

[“And the Woman Was Arrayed in Purple and Scarlet Colour...” – Revelation 17:4](#)




The woman of Revelation 17:4 arrayed in purple and scarlet is the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church, the bishops and cardinals.

[The Most Misunderstood Parts of the Olivet Discourse Explained!](#)



The Olivet Discourse in Matthew is so misunderstood because it transitions from the fall of Jerusalem up to verse 34 to the end of the world from verse 35!

[The Fatalism of Dispensationalism](#)



We don't have to accept the abuses of our constitutional liberties! We can pray that the Lord will defeat any government policy that is against our morals.

Martin Luther and the Protestant Reformation



The Protestant Reformation stands today as a testament to men's desire to find a greater understanding of the Scriptures and of God. The Protestant Reformation also stands as a reminder that when one omnipotent authority claims supremacy over the affairs of men, whether they be religious or secular, it is in the interest of all men to question where that authority is derived from, and whether it is just, and/or mistaken.

Five Basic Postulates Of Protestantism



Five basic differences between Bible following Christians and Roman Catholics.

God Is Not A Backstairs Politician



This article is from chapter 17 of “Out of the Labyrinth: The Conversion of a Roman Catholic Priest” by former Roman Catholic priest Leo Herbert Lehmann, first published in 1947 and made available online by The Lutheran Library Publishing Ministry LutheranLibrary.org. It’s good to share with Catholics. And if you were not raised a Catholic, it will give you insights about the Catholic mindset and why they pray to Mary and the saints.

I had to look up the meaning of the word “backstairs.” I don’t remember ever hearing it in conversation or reading it in print.

backstairs adjective

back·stairs 'bak-,sterz

1 : secret, furtive

Example: backstairs political deals

I FIND IT most difficult to convince Roman Catholic people that Christ has won for sinners the right of direct access to God. They always fall back on what their priests have taught them, that to obtain mercy and forgiveness they must cajole some saint, some close and favored friend of God to intercede for them. The most powerful intercessor of them all is Mary, since she, they say, is the actual mother of God.

A very sincere and devout Catholic woman once put it to me in the following way. “If you wanted an interview with President Truman,” she argued, “you would have to go first to some one else, his mother or some of his political friends, and ask them to intercede for you with the President and arrange for you to see him.” My answer was, of course, that that may be true as far as President Truman is concerned. “But it so happens,” I told her, “that President Truman is not God.”

This belief of Roman Catholics is in accord with their Church’s peculiar teaching that Jesus Christ brought only justice on earth, and that Mary and the other saints must be looked to for mercy. “Ye know very well, venerable brethren,” Pope Pius IX declares in one of his encyclicals, “that the whole of our confidence is placed in the most Holy Virgin, since God has placed in Mary the fullness of all good, that accordingly we may know that if there is any hope in us, if any grace, if any salvation, it redounds to us from her.”

From this extravagance it follows, in the eyes of Roman Catholics who are

taught in this way, that Mary and the saints have even more power to save than Christ. They come to believe that the saints can get them into heaven, literally, by the backstairs, even if they die before a priest can come to forgive them their sins. Saint Joseph, for instance, has been officially proclaimed by the Catholic Church as the "Patron of a Happy Death" This special work is given to him because he was the foster-father of Jesus Christ and because he died before Jesus left home to begin His ministry. He therefore had Our Lord and the Virgin Mary at his deathbed. As the husband of Mary, Joseph is believed to be very powerful as an intercessor with Jesus Christ, and can actually get sinners into heaven at the last minute even if they die without a priest to absolve them.

Priests go to extraordinary lengths to convince their congregations that devotion to Saint Joseph is the surest guarantee sinners can have of getting to heaven. They picture him as heaven's most powerful 'politician' who can obtain any favor he wants from God. I remember how a priest in Naples, Italy, once proved this in a sermon to his congregation. Here is the story he told (which is true in every detail according to what Catholics are taught about heaven, Jesus, Mary, Joseph, Saint Peter, Saint Michael and others there):

One day the Archangel Michael, the policeman of heaven, came to Saint Peter at the golden gates and said: "Look here, Peter! How is it that there are so many scoundrels in heaven who have no right to be here? Heaven is swarming with sinners who don't deserve a place even in Purgatory."

"Don't blame me, Michael," Peter replied. "Everyone knows my reputation as guardian of the heavenly gates. You know I would never let even a Pope get in unless I'm sure first that all his sins are forgiven and that he has served his full time in Purgatory. But since you've asked me a straight question I'll give you a straight answer, if you'll come with me after I've closed up the gates for the night."

They met as appointed and Peter led the way around the outer walls of the Celestial City to where the house of the 'Holy Family' was situated, high up against one of the battlements, and from the back window of which the Holy Family – Mary, Joseph and the infant Jesus – could look down and see everything that takes place on earth.

It was a bright moonlit night and Peter drew Michael down behind some shrubbery and told him to wait and see what would happen. After a little while, they heard what seemed like pebbles being thrown against the window overlooking the wall. In less than a minute the window was opened, and a rope was let down and pulled up again. At the end of the rope was one of the disreputable sinners whom Michael had complained about.

They waited until the sinner was hauled in and the window shut. "Now," said Peter triumphantly to the amazed Archangel, "There's your answer!"

Next morning early, Michael, dressed in his best official uniform,

and with a very determined look on his face, knocked at the door of the Holy Family's house. Mary opened the door and called to Joseph and the Child Jesus to welcome their distinguished visitor. He took a seat and in a tone of the sternest dignity turned to Joseph and said: "Joseph, I've found out what has been going on here every night, and I would fail in my sacred duty if I did not tell you that your practice of getting sinners into heaven by your back window must stop at once!"

"I'm sorry, Your Highness," Joseph replied with a guilty look, "but I'm publicized on earth as the last refuge of dying sinners. I've furthermore been proclaimed 'Patron of the Universal Church,' and I've solemnly promised to get poor sinners into heaven by hook or by crook who are faithful in their devotion to me during life. I simply can't refuse their appeals and let them go to hell. My position and reputation as husband of Mary and the foster-father of Jesus Christ are at stake."

Michael rose from his chair, and drawing himself up to his full archangelic height, decisively replied:

"There can be no exceptions to the eternal and immutable justice of the Almighty God whose stem commands I am appointed to carry out to the letter. Since the day I hurled Lucifer and his rebellious angels from these same ramparts of heaven I've been entrusted with the duty of keeping sinners out of it, and seeing that the laws of the Almighty are rigidly enforced."

"In that case," Joseph meekly replied, "I can no longer stay in heaven. I must go elsewhere and try to keep my promises to poor dying sinners."

As Joseph moved to the door, Mary ran to him and clutched his arm. Turning to the unbending Archangel, she said: "Joseph is my lawful husband, and if he goes I go too, and then there will be no Queen in heaven!" Michael was taken back at this thought, and tried to find words to meet this unexpected situation. But before he could think of anything appropriate to say, the Child Jesus spoke and said: "And if my mother goes I will have to go too, and then you'll have no God in heaven either."

This was too much, even for the Archangel Michael, and knowing himself defeated, he bowed himself out of the house with as much dignity as he could muster.


"And that is the reason why," this Neapolitan priest told his listeners, "no one who practices devotion to Saint Joseph during life will fail to get into heaven."

There are some, even non-Catholics, who will say this is a very realistic and human way of preaching to ignorant people who cannot read and write or

understand the things of God in the words of the Gospel. But is this sufficient excuse for the Roman Catholic Church which has been the sole, undisputed teacher of Christian people for more than fifteen centuries? The Roman Catholic Church insists to this day on being the sole interpreter of the Bible, its Pope the infallible mouthpiece of God. It could as easily have taught the people the truth from the New Testament which records Christ as saying (John 10:9): "I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture." Or again (John 14:6): "I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me." Or again (Acts 4:12): "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

But doing so would have meant the scrapping of its many shrines, saint-devotions and novenas, which are financially so profitable.

Religion As A System Of Power




Religion can uplift its devotees only if its worship is upward, if the image and object of its devotion are above the level of man. It is an historic fact that religions which have descended to the deification of creatures, whether of men or animals, have degraded, enslaved and impoverished their believers.

Counterfeit Christianity



To discover those who destroy true Christian teaching, you must look behind the banner of Christ they brazenly flourish. In this way you can expect to find the Antichrist usurping the place of Christ.

[The Tyranny Of Priestly Celibacy](#)



At ordination secular priests merely signify that they accept the Church's condition for ordination that they will not get legally married. They take no vow of chastity, that is, they make no explicit promise to refrain from sexual relations.

[Papal Abuse of Power](#)



The Apostle Peter plainly decreed that the method of governing the Christian Church must not be patterned after that of Caesar. The popes of Rome totally disregard Peter's admonition.

Evangelical Movements Within The Church Of Rome



I was offline for a week to get a broken bone fixed. Now I'm back to work!

This article is from chapter 31 of "Out of the Labyrinth: The Conversion of a Roman Catholic Priest" by former Roman Catholic priest Leo Herbert Lehmann, first published in 1947 and made available online by The Lutheran Library Publishing Ministry LutheranLibrary.org.

Leo Herbert Lehmann (1895-1950) was an Irish author, editor, and director of a Protestant ministry, Christ's Mission in New York. **He was a priest in the Roman Catholic Church who later in life converted to Protestantism** and served as the editor of The Converted Catholic Magazine. He authored magazine articles, books and pamphlets, condemning the programs and activities of the Roman Catholic Church. (Quoted from Wikipedia)

I'm posting this chapter because it has encouraging information I have never heard from anyone before, testimonials from members of the Catholic church including priests and nuns who had true saving faith in the grace of Jesus Christ but who remained in the Church.

CAN ROMAN CATHOLICS BE SAVED without breaking with their Church? Are there any Evangelical Christian believers within the Roman Catholic Church? These are questions which deserve, and require, extended answers.

It is **not generally known that movements toward acceptance of Evangelical Christian beliefs have always existed within the Roman Catholic Church** – both before and after the Reformation. Protestants have been so engrossed with the history of their own Church since the Reformation that they know little of

the struggles toward the revival of Evangelical Christianity within the Church of Rome since the sixteenth century. Because of this, **Protestants today have lost perspective of their own teachings**, and a necessary sense of contrast between the Gospel teaching which they believe, and the opposite erroneous teaching and practice of Roman Catholicism from which the early Protestants broke away. These early Protestants saw that contrast etched in all its clarity because **they knew both sides**.

The shining of a bright light on a dark object shows up its true condition. In the same way, the actual doctrinal state of Roman Catholicism is fully seen only when justification of sinners through faith in the finished sacrifice of Christ is definitely and fully preached against the background of the errors of Roman Catholicism. For **the main dividing line in the struggle of Roman Catholicism against Evangelical Christianity is drawn between their opposing views as to how the grace of salvation comes to the souls of men**. It is upon this ground that the Jesuits have fought their Counter-Reformation – not only against Protestants, but **also against those who have tried to reassert Evangelical teaching within the Roman Church itself** after the example of the Protestant reformers of the sixteenth century.

Three-Cornered Conflict

There have been, in fact, not just two but three sides to the religious struggle during the four centuries since the Reformation – between Protestantism and Jesuit Catholicism on the one hand, and Jesuit Catholicism and Evangelical factions within the Roman Church itself, on the other. The Jesuits have been as harsh and uncompromising against those who opposed them from within their own Church, as against the Protestants from the outside. It is sad to have to admit that today, there is little, if any, life left in Evangelical movements within the Church of Rome. The Jesuits have succeeded, almost completely, in crushing out the remnants of criticism in the Catholic Church of their teaching about grace and the means of salvation. Their **Pelagian doctrine of salvation by works of man** himself, with all it implies in their moral theology and devotional practices, is now almost universally accepted or reluctantly acquiesced in by the universal Roman Catholic Church.

(**Note:** Pelagianism is a set of beliefs associated with the British monk Pelagius (circa AD 354–420), who taught in Rome in the late fourth and early fifth centuries. Pelagius denied the doctrines of original sin and total depravity. According to his theology, people are not naturally sinful, but can live holy lives in harmony with God's will and thereby **earn salvation through good works**.)

The very fury of Jesuit opposition to the Gospel teaching of salvation by faith, as reasserted by Luther, Calvin, and other sixteenth century reformers, has led to the denial today in Roman Catholic teaching of almost every truth upon which the Gospel teaching about the grace of salvation rests.

Council Of Trent

But it was not so within the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation, and even within the Council of Trent (held between 1545 and 1563) itself, which was convened shortly thereafter for the special purpose of resisting the Evangelical teachings of the Protestant reformers. Many Roman Catholic churchmen in that council maintained that the only way to stop Luther and his associates from causing a rift in the Christian Church was **open opposition from the Church of Rome itself against the Pelagian error of the Jesuits**, and a firm declaration of salvation full and free by acceptance of the grace of God through the merits alone of Jesus Christ.

Had these Catholic spokesmen been listened to, the history of Christianity from that day to this would have been different. But the Jesuits triumphed in the Council of Trent on this vital question, as they did in the Vatican Council of 1870 on the question of Papal Infallibility. They have now this latter weapon of undisputed papal power with which to whip everyone – priests, bishops and laity alike – within the Roman Church into blind acceptance of their peculiar teaching about salvation and their devotional practices.

In the Council of Trent the Archbishop of Sienna, two bishops and five others, fought long and hard against the Jesuits by upholding justification simply and solely by the merits of Christ through faith. The English Cardinal Pole, who presided at the Council in the absence of Pope Paul III, also entreated those assembled not to reject this doctrine simply because it was held by Martin Luther. But the Jesuits – through their spokesmen Lainez and Salmeron – were adamant against even a compromise, and in the end secured adoption of the long list of Tridentine canons and anathemas that were finally pronounced against Protestant Evangelical teaching. Cardinal Pole and the Archbishop of Sienna left the Council in despair. So bitterly has the Jesuit Lainez been hated by Catholic anti-Jesuit writers that they have gone so far as to interpret Rev. 9:1, as if he were the fallen star who let loose the scorpion-locusts – the Jesuits – on the world.

Rift Within Catholicism

But the opponents of the Jesuits in the Catholic Church itself did not submit at once after the Council of Trent. The fight went on, continually at first, intermittently ever since. The Jesuits' chief opponents on the teaching about grace have been the *Dominicans*, and to this day a wide rift still exists between these two Orders in the Church of Rome, in spite of apparent unity from the outside. The Dominicans follow their great theologian St. Thomas Aquinas, who adopted a watered-down interpretation of Augustine's teaching on grace as an entirely free gift of God, and put it in his medieval syllogistic form. This is enough in the eyes of the Jesuits to brand them as 'Calvinistic.' Few people today know of this serious rift within the Roman Catholic Church, or stop to think that it is actually wider than any doctrinal difference separating the denominations of Protestantism.

The conflict concerning the nature of grace was openly continued between the Jesuits and Dominicans till the end of the sixteenth century, and on into the

seventeenth. In 1596, Pope Clement VIII consented to hear both sides and promised to give a decision. No less than sixty-five meetings and thirty-seven disputations were held on the subject in his presence. Pope Clement himself seems, from his writings, to have favored the Dominican side, but he put off giving a decision. The so-called infallible mouthpiece of God could not decide the most vital question of Christian teaching, on the question that really matters in the whole gamut of Christian doctrine: the truth about how men can be saved!

Pope Clement's hesitation can easily be explained. **The Jesuits by then had become, not only powerful, but violent and dangerous.** They had made themselves the great political prop of the Roman Church that had been shaken to its foundations in the principal countries of Europe. They went so far as to threaten the Pope himself, since they counted on having King Henry IV of France on their side. Pope Clement was also well aware that the political power of the papacy at that time was on the wane, threatened by Protestant England under Queen Elizabeth on one side, and by Protestant Germany, the Netherlands, and Scandinavia on the other. He was advised by the astute French Cardinal du Perron to leave matters as they were, since even a Protestant could subscribe to the doctrines of the Dominicans.

The dispute was continued under Pope Paul V, who became Pope in 1605. Seventeen meetings were held in his presence, but he too failed to condemn the Jesuits. Venice at that time was at war with the papacy, and the Jesuits fought so well for the Pope that they suffered expulsion by the Catholic rulers and people of the Venetian Republic rather than yield to the Pope's enemies. It thus seemed more important to the Pope to please the Jesuits than to uphold the most vital doctrine of the Christian Church. In the end Pope Paul issued the Bull *Unigenitus*, in which he promised that a decision would be published "at the proper time," and that in the meantime, neither side was to malign the other. And so it remains to this day in the Roman Catholic Church: **no official decision has ever been made as to how the grace of salvation comes to the souls of men!**

Jesuits Vs. Dominicans

This was a triumph for the Jesuits, and they have used it to great advantage ever since against both Protestants and those within the Roman Church who would dare to dispute their Pelagian doctrine of grace.

They have ruthlessly crushed any priest, bishop or even pope who seemed to veer in any way to the doctrine of the Reformation, namely that we can do no good works acceptable to God without the grace of God through Christ 'preventing' us; that the will to good, and the works we perform as a result of this good will, are all a free gift of God.

This was the teaching of Augustine against Pelagius and his followers, which was revived by the Protestant reformers. The Dominicans have always tended to this Augustinian doctrine of grace because St. Thomas Aquinas incorporated some of Augustine's teachings about grace into his *Summa Theologica*. But even **the Dominicans never have dared to carry Augustine's teaching to its logical conclusion, as Calvin did, since it would have led to the complete rejection**

of papal power. The Jesuits have made sure to this day that the Dominicans would never be allowed to go so far. But certain sections of the Roman Church are still accused by the Jesuits as "tainted" with Calvinism because of their advocacy even of the watered-down teachings of Augustine as expounded chiefly by the Dominican theologians.

A particular instance of this may be seen in the fact that most Roman Catholic priests, especially of the Dominican order, who renounce the Church of Rome join up with the Presbyterian Church and ministry. Two examples recently noted by *The Converted Catholic Magazine* are Rev. Dr. George Barrois, formerly a Dominican priest and professor at Catholic University in Washington, D. C., now a Presbyterian minister and Professor at Princeton Seminary, and Rev. J. A. Fernandez, for sixteen years a priest of the Dominican Order, now a Presbyterian pastor in Philadelphia.

The most notable example of the opposition to Jesuit Pelagianism is that of the Jansenists, who publicly professed their belief in the Evangelical teaching of salvation and justification by faith alone in the merits of Jesus Christ, but who still steadfastly continued within the Church of Rome. The suffering they endured from the Jesuits, the wonderful example and encouragement they supplied to those within the Roman Church who secretly resented the domination of the Jesuits, should give hope that it may not yet be too late for a second Reformation within the Church of Rome in our day.

Jansenius

The Jansenists got their name from Cornelius Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, who was born in 1585 and died of the plague in 1638, after being bishop for only two years. It was only after his death that his opposition to the Pelagian teaching of the Jesuits became known. But for many years he had made it his business to study the writings of Augustine on the vital subjects of grace, free will and human impotence, original sin, election, faith, etc. Whereas Calvin used Augustine's teaching on these subjects to oppose the whole nature and structure of Roman Catholicism, Jansenius used it only for one immediate object – to check the rising power of the Jesuits and their false teachings within the Church of Rome. His object was not to undermine the Roman Catholic Church as a whole, but to save it from complete corruption in matters of faith and morals.

