

# Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner

## Chapter V Peter



This is the continuation of the [previous chapter of Roman Catholicism](#) by Lorraine Boettner.

### **1 The Roman Catholic Position**

The controversial passage in regard to Peter's place in the Church is Matthew 16:13-19, which reads as follows: "Now Jesus, having come into the district of Caesarea Philippi, began to ask his disciples, saying, 'Who do men say the Son of Man is?' But they said, 'Some say, John the Baptist; and others, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets.' He said to them, 'But who do you say that I am?' Simon Peter answered and said, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' Then Jesus answered and said, 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed this to thee, but my Father in heaven. And I say to thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Confraternity Version).

To this passage the Confraternity Version adds the following interpretation:

"The rock was Peter. ... *The gates of hell*: hostile, evil powers. Their aggressive force will struggle in vain against the Church. She shall never be overcome; she is indefectible. And since she has the office of teacher (cf. 28, 16-20), and since she would be overcome if error prevailed, she is infallible.

"Keys: a symbol of authority. Peter has the power to admit into the Church and to exclude therefrom. Nor is he merely the porter; he has complete power within the Church. 'To bind and to loose' seems to have been used by the Jews in the sense of to forbid or to permit; but the present context requires a more comprehensive meaning. In heaven God ratifies the decisions which Peter makes on earth in the name of Christ" (pp. 36-37).

And the late Cardinal Gibbons, a former archbishop of Baltimore and one of the most representative American Roman Catholics, in his widely read book, *Faith of our Fathers*, set forth the position of his church in these words:

"The Catholic Church teaches that our Lord conferred on St. Peter the first place of honor and jurisdiction in the government of His whole church, and

that the same spiritual supremacy has always resided in the popes, or bishops of Rome, as being the successors of St. Peter. Consequently, to be true followers of Christ all Christians, both among the clergy and laity, must be in communion with the See of Rome, where Peter rules in the person of his successor" (p. 95).

The whole structure of the Roman Church is built on the assumption that in Matthew 16:13-19 Christ appointed Peter the first pope and so established the papacy. Disprove the primacy of Peter, and the foundation of the papacy is destroyed. Destroy the papacy, and the whole Roman hierarchy topples with it. Their system of priesthood depends absolutely upon their claim that Peter was the first pope at Rome, and that they are his successors. We propose to show that (1) Matthew 16:13-19 does not teach that Christ appointed Peter a pope; (2) that there is no proof that Peter ever was in Rome; and (3) that the New Testament records, particularly Peter's own writings, show that he never claimed authority over the other apostles or over the church, and that that authority was never accorded to him.

## **2 The "Rock"**

"And I say to thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matthew 16:18, Confraternity Version).

Romanists quote this verse with relish, and add their own interpretation to establish their claim for papal authority. But in the Greek the word Peter is Petros, a person, masculine, while the word "rock," *petra*, is feminine and refers not to a person but to the declaration of Christ's deity that Peter had just uttered—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

Using Peter's name and making, as it were, a play upon words, Jesus said to Peter, "You are Petros, and upon this *petra* I will build my church." The truth that Peter had just confessed was the foundation upon which Christ would build His church. He meant that Peter had seen the basic, essential truth concerning His person, the essential truth upon which the church would be founded, and that nothing would be able to overthrow that truth, not even all the forces of evil that might be arrayed against it. Peter was the first among the disciples to see our Lord as the Christ of God. Christ commended him for that spiritual insight, and said that His church would be founded upon that fact. And that, of course, was a far different thing from founding the church on Peter.

Had Christ intended to say that the Church would be founded on Peter, it would have been ridiculous for Him to have shifted to the feminine form of the word in the middle of the statement, saying, if we may translate literally and somewhat whimsically, "And I say unto thee, that thou art Mr. Rock, and upon this, the Miss Rock, I will build my church." Clearly it was upon the truth that Peter had expressed, the deity of Christ, and not upon weak, vacillating Peter, that the church would be founded. The Greek "*petros*" is commonly used of a small, movable stone, a mere pebble, as it were. But "*petra*" means an immovable foundation, in this instance, the basic truth that Peter had just confessed, the deity of Christ. And in fact, that is the point

of conflict in the churches today between evangelicals on the one hand, and modernists or liberals on the other—whether the church is founded on a truly divine Christ as revealed in a fully trustworthy Bible, or whether it is essentially a social service and moral welfare organization which recognizes Christ as an example, an outstandingly great and good man, but denies or ignores His deity.

