say Mother Teresa forgives even if someone doesn't ask for forgiveness. In any case, I will not go by the behaviors of the “saints” for they are just humans and they have no authority to lay down laws like Moses, prophets, or Jesus. Mother Teresa is famous for being a champion of charity, which is also a serious topic for us to discuss in details. For now, I want to state between you and me, or anyone else, that **the role of Church is not to beg and redistribute wealth**. Charity is good to practice, but if it goes above other major responsibilities, it will create problems. **The real major responsibilities of the Church is to TEACH and LEAD**. More important for Church or anyone to teach the sinners and lead them to the right path, than to give their evil life some fuel in wealth, food, possessions, and other necessities, while turning the blind eyes to see the real sins (the problems of that sinner) and try to figure out what's causing the problem! In fact, making the murderer rich, drug user rich, lazy person get more free things, will only encourage them to continue their evil ways. It will not change them! That act of encouragement is actually very dangerous and causes ripple effects (chain reactions) in the world that will turn the whole world deeper into evil. The trouble is that not many priests in the Church who are qualified to lead and teach...

Mother Teresa was always ready to show mercy and forgiveness to others. She said, “We need lots of love to forgive and we need lots of humility to forget, because it is not complete forgiveness unless we forget also. ... Very often we say we have forgiven but we cannot forget. And as long as we cannot forget, we really have not forgiven fully.”

The case below, again, is a generalization that is not applicable to apply relevant factor in the description about AUTO FORGIVENESS. It doesn't say Christians should forgive anyone who sins against them even if the sinner doesn't apologize, or asks for forgiveness.

St. Augustine said “There are many kinds of alms, the giving of which helps us to obtain pardon for our sins; but none is greater than that by which we forgive from our heart a sin that someone has committed against us.”

The case below is not applicable to AUTO FORGIVENESS because the murderer is begging, confessing, asking for forgiveness, and mercy in his act, although not with words but with body language. That is not bible teaching.

St. John Gualbert: John's older brother Hugh was murdered by someone pretending to be a friend. John swore vengeance, and one day encountered his unarmed enemy in a narrow passage that allowed no room for escape. Drawing his sword, John advanced, but was surprised when the murderer fell to his knees and crossed his arms on his breast. This posture reminded John of how Christ forgave His enemies while on the Cross. Profoundly moved, John put away his sword, embraced his enemy, and left him in peace. (It's said that John then went to a church to pray, and the image of Christ on the crucifix there miraculously bowed its head in recognition of John's sincere repentance and his act of forgiving his enemy.)

John Gualbert, like every other saint before and after him, came to realize the absolutely essential need to forgive our enemies, for Christ will reign only in a heart that seeks to be at peace.

The case below is a dangerous confusion. I don't trust its authenticity. That quote seems like some shallow impression someone tries to make by cutting out some phrase from some conversation (I have no idea) about some subject. Exploring it will waste time and will only create many interpretations for clever thinkers to make persuasive arguments towards their whims... These kinds of vague trimmed-out quotes should be avoided at any cost!

"If you are suffering from a bad man's injustice, forgive him, lest there be two bad men." — St. Augustine

The case below is possibly St Francis words about the Crusades. Again the question of our topic isn't about whether to forgive when someone apologizes, it's about whether to forgive when someone does wrong AND NOT apologizes. I don't go by whatever the saints are saying. They are humans and they can make mistakes by talking thus in confusing ways. It doesn't say "pardon even if they don't apologize". What if they keep doing it?

"Pardon one another so that later on you will not remember the injury. The recollection of an injury is itself wrong. It adds to our anger, nurtures our sin, and hates what is good. It is a rusty arrow and poison for the soul. It puts all virtue to flight." — St. Francis of Paola

Below is an irrelevant case again. It doesn't say anything about AUTO FORGIVENESS!

“I cannot believe that a soul which has arrived so near to Mercy itself, where she knows what she is, and how many sins God has forgiven her, should not instantly and willingly forgive others, and be pacified and wish well to everyone who has injured her, because she remembers the kindness and favors our Lord has shown her, whereby she has seen proofs of exceeding great love, and she is glad to have an opportunity offered to show some gratitude to her Lord.” — St. Teresa of Avila

The case below is deviation of our discussion about AUTO FORGIVENESS. It is about defining the word LOVE, which we should also discuss in details later. I am surprised that many people in the world do not understand its meaning. In short, LOVE is based on two fundamental acts: 1) speaking the truth; 2) acting respectfully. It is fundamental Law of God. Anything else is just embellishments or lies people add to and cause all kinds of problems. If anyone truly can go by the above definition, we can love anyone. Many confused souls speak in confounded ways to create impressions, but refusing to define the word usage in the speech.

St. Francis of Assisi wrote, “Our Lord says in the Gospel, ‘Love your enemies.’ A man really loves his enemy when he is not offended by the injury done to himself, but for love of God feels burning sorrow for the sin his enemy has brought on his own soul, and proves his love in a practical way.”