He put his findings in a book, entitled, *Augustinus*, which was published in Louvain two years after his death and was made the chief weapon by his followers to save the Catholic Church from the evil influence of the Jesuits. For there were many within the Church of Rome at that time who sighed for some real spirituality and who, like Bishop Jansenius, **found in the doctrine of salvation by grace, even though only partially and imperfectly apprehended, a great solace and an assurance** which the ritualistic observances of the Church of Rome could not supply.

Jesuit Opposition To Grace

That was before the blight of Jesuitism had descended completely on the Roman Catholic Church as we find it today. But the Jesuits were then, a hundred

years after their Order was founded, rapidly consolidating their power by their lax system of casuistry and other teachings which deadened the conscience. They had by then introduced themselves everywhere as confessors, and had gained great influence by softening all ideas of guilt. Their main purpose was to introduce into Catholic teaching the exclusion of real repentance before God as a prerequisite for forgiveness of sin. In this way salvation would become entirely dependent upon the priest, to the ultimate advantage of the Jesuits themselves – who have always aimed to make themselves the ruling caste of priests in the church of Rome. They have achieved this objective today, and hold the whip hand not only in religious matters, but also as the high political rulers of the Vatican.

What the Jesuits most abhorred, and continue today to abhor, is the true Christian teaching of justification of sinners through faith in the one finished sacrifice of Christ, and repentance for sin directly toward God. They were quick to see the danger to their aims in Jansenius' book, *Augustinus*, which upheld this true Christian teaching. They therefore had the book banned, and began by venting their enmity on Jean Baptiste du Vergier de Hauranne – better known as St. Cyran, after the monastery of that name of which he was abbot. St. Cyran had secretly studied the doctrine of grace together with Jansenius at Louvain. He was also connected with the celebrated Abbey of Port Royal in France, a community of nuns which had grown very lax in discipline and morals. Yet, it was through this French convent that what is known as "Jansenism" began, and which for almost seventy-five years carried on its remarkable fight to rid the Catholic Church of the perverse teachings and control of the Jesuits. The cruel methods used by the Jesuits to crush out the Jansenists were equalled only by the atrocities of the Nazi Gestapo in our time. **The inmates of Port Royal and their friends were hounded, brutally persecuted, excommunicated, and jailed, because they professed, above all else, the Evangelical doctrines of justification by grace.**

Port Royal

There are two things about the nuns of Port Royal and their friends that Protestants and Catholics alike today may well be amazed at. One was that they persisted in remaining within the Church of Rome while professing absolute faith in the saving grace of Jesus Christ alone. They strenuously objected to being called Protestants.

The second extraordinary fact is that the abbey of Port Royal, which was to become the great champion of this Evangelical teaching, was so lax in discipline in 1602, that Mother Angelique – under whose later guidance Jansenism thrived there – was appointed abbess when she was but a girl of eleven years old. The church authorities in France and her family connived at this, and had her certified as abbess by the Pope, by pretending she was seventeen!¹

How thoroughly Evangelical the inmates of Port Royal later became – while still remaining within the body of the Roman Catholic Church – may be judged from the story of the last prioress, Mother Dumesnil Courtinaux, as she lay on her dying bed. Port Royal had been finally suppressed and uprooted by the

Pope eight years previously, but this last Mother prioress still retained her faith in salvation by grace alone. But she desired to die in good standing in the Catholic Church and begged for the last sacraments. The Bishop of Blois came but refused to administer the sacraments to her, unless she first renounced her faith in the saving grace of Christ. But she remained steadfast in her Evangelical faith.

“What will you do when you have to appear before God, bearing the weight of your sins alone?” the bishop asked her.

The dying prioress replied: “Having made peace through the blood of His cross, my Saviour has reconciled all things unto Himself in the body of His flesh through death, to present us holy and unblameable and unreprouvable in His sight, if we continue in the faith grounded and settled, and not be moved away from the hope of the Gospel.”

She then added, with clasped hands, “In Thee, O Lord, have I trusted, nor wilt Thou suffer the creature that trusts in Thee to be confounded.” The bishop reviled her, but she meekly urged, with tears, that she be permitted to receive the sacraments. He firmly rejected her plea as coming from a “confirmed heretic.”

“Well, my Lord,” she replied, wiping her eyes, “I am content to bear with resignation whatever deprivation my God sees fit. I am convinced that His divine grace can supply even the want of sacraments.”

She fell asleep in the Lord that same night, March 18, 1716, in her seventieth year. Such was the Evangelical spirit of the followers of Jansenius at Port Royal.²

Sufferings And Persecutions

The abbess Mere Angelique brought about an Evangelical reformation not only at Port Royal, at the head of which she had been so strangely placed at the age of eleven, but also in many others, such as the rich abbey of Maubuisson, which also had become very corrupt. A group of men famous for their scholarship and piety also became her disciples. Among them may be mentioned Pascal, Le Maitre, Quesnel, Lancelot, Le Maitre de Sacy, Nicole and Singlin.

No fewer than four popes – Urban VII, Innocent X, Alexander VII, and Clement XI – fulminated bulls of excommunication, at the instigation of the Jesuits, against these defenders of Evangelical teachings. They had also against them King Louis XIV of France and his infamous mistress, Madame de Maintenon, Cardinal Richelieu and Cardinal Mazarin. Four French bishops favored and tried to help them. The Dominicans, the Franciscans, and the Benedictines, who to this day still timidly oppose the Jesuits on the teaching of grace, defended the Jansenists of Port Royal as much as they dared. But all the power of the Church of Rome and the King of France was in the hands of the Jesuits, and they used it mercilessly to wipe out every trace of the Jansenists and their Gospel teaching of salvation which they detested and condemned as an “abominable heresy.”

Finally, on July 11, 1709, Cardinal de Noailles, archbishop of Paris, was forced by the Pope and the Jesuits to order the complete suppression of the abbey of Port Royal. On the following October 29, the valley was filled with the king's troops, the abbey taken over and the nuns arrested and placed in confinement. The following year the cloister was pulled down; in 1711 the bodies of those buried there were dug up with gross brutality and indecency; two years later the church itself was destroyed. Cardinal de Noailles had ordered it all done according to the bull, *Vineam Domini*, of Pope Clement XI, in which he attacked the doctrines of grace. The cardinal later repented of his deed, and made a visit to the ruins of Port Royal, where on bended knees, he made public testimony of repentance for his weakness. After the death of King Louis XIV and his mistress, Cardinal de Noailles interceded for the imprisoned nuns of Port Royal and had them released.

Jansenism continued in Holland and other countries of Europe after the destruction of Port Royal. Ranke, the historian, says of the Jansenists: "We find traces of them in Vienna and in Brussels, in Spain and Portugal, and in every part of Italy. They disseminated their doctrines throughout all Roman Catholic Christendom, sometimes openly, often in secret."³

But it was in the Protestant country of Holland that they found best shelter and most freedom. It was there that they were able to organize into a regular Church body under their own bishops. Almost all the Roman Catholics in Holland, to the number of 330,000, at the end of the seventeenth century were Jansenists. The Jesuits had little power there, and they themselves had gone so far in their intrigues and immoral teachings that Pope Clement XIV – who had Jansenist sentiments – yielded to the demands of the Catholic countries of Europe and completely abolished the Jesuits in 1773.

Catholics Today (1947)

Today also there are many sensitive souls within the Roman Catholic Church who sigh for true spirituality and an assurance of salvation that their priests cannot offer. They fear, however, to break with their Church, and continue to accept the sacraments in order to remain in good standing. Strictly speaking, there is nothing in Roman Catholic teaching to prevent Roman Catholics from professing secretly (*in foro internet*) their faith in the absolute saving power of the Gospel. What is forbidden, under pain of excommunication, is the public profession (*in foro extemo*) of such belief.

Thus a Roman Catholic who comes to the true knowledge of Christ, is faced with making the decision of either risking excommunication and the opprobrium of his family and friends by openly professing and demonstrating his faith in Christ as all-sufficient Saviour, or avoiding the penalties by keeping it secret in his heart while conforming outwardly to the rules and ritual as commanded by his Church. But today in America, where freedom of religion is guaranteed to all, no one can be excused if he fails to profess openly his faith in Jesus Christ, who warns (Matt. 10:33): "Whosoever shall deny me before men, him also will I deny before my Father which is in heaven."

1. See, *The Jansenists, Their Rise, Persecutions by the Jesuits, and Remnants*, by S. P. Tregelles, London, 1851.↵

2.cf. The Jansenists, ut supra, pp. 40-41.↵

3.Op. cit. p. 45.↵

Jesuit Disinformation Agents



Jesuit disinformation is rife on the Internet. The Jesuits are the leaders of the Catholic Counter-Reformation. Their goal is to destroy Bible-based Christianity in the USA and the world. It's no surprise, therefore, when some people are actively working to divert attention from the Jesuits and call Satan's work on earth a "Jewish-Masonic cryptocracy."

I'm thinking specifically now about a guy named Timothy Fitzpatrick of fitzinfo.net which has the tagline "Exposing the Judeo-masonic-Bolshevist conspiracy." He mocks conspiracy researchers who point to the Jesuits as the movers and shakers of conspiracies that destabilize societies and calls them, "naïve dupes." He specifically criticizes honest truth-telling conspiracy researchers such as Alexander Hislop, Walter J. Veith, Christian J. Pinto, Tupper Saussy, David Wilcock and Sherman Skolnick whose articles are on this website. But Fitzpatrick exposes himself when he writes such things as,

Documentary filmmaker Christian J. Pinto of Adullam Films pulls out all the tired old slanders against **the Church**—all for the advancement of the **Jewish-Protestant alliance**...

and,

Pinto is your typical Zionist shill accusing the Vatican of everything the world has known for 500-plus years that the Jews are responsible for. Make no mistake, the Vatican is now an agent of the Judeo-Masonic conspiracy, thanks to Jews and masons subverting **the Church**, especially during the buildup to the Protestant Reformation and the French Revolution, culminating in the Jewish-sponsored Second Vatican Council in the 1960s. But **the true Church remains within the fractured Vatican** as well as in the Eastern Orthodox Church. **Protestantism has and always will be a Jewish perversion**, a cheap imitation of the Church of Christ, right down to the sexually depraved Waledensians and Albigensians, whom Pinto specifically defends, giving away his Puritan bias. (Ref:

<https://fitzinfo.net/2014/04/01/christian-j-pinto-zionist-shill-espousing-what-else-jesuit-conspiracy-theories/>)

Wow! Timothy Fitzpatrick is obviously identifying “the Church” as the Roman Catholic Church. And he’s calling Protestantism – which is really only Bible-based faith in Jesus Christ – a “Jewish perversion, a cheap imitation of the Church of Christ.” And he’s falsely accusing of wrongdoing the Waledensians and Albigensians. These are groups of Christians the Catholic Church charged with heresy and *murdered* just because they would not acknowledge the Pope as their spiritual leader. Who else would say such things but a Jesuit, a Catholic priest, or a hard-core traditional Catholic?

Who exactly is Timothy Fitzpatrick? He doesn’t give his bio on his website. If he did, we might find out some incriminating things about his biases such as what schools he attended. For all we know, Fitzpatrick may even be a Jesuit or a Catholic priest. Fitzpatrick is an Irish name. Many Irish are Catholics.

I believe the primary source of Neo-Nazi antisemitic rhetoric is the Roman Catholic Church. It’s very convenient for the Jesuits to deflect blame of the evils they are doing away from themselves and say, “The Jews did it!”

Don’t get me wrong, I’m not saying all Jews are guiltless. Any Jew who purposely rejects Jesus as the Son of God and Messiah is an antichrist according to 2 John 1:7. What I am saying is the Jesuits are using the Jews as scapegoats to deflect blame from themselves and the Vatican. Former Catholic priest Leo H. Lehmann gives pretty convincing evidence that the Protocols of the Elders of Zion was written by Jesuits, not Jews!

Articles about that:

- [Evidence of Jesuit authorship of the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion](#)
- [Authors of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion – Jews? Or Jesuits!](#)

If anybody has any further evidence of the Jesuits / Catholic Church as the source of antisemitism, please share it in the comments section.

[William Tyndale’s Concept of the Church](#)



A regular visitor of this website suggested that I post testimonials of the martyrs and saints to inspire us all. The first person that came to mind was William Tyndale.

Quotes about Tyndale from https://www.worldhistory.org/William_Tyndale/

William Tyndale (1494-1536) was a talented English linguist, scholar and priest who was the first to translate the Bible into English. Tyndale objected to the Catholic Church's control of scripture in Latin and the prohibition against an English translation. His work formed the basis of all other English translations of the Bible up through the modern era.

Tyndale is recognized as the first to translate the Bible into English, rather than Wycliffe, because he worked from the original languages, not just the Latin translation, as Wycliffe had done.

Tyndale moved about to maintain safety after Henry VIII (r. 1509-1547) called for his arrest and was well-protected by wealthy merchants in Antwerp when he was betrayed by Henry Phillips, a man he thought was his friend, and imprisoned. He was executed by strangulation and his body burned at the stake in October 1536. Three years later, the English version of the Bible completed by his colleague Myles Coverdale (l. 1488-1569) was published in England with the king's approval. Tyndale and Coverdale are both honored in the present day as the first to translate the Bible into English even though it is acknowledged that Coverdale largely developed Tyndale's earlier work.

The following is a repost from <https://www.christianstudylibrary.org/article/william-tyndales-concept-church>

Introduction

A significant contribution to the reformation of the church in England was William Tyndale's translation of the Bible. With no support and little assistance, Tyndale produced an edition of the New Testament in 1526, and published translations of parts of the Old Testament from 1530 until 1534. Having profited from Luther's German translation and the writings of other continental reformers, Tyndale provided a version superior to the one by John Wycliffe. The Romanist clergy, however, noting that Tyndale's translation excluded words that were associated with such customs as penance, ceremonies,

and confession to priests, decried the work as "*poison in the vulgar tongue.*" And the college of bishops claimed that Tyndale's version would infect the laity with the "*sickness of heresy.*" For it saw that Tyndale avoided vocabulary which papal decrees and other authorized documents had used to promote Romanist practices. In fact, wherever it was possible, Tyndale translated the original Greek and Hebrew with English words which had not been forced into false usage by Roman Catholicism.

It is not surprising that Tyndale's translation received much criticism from the Roman Catholic bishops. Especially Thomas More, who was the spokesman for English Roman Catholicism, inveighed against Tyndale.

In 1529 More wrote a treatise, the *Dialogue Concerning Heresies and Matters of Religion*, in which he attacked the vocabulary of the new English Bible. More chided Tyndale for "mistranslating" several words of theological importance: the translator used "love" instead of "charity" for the Greek word *agape*, "senior" or "elder" instead of "priest" for *presbyteros*, and "repentance" instead of "penance" for the Greek *metanoia*. As one biographer observes, More declared Tyndale guilty of deliberately replacing theological terms with words not normally used by theologians.² And More tried to show that by means of these "radical" translations Tyndale was subverting the authority of the church and its doctrines.

Tyndale was obliged to reply to More, and he published *An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue* in 1531 to defend the vocabulary of his edition.³ The debate between the two scholars was more than academic bickering, for as W. Clebsch notes, "resistance to More's attacks on certain words was for Tyndale philological and literary but above all *theological.*"⁴ The upshot of More's arguments was that Tyndale's translation was unauthorized, not sanctioned by the Roman Catholic church. With its unorthodox vocabulary, the English edition posed a threat to the authority of the church. More and Tyndale knew that the new translation of the Bible could become a powerful tool in the hands of the reformers. And More intended to halt the spreading of Tyndale's Bible by criticizing it forcefully.

One word in the new translation which annoyed More considerably was "congregation." Tyndale preferred this word to "church" as a rendering of the Greek *ekklesia* and the Hebrew *qahal* and *edah*. Herein Tyndale was following the lead given by Martin Luther's translation of the Bible into German, in which Luther had avoided the word *Kirche*, preferring instead *Gemeinde*. Both reformers wished to avoid a word which in the popular mind referred to the so-called Holy Roman Church. Yet Tyndale's reasons for avoiding "church" were not merely epigonal, but were based upon his own observations of the government of the church in England, and of spiritual life. After all, it was for the English ploughboy that Tyndale had laboured.

As we investigate Tyndale's concept of the church, we must bear in mind that Tyndale is noted as a translator, not as a theologian. Unlike some of the continental reformers, he did not produce a systematic theology in which the doctrine of the church is exhaustively expounded. His statements about the church are unconnected, and little effort is made therein to link ecclesiology to other doctrines. For the doctrine of the church, Reformed

readers are accustomed to turn to Book Four of Calvin's *Institutes*, to Articles 27-30 of the *Belgic Confession*, and to other Reformed confessions. However, because Tyndale was forced to defend, among other things, his translation of *ekklesia* with "congregation," he did write extensively about the church.

An examination of the concept of the church as it was formulated by one of the first English reformers will prove fruitful. Tyndale's writings reflect many scriptural ideas formulated by the continental reformers, especially Martin Luther. Whenever he deemed the thoughts of the other reformers sound, he incorporated them into his own writings, sometimes adapting them to the English setting. Tyndale was influenced also by other writers; John Hus, Huldrych Zwingli, and the followers of Wycliffe, the so-called Lollards, are but a few.⁵ Yet Tyndale does display his own concept of the church, especially as he was forced to develop it in his translation of the Bible. The purpose of this article is to reveal Tyndale's reasons for using "congregation" and not "church" in his English translation of the Bible, and to make some observations about Tyndale's concept of the church. I shall also note those features in Tyndale's ecclesiology which strike me as particularly Reformed, and shall offer some criticism of his ideas. Perhaps an appreciation for Tyndale's writings on the church will serve to sharpen our knowledge of a doctrine which remains relevant at the close of the twentieth century.

Why Tyndale does not use "Church" in his Translations

As we might expect from a translator, Tyndale begins his *Answer* with an exposition of the meaning and usage of the word "church" in sixteenth century England. Tyndale observes that the word is used in different senses, and that some of these were promoted falsely by the Roman Catholic clergy to its own advantage. Since the word "church" may mislead the reader, Tyndale does not use it in his translation.

First Tyndale treats the literal meaning of the word "church":

it signifies a place or house, whither the Christian people were wont in the old time to resort ... to hear the word of doctrine, the law of God, and the faith of our Saviour Jesus Christ.⁶

In short, "church" denotes the building in which the Word of God was preached. Tyndale goes on to describe the church building as it functioned before Roman Catholicism altered it.

In the ancient church building the minister preached the pure Word of God only, and prayed in a tongue that all men understood ... and of him (all) learned to pray at home and everywhere, and to instruct every man his household (11).