The Bible tells us plainly, not that the church is built upon Peter, but that it is “built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone” (Ephesians 2:20). And again, “For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (1 Corinthians 3:11). Without that foundation the true Christian church could not exist.

If Matthew 16:18 had been intended to teach that the church is founded on Peter, it would have read something like this: “Thou art Peter, and upon you I will build my church”; or, “Thou art Peter, and upon you the rock I will build my church.” But that is not what Christ said. He made two complete, distinct statements. He said, “Thou art Peter,” and, “Upon this rock (change of gender, indicating change of subject) I will build my church.”

The gates of hell were not to prevail against the church. But the gates of hell did prevail against Peter shortly afterward, as recorded in this same chapter, when he attempted to deny that Christ would be crucified, and almost immediately afterward, in the presence of the other disciples, received the stinging rebuke, “Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art a stumbling block unto me, for thou mindest not the things of God but the things of men” (v. 23)—surely strong words to use against one who had just been appointed pope!

Later we read that Peter slept in Gethsemane, during Christ’s agony. His rash act in cutting off the servant’s ear drew Christ’s rebuke. He boasted that he was ready to die for his Master, but shortly afterward shamefully denied with oaths and curses that he even knew Him. And even after Pentecost Peter still was subject to such serious error that his hypocrisy had to be rebuked by Paul, who says: “But when Cephas came to Antioch [at which time he was in full possession of his papal powers, according to Romanist doctrine], I resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned” (Galatians 2:11). And yet Romanists allege that their pope, as Peter’s successor, is infallible in matters of faith and morals!

The Gospel written by Mark, who is described in early Christian literature as Peter’s close companion and understudy, does not even record the remark about the “rock” in reporting Peter’s confession at Caesarea Philippi (Mark 8:27-30). No, Christ did not build His church upon a weak, sinful man. Rather the essential deity of Christ, which was so forcefully set forth in Peter’s confession, was the foundation stone, the starting point, on which the church would be built.

That no superior standing was conferred upon Peter is clear from the later disputes among the disciples concerning who should be greatest among them. Had such rank already been given, Christ would simply have referred to His grant of power to Peter. Instead we read:

"And they came to Capernaum: and when he was in the house he asked them, What were ye reasoning on the way? But they held their Peace: for they had disputed one with another on the way, who was the greatest. And he sat down, and called the twelve; and he saith unto them, If any man would be first, he shall be last of all, and servant of all" (Mark 9:33-35).

And again:

"And there came near unto him James and John, the sons of Zebedee, saying unto him, Teacher, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall ask of thee. And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you? And they said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand, in thy glory. And when the ten heard it, they began to be moved with indignation concerning James and John. And Jesus called them unto him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they who are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all" (Mark 10:34-44).

It is interesting to notice that some of the church fathers, Augustine and Jerome among them, gave the Protestant explanation of this verse, understanding the "rock" to mean not Peter but Christ. Others, of course, gave the papal interpretation. But this shows that there was no "unanimous consent of the fathers," as the Roman Church claims, on this subject.

Dr. Harris says concerning the reference to the "rock":

"Mark's Gospel is connected with Peter by all early Christian tradition and it does not even include this word of Jesus to Peter. Likewise in the Epistles of Peter there is no such claim. In 1 Peter 2:6-8 Christ is called a rock and a chief cornerstone. But Peter here claims nothing for himself. Indeed he is explicit in calling all believers living stones built up a spiritual house with Christ as the head of the corner.

"Christ is repeatedly called a Rock. The background for this is that around thirty-four times in the Old Testament God is called a Rock or the Rock of Israel. It was a designation of God. In the Messianic passages, Isaiah 8:14; 28:16; and Psalm 118:22, Christ is called a Rock or Stone upon which we should believe. These passages are quoted in the New Testament and for that reason Christ is called a Rock several times. It designates Him as divine. For that reason, every Jew, knowing the Old Testament, would refuse the designation to Peter or to anyone except insofar as we are children of Christ. He is the Rock. We are living stones built upon Him. Ephesians 2:20 says this plainly. We are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone. Paul says of the Rock from which the Israelites drank that it typified Christ (1 Corinthians 10:4). In the New Testament there are twelve foundations and on them are the names of the twelve apostles—none of them are made pre-eminent" (The Bible Presbyterian Reporter, January, 1959.)