The case below irrelevant because it talks about how to forgive when someone has to forgive. We are discussing about when and under what circumstances we have to forgive.

To forgive doesn’t mean to approve of what happened or to act as if it didn’t really matter. Forgiving simply means wishing the other person well in a spiritual sense — as in praying that he or she will be blessed by God. If you can offer this prayer, God will be very pleased with you. If this is too hard to do, do this instead: ask Jesus to forgive the person on your behalf. Imagine yourself and your enemy standing together before Jesus. Ask Jesus to forgive the person for you; imagine Him turning to your enemy and saying, “You are forgiven.”

The case below is a dangerous evil confusion that will cause so much problems. I have no idea what “Ignatian thought” is. It contradicts the Gospel, where it explicitly states that forgiveness involves a priest, witnesses, congregation, and the Church. I completely reject that below passage as evil deceptive shallow person’s thoughts. I

can go line by line showing many contradictions with itself and with Gospel, impractical whims, and childish babbling. Forgiveness is not spiritual act alone, but also social act and law. It is a law for Christians.

From Ignatian thought- With God's help, I have the power to forgive anything. That doesn't mean that I'm willing to forgive anything or that it will be easy. And sometimes a wrong is so heinous that it can take the rest of my life to forgive completely. But the possibility is there. My capacity to forgive does not depend on anyone else's behavior or permission. The person I forgive can continue to be cruel, thoughtless, and relentlessly set against me. But he or she cannot command my spirit to offer or withhold forgiveness. Forgiveness is a spiritual act, which means that, ultimately, I rely on God's grace to accomplish it. In fact, my own faults and weaknesses will get in the way of my ability to forgive, especially in some situations. But whatever I'm lacking, God can supply. At times my need for God's assistance is acute, but when I choose to forgive, my effort does not rely on any other person.

Do you see the line "reconciliation is a multiple-person process" immediately contradicts the line in above passage, "my effort does not rely on any other person"? I agree with the passage below because that is what we are discussing about. Forgiveness cannot be auto, but it involved two parties. It sneaks in something "offering forgiveness" but I don't see any harm because the offer will only be valid when the sinner apologizes anyway. It states "if the other person is not willing, reconciliation is not possible." This directly addresses the topic we are on.

Reconciliation is a multiple-person process. When I reconcile with another person, both of us must first ask and/or offer forgiveness. But it must go further than that. Both people choose to do whatever it takes to restore the relationship. One person can be completely willing, but if the other person is not willing, reconciliation is not possible.

The passage below is more on the topic of mercy or pity. It doesn't address our topic-- and even so, not applicable for it is not Gospel anyway. Anyone can write out their whimsical thoughts about how a human being should behave, but it will only lead to evil and great deals of problems if it's not God's Words. Only the passage in green fonts address the topic and all others are not relevant. The Gospel clearly shows the procedures of forgiveness, but many Christians I knew are ignorant about it and evil sinners programmed them into vulnerable subjects who cannot live with honesty, courage, and strength. Christians have to be hiding, lying, and running because of this ignorance. Your story in bringing in the second brother act as reference for forgiveness (during mass) is misleading and can create great misunderstanding. The first half of the story can be used as reference for forgiveness. The younger son apologizes to his father. The second half about his brother not approving his father is a teaching for

accepting those who would return to God, Life from Death. You used it as brother noting willing to forgive. There was no apology between the two brothers and the younger brother didn't even talk to him. It's only for those who are not approving or accepting God's willingness to keep the possibility open for the sinners to turn back. It is teaching about not to be jealous and be open-minded about the POSSIBILITY for sinners to turn to God. You explicitly used it as an example for forgiveness and it would create chain of problems if anyone really tries to apply it or takes it seriously.

Lastly, JRR Tolkien's writing below cannot be the ground for decoding God's Codes (laws) for people. It's just a fiction. Fictions are lies. No one can serve God via lying. Anyone who lies automatically uses devil's power, draws devil closer to their spirit, and sends Holy Spirit further away. Whenever I find out someone lies to me, I don't talk to them anymore... Find an example of auto forgiveness in the Bible if you can for me to convince me wrong.

Lastly something from JRR Tolkien, I'm a big fan.....

But at this point the 'salvation' of the world and Frodo's own 'salvation' is achieved by his previous pity and forgiveness of injury. At any point any prudent person would have told Frodo that Gollum would certainly betray him, and could rob him in the end. To 'pity' him, to forbear to kill him, was a piece of folly, or a mystical belief in the ultimate value-in-itself of pity and generosity even if disastrous in the world of time. He did rob him and injure him in the end – but by a 'grace', that last betrayal was at a precise juncture when the final evil deed was the most beneficial thing anyone could have done for Frodo! By a situation created by his 'forgiveness', he was saved himself, and relieved of his burden.

Tolkien, J.R.R.. The Letters of J.R.R. Tolkien . HMH Books. Kindle Edition.