Tyndale makes it clear that the function which the building performed in

former times was unlike that of the sixteenth century building. He states that for his contemporaries "church" no longer implies the place where the true Gospel is proclaimed. Indeed, he complains that in the so-called church of his age only voices without meaning are heard, and "*we be fallen into such ignorance, that we know of the mercy and promises, which are in Christ, nothing at all*" (11).

Tyndale avoids "church" in his translation because an important connotation of the word – the true preaching of the Gospel – is absent. Although he does not state so explicitly, Tyndale notes that one of the marks of the true church is lacking to the sixteenth century Romanist church. And as an advocate for reform, Tyndale is annoyed that Roman Catholicism had deprived "church" of this fundamental characteristic. It is unfortunate, however, that Tyndale overlooks the fact that the true church of Christ exists beyond human observation. Perhaps the decrepit state of the church in Tyndale's time caused the reformer to think that the true church was not to be found in England. But we may say that the church which preached the gospel of Christ did exist and would always exist: the Word of God is everlasting. Careful and accurate use of the word "church" is therefore appropriate.

Tyndale also avoids "church" in his translation because it had come to signify the Romanist clergy, which he describes pejoratively as "*a multitude of shaven, shorn, and oiled.*" According to this apparently common usage the word could refer to the pope, cardinals, legates, bishops, abbots, or monks; indeed, to "*a thousand names of blasphemy and hypocrisies*" (12). In everyday parlance the entire hierarchy within Roman Catholicism was referred to by the word "church." Tyndale offers many examples of this usage; one must suffice. He quotes a commonly heard saying:

You must believe in holy church [i.e. the clergymen], and do as they teach you (12).

Tyndale avoids translating the Greek *ekklesia* or Hebrew *qahal* with "church," because the reader may get the impression that the existence of numerous Roman Catholic orders is justified by the word "church" in Scripture. Tyndale does not want to give this impression to the innocent reader who may not know that the Bible does not speak of monks, or abbots, or even of popes.

"Church" was used in the sixteenth century as an inclusive term for all those who *call* themselves Christians, "*though their faith be naught, or though they have no faith at all*" (13).⁷ Just as "Christendom" is used in modern times to designate all those who call themselves Christians, so too the word "church" was used in the sixteenth century as a popular term for those who considered themselves Christians, although their thoughts, words and actions perhaps proved otherwise. Again, Tyndale suggests that the writers of the Bible did not employ the word for church in this sense; therefore he excludes "church" from his translation.

Tyndale also points out that the word "*has, or should have, another signification: a congregation; a multitude or a company gathered together in*

one, of all degrees of people" (12). In this sense "church" refers to the people who are gathered together. And according to Tyndale the nature of that congregation is seen by *"the circumstances thereof."* There may be a holy, righteous congregation, and there may be an ungodly, impious congregation. This distinction is based upon the two uses of *ekklesia* in the New Testament, as Tyndale himself knows well. Like the continental reformers, Tyndale uses Acts 19:32, 39, 41 (where the assembly in Ephesus is called *ekklesia*) as prooftexts that *ekklesia* is not used only to denote an assembly of Christians.

Tyndale explains what he means by a company of ... all degrees of people": "church" is used for "the whole multitude of all them that receive the name of Christ to believe in him and *not for the clergy only* (12).

To the modern reader Tyndale may seem to be stating the obvious, but in sixteenth century England many were led to believe that the church comprised only the Roman Catholic clergy. Tyndale struggles against the misappropriation of the term by one elite group. He offers a host of scriptural evidence which shows that *ekklesia* refers to the body of *all* believers. One text in which we read that the church comprises both the laity and the clergy is Galatians 1:13, where Paul writes that he had persecuted the church of God. Tyndale explains that Paul had tried to destroy *"not the preachers only, but all that believed generally"* (13). Comparing Scripture with Scripture, Tyndale adduces Acts 22:4 as further proof that Paul uses *ekklesia* in Galatians 1 to denote all the members of the church. For there he writes about his persecution of *"men and women"* of the church. Space prevents the discussion of all the other texts which Tyndale mentions in his condemnation of the restrictive use of "church." But the attention which Tyndale paid to this matter reveals to what extent the Roman Catholic hierarchy had appropriated for itself the word "church," and how it had excluded a vast number of believers.

While demonstrating that "church" refers to the laity as well as to the clergy, Tyndale offers another positive definition: *"... throughout all the Scripture, the church is taken for the whole multitude of them that believe in Christ in that place, in that parish, town, city, province, land, or throughout all the world"* (13). It is noteworthy that he speaks of the church local and the church universal in one breath. This is in keeping with the writings of the church in its early existence, during the apostolic and patristic eras. In one and the same sentence, Tyndale describes the church as the gathering of true believers in one place or throughout the world. It is interesting to note that the sharp distinction which many documents of the continental Reformation, and some modern theologians, have drawn between the local and universal church is not to be found here in Tyndale's treatise.

It is also interesting to read that Tyndale knows of a more strict usage of "church," whereby the word refers only to those who have been chosen by God's eternal decree.

“Sometimes it is taken specially for the elect only; in whose hearts *God* has written his law with His *Holy Spirit*, and given them a feeling faith of the mercy that is in *Christ Jesus* our Lord” (13).

From the words italicized in the quotation one may note that Tyndale describes the body of the elect in terms of the *triune* God. Such language reminds one of Calvin’s definition in Institutes IV.1.7:

Sometimes by the term ‘church’ it means that which is actually in God’s presence, into which no persons are received but those who are children of God by grace of adoption and true members of *Christ* by sanctification of the *Holy Spirit*.

Yet the differences between the two definitions are also telling: Tyndale avoids the word “grace,” opting instead for “mercy;” he gives the law of God a prominent position, and he does not speak explicitly of the sanctification of God’s adopted children. Yet, according to both reformers, the elect are those who have been chosen by God the Father, saved by God the Son, and sanctified by God the Spirit. As we shall observe later, Tyndale knows that a difference exists between God’s elect and the members of the manifest church.

Why Tyndale uses “Congregation” in his Translations

Apart from the reasons stated above, Tyndale has no objection to the word “church.” Indeed, in the *Answer to Sir Thomas More’s Dialogue*, and in other writings, he frequently interchanges “church” and “congregation.” To Tyndale they are, insofar as we are able to tell, synonymous. Yet he is steadfast in his use of “congregation” in the English translations of the Old and New Testaments. And just as Tyndale offers reasons based on philology for the rejection of “church,” so too he offers philological reasons for the use of “congregation.” Yet it should be obvious that the philological debate is merely the tip of a *theological* iceberg, and the diction hides a mass of theological reasons which was destined to collide with the ship of Roman Catholicism.

Tyndale provides philological reasons for his choice of “congregation.” The word has a broad range of uses, Tyndale suggests, which reflects the broad range of uses which the Greek word *ekklesia* also possessed in the first century. Like the reformers on the continent, Tyndale knew that the Greek word *ekklesia* had been employed long before the New Testament church was established. It was a common term for the assembly of people at civic functions in Athens and other Greek city-states. Even in the New Testament *ekklesia* is used with this secular meaning; we noted above that in Acts 19:32, 39, 41 Demetrius the silversmith addresses a public assembly (*ekklesia*) in Ephesus. The word “congregation,” according to Tyndale, is – like the Greek word – a “*more general term*” (13), and therefore appropriate in this, and similar, contexts.

Tyndale chose “congregation” also in part because Erasmus uses words other than *ecclesia* in his Latin translation of the New Testament. Tyndale reminds

his opponent that Erasmus, More's dear friend, also employs unorthodox language in the Latin translation, which had appeared in 1516. Though his tone is less than kind, Tyndale's point is well taken: the Church has no right to impose its language upon Scripture. The Bible is the Word of God. Tyndale knows well, of course, that More and the other clergy saw in "congregation" a purposeful rejection of the language which the church had made standard over generations. Whereas "church" was a word with Roman Catholic associations, "congregation" belonged to the diction of the reformers.

At the conclusion of the philological rebuttal, Tyndale recapitulates the reasons for rejecting "church" from his English translation. "Church" is a word which in the New Testament denoted a place where the Gospel was preached. It did not denote the clergy only, did not exclude the flock of believers, did not refer to Christendom in general, and did not refer to the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Since his contemporaries might understand the word to refer to any, or any number, of these usages, Tyndale chose to avoid it. Tyndale argues positively that in Scripture "church" applied to an assembly of people. The assembly might be secular or sacred. In the early history of the church the word was also used for the body of God's elect, and for the mixed congregation of believers and unbelievers.

Tyndale concludes: in as much as the clergy ... had appropriated unto themselves the term that of right is common to all the congregation of them that believe in Christ ... and brought (the people) into ignorance of the word ..., therefore in the translation of the New Testament, where I found this word *ekklesia*, I interpreted it by this word *congregation* (13).

Tyndale's *Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue* does not end there. After treating the words "church" and "congregation," Tyndale explains his preference for other important words, such as "love", "favour", and "repentance." Thereupon Tyndale gives a lengthy reply to More's defence of the worship of images, pilgrimages, and prayers offered to saints. In several places Tyndale discusses the nature of the church, and shows that the truly Biblical ecclesiology is that of the reformers, whom More called the "*pestilent sect of Luther and Tyndale.*"

Reformed Elements in Tyndale's Ecclesiology

Introduction

In the treatise, *An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*, William Tyndale defends the translation of *ekklesia* in the Bible with "congregation" and not "church." Tyndale prefers "congregation," since it does not lead the readers of the English Bible into thinking that the Roman Catholic church with its false doctrines and practices has its foundation in Scripture. Like the reformers on the European continent, Tyndale strives to establish a text of the Bible which is free of associations with Roman Catholicism.

Thomas More, the reader will also recall, in the *Dialogue Concerning Heresies and Matters of Religion*, attacked Tyndale for using unorthodox and revisionist language. It was obvious to all in England that Tyndale's translation reflected many Reformed ideas. And therefore More's treatise was not merely a critical review of the vocabulary of the new English Bible; it charged the "*pestilent sect*" of reformers with heresy. More defended the authority of the pope and the power of church tradition. He strongly restated the Romanist belief that the church is the sole, infallible source of divine truth. He argued that whatever the church states as true, the believers must accept as the Word of God. Indeed, More suggested, the church had existed before Scripture was written, and even since the writing of the Bible, the church has proclaimed other truths that are not contained in Scripture. The church, therefore, determines Scripture and is its only interpreter. Accordingly, More concluded, Tyndale's translation constituted a heretical subversion of the church and its authority. ⁸

In *An Answer to Sir Thomas More*, Tyndale treats many of the "*heresies and matters of religion*" which More had discussed. The translator defends not only the vocabulary of his edition, but also the Reformed criticism of such matters as the position of the pope, the worship of images and relics, and pilgrimages. In discussing these matters, Tyndale has occasion to touch upon the nature and role of the church. The relationship between the church and Scripture, and between the church and Christ its Head, are but two of the topics Tyndale broaches. In so doing, the translator provides us with one of the earliest English documents which promoted the Reformed doctrine of the church. In this article we shall consider some of the attributes of the church as observed by Tyndale. We shall observe the influences of the continental Reformation upon Tyndale's thought, point out the Reformed character of Tyndale's ecclesiology, and shall conclude with some notes of criticism.

The Church is Formed by God's Word

According to Tyndale, one attribute of the church is that it is formed by the preaching of the Word of God.

*"The whole Scripture, and all believing hearts, testify that we are begotten through the Word."*⁹

As proof for this attribute, Tyndale offers Romans 10:14: *"How are they to believe in him of whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear without a preacher?"*¹⁰

He explains the text thus, *"Christ must first be preached, ere men can believe in him ... And therefore, in as much as the Word is before faith, and faith makes the congregation, therefore is the Word or Gospel before the congregation"* (24).

In stating that the preaching of the Gospel and the resultant faith are needed for the formation of a church, Tyndale follows the continental reformers. It was Luther who had described the church as *creatura verbi*: a creature of the Word. Tyndale espouses this tenet of the Reformation and

refutes the Romanist ecclesiology as expressed by More, according to whom the church is above Scripture and its sole expositor.

In his *Dialogue* More had argued that the Roman Catholic Church is superior to the Bible in part because it *predates* Scripture, and that therefore it alone is able to instruct the laity in the meaning of Scripture and in the doctrine that it expresses. For this reason Tyndale's translation was so hated by the clergy, which realized the English Bible would undermine its authoritative position. But Tyndale, as A.G. Dickens notes, "*firmly believed that the Bible came first and should invariably determine the doctrines, institutions and ceremonies of a Church which had come to bear little or no relation to that of the New Testament.*"¹¹ In stating that the church is a product of the preaching of the Word, Tyndale argues that the Church is subservient to the Word, and should conform to it.

Tyndale's reasoning follows that of the continental Reformers. Huldrych Zwingli, for example, had also written about the church's subservience to the Word. One may recall that of the sixty-seven theses which Zwingli published in 1523, several concerned the authority of Scripture.

The first thesis reads: "*All who say that the Gospel is invalid without the confirmation of the church err and slander God.*"

Following Zwingli, Tyndale replaces the authority of the Romanist Church with the authority of Scripture. The church must obey the Word of God by which it is formed. There is no divine revelation besides the Word, and the church may not claim to possess truths outside Scripture. In stating that the church is a product of the Gospel, Tyndale refutes More's contention that the church is superior to the Word.

Faith is the Basis of the Church

We read in Romans 10:17, "*So faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes by the preaching of Christ.*" Tyndale has already argued that the preaching of the Gospel precedes the formation of the church; now he argues that faith in Jesus Christ's saving work, which is granted through the preaching, is a cornerstone of Christ's church. Tyndale points out that all who are born anew and become children of God, are members of his church. Though one might question Tyndale's exegesis of Matthew 16:18, his statement that "*faith is the rock, whereon Christ built his congregation*" (31) is true. And this faith, Tyndale writes, is the "*foundation, laid of the apostles and the prophets; whereon Paul says (Ephesians 2:20) that we are built, and thereby of the household of God*" (31).

Following the continental reformers, Tyndale emphasizes the role of the saving work of Christ in the formation of the church. Without the satisfaction of Christ for the sins of the world, the church could not exist. After all, the church is Christ's body (Colossians 1:18), "*and every person of the church is a member of Christ (Ephesians 5:23b). Now it is no member of Christ that has not Christ's Spirit in him*" (Romans 8:9) (31). Especially Ephesians 5:23b supports Tyndale's argument: "*Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Saviour.*" Faith in the expiation of

Jesus Christ unites members into one body, and those who do not share in this faith, do not contribute to the unity of Christ's body. It is clear to Tyndale that *"both they that trust in their own works, and they also that put confidence in their own opinions, be fallen from Christ, and err from the way of faith that is in Christ's blood, and therefore are not of Christ's church"* (33-34). *Sola fide* is an important creed of the church.

Such line of reasoning leads Tyndale to the logical conclusion that the Roman Catholic church is not the church of Christ. For *"he that has no faith to be saved through Christ, is not of Christ's church. And the pope believes not to be saved through Christ"* (39), for he teaches to put trust in penance, pilgrimages, ceremonies, and the like – which *"all are the denying of Christ's blood."* (40) Since the pope has replaced Scripture with his own doctrine, and because the pope and the clergy have shown themselves in their conduct to be unholy, the Roman Catholic church cannot be the true church.

On the other hand, all those who *"depart from them unto true Scripture, and unto the faith and living thereof"* (45) form the true church. Members of the true church, Tyndale writes, *"thou shalt always know by their **faith**, examined by Scripture, and by their profession and consent to live according to the law of God"* (45). Evacuation from the false church, from "Babylon," as the Second Helvetic Confession expresses it, is a necessity for all true believers. For Tyndale all believers should depart from the false church, namely, the Roman Catholic church. At a time when the only church in England was the Roman Catholic church as controlled by Henry VIII, even departure from this congregation of Satan was virtually impossible. Notions of forming a true congregation of believers were still in infancy. Nevertheless Tyndale urges those who have faith to leave the Romanist church.

The Church is an Assembly of Sinful Believers

Tyndale's most complete definition of the true church or congregation is expressed in his rebuttal of the Romanist claim that the church cannot err. Thomas More had argued that the Roman Catholic church was infallible. To this Tyndale angrily retorts that if by church More means the Roman Catholic church, then the church certainly does err! And he cites many instances in which the church of Rome erred from the truth of God's Word.

But as for the question of sin within the true church of Christ, Tyndale posits that, whereas sin exists in all people, God forgives those believers who ask him.

The church is the whole multitude of all repenting sinners that believe in Christ, and put all their trust and confidence in the mercy of God; feeling in their hearts that God for Christ's sake loved them, and will be, or rather is, merciful to them, and forgives them their sins of which they repent; and that he forgives them also all the motions unto sin, of which they fear, lest they should thereby be drawn into sin again (30).

The church consists of believers who are miserable sinners; yet it consists of believers whose sins are forgiven. Quoting 1 John 3:9 (“*no-one born of God commits sin*”) and other texts, Tyndale states that the church consists of sinners who ask God for forgiveness and show amendment of life. The church comprises sinful *believers*, who are totally depraved and totally saved.

Tyndale does not forget the role of the Holy Spirit in the sanctification of believers, for he writes that it is the Holy Spirit which “*keeps a man’s heart from consenting to sin*” (31). In a sense, Tyndale dares to write, we are not sinners: “Not sinners if you look to the *profession* of our hearts toward the law of God, to our repentance and sorrow that we have, to the promises and mercy in our Saviour Christ, and to our faith.”

And yet, Tyndale writes, “*every member of Christ’s congregation is a sinner, and sins daily*” (32).

1 John 1:8 reminds us: “*If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves.*”

Sin is a matter of fact, even in the congregation of Christ. “*Sinners we are,*” writes Tyndale, “*if you look to the frailty of our flesh, which is like the weakness of one who is newly recovered out of a great disease, by reason whereof our deeds are imperfect; and by reason whereof also, when occasions be great, we fall into horrible deeds, and the fruit of the sin which remains in our members breaks out*” (32).

Yet, as Tyndale also reminds us, the Holy Spirit helps us in our weaknesses (Romans 8:26).

Hypocrites within the Church

Tyndale also treats the matter of unbelievers within the church. Like the continental reformers, he knows that there are hypocrites within the body of Christ (44). For this attribute of the church the reformers were indebted to Augustine, who had explained (*de Doctrina Christiana*, III, 32) that the church is “mixed”: in the church believers mingle with unbelievers. Tyndale calls the church “double,” that is, consisting of the “fleshly” and the “spiritual.” Just as the disciples of Christ could not look into the heart of the betrayer Judas, so too one cannot know perfectly what is in the heart of the members of one’s congregation. *The Belgic Confession* also speaks of “*hypocrites, who are mixed in the Church along with the good and yet are not part of the Church, although they are outwardly in it*” (Art. 29). And Calvin, too, would write about those “*who have nothing of Christ but the name and outward appearance*” (*Institutes* IV.1.7). It is remarkable that already in the first decades of the Reformation in England, the word “church” could convey the nuanced sense of *ecclesia permixta*, the “mingled church.”¹²

The Church is the Gathering of the Elect

We noted above that Tyndale describes the church as “double.” He applies this sense also to the distinction between the elect of God (the “spiritual”) and those not chosen to everlasting life (“the fleshly”).