And Dr. Henry M. Woods says:

"If Christ had meant that Peter was to be the foundation, the natural form of statement would have been, 'Thou art Peter, and on thee I will build my church'; but He does not say this, because Peter was not to be the rock on which the church was built. Note also that in the expression 'on this rock,' our Lord purposely uses a different Greek word, Petra, from that used for Peter, Petros. He did this to show that, not Peter, but the great truth which had just been revealed to him, viz., that our Lord was 'the Christ, the Son of the living God,' was to be the church's foundation. Built on the Christ, the everlasting Saviour, the gates of hell would never prevail against the Church. But built on the well-meaning but sinful Peter, the gates of hell would surely prevail; for a little later our Lord had to severely rebuke Peter, calling him 'Satan'" (*Our Priceless Heritage*, p. 40).

### 3 The "Keys"

"And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matthew 16:19, Confraternity Version).

Admittedly this is a difficult verse to interpret, and numerous explanations have been given. It is important to notice, however, that the authority to bind and to loose was not given exclusively to Peter. In the eighteenth chapter of Matthew the same power *is given to all of the disciples*. There we read:

"At that hour the disciples came to Jesus. ... Amen. I say to you, whatever you bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven" (vv. 1,18, Confraternity Version).

Consequently Matthew 16:19 does not prove any superiority on Peter's part. Even the scribes and Pharisees had this same power, for Jesus said to them: "But woe upon you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye shut the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye enter not in yourselves, neither suffer them that are entering in to enter" (Matthew 23:13). And on another occasion He said: "The scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses' seat: all things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe: but do not ye after their works; for they say, and do not. Yea, they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be born, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with their finger" (Matthew 23:2-4).

Here the expression clearly means that the scribes and Pharisees, in that the Word of God was in their hands, thereby had the power, in declaring that Word to the people, to open the kingdom of heaven to them, and in withholding that Word they shut the kingdom of heaven against people. That was Moses' function in giving the law. It was, therefore, a declaratory power, the authority to announce the terms on which God would grant salvation, not an absolute power to admit or to exclude from the kingdom of heaven. Only God can do that, and He never delegates that authority to men.

And in Luke 11:52 Jesus says: "Woe unto you lawyers! for ye took away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered." Here, the key of the knowledge of the way of salvation, by which

entrance into the kingdom of heaven is obtained, was in the hands of the Pharisees in that they had the law of Moses in their possession, and were therefore the custodians of the Word of God. In that sense they possessed the key to the kingdom. They took away that key in that they failed to proclaim the Word of God to the people. They were not entering into the kingdom of heaven themselves, and they were hindering those who wanted to enter.

Furthermore, we notice that in the words spoken to Peter, it was "things," not "persons," that were to be bound or loosed—"whatsoever," not "whomsoever"—things such as the ceremonial laws and customs of the Old Testament dispensation were to be done away with, and new rituals and practices of the Gospel age were to be established.

Thus the "keys" symbolize the authority to open, in this instance, to open the kingdom of heaven to men through the proclamation of the Gospel. What the disciples were commissioned to do, given the privilege of doing, was the opposite of that which the scribes and Pharisees were doing; that is, they were to facilitate the entrance of the people into the kingdom of heaven.

There was, of course, no physical seat which had been used by Moses and which now was being used by the scribes and Pharisees. But the scribes and Pharisees, who were in possession of the law of Moses, were giving precepts which in themselves were authoritative and good and which therefore were to be obeyed; but since they did not live up to those precepts the people were not to follow their example.

It is clear that the keys were symbolical of authority, which here is specified as the power of binding and loosing; and it is also clear that the consequences of what the disciples did in this regard would go far beyond earth and would have their permanent results in heaven. They were in a real sense building for eternity. In referring to the keys of the kingdom Jesus was continuing the figure in which He had been comparing the kingdom of heaven to a house which He was about to build. It would be built upon a solid rock (Matthew 7:24). Entrance into that house was through the door of faith. This door was to be opened, first to the Jews, and then to the Gentiles. And Peter, who had been the first of the disciples to comprehend the person of Christ in His true deity and to confess that deity before the other disciples, was commissioned to be the first to open that door. In this sense the keys were first given to him. To him was given the distinction and high honor among the apostles of being the first to open the door of faith to the Jewish world, which he did on the day of Pentecost when through his sermon some three thousand Jews were converted (Acts 2:14-42), and a short time later the distinction and high honor of opening the door of faith to the Gentile world, which he did in the house of Cornelius (Acts 10:1-48). And while the keys were in this respect first given to Peter, they were soon afterward also given to the other disciples as they too proclaimed the Gospel both to Jews and Gentiles. But while Peter was given the distinction and honor of being the first to open the kingdom to the Jews, and then to the Gentiles, he did not claim nor assume any other authority, and was in all other respects on precisely the same footing as were the other apostles.

