Refutation of RCC scourge of Christian fundamentalists by Lambeth Quadrilateral (1888)
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Abstract: We evaluate the Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888 as minimal membership in the Historic Church. The Roman Catholic Church and Christian fundamentalists share the same non tautologous states, hence refuting claim of supremacy. These results form a non tautologous fragment of the universal logic VŁ4.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VŁ4 with Tautology as the designated proof value, F as contradiction, N as truthity (non-contingency), and C as falsity (contingency). The 16-valued truth table is row-major and horizontal, or repeating fragments of 128-tables, sometimes with table counts, for more variables. (See ersatz-systems.com.)

From: dcclothesline.com/2019/12/03/pope-francis-declares-that-christian-fundamentalists-are-a-scourge/

This logic question traces to when the Bishop of Rome, Francis, erroneously condemned Christian fundamentalists as scourge (2019). (The correct pastoral approach is to designate Christian fundamentalists as nominal Christians, with the hope of imminent induction into the fuller Historic Church.)

The Lambeth Quadrilateral resulted from the Anglican Synod in Chicago of 1888 where denomination membership in the Historic Church specified the four requirements of creeds (Nicene, Apostles, and Athanasian), two sacraments (baptism and holy communion), apostolic succession, and scripture (above tradition).

We write the conjecture of the minimal requirements of the Historic Church as:

If scripture above tradition implies the creeds, and the two sacraments imply apostolic succession, and scripture above tradition implies apostolic succession, and the creeds imply the two sacraments, then both scripture above tradition implies the two sacraments and the creeds imply apostolic succession.

(1.1)

We usually distribute quantifiers onto each designated variable.
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Remark 2.2: Because the Roman Catholic Church (RCC) places tradition above scripture, this schema is not tautological. The state of tradition not implying the creeds is borne out by injection of the filioque and in not inviting the Eastern Orthodox Church (EoC) to Nicea and adoption of Marian doctrines such as immaculate conception and bodily assumption. The state of tradition not implying the two sacraments is borne out by the doctrine of transubstantiation as an attempt to mechanize the operation of the Holy Ghost at epiclesis which by definition is a mystery and arguably a miracle, and further by the adoption of five more sacraments as holy orders, marriage, confession, confirmation, and unction.

The RCC labels any non-catholic denomination as protestant, used as a pejorative term to signal catholic superiority. While traditional Anglo Catholicism protests the detestable enormities of the Bishop of Rome, as do some Eastern Orthodox branches, both excommunicated by Rome, those denominations are nevertheless co-equal and universal parts of the Historic Church and not heir to supremacy by Rome.

If apostolic succession is excepted, then Eq. 1.1 maps as:

\[((((p>q)\&(r>\neg s))\&(p>\neg s)\&(q>r)))>((p>r)\&(q>s))\] ;
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
TTTT & TTTT & TTT & TTTT \\
\end{array}
\]

Remark 3.2: What is generally known as Christian fundamentalism ignores apostolic succession as non scriptural, which is denied by the monarchical structure of the Historic Church in the Book of Acts. Hence this schema is also not tautological.

What follows is that the fundamentalist minister does not confect literally the Body and Blood of Christ as a supernatural species but rather manufactures a token of periodic remembrance with any excess discarded into the waste system.

In fact, denial of infant baptism by some Christian fundamentalists is mapped in Eq. 4.2, and the assembly of a mission statement as a trendy rule of faith is mapped in Eq. 5.2.

If the two sacraments are excepted, then Eq. 1.1 maps as:

\[(((p>q)\&(\neg r>s))\&(p>s)\&(q>r)))>((p>r)\&(q>s))\] ;
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
TTTT & TTTT & TTTT & TTTT \\
\end{array}
\]

If the creeds are excepted, then Eq. 1.1 maps as:

\[(((\neg p>q)\&(r>s))\&(p>s)\&(\neg q>r)))>((p>r)\&(q>s))\] ;
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
TTTT & TTTT & TTTT & TTTT \\
\end{array}
\]

Eqs. 2.2-5.2 as rendered are not tautological. Eqs. 2.2 and 3.2 diverge more from tautology with two \(F\) values respectively than do 4.2 and 5.2 with one \(F\) value. This matches the relative non-tautology of the RCC with that of Christian fundamentalism. Hence the RCC is in no position to claim supreme status over Christian fundamentalists as scourge. In fact, the RCC is marginally as much of the Historic Church as are nominal Christian denominations anathematized by them.