Tyndale explains:

there shall be in the church a fleshly seed of Abraham and a spiritual; a Cain and an Abel; an Ishmael and an Isaac; and Esau and a Jacob ... a great multitude of them that be called, and a small flock of them that be chosen. And the fleshly shall persecute the spiritual (107).

Tyndale sees this attribute of the church in his own times, in which the pope and the Romanists are the "fleshly" who persecute the little flock of Christ. Pretending and believing to be the true church, the Roman Catholics "*go unto their own imaginations*" and "*the manner of service they fetch out of their own brains, and not of the Word of God; and serve God with bodily service*" (107). On the other hand, the body of the elect, "*runneth not unto his own imaginations,*" but seeks the Word of God. And the "*little flock,*" as Tyndale calls the elect, "*receives this testament in his heart, and in it walks and serves God in spirit*" (109). It is not surprising that Tyndale should depict the elect as a small and oppressed group within a large body of so-called believers, for in England the number of true believers must have appeared small in comparison with the large and powerful Romanist Church.

The Church as the Flock of the Shepherd

Of the other attributes of the church discussed in Tyndale's *Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue* one in particular should not be overlooked. In the treatise Tyndale repeatedly refers to the church as "*little flock.*" This Biblical expression had been used by the Lollards before Tyndale, yet the translator appropriates it for his own reasons.¹³ In several places of *An Answer* Tyndale uses the image of the church as a flock of sheep. The church is gathered by the Good Shepherd, Jesus Christ.

Tyndale writes, "*God, when He calls a congregation unto his name, sends forth His messengers to call*" (107).

The church is formed by the power of God, and not by the impetus of man. The "little flock" is formed, guided, and fed by the Shepherd.

The "*little flock,*" because "*they have run clean contrary unto that good law, they sorrow and mourn ... But the preacher comforts them, and shows them the testament of Christ's blood ... And the little flock receives this testament in his heart ...*" (108).

This image of the church as Christ's flock is, as all well know, a Scriptural image. Therefore, one will not be surprised to learn that it appears in the Second Helvetic Confession and in the writings of the continental reformers. Indeed, the image of the church as flock is used by modern Reformed theologians also: K. Schilder saw in *congregatio* the ongoing, active, church-gathering work of Jesus Christ, the Shepherd.

When one appreciates Tyndale's depiction of the church as the flock of

Christ, one understands more fully his reasons for preferring “congregation” to “church” as the translation of *ekklesia* in the English Bible. For the English word “congregation” derives from the Latin word for “flock,” *grex*. Tyndale the translator is keenly aware of this etymology of the word, and despite his penchant for non-Latinate words, he employs this one in his translation. It appeals to him for it conveys a meaning which the Biblical expressions for the church also convey. To Tyndale, “congregation” is altogether an appropriate word.

Conclusion

In conclusion, a number of critical observations of Tyndale’s ecclesiology are in order. Although Tyndale discusses the nature and the role of the church in *An Answer to Sir Thomas More’s Dialogue*, he makes no attempt to present an exhaustive, systematic argument. Important essential and accidental features of the church are lacking to Tyndale’s treatise. There is no discussion, for example, of the marks of the true church. Discipline within the church is not treated. There is no explanation of the relationship between the administration of the sacraments and the church. Matters which appear to the post-Reformation churches as crucial to ecclesiology are glossed over by Tyndale.

But one should bear in mind that Tyndale does not claim to put forth a complete doctrine of the church. And perhaps Tyndale’s inchoate ecclesiology is to be explained by the circumstances in which he wrote. The reformation of the church in England occurred after Tyndale’s death. During his lifetime there were few attempts to reform the church on the scale attempted by Luther and the continental reformers. Tyndale was among the first to begin to call for change in England. By providing an English translation of the Bible Tyndale made the important first step toward reform.

There are many other features of Tyndale’s ecclesiology which might be discussed critically; here I shall merely list them. Some have noted a development in the theology of Tyndale which might be called inconsistent. Luther and Calvin also developed their theologies over time, yet their more systematic approach to ecclesiastical reform caused them to be more complete and consistent. There is little evidence that Tyndale envisages a schematic reform of the church; he appears content to make changes within the existing “multitude.” Others have suggested that there is evidence for a development toward legalism in Tyndale’s thought.¹⁴ His view of the covenant has been described as that of a contract between parties: Tyndale has been linked to the development of Puritanism. Yet again others have observed an emphasis upon individualism in the theology of Tyndale. Even in the language of Tyndale’s English Bible one could criticize the translator. But when all is said and done, it should be acknowledged that the role of William Tyndale in the Reformation of the church in England was not a minor one.

Endnotes

1. [^] Faber zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet.

2. ^ C.H. Williams, *William Tyndale* (London: Nelson, 1969), 76.
3. ^ The fact that More wrote a nine-volume rebuttal, the *Confutation of Tyndale's Answer* (1532), attests to the gravity of the debate.
4. ^ W. Clebsch, *England's Earliest Protestants* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964), 144.
5. ^ The influence of Luther's ecclesiology upon Tyndale is obvious; consider, e.g., Luther's understanding of the church as described by H. Prien, "Grundgedanken der Ekklesiologie beim jungen Luther," *Archiv für Reformations geschichte* 76, 1985, 96-119. The influence of Lollard writings upon Tyndale's theology is treated by D. Smeeton, *Lollard Themes in the Reformation Theology of William Tyndale* (Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1986), esp. 159-220.
6. ^ W. Tyndale, *An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*, ed. H. Walter (The Parker Society. Cambridge: University Press, 1850), 11; subsequent quotations from *An Answer* derive from this edition.
7. ^ In the *Institutes* (IV.1.7), Calvin would also refer to this usage of the word: "Often, however, the name "church" designates the whole multitude of men spread over the earth who *profess* to worship one God and Christ" (trans. F.L. Battles, *Calvin. Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Vol. 2 Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1960, 1021. Subsequent quotations of *Institutes* derive from this edition).
8. ^ For a summary of More's *Dialogue* and Tyndale's reply, see W.E. Campbell, *Erasmus, Tyndale and More* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1949), 124-154.
9. ^ W. Tyndale, *An Answer to Sir Tomas More's Dialogue*, ed. H. Walter (The Parker Society. Cambridge: University Press, 1850), 24; future citations of *An Answer* derive from this edition.
10. ^ Tyndale mentions two other texts for proof that believers form a gathering as a result of the preaching: John 15:3, John 17:17.
11. ^ A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (New York: Schocken, 1964), 71.
12. ^ For discussions by other English reformers of the "mingled church" see P. Hughes, *Theology of the English Reformers* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1965), 225-262, esp. 228.
13. ^ For the influence of Lollard ecclesiology upon Tyndale's thought see D.D. Smeeton, *Lollard Themes in the Reformation Theology of William Tyndale* (Kirksville, Missouri: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1986), esp. ch.6.
14. ^ See, e.g., W. Clebsch, *England's Earliest Protestants* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964), 168.

[Protestant Reformation Notes](#)



An outline of the Protestant Reformation which Martin Luther started on October 31st, 1517, when he nailed his Ninety-five Theses on a church door in Wittenburg Germany.

[Summary of TRUE Church History By Jim Searcy](#)



The false church

This article is a re-post from <https://www.jimsearcy.com/ChurchHistory.htm>.

The early Church understood apostolic doctrine to mean the written Word of the Apostles, as it was contained in the Scriptures, in accord with the Old Testament, and given final revelation by the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, the very I AM, who taught Moses. That is worth repeating, and is the basis for understanding True Church History.

From the very beginning, even from before all of the Apostles had been

martyred, the writings of people like Polycarp, and Clement made clear and explicit, that ONLY the Scriptures, Old Testament, Gospels, and letters of the Apostles, and the Revelation given by John, was the authority for right and true teaching of doctrine. Only the Scriptures were to be the defense of the truth against heresy. The writings of the men who were direct disciples of the Apostles literally breathe with the Spirit of the Old and New Testaments. This may be seen in the writings of the disciples like Justin Martyr, and Athenagoras, in the second through fourth centuries.

There is no appeal in any of these writings to the authority of a verbal or extra-biblical tradition as a separate and independent body of revelation. The first writings ever to mention the concept of apostolic tradition were the writings of Irenaeus and Tertullian in the mid to late second century. The clear meaning of that word "tradition" as they used and intended the term, was the teaching of the Apostles, the oral communication of what had been written by the Apostles. Irenaeus and Tertullian state emphatically, that all the teachings of the bishops that were given orally, were rooted in Scripture, and could be proven from the written Scriptures. Both men give the actual doctrinal content of the apostolic teaching that was orally preached in the Churches. It is very explicit that ALL of their doctrine was derived from Scripture. There was no doctrine in what they refer to as apostolic "tradition" that is not found in Scripture. In other words, the apostolic tradition, defined by Irenaeus and Tertullian, is simply the teaching of Scripture. It was Irenaeus who stated that while the Apostles at first preached orally, their teaching was later committed to writing, and the Scriptures had since that day become the pillar and ground of the Church's faith.



The true church!

Even in the first century there was available to the believers a substantial part of the New Testament. The four Gospels were known and read in the Churches. The letters of the Apostles Paul, and Peter, were circulated and used, even while the Apostles lived.

IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND AND KNOW that these New Testament books did NOT become authoritative because they were being formally accepted as Scripture by any Church or group of Churches. These New Testament books were AUTHORITATIVE, because, the believers received them as inspired by the witness of the indwelling Holy Spirit. It was indeed by the witness of the Holy Spirit of Truth, BY WHICH the believers KNEW, and did positively recognize, as the very Word of God. From the early writings, it is clear that the believers, by the Holy Ghost, KNEW the life of Christ Jesus, and His role as the final and full revelation of God. That same accepted KNOWLEDGE by the Holy Spirit of Truth was, and remains to this day, the very same New Testament canon. It expressed the final prophetic Word of grace and truth, given just as the Apostle Paul had said, to open his epistle to Messianic Jewish Believers: God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in

time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds.

God's people, in the first three centuries after Christ, universally accepted what we now know as the New Testament. Those who would say otherwise are unlearned, or deceived. The believers in the first three centuries, by the Holy Spirit of Truth, received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the very Word of God. Yes, there were some controversies over individual books. However, these did, by the working of the same Spirit of Truth, solidly confirm the New Testament Scriptures. In fact, the controversies ultimately helped establish the certainty that the BELIEVERS in the first three centuries, after the birth of Messiah, INDEED DID HAVE God's final Written Word, which was ONCE delivered unto the saints.

The disciples of the Lord universally knew the contents of the canon of the New Testament well before the local Council of Hippo formally accepted it in 393A.D, and before the provincial Council of Carthage in 397A.D.

The Christian faith rapidly extended throughout the known world during the first three centuries. The main reason for such a rapid spreading of the Christian faith should be recognized as the sovereign will, and divine intervention, of God. However, we should also be aware that by the same Holy Spirit of God, there was, in the Preachers of the Doctrine of the Apostles, a Holy faithfulness and zeal. Common among the preachers of the Gospel in those first three centuries were the heroic deaths of the martyrs, and the translation of the Scriptures into the languages of the Roman world.

Under Emperor Septimius Severus (193-211) Christians suffered great persecution. However, the most severe persecution was under the Emperor Diocletian and his co-regent, Galerius, during the years 303-311. The historian Philip Schaff states that, "all copies of the Bible were to be burned; all Christians were to be deprived of public office and civil rights; and last, all, without exception, were to sacrifice to the gods upon pain of death."

Though Lucifer and his advocates love to kill, and persecute Christians, as any history written outside of Vatican Roma's control clearly will show, persecution, torture, and murder of real Christians, by no means could, or will ever, exterminate the True Christians, and the Gospel. Though today, as of July 10, 2007, Vatican Roma seems ready to again crank up her infamous inquisition, honest history will show that Vatican Roma's persecution purified those who preached. The history of persecution by the Roman church, of the True Christian, and only True Faith, increased the ability of BELIEVERS to give the Gospel message.

The Vaudois is the name of the best French Bible. The history of the Vaudois people is the history of a people who withdrew from the areas in and around Rome to the valleys of the Cottian Alps during the persecutions of the early Church. These Bible believers always held to the Scriptures as their ONLY authority. This was evident in their faith, and practice for centuries, dating back to the persecutions of the Roman emperor Diocletian. The

testimony of their lives over the centuries shows that the Vaudois, and others, had chosen to follow the authority of the Bible as their Rule of Life.

One solid fact of True Church History is that "people of the book," as Islam calls Jews and true Christians are persecuted. People of the book are vilified, and the persecution of them minimized if not even justified, in the history one finds under the influence, and control, of Vatican Roma.

Vatican Roma's help, favor, and control of Islam, is obvious in paragraph #841 of the latest version of the Roman Catholic Catechism. That infamous paragraph #841 states – The Church's relationship with the Muslims. "The plan of salvation also includes those who acknowledge the Creator, in the first place amongst whom are the Muslims; these profess to hold the faith of Abraham, and together with us they adore the one, merciful God, mankind's judge on the last day." (Latest Catechism which includes the corrections by Pope John Paul II on 8 September 1997.)

In these last days of strong delusion it is good to know the history of how Vatican Roma put Muhammad in the religion business and controls Islam to this day. The popes of Rome have always wanted to possess the city of Jerusalem. Because of its religious history and its strategic location, the Holy City was considered a priceless treasure. A scheme had to be developed to make Jerusalem a Roman Catholic city. The great untapped source of manpower that could do this job was the children of Ishmael. The poor Arabs fell victim to one of the most clever plans ever devised by the powers of darkness.

Early Christians went everywhere with the gospel setting up small churches, but they met heavy opposition. Both the Jews and the pagan Roman government persecuted the believers in Christ to stop their spread. But the Jews rebelled against Rome, and in 70 AD, Roman armies under General Titus smashed Jerusalem and destroyed the great Jewish temple, which was the heart of Jewish worship. This quite literally fulfilled the prophecy of the Lord Jesus Christ given in Matt 24:2.

Corruption, apathy, greed, cruelty, perversion, and rebellion were eating away at the Roman Empire, and it was ready to collapse. The persecution against Christians was useless as they continued to lay down their lives for the gospel of Christ. The only way Satan could stop the spread of the Gospel, and the establishment of true apostolic Biblical Churches, was to create a counterfeit so-called Christian religion.

Rome brought about this great counterfeit "Christian" religion with the first sovereign pontiff, the Roman Emperor Constantine. Constantine's religion was the religion of Nimrod, Semiramis, and Tamuz. It was the religion with the sun god, the queen of heaven, and son of the queen of heaven, the religion of Babylon. The ancient Babylonian religion's deities took on many names in many different cultures and countries. The favorite flavor of this Babylon religion of pagan Rome, at the time of the first supreme pontiff Constantine, was Mithraism. The religion of pagan Roma had come from Babylon and all it needed was a face-lift of applying Christian terms to that religion. This did not happen immediately, but began in the writings of the early so-called

church fathers.

It was through their writings that a new religion would take shape. The statue of Jupiter in Rome was eventually called St. Peter, and the statue of Venus was called the Virgin Mary. The site chose for the headquarters of this new form of pagan Roman counterfeit Christianity was one of the seven hills of Rome called Vaticanus, the place of the diving serpent where the Satanic temple of Janus stood.

The great counterfeit religion, Roman Catholicism, called MYSTERY BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH – Rev 17:5. Satan, the god of all false religions, raised up this Roman counterfeit religion of Babylon with Christian terms to block the Gospel, slaughter the believers in Christ, establish new false religions, create wars, and make the nations drunk with the wine of her spiritual fornication.

Rev 17:1-6 And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying unto me, Come hither; I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters: With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication. So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration.

The greatest of the daughter harlots of the MOTHER OF HARLOTS is ISLAM.

The creation of Islam

Before Vatican Roma put Mohammad in the religion business pagan Arabs would bring gifts to what they believed was the House of God, the Kaaba in Mecca. The keepers of the Kaaba were gracious to receive the gifts of all of the Arabs making pilgrimage to the Kaaba. Some brought their idols, and not wanting to offend these people, their idols were placed inside the Kaaba sanctuary. The Jews of Mecca were said to have looked upon the Kaaba as an outlying tabernacle of the Lord until it became polluted with idols.

There were Arab tribal wars over the well at the Kaaba called Zamzam, and the treasure of the Kaaba. The valuable offerings of the pilgrims were dumped down into the well during one of these tribal war periods and the well was filled with sand, where it disappeared in a sandstorm. Many years later Adb Al-Muttalib was given visions telling him where to find the well and its treasure. He became very wealthy and the hero of Mecca when he found that well and the treasure of the Kabba which it contained. Adb Al-Muttalib was the grandfather of Muhammad.

Before this time, Augustine became the bishop of North Africa and had limited success in winning Arabs to Vatican Roma's adulterated Christianity. Vatican Roma's religion was more and more becoming identical to the pagan Babylon religion except for its Christian terminology. Among these Arab converts to Vatican Roma's religion Augustine promoted the concept of looking for an Arab prophet. Augustine, as all bishops of Vatican Roma, paid particular attention to the wealthy. Pre-eminent among the wealthy Arabs of this time was the grandfather of Muhammad.

Muhammad's father died several months before the birth of Muhammad. The sons of wealthy Arab families in places like Mecca were sent into the desert to be nursed until about age four, and spend several more years of childhood with Bedouin tribes for training and to avoid the plagues and very high infant child mortality in the cities. The watchful eyes of Vatican Roma, particularly watchful of the wealthy, noted the grandchild of Adb Al-Muttalib was born with a birthmark on his back. Muhammad's mother died when he was six, and he was in the care of his grandfather Adb Al-Mutalib until his grandfather died when he was nine. Muhammad then came under the care of his uncle. One of Augustine's monks met Muhammad and his uncle in a caravan and asked if he could see the child's back, and then proclaimed this is the mark of the prophet. The monk of Vatican Roma warned Muhammad's uncle to "Take your brother's son back to his country and guard him against the Jews, for by god, if they see him and know of him that which I know, they will kill him. Great things are in store for this brother's son of yours." So agents of Vatican Roma instilled Muhammad's Jew hate and bigotry from the time when he was just nine years old.

Indeed history has shown how very effective was this ploy of Vatican Roma's monk to fan the flames for future Jewish persecutions at the hands of the followers of Muhammad. The Vatican desperately wanted Jerusalem because of its religious significance, but was blocked by the Jews.

Another major problem of Vatican Roma's Christianized paganism at this time was the large number of true Christians in North Africa who preached THE Gospel. The Roman religion was growing in power, and would not tolerate opposition. Somehow Vatican Roma had to create a weapon to eliminate both the Jews and the true New Testament gospel believers who refused to accept Vatican Roma's brand of Christianized Babylonian paganism.