Possession of the keys, therefore, did not mean that Peter had sovereignly

within his own person the authority to determine who should be admitted to heaven and who should be excluded, as the Roman Church now attempts to confer that authority on the pope and priests. Ultimate authority is in the hands of Christ alone—it is He “that openeth and none shall shut, and that shutteth and none openeth” (Revelation 3:7). But it did mean that Peter, and later the other apostles, being in possession of the Gospel message, truly did open the door and present the opportunity to enter in as they proclaimed the message before the people. This same privilege of opening the door or of closing the door of salvation to others is given to every Christian, for the command that Christ gave His church was to go and make disciples of all the nations. Thus “the power of the keys” is a *declarative* power only.

It can almost be said that the Roman Catholics build their church upon these two verses which speak of the “rock” and the “keys.” They say that the power given to Peter was absolute and that it was transferred by him to his successors, although they have to admit that there is not one verse in Scripture which teaches such a transfer. Under this “power of the keys” the Roman Church claims that “In heaven God ratifies the decisions which Peter makes on earth” (footnote, Confraternity Version, p. 37).

But it is interesting to see how Peter himself understood this grant of power. In his exercise of the power of the keys he says: “And it shall be, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved” (Acts 2:21). And at the house of the Roman centurion Cornelius he again gave a universal Gospel invitation: “To him [Christ] bear all the prophets witness, that through his name every one that believeth on him shall receive remission of sins” (Acts 10:43). So, in the preaching of Peter, as elsewhere in the New Testament, salvation is set forth as based on faith in Christ, and nowhere is obedience to Peter, or to the pope, or to any other man even hinted at.

Rome terribly abuses this “power of the keys” to insure obedience to her commands on the part of her church members and to instill in them a sense of fear and of constant dependence on the church for their salvation. This sense of fear and dependence, with constant references to “Mother Church,” goes far to explain the power that the Roman Church has over her members, even cowing them to the extent that they are afraid to read or to listen to anything contrary to what their church teaches. And since that teaching is drilled into them from childhood, the truly formidable power that the Roman Church exercises over the laity can be easily understood.

#### **4 Papal Authority Not Claimed by Peter**

The Roman Church claims that Peter was the first bishop or pope in Rome and that the later popes are his successors. But the best proof of a man’s position and authority is his own testimony. Does Peter claim to be a pope, or to have primacy over the other apostles? Fortunately, he wrote two epistles or letters which are found in the New Testament. There he gives his position and certain instructions as to how others in the same position are to perform their duties. We read:

“Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ. ... The elders therefore among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, who

am also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight, not of constraint, but willingly, according to the will of God; nor yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock" (1 Peter 1:1, 5:1-3).

Here Peter refers to himself as an apostle of Jesus Christ, an elder (the word in the Greek is presbuteros), which of course has nothing to do with a sacrificing priesthood. He does not claim the highest place in the church as some would expect him to do or as some would claim for him. He assumes no ecclesiastical superiority, but with profound humility puts himself on a level with those whom he exhorts. He makes it clear that the church must be democratic, not authoritarian. He forbids the leaders to lord it over the people, to work for money or to take money unjustly. He says that they are to serve the people willingly, even eagerly, and that by their general lives they are to make themselves examples for the people.

But the fact is that the Church of Rome acts directly contrary to these instructions. Can anyone imagine the proud popes of later times adopting such a role of humility? It was several centuries later, when the church had lost much of its original simplicity and spiritual power, and had been submerged in a flood of worldliness, that the autocratic authority of the popes began to appear. After the fourth century, when the Roman empire had fallen, the bishops of Rome stepped into Caesar's shoes, took his pagan title of Pontifex Maximus, the supreme high priest of the pagan Roman religion, sat down on Caesar's throne, and wrapped themselves in Caesar's gaudy trappings. And that role they have continued ever since.

In regard to the title Pontifex, the *Standard International Encyclopedia* says this was "the title given by the ancient Romans to members of one of the two celebrated religious colleges. The chief of the order was called Pontifex Maximus. The pontiffs had general control of the official religion, and their head was the highest religious authority in the state. ... Following Julius Caesar the emperor was the Pontifex Maximus. In the time of Theodosius [emperor, died A.D. 395] the title became equivalent to Pope, now one of the titles of the head of the Roman Catholic Church."