In North Africa, Vatican Roma saw multitudes of Arabs who had not been converted from their Arabian paganism to Roman paganism nor had they become Christians. This was the source of the manpower to do Vatican Roma's dirty work of killing Jews and Christians. Jews and Christians are known as "people of the book," in Muhammad's religion of Islam's holy book, called the Koran. Some Arabs had become Roman Catholic, and could be used in a spy network for Vatican Roma's master plan to control the great multitudes of Arabs who rejected the Roman brand of paganism with Christian terms. Augustine had good intelligence. His monasteries served as bases to seek out and destroy Bible manuscripts owned by the true Christians of North Africa.

Vatican Roma wanted to create a messiah for the Arabs, someone they could raise up as a great leader, a man with charisma whom they would train, and

eventually unite all the non-Catholic Arabs behind him. The great Arab leader would create a mighty army that would ultimately capture Jerusalem for the pope.

A wealthy Arabian lady who was a faithful follower of the pope played a tremendous part in this plan. She was a widow named Khadijah. She entrusted her wealth to Vatican Roma's religion and retired to a convent, and there was given an assignment. She was to find a brilliant young man who could be used by the Vatican to create a new religion and become the messiah for the children of Ishmael. Khadijah had a cousin named Waraquah, who was also faithful to Vatican Roma, and he was placed in a critical role as Muhammad's advisor. He had tremendous influence on Muhammad.

Teachers were sent to young Muhammad and he had intensive training in the writings of Augustine the top bishop of Vatican Roma in all of North Africa. Muhammad studied the writings of Augustine, which prepared him for his great calling. Vatican Roma had Arabs across North Africa spread the story of a great one who was about to rise up among the Arab people and be the chosen one of their God.

While Muhammad was being prepared, he was told that his enemies were the Jews and that the only true Christians were Roman Catholics. He was taught that others calling themselves Christians were actually wicked impostors and should be destroyed. Many Muslims believe this. Though most Roman Catholics are too nice to say so, they believe this too.

Some of the more mystical aspects of Vatican Roma's program are designed to lead to questionable spiritual experiences, which do not get tested. Muhammad began receiving what he thought were divine revelations. His wife's Catholic cousin Waraquah was always right there with the interpretation according to the plan Vatican Roma had for Muhammad. Eventually these revelations with Waraquah's interpretations would result in the Koran. Sura Nine, the Immunity Sura is what the Koran really teaches. All of the rest of the Koran is to provide plausible deniability to the Satanic teaching of the Koran. Everything in the Koran abrogates to Sura Nine and that one sura supersedes whatever else the Koran may teach, because the Immunity sura was the last sura of Muhammad.

Anyone desiring to know the teaching of Islam only needs to read that one Immunity sura. EVERYTHING else in the Koran abrogates to that sura nine and NOTHING in that sura nine can be abrogated away. Knowing what is said in that one sura without all of the other suras which are only there to hide the central core teaching of the Koran gives one better understanding of Islam than those who teach it.

In the fifth year of Muhammad's mission, persecution came against his followers because they refused to worship the idols in the Kaaba. They fled to Abyssinia or Ethiopia where King Negus, a Roman Catholic king received them because Muhammad's views on the Virgin Mary were so close to Roman Catholic regarding the queen of heaven. The only place where Muhammad's writings about the Virgin Mary could have come is Augustine, for that doctrine was unique to Augustine at that time and did not become universal

Roman Catholic dogma of the Immaculate Conception that Mary was born of a virgin mother, until 1854. King Negus and Muhammad both worshipped the queen of heaven.

Muhammad later conquered Mecca and the Kabba was cleared of idols. It is a well established fact of history that before Islam came into existence, the Sabeans in Arabia worshipped the moon-god. Allah's wife gave birth to three goddesses who were worshipped throughout the Arab world as the "Daughters of Allah." An idol excavated at Hazor in Palestine in the 1950's shows Allah sitting on a throne with the crescent moon on his chest. Because Allah has always been the moon god of Arabia is why one finds crescent moons on every mosque, and so many Muslim emblems. Allah, the moon god of Arabia was worshipped in Arabia for a thousand years before Muhammad was born. Allah is one of the many aliases of Satan. One also should not fail to notice how often the crescent moon is associated with various paintings and statues of the Virgin Mary.

Muhammad claimed he had a vision from Allah where Allah sent the angel Gabriel with the message – You are the messenger of Allah. This launched Muhammad's prophet career as the self-fulfilling prophecy he had gotten from the monk of Vatican Roma when he was nine. By the time Muhammad died, the religion of Islam was exploding. The nomadic Arab tribes were joining forces in the name of Allah and his prophet, Mohammad.

Some of Muhammad's revelations were recorded and placed in the Koran, and others were never published. The unpublished ones are now in the hands of high-ranking Ayatollahs in the Islam. These writings, which are not in the Koran are guarded, because they contain information that links the Vatican to the creation of Islam. Both Vatican Roma and Islam have so much information on each other that if exposed, could create such a scandal that it would be a disaster for both religions. This truth about Islam was given by no less authority than what Cardinal Augustine Bea had to say regarding Vatican Roma's creation and control of Islam.

In the so-called holy book of Islam, The Lord Jesus Christ is regarded as only a prophet. If the pope of Vatican Roma was His representative on earth, then he also must be a prophet of God. This caused the followers of Muhammad to fear and respect the pope as another holy man.

When the Arabs became unified under the banner of Muhammad, the Vatican pope moved quickly and issued bulls granting the Arab generals permission to invade and conquer the nations of North Africa. Vatican Roma helped to finance the building of these massive Islamic armies in exchange for three favors:

1. Eliminate the Jews and Bible believing Christians, which the Muslims called infidels.
2. Protect the Augustinian Monks, and the Roman Catholics and their shrines, churches, and properties.
3. Conquer Jerusalem for the pope and Vatican Roma.

Soon the power of the Islamic armies became tremendous. Jews and Bible believing Christians were slaughtered, and Jerusalem was conquered. Roman Catholics were never attacked; their churches, shrines, and properties were not touched. However, when the pope asked for Jerusalem he was shocked that the Arab generals said NO. The Islamic generals had become so powerful that the pope could not control them. The Islamic armies began their conquests with the help and plans of Vatican Roma; but, now they had their own plan.

Waraqah directed Muhammad to have the Koran say that Abraham offered Ishmael, and not Isaac, as a sacrifice on Mt. Mariah. Muhammad contradicted the Holy Bible, which explicitly says Isaac was to be sacrificed, but the Muhammad's Koran would substitute Ishmael's name for Isaac, and assert the biblical record to be in error. As a result of this and Muhammad's vision, the Muslims built a mosque and shrine, the Dome of the Rock, in Ishmael's honor, on the site of the Jewish Temple that was destroyed by the Roman armies in 70 AD. This made Jerusalem the 3rd most holy place of pilgrimage for the Muslims behind Mecca and Medina.

Vatican Roma realized what they had created was out of control when the Arab generals and their Muslims began referring to the pope as an infidel. The Muslim generals were determined to conquer the world for Allah, and had set their sights on conquering Europe.

Representatives of the Muslim generals went to the Vatican and asked for papal bulls to give them permission to invade Europe. The Roman pope was outraged. War was inevitable. The pope considered the temporal power and control of the world to be the exclusive right of Vatican Roma's pope. The Muslim generals of the armies of Muhammad, which Vatican Roma had put in business for killing the enemies of the Vatican, now threatened Vatican Roma. The pope would not think of sharing his power over the world with the Muslims who Vatican Roma had established for the popes purposes, and that the pope considered to be heathens.

The pope quickly raised up Vatican Roma's armies for the pope's Crusades against the rebellious Muslim heathens. In no way was the pope going to allow the Muslim generals to take over Catholic Europe. The Crusades lasted for centuries and the prize of Jerusalem, which Vatican Roma always desired, always managed to stay free of the pope's control.

Turkey fell, which caused many Greek-speaking Christians to flee to the West with their Greek Scriptures. The Western Roman Empire, prior to the fall of Constantinople in 1453, had only Latin scriptures, carefully revised and absolutely controlled by Vatican Roma.

The Muslim armies invaded Spain and Portugal. In Portugal, the Muslim armies named a mountain village FATIMA in honor of Muhammad's daughter. In no way could anyone at that time ever think the village of Fatima would become world famous.

In 849 AD the great Arab Muslim fleet was set to invade Italy from Sardinia. When the Muslim fleet appeared on the horizon, Vatican Roma's fleet defeated the Muslims. However, Muslims occupied Sicily for nearly three centuries from

812 up until 1071 AD.

With the invasion of Spain and Portugal the Muslim generals realized that they were too far extended. The Muslim generals realized that it was time for seeking terms of peace. Francis of Assisi negotiated peace with the Muslim generals for Vatican Roma. The terms of peace brokered by Francis of Assisi were that the Muslims were allowed to occupy Turkey and Vatican Roma's Catholics were allowed to occupy Lebanon in the Arab world. It was also agreed that Muslims could build mosques in Catholic countries without interference, as long as Roman Catholicism could be allowed to flourish in Muslim countries. This is why one so often may find churches of Vatican Roma in the same neighborhoods as mosques in so many regions of the world.

Vatican Roma and the Muslims agreed to continue efforts to block, thwart, and destroy their common enemy, the people of the book, Jews and Bible believing Christians. By way of these concordats of Vatican Roma with Islam, Satan, the god of all false religions, has effectively blocked the now almost one BILLION children of Ishmael from knowledge of the truth of the Word of God.

Vatican Roma has maintained a light and invisible control of Islam on Muslims from the highest-ranking Ayatollah on down, through the Islamic clerics. Vatican Roma has always done everything possible to inflame hatred between Muslim Arabs and Jews, which prior to the Vatican putting Muhammad in his religion business, had lived peacefully together.

Muslims are taught to view Bible believing missionaries as the devil incarnate, which are sent to poison the children of Allah. This is why, up until recently, the ministry of missionaries in Muslim countries, aside from being difficult and often leading to martyrdom, has born so little fruit. However, with the global access to the truth provided by the internet, this is changing. By the Muslim's own statistics, there are 16,000 Muslims per day forsaking Islam to become Bible believing Christians.

Bible believing Christians have a mandate and duty of love toward the Muslims. All Christians are to participate in the great commission, and that great commission definitely applies to Muslims. It is the duty of love to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in The Lord Jesus Christ.

However, Vatican Roma's original plan to use Islam to kill people of the book, continues to this day.

The Vision at Fatima Portugal

In 1910, Portugal was going Socialistic and Vatican Roma was facing a major problem. There were rapidly increasing numbers forsaking the religion of Vatican Roma and actually becoming hostile in rebellion to the bondage of the Vatican. This brought about perhaps the greatest display of Vatican Roma's religious showmanship in history, and even facilitated Vatican Roma's victory over the Russian Orthodox Church. This great Vatican Roman display of religious showmanship took place in Fatima Portugal, and has been very

instrumental in strengthening Vatican Roma's control of Islam.

In 1917, the Virgin appeared in Fatima, and the Mother of God show there was one of Vatican Roma's greatest successes. Mary appeared in Fatima to three shepherd children calling herself "Lady of the Rosary." The Fatima appearances instantly became world famous due to their elements of prophecy with regard to the possibility of world war and the conversion of Orthodox Soviet Russia to Roman Catholicism. Vatican Roma was quick to declare the apparitions at Fatima "worthy of belief" and quickly put the Vatican's massive resources in the media in to high gear.

The message of the apparition of Mary was that three secrets were to be given about future world events, and that praying the rosary every day, and saying the rosary many times, was the key to personal and WORLD peace. This was a resonating message since so many young men of Portugal, and the rest of Europe, were then fighting in World War I. Within months thousands of people were flocking to Fatima.

In addition to the three secrets of Fatima a miracle of the sun was promised. The great worldwide publicity of Fatima brought about an immediate major defeat for the Socialists in Portugal. Within months the pope announced a very highly promoted trip, the pope had planned to visit Fatima. When the pope made his highly published plans to be at Fatima for the October 13th final apparition, anticipation to see the highly promoted miracle of the sun, caused a crowd estimated to be over 70,000 to assemble at Fatima for the pope's visit and final third apparition. Only the pope could see the miracle of the sun in its fullness. Of the 70,000 witnesses there were 70,000 different descriptions of what the people saw in the miracle of the sun. It did not seem hard for anyone to believe that only the pope, and not even the three shepherds, could see the miracle of the sun in its perfection and fullness. Yes, one could call it a strong delusion, but all seemed to trust what the pope said he saw, was sort of like what they saw. There was no physical evidence of the miracle of the sun, no one got any photographs of the sun doing miraculous things. The majority today suspect the combination of an anticipated miracle of the sun, and the excitement of the pope being right there to help, combined with the unusual rainy, cloudy, and sunny day, and great religious fervor of the large crowd, to be conducive to mass hallucination. However, it was so convenient of the pope to be there to clarify and certify the miracle of the sun.

Roman Catholics world wide began praying for the conversion of Russia and the Jesuits invented the Novenas to Fatima, which when done throughout North Africa, produced great public relations between Vatican Roma and the Muslim world. Today there are often times more Muslim pilgrims to Fatima then there are Roman Catholic pilgrims. The Muslim Arabs thought the Novenas to Fatima were honoring the daughter of Muhammad. That is exactly what the Jesuits wanted the Muslims to believe.

As a result of the vision of Fatima, Pope Pius XII ordered his Nazi army to crush Russia and the Russian Orthodox religion to make Russia Roman Catholic. Hitler, and the entire German army which fought on the Russian front, can testify the pope was mistaken and not infallible in his conclusions and

direction to the Nazi army from that particular part of his vision of the miracle of the sun at Fatima.

In fairness it should be pointed out that it was several years after he lost World War II that Pope Pius XII shocked the world with his FULL revelation of the dancing sun miracle keeping Fatima in the news. It was truly great religious showmanship and the world eagerly consumed and embraced the pope's private interpretations of the miracle of the sun at Fatima. It should be surprising to everyone, but seems to surprise no one, that the only one to really see the vision and miracle was Pope Pius XII. Nevertheless, the pope's revelation of the vision as only he could see it, has produced a huge world wide group of followers known as the Blue Army. The Blue Army has millions of faithful Roman Catholics ready to die for the blessed virgin.

Project Blue Beam

Project Blue Beam is something that is good for everyone to know about. Here is a link – <http://www.moresureword.com/bluebeam.htm> We must remember that the new global RELIGION lead by the pope, who is the second beast, positional false prophet of the antichrist, is the very foundation for the new world government. Without the Luciferian global religion the antichrist dictatorship of the New World Order is completely impossible. That is why the Project Blue Beam is so important to the antichrist Luciferians, and why it has been so well hidden.

The Jesuits of Vatican Roma have their Virgin Mary scheduled to appear four or five times in China, Russia, the US and other parts of the world. The apparitions at Fatima marked a turning point for hundreds of millions of Muslims. After the death of his daughter Fatima, Muhammad wrote that she "is the most holy of all women in Paradise, next to Mary." The majority of Muslims are led to believe that the Virgin Mary chose to be known as Our Lady of Fatima as a sign and a pledge that the Muslims who believe in Christ's virgin birth will come to believe in His divinity. That is a large part of the reason why there are so many Muslims, who today are open to receive the Gospel. Ex-Muslims just like Ex-Roman Catholics, make some of the most earnest contenders for THE FAITH WHICH WAS ONCE DELIVERED UNTO THE SAINTS.

Yes, according to the Muslims own statistics, 16,000 per day. They make such good Bible believing Christians because they MUST count the cost. Muslims know how rigidly the death penalty is enforced on any Muslim who forsakes Islam to become "one of the people of the book" whom all one billion Muslims are religiously duty bound to kill.

Gal 1:8-9 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. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.

There may have been a time when those who were Roman Catholics might possibly have been saved. That possibility came to an end in June of 1963, when the highest possible Satanic ceremony was conducted in the Vatican and simultaneously in the top freemason temple. That highest of all Satanic

ceremonies is known as the ENTHRONEMENT OF THE FALLEN ARCHANGEL LUCIFER. Details regarding that important event are available near the bottom of this important link – <http://www.moresureword.com/GASstones.htm>

This short history should explain why this infamous paragraph #841 is in the Roman Catholic Catechism:

841 The Church's relationship with the Muslims.

"The plan of salvation also includes those who acknowledge the Creator, in the first place amongst whom are the Muslims; these profess to hold the faith of Abraham, and together with us they adore the one, merciful God, mankind's judge on the last day."

Paulicianism

A look at what most call Paulicianism might be more valuable than giving any further mention of Islam in this summary of True Church History. The history of the Christians, called Paulicians by their enemies, really illustrates the point of how revised and wrested one will find the majority of Church History under the control of Vatican Roma. It is sad, but typical, that most of the information concerning the Paulicians comes through their enemies.

Paulicianism was a Christian sect that flourished between 650 and 872 in the Byzantine Empire. They called themselves Christians, and others gave them the name Paulicians. Some also have supposed that the Paulician name was derived from their obvious respect for the Apostle Paul. When one would look at their own writings, rather than what their enemies reported and revised about them, we find great difference.

Their real identification however, is that they were people who held the Scriptures as the only and highest authority for living, faith, and doctrine. Their own writings show this high honor for the Gospels, and the letters of the Apostles, and how strongly they adhered to BOTH the Old and New Testaments. This is very much the opposite of the Popery of Vatican Roma, and the Patriarchy of the Greek Orthodox Church.

The Paulicians had baptism by immersion in the name of Jesus Christ, failing to baptize in the name of the Trinity, which is so often reported by their enemies. According to their own writings, only adults 30 years of age or over were eligible for baptism, since this was the age Christ was baptized. The person that performed the baptism had to be pure of heart in order for the baptism to be considered valid.

The Paulicians strongly opposed any formalism, ritualism, and pomp. This obviously would make them enemies of both Vatican Roma and the Greek Orthodox Patriarchy. The empress Theodora killed, drowned, or hanged, more than 100,000 Paulicians in Grecian Armenia. The majority of the remaining Christians of this group who held to the Scriptures, and stood against ritualism, and against icons, and against saint veneration, and incense, and ritual priestcraft, had to flee from the area of Armenia. These Christians, named Paulicians by their enemies, were FALSELY called Manichaeans or

Dualists.

By far the largest group of them, perhaps over 200,000 of them survived by fleeing to Europe. They fled out of the frying pan of the Greek Orthodox persecution, into the fires of Vatican Roma's persecutions.

The vast majority of those writing about the Paulicians seem never to have thought to look at the writings of the Paulicians themselves. Almost all of what I have seen written about them is from sources known to be the enemies of the Paulicians. However, their own writings are available, which prove the very common FALSE accusation that they were dualists, or Manichaeans. One of the very few reporting truth regarding the Paulicians, from the study of their own writings, rather than the writings of their enemies, was Fred Conybeare. An ancient Paulician manuscript, The Key of Truth, was discovered in Armenia in 1891. The translator, Fred Conybeare, said "I found NOTHING that savoured of these ancient heresies, of the Manicheans. Mani was anathematized by the Paulician Church." (The Key of Truth, Conybeare, 1898, pg. vi, cxxxix) "The Paulicians are not Dualists in any other sense than the New Testament was dualistic." (pg. xxxvi) "The Old Testament is not rejected." (pg. xxxvii).

Just because certain Gnostics left some True Christian Church group and formed a heretical group, does NOT necessarily mean that the Christian group that they left, or which expelled them for heresy, was heretical. However, Vatican Roma is often found pinning the label of obvious Gnostic heretics, on the group that actually expelled them for their heresy.

By the early tenth century, the Paulicians had a common history as the Waldenses of being mercilessly persecuted by the Roman Church. The Waldenses were purified, and even strengthened, by the persecution of the Popes of Rome, and Patriarchs of Constantinople. The Waldenses were known for always having and holding, as the final authority, the Orthodox Scriptures. They adhered to the Scriptures which God had promised BOTH plenary inspiration, AND preservation. Through their protection, and preservation, and preaching of the More Sure Words of the Scriptures, they made many converts to true biblical faith. It was in the French and Swiss Alps that the Paulicians and Waldenses were most deeply rooted.

The faith of the Paulicians from their own writings is clearly seen as the same as that among the Waldenses. The Popes persecuted them doing everything possible to wipe out every literary trace of them. Yet, God obviously did not allow them to be destroyed, though all suffered persecution, and many did lose their life in defense of the Gospel, and their precious Scriptures, under the persecutions of Vatican Roma. The Waldense, Paulician, and Vaudois, Scriptures are traceable all the way back to the Antioch missionaries, as far back as 150 AD. There is astonishing perfect agreement to the KJV English Scriptures.

It is important to note that a specific founding goal of Rome's Jesuit Order is to destroy those Scriptures. Today essentially that means ONLY the KJV, which still remains outside of Rome's control and corruption, also known as Mesorite Old Testament text and the Erasmus New Testament text, or the

RECEIVED TEXTS. Indeed that is a founding goal of the Jesuits, to destroy the Erasmus Text.

The Authentic Early Church assemblies of the Waldenses of the French Alps, were persecuted, and the majority exterminated by the merciless persecution of the corrupt Roman Church. Still a persecuted, remnant escaped, fled, and were hidden and preserved. Some of them even hid by way of an external show of conformity to the Roman Catholic Church. However, there remains a traceable remnant of the Paulicians, in the face of demonically driven persecution of Vatican Roma, in those regions of southern France, and the Swiss Alps, who were preserved as they protested against the tyranny of Rome. As honest history, not revised by Rome, always attests the True Church held the Scriptures that are amazingly the same as the KJV Holy Bible, as their rule of life, faith, doctrine, and practice. They would allow only the Scriptures to keep their beliefs pure and free from all the visions of the Gnostic theology. The Paulicians were falsely accused of being Manichaeans, and there has been much historic prejudice against them. However, history free of Roman Catholic, and Greek Orthodox revision, has allowed it to be proven that the Paulicians were not Manichaeans.

The Waldenses

Study of the doctrines and practices of the Waldenses finds that they made constant use of BOTH the Old and New Testaments. They obviously hated, what Jesus said He hates, that Nicolaitanes spirit of Vatican Roma. Rev 2:6 & 15. They had no clergy distinction from laymen by the way they lived, dressed, or in any other manner. They had NO councils, magisteriums, or rulings of doctors, rabbis, esteemed teachers, or seminaries. Their teachers were of equal rank. They obviously were against such. They obviously were diligent to ALL live according to the simplicity of the apostolic life. They opposed all image worship, which was practiced in Vatican Roma, and the so-called Eastern Orthodox Churches. They considered such things as miracle empowered relics as just a rubbish heap of bones and ashes, with less than any virtue, and in fact held them to be abominable. They held to the biblical doctrine and Orthodox view of the Trinity. Yes, for all the Yachidites, and so-called Oneness Brethren, the doctrine of the TRINITY is BIBLICAL, and traceable to the Apostles by the Scriptures, and such historically persecuted saints. They upheld the biblical view of fallen, unregenerate, depraved and sinful human nature. They recognized the sufferings of the Son of God as their ONLY, and blessed Hope of Salvation, through REPENTANCE, and FAITH, in Him ONLY.

The Vaudois are traceable to 150 AD, and most students of Church History would say existed within a few decades from apostolic times. They are sometimes called Waldenses, after the name of one of their famous leaders, Peter Waldo of Lyon, also known as Peter Valdès. It was the received opinion among the Waldenses that they were of ancient origin and truly apostolic. They claimed to possess apostolic authority by reason of the purity of their Scriptures, and the keys to binding and loosing.

Theodore Beza, the sixteenth century Reformer, and disciple of John Calvin, said, "As for the Waldenses, I may be permitted to call them the very seed of the primitive and purer Christian Church, since, they are those that have

been upheld, as is abundantly manifest, by the wonderful providence of God, so that neither those endless storms and tempests by which the whole Christian world has been shaken for so many succeeding ages, and the Western part so miserably oppressed by the Bishop of Rome, falsely so called; nor those horrible persecutions which have been expressly raised against them, were able so far to prevail as to make them bend, or yield a voluntary subjection to the Roman tyranny and idolatry”.

In study of the Waldenses, the most obvious thing, which one would observe about them, was holiness in their every day lifestyle. The Waldenses lived the profession of Peter that we ought to obey God rather than men. The characteristic that distinguished them was the principle that Scripture was their authority and how they sought to have all the Waldenses memorize the Holy Scriptures. To the Waldenses, long before the Reformation, they held the Holy Bible to be their living book. Though such might seem an impossibility, there were reports that there were those among the Waldenses who could quote the entire Holy Bible, both Old and New Testament from memory.

Another of the Waldenses distinguishing life principles was the importance of preaching. They believed it to be the right of ALL of the BELIEVING MEN to exercise preaching of the Scriptures as their DUTY. Peter Waldo and his associates were preachers. Their fundamental principle basis was the Sermon on the Mount, rejection of oaths, the condemnation of purgatory, and condemnation of prayers for the dead. The Waldenses declared with Holy Boldness that cost many of them their very lives, that there are only two ways after death, the way to heaven and the way to hell.

The Waldensian movement touched many people, through many centuries. The Waldenses attracted converts from many sources, including a great number of Roman Catholics. The agreement of their French Scriptures, known as the Vaudois, with the KJV Holy Bible is both amazing and stunning proof of God's promise in Ps 12:6-7.

Peter was the Apostle to the Jews and did minister to the Churches of Asia. There is NO Scripture, or historic indication, outside of Vatican Roma's revised history and fables, that would suggest that the Apostle Peter ever set foot in Rome. That Church was planted and nurtured by Paul the apostle to the Gentiles. The expansion of Christianity in Asia was well advanced before the end of the first century. The Christian faith broke out across the borders of Rome into Asia. In the first century the true Christian faith may have spread as far as India. It is certain that it had spread east of the Euphrates and three hundred miles further east across the Tigris River, to the area of ancient Nineveh. By the end of the second century, missionary expansion had carried the Church as Far East as northern Afghanistan. It is abundantly clear from the book of Revelation that there had, by the end of the first century, been mass conversions of the Turks in Central Asia. The Seven Churches of Revelation, chapters two and three, were all located in Asia minor today known as Turkey.

Most have heard of St. Patrick and few know much of the history of this great man of God in the history of Ireland. The work of this great Gospel Preacher and his associates in Ireland is so great, in part, is because it was so very

difficult. Patrick met head on against the old pagan religion of the Druids. All of the people of Ireland when Patrick began preaching the Gospel, very strongly believed in the Druids as pagan priests who mediated for them in the things of the spirit. We know of his difficulties, and disappointments from his writings, which were preserved. He resisted the powers of darkness in the priesthood of the Druids. He very obviously trusted the Lord Jesus, the Living Word, by the power of His Holy Spirit to convict people of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. From the writings of Patrick and his disciples, he understood salvation to be 100% entirely by grace from God. Over the course of 60 years, Patrick had covered the entire country of Ireland preaching the Gospel. Patrick faithfully followed the instructions given by Paul to Timothy and Titus, in ordaining elders and establishing Churches. The best estimate is that by the end of those 60 years of preaching ministry in Ireland, that there were 365 Churches across Ireland. The Churches Patrick established were after the Biblical pattern where the people were SERVED by a pastor or elder. The authority of the pastor was by and according to Scripture that of SERVICE, rather than of being served by the people.

The monasteries which Patrick established were the opposite of those established by Vatican Roma. Patrick's monasteries were very much the same as those of the Vaudois, and other early Christian Churches of northern Italy and southern France. There, men came aside for some years to be trained in the Scriptures, and to learn how to evangelize and to bring the Gospel to others. After their time in such a set apart place, these men married and had families. They were not forsaking the world for some retreat of inner holiness, but men, who having received the new life in Christ Jesus, responded to the call to evangelize others with the true Gospel. It was because of these monasteries and the Churches that Patrick founded in Ireland, that Ireland became known as the "Isle of Saints and Scholars".

There were more than 600 years of fruitfulness in the clarity of the Gospel message so faithfully preached by Patrick and those whom he disciplined, and those they disciplined after them. Over 600 years hallmarked by SCRIPTURE faithfulness. From those churches and missionary training centers called monasteries, missionaries were sent to Scotland, France, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, and beyond. The SCRIPTURE, authority, and faithfulness of living the scriptures, were the hallmark of these later missionaries from Patrick's work as certainly as the Vaudois.

The Nicolatine spirit

The Papal Roman Church is historically almost the opposite and historically found persecuting these SCRIPTURE based true believers, preachers, and those who LIVED according to the Scriptures. Rome is wealthy almost beyond comprehension having great political power. Rome also exercised great power over all of the Churches except for those few empowered by God and their faithfulness to the Scriptures to escape and evade, Vatican Roma's persecutions of all who would not submit to her Nicolatine spirit of control.

The headquarters of the Nicolatine spirit, seeking control over Churches always seems to have been Rome. The Church in Rome is actually a very

stunning contrast. The Church in Rome that Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, had started there in the first century, compared to what the Church in Rome came to be after Constantine, is truly stunning in comparison and contrast.

We know from the scriptures that Paul had discipled some pastors who ministered by SERVING small congregations in Rome. The DIFFERENCES between what Paul started, and what Vatican Roma soon became, is most remarkable. The early Home Churches, under their pastors, looked to the authority of the Scriptures as received in the gospel accounts of the life of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the writings of the Apostles. All authority was based upon the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.

These early pastors and Churches had a true and living faith in God's grace through the Gospel. We see the evidence of this in the Scriptures themselves in the letter of Paul to the Romans. We see how the Gospel was faithfully treasured in those early Roman congregations. At the beginning of his letter, the Apostle commends the believers at Rome for their FAITH. First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world. For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son.

This level of approval is not often seen in the letters of the Apostle Paul. For two hundred fifty years, THE Faith of the Churches of Rome continued to be well known for their lifestyle conformity to the Scriptures, while they lived under extreme persecutions. Perhaps the most famous of the persecutions took place under Emperor Nero in 64 A.D. It would be certainly beyond imagination for those believers in Rome in the first 200-250 years after Christ, to think what the so-called Church of Rome has become. No way could such persecuted, SCRIPTURE living believers, imagine the idea of a Most Holy Roman Pontiff. They would all shout, BLASPHEMY, in the face of anyone referring to the Pope, or any man, as The Holy Father. It would be impossible for such SCRIPTURE living believers, to think how the belief in rituals, and priestcraft, could confer the grace of the Holy Spirit. None of the believers who were part of the Church that was in Rome for the first 250 years after Christ, could imagine someone who claimed to be a Christian would venerate saints, or pray the Hail Mary, or pray to the Queen of Heaven, or any saint. They knew what Jeremiah had said in 7:18, and 44:17-28. Every single one of them would be astonished at what a Mother of Harlots the big Church of Rome would become.

The Apostle John was actually given Revelation, by the Lord, to see what the Church in Rome would become, and was equally shocked by what he saw. John wrote: So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration. And the angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou marvel? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and

of the beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns.

Scripture believers know the pyramid which the Lord Jesus Christ established is up side down, compared to what the Roman Catholic Church formed, since its first Pope, Constantine, established himself as the first Pontifus Maximus. Yes, the Roman Pope's title, Supreme Pontiff, first entered church history by way of Constantine in the fourth century, and means high priest of PAGANISM. Christians located in Rome for the first three centuries could not imagine Vatican Roma's top heavy Nicolaitane hierarchy. How such a system of layperson to priest, from priest to bishop, from bishop to archbishop, from archbishop to cardinal, and cardinal to pope, would have been to them rejected as the abomination which the scriptures teach it to be. The Lord HATES such Nicolaitane hierarchy according to Rev 2:6-15, and in Matt 23:8-11 said – But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call NO man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your SERVANT.

The Roman state sponsored persecution of Christians ended in 313 A.D. It was at that time that the emperors, Constantine in the West, and Licinius in the East, proclaimed the Edict of Milan. This decree established the policy of religious freedom for both paganism, and Christianity. No real truthful Pope roots go any farther back in history than the first Pope Constantine. The claims of Vatican Roma, or Eastern Orthodox of apostolic succession are 100% FRAUD, and history revision.

Constantine set up four vice-prefects to govern the Roman Empire. Under Constantine's authority the Christian world was to be governed from four great cities, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Rome. Over each city there was set a Patriarch, who governed all the elders of his domain, which was later to be called a Diocese. Constantine wanted the Christian Churches to be organized like the government of the Empire.

By what Constantine established, the respect and status of the various Christian elders directly related to the status of their city. Since Rome was the most powerful, and prestigious city in the world at the time, contrary to the scriptures, and in accord with the respecting of persons, and according to the way of the world, the flesh, and the devil, Rome was destined to have the most prominent, and influential bishop. The bishop of Rome, according to the ways of the world, and contrary to the Scriptures, was to Lord it over the rest of the Christian world. Gradually the honor and respect given to the bishop of Rome grew, and these bishops going further and further away from the Scriptures, wanted, and would eventually, require worship from the bishops of other cities. By the end of the fourth century the bishops of Rome began to demand recognition for their exalted position.

By the fifth century the true Gospel was being very effectively subverted by Vatican Roma. In place of the Gospel, and the authority of the Scriptures, and salvation by grace through repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, now it was by the rituals and ceremonies, which Vatican Roma had for sale. Ask any catholic. The real difference between a high mass and a low mass, is

the higher price that one has to pay for mention in a high mass, in relation to the price that one has to pay for mention in a low mass. Want to purchase some early out time from some departed loved one to shorten their time in purgatory? Vatican Roma has any indulgence for sale, if you will just give them the money.

By the fifth century Vatican Roma had effectively replaced the true worship of God, and the inner conviction of the Holy Spirit. Vatican Roma established the Cadillac version of religion, in terms of formal rites and idolatry. Pagan practices were given Christian terms, to put a false Christian covering on very pagan practices such as the celebration of the winter solstice, and spring equinox. Yes, those celebrations had Christian terms applied to them. Most would be offended by the truth that the celebrations of the birthday of Tamuz at the winter solstice, and the celebration of the fertility goddess at the spring equinox, are being done in their Church. Dose the application of Christian terms to such pagan celebrations make them pleasing to the Lord? One only has to look at what Jeremiah had to say in Chapter 10 to know the answer.

Vatican Roma's gospel is another gospel, very far removed from the true Gospel and Scripture authority, which was known by the persecuted Churches of Rome, before the first Roman Catholic Pope Constantine. The true Gospel, which was preached and lived BEFORE Constantine founded the Roman State Religion, had produced an internal unity among the believers. However, after the first Pope Constantine, the Roman State Church of paganism with Christian terms, had substituted ritualism for the Gospel. The insistence was now on an external, visible unity for the Church.

The clergy and laity division of the Nicolaitane spirit of religious control, which the Lord HATES, became the base and hallmark of what was to become the Roman Catholic Church. The corruption produced a Nicolaitane hierarchy of the ruling clergy. By the end of the fifth century, a ritual performing priesthood, where the priest presumed to mediate between God and men, had replaced the ministry of a Pastor Servant. The contrary to scripture nature of Vatican Roma is most clearly seen in the light of this Word of God – 1 Tim 2:5 – For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus. Thus, Vatican Roma's priestcraft ritual, by the end of the fifth century, had replaced the Preachers of the Gospel who had taught the Scripture.

IT IS HOPED THAT EVERYONE CAN SEE THE GREAT FRAUD AT THE ROOT OF ALL APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION CLAIMS OF BOTH ROME, AND THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH. The Church was no more the fellowship of believers under Christ Jesus, united by the Gospel, the absolute authority of Scripture, true worship, and indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Now, it was all external hypocritical religious showmanship. Now, Vatican Roma controlled, as an institution dominated by a hierarchy of priests and bishops.

Within 100 years after Constantine had stopped the state sponsored persecution of the Christians, Vatican Roma had effectively replaced the true worship of God, and the inner conviction of the Holy Spirit, by the preaching of the Word of God. Vatican Roma made the state sponsored form of

Christianity to be outward show and ritualism. Vatican Roma had established a form of paganism cloaked in Christian terms. It was a comfortable religion that could easily accommodate the pagans, complete with formal rites, holidays, and idolatry. Statues of Jupiter or Zeus became statues of St. Peter. The statues of the Queen of Heaven became statues of Mother Mary with baby Jesus. The vast majority of pagans had similar forms and rituals, and the adoption of Christian terms for these things made the religion tolerable for all except a very FEW PEOPLE OF THE BOOK.

About this same time, the city of Rome began to be attacked by the Goths. In 410 Alaric the Goth captured Rome but did not stay to rule. Attila the Hun then conquered Rome in 452. Pope Leo somehow influenced Attila to stop his advance and leave Italy. No one knows for sure if Attila had just had enough war and chose to enjoy the spoils of his conquests. However, everyone knows that pope Leo took credit for saving Rome. Then Leo was able to use the same great persuasive power to get the leader of the Vandals, who also captured Rome after Attila, to stop killing the Romans and leave.

Pope Leo The Great represents a strong testimony to the capabilities of Vatican Roma in intrigue. Almost a millennium later the Jesuit order would be founded to give a quantum leap to Vatican Roma's already proven capability of intrigue. The significance of Leo's pontificate lies in the fact of his assertion of the universal episcopate of the Roman bishop, which comes out in his letters, and still more in his ninety-six extant orations. This assertion is commonly referred to as the doctrine of Petrine supremacy. Was Pope Leo The Great truly a Christian, and professor of THE Faith, and Doctrine of the Apostles? YES, on the basis of his most famous Tome, letter 28, to Flavian, Leo gave an impecable defense of the Gospel from which modern popes could learn much to forsake their shipwrecking, and subversion of THE Faith.

There was a vacancy for the position of Roman Emperor. A vacuum had been established because the Imperial leadership had left Rome. None of the barbarian leaders that conquered Rome wanted to take the position of ruler of Rome, to reside in Rome. In spite of the profound truth to the contrary, given by the Lord in Luke 16:13, No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. Leo seemed to act as if he thought he could do what the Lord said was impossible.

Leo, as the bishop of Rome, saw the opportunity that was presented to him by the situation of Rome being attacked by Attila. God only knows the intrigue that convinced Attila and the other conquerors of Rome not to set up a throne there, or at least put one of their Generals on a throne there.

Augustine had already written some things very pleasing to the popes, that they were intended to rule over the world for Christ. Leo thought he was just the right pope to run the millennial kingdom for Christ. Leo loudly proclaimed his vested and sole right to bind and loose in place of Christ, and finally declared his right to the throne of the exiled Roman emperor, as the position from which the pope should rule the world in place of Christ. From the throne of Rome, Pope Leo claimed to have the seat of Christ's universal kingdom.

Vatican Roma in a very real way is a continuation of the iron legs of the Roman Empire in the visions of the prophet Daniel, and a certain part of the Fourth Beast of which Daniel did speak. By way of Vatican Roma, the beast that was, and is not, YET IS. The Roman Empire did not really end. The Roman Empire simply changed its form. The pope became Caesar's successor.

When Constantine moved his capital of the Roman Empire from Rome to Constantinople in 330 A.D. it gave a tremendous increase to the power of the bishop of Rome. The ecclesiastical contest that had been going on for some time between Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Rome, regarding which was the greatest, was decided by that move of Constantine. The struggle now for ecclesiastical dominance was between Rome and the new Constantinople. The barbarian invasions of the Western Roman Empire were the best thing that ever happened to build up the power of the Roman popes. The pope, and only the pope, according to the pope, could help Rome against the threats of the Alamanni, Franks, Visigoths, Burgundians, Suevi, Anglo-Saxons, Lombards, Heruli, Vandals, and the Ostrogoths.

The Emperor of Rome now lived in Constantinople. It was Clovis, King of the Franks, who was the first of the barbarian princes to accept the faith proposed by the Church of Vatican Roma. To fulfill a vow that he had made on the battlefield when he defeated the Allemanni, Clovis was baptized in 496 A. D. in the Cathedral of Rheims. The Bishop of Rome gave him the title of the eldest son of the Church.

Then, in the sixth century, the Burgundians of Gaul, the Visigoths of Spain, the Suevi of Portugal, and the Anglo-Saxons of Britain, all also joined themselves to the religion of the Bishop of Rome. These barbaric kings and their peoples accepted easily the pagan religion of Rome, because they got to keep all of their pagan celebrations, with just some new Christianized terms. Rome did NOT now have the very narrow way of the Scriptures, and the Gospel. Rome was their same beloved pagan priestcraft rituals with Christian terminology. Vatican Roma's religion was, in fact, very little different in form and substantially the same as their own beloved pagan worship.

In terms of the power of Vatican Roma, all of these conversions represented a quantum leap in the power of the Bishop of Rome. These nations more easily accepted the religion of Rome, because this city had traditionally been the seat of authority of the Caesars, who had previously ruled them with general prosperity. The Bishops of Rome assumed the position as heir to the Caesars, just as Constantine the Caesar, was the first Supreme Pontiff, meaning high priest of paganism, which is a title the pope maintains to the present day.

Rome had long been the seat of power for the Empire. Now Rome would be the place for the high priest of paganism to exercise his authority. More and more Western nations accepted the position of authority of the Bishop of Rome. Emperor Justinian I (527-565), established the dominance of the Bishop of Rome by bringing his ecclesiastical edicts and regulations under the control of civil law.

Justinian's decree set the legal foundation for ruling power by the Bishops of Rome. Justinian used forced ecclesiastical unity to strengthen his

political position. As the head of the Empire's Church, the Bishop of Rome took the title of POPE, to be the one who would be in the power position seat of the Bishop of Rome. As pope, the Bishop of Rome could use the sword of the Empire's armies given to him by the decree of Justinian.

Before the sixth century, Christian Church unity came by the moral persuasion of the Gospel. The conviction of the Holy Spirit through the Scriptures alone brought salvation to such as should be saved. These genuinely saved individuals would be salt and light to their civil societies. However, the application of Christian terms to pagan rituals and celebrations, and departure from Scriptural basis of authority, and adoption of carnal, pagan ethics employed by the Bishops of Rome, could certainly only produce the same old worldly corruption of Lucifer's, antichrist, Nicolaitane, controlling spirit of corruption.

As expected, the Bishop of Rome soon enough wanted to reign like a king with worldly pomp, and worldly power. The very thing that the Lord had warned against was now happening. The very Nicolaitane spirit the Lord said that He HATES was now going to rule. The religion of Vatican Roma quickly became the exact opposite of the instruction of the Lord in Mat 20:25-28:

But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

History has shown the Vatican Roman Popes to PERSONIFY THE OPPOSITE if the clear teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ. Since the pope spoke as a DRAGON on July 10, 2007, maybe it is time for Roman Catholics and every one else bowing the knee to the pope on Sunday, in pre-trib lala land to DO according to 2 Cor 13:5 and Rev 18: 4: Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates? And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.

I believe that it is time that it be said with all holy boldness that the SAINTS must prepare for 42 months of war with the antichrist host, and an unprecedented holocaust lead by the antichrist false prophet pope. The pre-trib lala landers are about to receive the shock of their life, realizing the FRAUD of Vatican Roma, and the Abominable lies of Dispensational Theology, originally financed by Illuminati Satanists and subsequently promoted from within by the Jesuits.

If you want convincing documentation on this entire subject of True History Since the time of the apostles, and how wide and firm is the connection of the antichrist with Vatican Roma just click this for the proof:

The Secret of Secret Societies

National or enforced religions have never changed the heart and lives of mankind. People are born destitute of spirit and and true spiritual life, and therefore all must be born again. Sadly, in these last days of great apostasy and strong delusion the majority who once testified of a born again experience are in the most serious need of being born again, AGAIN. Worse yet they do NOT perceive this great need and some would dare to attack the affirmation of the grace of God found and evidenced in repentance that being born again, AGAIN, represents as their only hope.

The FRAUD, history revision, fallacies, intrigue, priestcraft, and Nicolaitane spirit is not what is needed in such a time as this. The huge Roman Empire brought in some political unity, but no light and hope.

However, when the Lord Jesus Christ came, for the FEW who would REALLY RECEIVE HIM, to them gave He the Power to BECOME sons of God. He ONLY, and NO Pope, or priestcraft worker of any sort among men can save and give everlasting life. The death, burial, and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ is the the greatest event the history of the world. The Old Testament Scriptures foretold it, and the Gospel of the New Testament proclaimed it.

Beginning at Jerusalem, the Apostles proclaimed Him as the author of everlasting life. From among a people who were despised by all nations, came these Apostles with the proclamation and demonstration of the mercy and power of God. THE Gospel, the only TRUE Gospel, and doctrine of the Apostles, invited all men to receive new, abundant, eternal LIFE. Greeks and Romans, slaves and slave owners, men and women. From from across the known world, many came to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. REPENTANCE and Faith IN Him gave them new life in Him to the glory of God the Father Almighty in the Name of Jesus. People from all of the known world, as far as India to the East, Africa to the South, and Ireland to the West, received the light of life and freedom from the bondage to Satan with THE Gospel by the conviction of the Holy Sprit through the SCRIPTURES. Yes, the Word of God was preached in the Power of the Holy Ghost.

THE Gospel, very definite article, not another gospel of Vatican Roma was preached in the power of God and not by the force of man. That gave new life, even abundant, and eternal life, and a Blessed Hope. The Gospel proclaimed that salvation comes from Him alone by His grace ONLY by Repentance and Faith in Him as The Lord.

The Gospels of the Lord Jesus Christ and the written letters of the Apostles settled the great questions of doctrine, being BOTH the Doctrine of Messiah and the Doctrine of the Apostles, and the only LEGITIMATE claim to true or real apostolic authority or apostolic succession.

The claim of Vatican Roma to apostolic succession is 100% FRAUD. The fraud is based upon history revision, and wresting of the Scriptures. The same may be said of so-called Orthodox churches, not to mention such Luciferian frauds as Islam, Mormons, and Jehovah's Witnesses. Yes, that also includes Judaism unless such a so-called form of Judaism would proclaim Yeshua Messiah as the I AM who taught Torah to moses, being known and exalted as BOTH Creator and Redeemer.

There was nothing arrogant or high and mighty as the apostles addressed the churches. The unity in the Lord is clearly seen when in the Acts of the Apostles, we see such expressions as – The apostles and elders and brethren send greetings unto the brethren. In the face of great persecution by the middle of the second century true history will show that the authentic Church had the true Gospel of God's grace. The ONLY True Gospel had been preached to the western end of Europe and even to the eastern end of Asia.

The ONLY TRUE Faith, the Faith of Abraham, that God would provide Himself, as THE Lamb of God, MUST be in perfect agreement with the scriptures, of BOTH the Old and New Testaments. Today that God promised PERFECT and only Holy Bible is found today in plain English, in the Authorized, KJV, which I like to call the King Jesus Version Holy Bible. The Scriptures and ONLY the Scriptures is the means by which the believer enters into the salvation purchased by the sacrifice of THE Messiah as the Lamb of God. The Lord God is almighty and He has provided the good news of THE Gospel, for all who are dead in trespasses and sins. This we do KNOW – that the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.

Some, like Roman Catholics, believe on their church, their pope, their leader, their sacraments, and their rituals. The Roman Catholic Church is the Cadillac of religion when it comes to having such things for sale. THEY WILL PERISH IN THE BOSSOM OF THE MOTHER OF ALL HARLOT RELIGIONS.

By nature we are all born sinners and children of wrath. We are all born rebels at enmity against God and in rebellion against His Word. We are all born rebels at enmity against the Lord God and His Word. The perfect and just law of God has condemned us all. The Lord God is not responsible to rescue any of us from His just wrath which every one of us deserves. Despite our sin nature and personal sin, the Lord God has given the PERFECT sacrifice of His Only Begotten Son for all TRULY born again BELIEVERS, by His Spirit of Truth and Holiness, True believers IN His WORD. God alone is Holy. All sin is an offense to the Holiness of God. Only God can give the terms by which the offense to His Holiness can be satisfied. ALL simply MUST turn to God in REPENTANCE and Faith IN The Lord Jesus Christ, and Him alone, for the salvation that ONLY His sacrifice, and His Faith can give by His Word, by the conviction of the Holy Spirit. Salvation MUST be based ONLY on Christ's death and resurrection. One can NOT find any hope of salvation by faith in a church, or sacraments of a church, or any ritual of any church. Faith must be of, by, and through Him only, with NO other mediator allowed in His place. For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen.

Those trusting in the Roman Catholic Church, the religion of Islam, the

Mormon Church, Hinduism, Buddhism, or any other church or religion need to be told in truth and in love that they are perishing. We are his witnesses with the TRUE Gospel in the full context of the KJV Holy Bible rightly divided, that may make the true claim without fraud, to true apostolic succession. They were sent out to make disciples, disciplined ones IN the Word of God. We therefore are of that succession to be disciples and make disciples IN the Word of God. Those trusting in any church are really just like the lost Pharisees who had opportunity to hear directly from the Lord and rejected the One and ONLY Messiah. The Jesus problem was expressed most explicitly in John 8:24, – I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I AM, ye shall die in your sins. Those who hold faith in a church, an organization, sacraments, rituals, or traditions, are DENYING THE PERSON OF THE LORD.

Eph 2:8-10 and Titus 3:5-7 says it so simple direct and clear – For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.

If you are trusting in the Roman Catholic Church, the Mormon Church, the Watchtower, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, or any religion, or church, or organization and its rituals, you are LOST and without the Blessed Hope of eternal life.

Pray for the peace of Jerusalem. Pray Psalm 83 every day. Only be very strong and of good courage. Stay IN the Word.

Catholic Vs. Protestant Jesus



This is a transcription of a podcast by Christian J. Pinto given on Aug. 1, 2022, on [Noise of Thunder Radio](#). Chris gives many interesting insights, things that I believe deepen our understanding of the spiritual warfare we are all experiencing.

In this transcription, I added titles to identify the contents of the

subsection. The titles also automatically generate a menu on the page. I hope you find them useful.

Okay, praise the Lord you guys and welcome. I'm Chris Pinto. This is noise of thunder radio today in the show.

We are going to talk about the Catholic Jesus. The Catholic Jesus is the Catholic Jesus, the same Jesus of Protestantism. Is the Catholic Jesus the same Jesus of Protestantism? Well, we're going to allow a very traditional Catholic ministry, a very traditional Catholic organization called Church Militant, one that I've mentioned on this program a number of times. I've made reference to articles that they have. They are very traditional Catholics. They believe that the liberalism and really leftism that's going on, which I'm not sure if they understand is really Jesuitism. I'm not sure that they have that understanding of history. I'm not sure that they understand that the Jesuits are behind social justice and that they're the co-authors of socialism and communism and that the Vatican is really the well-spring of communism.

We're going to talk about that on the program as well. But right now I want to focus on that version of Jesus, the Lord Jesus Christ that is presented by the Roman Catholic Church. Now when we talk about the Catholic Jesus, as opposed to the Protestant Jesus, the Protestant Jesus, if we're talking historic Protestantism is Jesus according to the Bible. As one historian put it, *Protestantism is the Bible*, the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible. So if you're going to talk about the Protestant faith historically, it must be based on the Bible. Otherwise, it's not really Protestantism. It might be some offshoot of Protestantism where people come up with different ideas about things. That's something else entirely.

Historic Protestantism

Historic Protestantism, however imperfectly a particular church may pursue it or achieve it or accomplish it, the aim is to obey every word of God according to scripture. To live as Jesus said, man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God. That is historic Protestantism. Now we all know that that changed in the late 19th century into the 20th century. You have so-called Protestant groups that are not really Protestant at all because they're pursuing ideas that would be utterly rejected by the Reformers. The Reformers would have nothing to do with them.

Probably the one that I'm seeing more and more is this partitioning of the gospel into two categories that insist that there are two gospels, one gospel for the Jews and one gospel for the Gentiles. And that, of course, we believe is complete heresy. It's a violation of Galatians chapter 1. The Apostle Paul says, if any man or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel, let him be accursed. So we reject the idea that there are somehow or other two gospels that are contained in the New Testament or really anywhere in the Bible. Jesus is one Lord. He is the way, the truth, the life. No man comes under the

Father, but by him. Praise the Lord.

But let's talk about this issue of another Jesus and why this is so important. We have in the New Testament in 2 Corinthians chapter 11, 2 Corinthians chapter 11, the Apostle Paul is writing to the church at Corinth. And he says in verse 2,

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 subtlety, so your mind should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. Or if you receive another spirit which you have not received, or another gospel which you have not accepted, you might well bear with him.

Another Jesus? Two Gospels?

So notice the Apostle Paul is confronting this idea of another Jesus. And that's actually his terminology, *another* Jesus. So obviously, when people come and they talk to you about Jesus, we have to be discerning at that point whether or not they're really describing the Jesus of the Bible, or if they're preaching another Jesus.

And in verse 3, Paul is warning the church, he's saying, I fear lest by any means as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, that it'll be through subtle deception and lies obviously, that will contradict the clearly stated words of God. Remember what God said to Adam concerning the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, that in the day that you eat thereof, you will surely die? And what does the serpent do? He shows up and he says, you will not surely die, you shall not surely die. But your eyes shall be opened and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. So the serpent openly contradicts the clearly stated word of God, the clearly stated commandment of God. So that is the immediate context of what we're looking at.

That's one of the reasons why I think those who are preaching the two gospel message, they're claiming that there's one gospel for the Jews, one gospel for the Gentiles. That's obviously wrong, it's obviously condemned by the clear statements that we have throughout the New Testament.

And just as when the serpent beguiled Eve, if Eve had obeyed what God had commanded Adam, "In the day that you eat thereof, you will surely die." Don't eat of that fruit. Very simple, very straightforward. Then Eve would not have been beguiled or bewitched and she would not have sinned then against God.

And so it is now, you have a clear scripture, if any man or an angel preach any other gospel, let him be accursed. And yet now we have people who are doing exactly that, they're contradicting the clear warnings that we have in scripture.

Any other gospel is quite often applied to Rome

Yet if we were to go and read commentaries prior to the 20th century, the reference to if any man preach any other gospel is quite often applied to

Rome. Because the context is you had the circumcision teachers who were saying that except you get circumcised and keep the law you cannot be saved, *they're adding something to the gospel of grace*. And you have earlier commentators who argue that really Rome, when you look at Rome and the sacramental salvation, things like you've got to be in submission to the Pope and you've got to be in submission to the Church of Rome in particular, or you cannot be saved. They have all of these different conditions for salvation that have been added over the centuries. And this is really what brings us to the issue of the Protestant Jesus versus the Roman Catholic Jesus, the papal version of Christ.

So let's define our terminology here. The Protestant Jesus is Jesus based on the Bible, and it can only be that, it cannot be Jesus based on something else, because historic Protestantism embraces only the Bible, which even Catholics who are aware of what historic Protestantism is acknowledge.

And we're going to hear that from a statement made by Michael Voris (who aggressively promotes traditional Catholicism) of Church militant, which I think is very important.

If we were going to talk about the Mormon Jesus, for example, if you're going to talk about the Mormon Jesus, you cannot define the Mormon Jesus without the Book of Mormon. The Mormon Jesus is defined by the Book of Mormon. If you're going to talk about the Islamic Jesus, because yes, in Islam, they also claim to believe in Jesus. But to understand the Islamic Jesus, you have to read the Quran, you have to read the Hadiths, you have to read their writings.

Defining the Catholic Jesus

So how would we define the Catholic Jesus? How would we define the Catholic Jesus? You have to read writings outside of the Bible. Because what is it that makes the Catholic Jesus Catholic? I would propose that you have at least three documents that you have to take into consideration in order to understand the Catholic Jesus.

The Catholic Jesus is defined by the Council of Trent, by Vatican Council I, and by Vatican Council II. Those three documents at the very least, now there may be other documents as well. In fact, Rome has a whole series of documents and councils and things like that. But the three major documents would be the Council of Trent, Vatican Council I, and then of course they're most up-to-date, extensive declaration, which is Vatican Council II. That is where you define the Catholic Jesus.

And as I've said before, if you believe official Roman Catholic doctrine, if you actually believe the doctrines of Rome as they are set down on paper, you cannot be saved. It is simply not possible because you have to reject the true gospel as it is given in the New Testament. Now what do we mean by that? Let's look at the Council of Trent just very quickly.

The Council of Trent is, I think, the clearest example. You have Canon 9, which says,

“If any one saith, that by faith alone the impious is justified; in such wise as to mean, that nothing else is required to co-operate in order to the obtaining the grace of Justification and that it is not in any way necessary, that he be prepared and disposed by the movement of his own will; let him be anathema.”

<https://history.hanover.edu/texts/trent/ct06.html>

Let him be accursed. That's Canon 9 from the Council of Trent. If anyone says that by faith alone, the impious is justified. Okay, and then nothing else is required in order to obtain the grace of justification. Nothing else required. Let him be anathema. That's one.

Canon 12 says,

“If any one shall say that justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in the divine mercy pardoning sins for Christ's sake, or that it is that confidence alone by which we are justified...let him be accursed.”

So the Council of Trent pronounces a curse upon you if you believe that you're saved by God's grace through faith in Jesus Christ apart from works. That is the whole problem. I mean, that right there, that just cuts right through everything and gets to the fundamental problem with Rome and Romanism.

Michael Voris and his Church Militant organization

Now, something that I'm typically careful to say whenever these discussions happen is that it's important to remember that the average Catholic, especially here in America, is not aware of the official doctrines of Rome. They're not aware of the details of the Council of Trent. However, when we talk about a group like Church Militant and Michael Voris, you're not talking about ignorant Catholics. You're talking about Catholics who know full well what the official doctrines of Rome are. And so what happened was I was sent an email by one of our listeners that contained a video link to a video that was made and published by Michael Voris of Church Militant, where he is the one who asks the question, do Catholics and Protestants worship the same Jesus? And he very clearly says, no, we do not worship the same Jesus. I'd never seen this before. I knew that Church Militant was hostile to the Reformation and to people like Martin Luther, etc. But I did not realize that they went this far with it. And I think it's very important that anybody who's stumbling upon the Church Militant website understands what they really believe, which is very important, brothers and sisters, because the ecumenical movement is telling the Protestants, the evangelicals, that really they need to join hands with Rome. They need to see the Pope as a Christian. They need to see Catholics as Christians and this kind of thing. And it is very, very deceptive, very deceptive.

So again, that's why I say you might have a Catholic friend who seems to

believe about Jesus what you believe. That could be the case. But when we say the Catholic Jesus, what it comes down to are those documents that are unique to Rome, wherein they define the faith that they believe in, that's the only way you can define the Catholic Jesus.

But here we're going to play some of the audio from Michael Voris on the Church Militant website. And this particular message is called the Vortex "Prodi Jesus." Now Prodi, the word Prodi, just so you know, is sort of a slang or really seems to be kind of an insult for Protestant. So instead of Protestant, they're saying Prodi, the Prodi Jesus. So here is what Michael Voris has to say about the Protestant Jesus versus the Catholic version of Jesus.

(Audio of Michael Voris mocking Protestantism and the biblical Jesus while claiming the Catholic Jesus is superior.)

All right, I have to jump in here very quickly because I can't let that go unanswered, the idea that it's the Protestant form of Jesus who says, "Hey, do whatever you want." Historically, that's not the case at all. That is completely opposite to the Reformed and the Puritan movement. The Puritan movement is the reason why we have moral standards in both church and state that are upheld and defended. Wherever you have Rome and her priesthood in charge, you will have gross immorality normalized and that is throughout history. Nobody pushes LGBT like the Vatican and her agents in America and throughout the world. That's provable beyond any doubt.

But let's listen to the rest of what Michael Voris has to say.

(Voris talks about the worship of Jesus' mother and prayers to Catholic saints.)

Now the reference to the saints is, I believe in the Catholic context, a reference to praying to the saints, patron saints and exalting patron saints over this issue and that issue, etc. Which is really a form of idolatry as we see it as Protestant evangelicals. Certainly when Michael Voris says prodi Jesus has no regard for his mother, if you go and read everything that Church Militant says about the Virgin Mary, they engage in idolatry. What can only be called outright idolatry where the Virgin Mary is concerned. There's no question about that. But go to their website, look up what Voris says on the Virgin Mary. It's very, very clear. It's nothing that they can defend as venerating the mother of Jesus. They can't claim that because they're looking to Mary in the same way that Christians should be looking to God. They're putting their faith in their trust in Mary to empower them and help them and all this other kind of stuff. Whereas the scripture never tells us anything like that. All of our trust and reliance is to be upon the Lord, upon God Himself and upon the Lord Jesus Christ, not upon Mary or any of these patron saints, so called.

Michael Voris of the Catholic media organization called Church Militant is very, very conservative traditional Catholic. They resist liberalism and leftism in the Catholic church today. However, they also are very, very hostile toward historic Protestantism and make it very clear that they

completely denounce the Protestant Reformation.

Catholic means of salvation vs. the Bible

Michael Voris says the Protestant version of Jesus is basically denying people the means of "salvation." And this is what it comes down to, brothers and sisters, the understanding of salvation. Rome teaches a sacramental form of salvation, works-oriented salvation. And they believe that you have to take the Eucharist, the Eucharist, meaning the wafer, which has been called for several hundred years, the true God of Rome, the God of Rome is the wafer. When the Catholic priest holds up the wafer, the Eucharist, the host and says, *hoc est corpus meum*, (Latin for this is my body) the Protestant corruption of which is Hocus Pocus, supposedly the Eucharist then becomes the literal physical body, blood, bones and sinew of the Lord Jesus Christ. That is what they believe. That's the doctrine of trans-substantiation.

It's important to understand that the doctrine of trans-substantiation is said to have begun with Pope Innocent III, the same pope who initiated the great Inquisition. And through the dark age period, what happened was you'd have Catholic priests that would hold up the wafer and they expected people to come and bow down and worship the wafer or the Eucharist as God, as Christ, manifest in the flesh, in the hands of a Roman priest. And if you did not come and bow down, there are multiple cases, many, many cases of people who were taken and punished and put to death for refusing to bow before this Eucharist, the Eucharistic Adoration.

Now, if you want to read a book on this to really understand the extreme nature of it and the absurdity of it, look for the book by 19th century Catholic priest who eventually became a Protestant, Charles Chiniquy, who was the personal friend of Abraham Lincoln. He wrote a book called [The God of Rome, eaten by a rat](#). And he talks about ministering at a church in Quebec in Canada, and that there was an older priest there who was blind, and that one day the priest was hunting about on the altar in a Catholic church, looking for the wafer, and the wafer had disappeared. And the priest is saying to him, he tells the story, let me see if I can get the dialogue.

(Please read the entire account, [The God of Rome, eaten by a rat](#).)

Chiniquy is revealing to us that this old Catholic priest in Canada openly referred to the wafer, the Eucharist, as God. They believed the wafer was and is God. That is the God of Rome. And if you don't believe on this wafer God, you cannot be saved according to Michael Voris.

The God of Roman Catholicism, the Jesus of Roman Catholicism, the Catholic Jesus is another Jesus, if in fact, Catholics believe in that version of Jesus that is contained in the official writings and doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. If that's the Jesus you believe in, you believe in another Jesus and your Christ is really an anti-Christ, another Christ. It is not the Christ of the Bible.

Now to read another quote from the book, here's a quote. It says,

If there is a thing which is as evident as two and two make four, it is that Romanism is the old idolatry of Babylon, Egypt and Rome under a Christian mask. But this new form of idolatry is so boldly denied by some of the great dignitaries of Rome and so skillfully concealed by others under the spotless robe of Jesus that not only the two unsuspecting nominal Protestants, but even the very elect are in danger of being entrapped and deceived.

Okay, that's just one of the quotes from the book. And so you have people who are saying, well, let's just focus on Jesus and we all believe in Jesus, right? And so we just focus on Jesus and we'll forget about everything else. But here we're learning from a very traditional Catholic organization, Church Militant, that the Jesus of Roman Catholicism is not the Jesus of Protestantism, meaning it's not the Jesus of the Bible. It can't be.

Now we know that the liberal Jesus, the LGBT Jesus is obviously not the Jesus of the Bible. That's the other Jesus that's also being preached by Rome and by the Jesuits in particular. They are promoting the rainbow Jesus and we say rainbow in the sense of LGBT activism. It is a different Jesus. So whether it's the traditional Catholic Jesus that Church militant is describing based on historic Catholicism, or it is the LGBT Jesus that is now being promoted by the Jesuit order and to some extent by Pope Francis, whatever the case may be, it is another Jesus entirely. And Catholics themselves admit it. That's what we have to recognize. They admit that they bow to a different Christ.

Now there was a time when Protestants understood this. There was a time when they understood it and they believed it was a critical understanding because if you allow Catholics to be in charge in matters of government, what happens is your government is essentially going to be controlled by the Vatican because the Catholic version of Christianity, so-called Christianity, is to do whatever the pope tells you to do. That's Roman Catholicism. And so if Catholics are in charge, that means the pope is in charge. That means the Jesuits are in charge. The Holy See in Rome is in charge of your country. That's the problem.

The No Religious Test Clause

And if you examine early American laws where the states are concerned, it was required that you had to be a Protestant in order to hold political office anywhere in early America.

This is from the <https://constitutioncenter.org/>. And an article they have called [The No Religious Test Clause](#). This is one of the most misunderstood things happening politically in our country, one of the most misunderstood parts of the Constitution. And I could probably talk about this for an hour, but we're not going to have time, but where it says the No Religious Test Clause, no religious test shall be required, etc.

The thing that we've gotten away from is that the whole concept of a religious test was the swearing of an oath. It was not seen as the same thing as a religious requirement. Religious requirements are entirely

constitutional. You just can't have somebody swear an oath concerning it.

So let me read part of this article. It says,

In England, religious tests were used to "establish" the Church of England as an official national church. The Test Acts, in force from the 1660s until the 1820s, required all government officials to take an oath disclaiming the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and affirming the Church of England's teachings about receiving the sacrament. These laws effectively excluded Catholics and members of dissenting Protestant sects from exercising political power. Religious tests were needed, William Blackstone explained, to protect the established church and the government "against perils from non-conformists of all denominations, infidels, turks, jews, heretics, papists, and sectaries."

That's them quoting William Blackstone. Then it goes on in the same article. It says,

At the time the United States Constitution was adopted, religious qualifications for holding office also were pervasive throughout the states. Delaware's constitution, for example, required government officials to "profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ His only Son, and in the Holy Ghost." North Carolina barred anyone "who shall deny the being of God or the truth of the Protestant religion" from serving in the government. Unlike the rule in England, however, American religious tests did not limit office-holding to members of a particular established church. Every state allowed Protestants of all varieties to serve in government. Still, religious tests were designed to exclude certain people—often Catholics or non-Christians—from holding office based on their faith.

Now bear this in mind, brothers and sisters, that principle, you see the no religious test shall be required, had to do with not requiring people to swear an oath and they limited religious liberty to Protestant belief systems. Why? Because Catholics were devoted to a foreign power, a foreign leader. And atheists and Turks, etc. did not acknowledge the Bible as the Word of God. And the Bible is what is intended in the Constitution rather in the Declaration of Independence, where it mentions the laws of nature and of nature's God. That's a very direct reference to the Bible. Furthermore, the subscription clause of the Constitution, which says in the year of our Lord, is a direct reference to the Lord Jesus Christ.

So Catholics believing transubstantiation, they believe the Eucharist is Christ. And that's a problem when you've got Catholics involved in government, because they bend and twist everything towards Rome, typically. Maybe not every single Catholic, not every single one, but collectively,

ultimately they're going to bend things in the direction of the Pope. And all of the teachings of Rome that basically say the Pope has the authority to control all the countries, especially professing Christian countries, the Pope has the authority to control all of them.

Now this used to be well known, and was the reason why there were laws against having Catholics in position to political power. And that continued all the way until when, until 1961. And this article at ConstitutionCenter.org acknowledges that.

It says;

But in *Torcaso v. Watkins* (1961), the Supreme Court unanimously held that religious tests for state office-holding violate the religion clauses of the First Amendment.

And what they did really is they reinterpreted Article 6 so that now a religious test was equal to having a requirement. You see, before, the religious test was only the swearing of an oath. It just like getting you to testify is one thing. Getting you to testify under oath is a different level of accountability. If you say something when you're being questioned kind of unofficially and you make certain statements, that's one thing. If you're under oath and you go into a court of law, you go before the FBI or you go before the US Congress and you testify under oath and you lie and you give out false information, you're committing a crime. You can be arrested and prosecuting go to jail. It's a different level of accountability. And that's what they were trying to remove from articles of religion. They wanted to remove that the oath and the punishment of somehow or other being in violation of a religious oath.

That's what Article 6 originally represented. There's even a whole article on this on the Harvard University website for those who want to investigate it further. I learned it from reading this article on the Harvard website.

Because our forefathers understood the political influence of the Vatican over all the countries in Europe, how that had created so many of the wars and so many of the problems even wrote about it.

Read what Sam Adams says in his [Rights of the Colonists 1772](#). He talks about the manipulations of Rome in a country, and that they established secret groups in a country, and they develop a hidden order within the established order.

And now, of course, people are trying to figure out why is communism taking over our country? Why is that happening? We're going to be talking about this in this new film on the Jesuits on American Jesuits. We're going to go over in part the history of the Jesuits and the development of communism in the 19th century.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation is political

That the word communism is traced to the word communion. Communion. That's not typically what we're told, but it is traced to the word communion. And in the communion, the Catholic communion, when the priest holds up the wafer and he says the words, *hoc est corpus*, and the wafer now becomes God, becomes Christ in the flesh, so much so that you have to go and bow down and worship this wafer. And if you don't, then you're in rebellion to God. Well, who's holding the wafer? The Catholic priest. And only an ordained Roman Catholic priest has the power and the authority to call down Christ from heaven. So if a Roman Catholic priest has the power to call down God himself from heaven, if God is going to obey the priesthood of Rome, well, then how much more should everybody else obey the priesthood of Rome?

You see where this is headed. This is where transubstantiation was a very politicized issue. It wasn't just about somebody's theology. It became very political and it became about the priesthood of Rome controlling all areas of society. And that's what transubstantiation empowered the priesthood of Rome to do.

Catholic Communion linked to Communism!

And so what they did is they took that concept of communion and they turned into communism. So now instead of the wafer, instead of all power being channeled into the wafer as God, now all power is channeled into the state. And the state effectively becomes God. That, I believe, is what the Jesuits engineered in the 19th century with Karl Marx as one of their co-conspirators, if you will.

This is from a work by J.A. Wiley called [The Seventh Vile or The Past and Present of Papal Europe](#). And this was published by J.A. Wiley in 1868. 1868. Mark the date. 1868. Before communism ever really took over any country anywhere, but this is before the communists take over of China or Russia or any other part of the world. You had Wiley warning people that communism emanates from Rome. All right, so here is the quote. I'm going to read at least part of it. He says:

“Despotism had long withheld from society it's rights. Communism has now come affirming that society has no rights.

And then he goes on to say,

“If ever Heaven in his wrath sent an incarnation of malignity from the place of all evil to chastise the guilty race of man, it is communism. But the hell from which it has come is Rome. Communism has drawn its birth from the fetid womb of Popery, whose superstition has passed into atheism.”

Wow, isn't that powerful? Wiley goes on. Of course, he saw he saw prophetic

fulfillment happening with the development of communism. So he goes on, I'll skip down a bit. He said,

"Should the communists prevail? There remains on earth no further power of staying the revolution. And it must roll on avalanche like to the awful born. Providence may have assigned it, crushing and bearing in its progress, thrones, altars, laws, rights, the fences of order and the bulwarks of despotism, the happiness of families and the prosperity of kingdoms. But above the crash of thrones and the agonies of expiring nations, we may hear the voice of the angel of the waters saying, Thou art righteous, O Lord, because Thou has judged thus, for they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and Thou has given them blood to drink, for they are worthy.

So Wiley saw communism as a righteous judgment from God, God's judgment upon man and his sin and rebellion against God in the gospel of Christ. He goes on, he says,

"Had the Reformation succeeded, the world would have been spared all these dreadful calamities. The Reformation was the Elijah before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord. It was the voice crying in the papal wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord. It addressed the apostate churches of Europe, as John did, the Jewish church. The axe is laid unto the root of the trees, therefore every tree which bringeth not forth fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.

Now I think what Wiley is communicating in his teaching here is his belief that events are unfolding, that the same pattern of warnings and followed by judgment that we have seen in the past, as recorded in the scripture, that those same patterns of warning and judgment we find throughout history. And Wiley saw that beginning to come to pass in his day in the 19th century. I don't think J.A. Wiley could have foreseen how devastating communism would be. But maybe I'm wrong. Maybe he did, because you know the wording, the words that he's choosing and the description, talking about destroying everything in its path, that is very much the impact that communism has had in many parts of the world. It has had a very destructive ruinous, calamitous, bloody impact on mankind.

And now what we're watching here in the United States of America, now that agents of Rome have captured the government of the United States of America, we are sitting on the brink of a full-blown communist revolution and takeover of our country. In fact, some people are already arguing that the United States government is operating as a communist government. There are people who are saying that we're already there, and they're pointing to things like what's going on with the January 6 trials. People just rounded up, and it's obviously a show trial where the due process is not really being followed. The rule of law is not really being obeyed. The rule of law, and this is the

great danger. It's what all of our ancestors warned us about.

Once we the people allow those who are in charge of government to remove the laws of God, you allow God's law to be taken out of the way, you have to ask yourself the question, what are they going to replace it with? And typically what happens is they replace it with arbitrary decision-making. In other words, whoever's in charge just says, okay, here's what we're going to do. Do this, do that, whatever. And the rule of law is cast aside. And that's what we're seeing happen. The rule of law is cast aside.

Now we have people in government making these arbitrary decisions about gender confusion. I mean, there's a video clip of Kamala Harris sitting down and talking about her pronouns, and she identifies as a female, and her pronouns are this and that. And all this other, there's been no formal decision made by our Congress. The American people haven't voted for people to get involved in Congress and start passing laws to support these things. No, they're just arbitrarily making them up and imposing them on our schools, colleges, universities, and on the government.

What they're doing, of course, by denying the authority of our Creator and the boundaries given to us by God Himself is engaging in a form of sedition and ultimately treason. Because the very foundation of our law begins with the authority of God with the laws of nature and of nature's God and the authority of God as our Creator. And that's what they're denying fundamentally. But nevertheless, these things have happened before throughout history.

Brothers and sisters, I mean, we're told, for example, in the Old Testament where it says in Psalm 119, verse 126, it says, It's time for the Lord to work for they have made void thy law. God's law has been made void because of how these corruptors and usurpers are handling the rule of law. They've cast aside the whole idea that government is supposed to operate as the minister of God. They've cast aside what King David says in the Old Testament. The word of the Lord came unto me saying, He that ruleth over men must be just reigning in the fear of God. That's what they have put aside.

Our only hope as a nation

And we believe, as we've said before, if there's any hope for America for us as a nation, it is to repent of the ungodliness that's being normalized before our very eyes, to repent of that and turn this country back toward God and to restore the authority of God and His Word in the Bible, which, yes, I believe we have the right to do. Why? Because that's what our country was founded on. That's the whole point of my film, the true Christian history of America. There is a true Christian history.

Yes, there are tares among the wheat, but the wheat don't stand down because of the tares. In other words, God's authority is not overthrown because there's tares in the wheat field. So there's nothing in the Scripture that says any such thing. In fact, God's people are called to stand up and to confront the wicked and ultimately to overcome them by faith, and by the power of God above all, praise the Lord.

Listen to the entire talk!