Peter refused to accept homage from men—as when Cornelius the Roman centurion fell down at his feet and would have worshipped him, Peter protested quickly and said, "Stand up; I myself also am a man" (Acts 10:25-26). Yet the popes accept the blasphemous title of "Holy Father" as theirs as a matter of right. And how the cardinals, bishops, and priests do like to set themselves apart from the congregations and to lord it over the people!

Surely if Peter had been a pope, "the supreme head of the church," he would have declared that fact in his general epistles, for that was the place of all others to have asserted his authority. The popes have never been slow to make such claims for themselves, or to extend their authority as far as possible. But instead Peter refers to himself only as an apostle (of which there were eleven others), and as an elder or presbyter, that is, simply as a minister of Christ.



## 5 Paul's Attitude toward Peter

It is very interesting to notice Paul's attitude toward Peter. Paul was called to be an apostle at a later time, after church had been launched. Yet Peter had nothing to do with that choice, as he surely would have had, if he had been pope. Instead God called and ordained Paul without consulting Peter, as He has called and ordained many thousands of ministers and evangelists since then without reference to the popes of Rome. Paul was easily the greatest of the apostles, with a deeper insight into the way of salvation and a larger revealed knowledge concerning the mysteries of life and death. He wrote much more of the New Testament than did Peter. His thirteen epistles contain 2,023 verses, while Peter's two epistles contain only 166 verses. And if we ascribe the Epistle to the Hebrews to Paul, as does the Roman Catholic Church (Confraternity Version, p. 397), he wrote an even larger proportion. Peter's epistles do not stand first among the epistles, but after those of Paul; and in fact his second epistle was one of the last to be accepted by the church. Paul worked more recorded miracles than did Peter, and he seems to have established more churches than did Peter. Apart from the church at Rome, which we believe was established by laymen, Paul established more prominent and more permanent churches than did Peter. And, so far as the New Testament record goes, Paul's influence in the church at Rome was much greater than was that of Peter. Paul mentions Peter more than once, but nowhere does he defer to Peter's authority, or acknowledge him as pope.

Indeed, quite the contrary is the case. Paul had founded the church at Corinth, but when some there rebelled against his authority, even to the extent of favoring Peter, he does not give even an inch on his own authority. Instead he vigorously defends his authority, declaring, "Am I not an apostle? have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" (1 Corinthians 9:1), and again, "For in nothing was I behind the very chiefest apostles" (2 Corinthians 12:11), or, as translated in the Confraternity Version, "In no way have I fallen short of the most eminent apostles." He declares that he has been "intrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter with the gospel of the circumcision" (Galatians 2:7). He therefore put himself on a level with all the other apostles. Certainly those ideas were incompatible with any idea of a pope in Paul's day.

But beyond all that, on one occasion Paul publicly rebuked Peter. When Peter at Antioch sided with the "false brethren" (v. 4) in their Jewish legalism and "drew back and separated himself" from the Gentiles and was even the cause of Barnabas being misled, Paul administered a severe rebuke. We read:

"But when Cephas came to Antioch, I resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned. For before that certain came from James, he ate with the Gentiles; but when they came, he drew back and separated himself, fearing them that were of the circumcision. And the rest of the Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Cephas before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" (Galatians 2:11-14).

He then impressed upon Peter some good, sound, evangelical theology, declaring that:

"...a man is not justified by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ... because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified" (v. 16).

In other words, Paul gave the "Holy Father" a "dressing down" before them all, accusing him of not walking uprightly in the truth of the Gospel. Surely that was no way to talk to a pope! Imagine anyone today, even a cardinal, taking it upon himself to rebuke and instruct a real pope with such language! Just who was Paul that he should rebuke the Vicar of Christ for unchristian conduct? If Peter was the chief it was Paul's duty and the duty of the other apostles to recognize him as such and to teach only what he approved. Obviously Paul did not regard Peter as infallible in faith and morals, or recognize any supremacy on his part.

## **6 Attitude of the Other Apostles toward Peter**

The other apostles as well as Paul seem totally unaware of any appointment that made Peter the head of the church. Nowhere do they acknowledge his authority. And nowhere does he attempt to exercise authority over them. The only instance in which another man was chosen to succeed an apostle is recorded in Acts 1:15-26, and there the choice was made not by Peter but by popular choice on the part the brethren who numbered about one hundred and twenty, and by the casting of lots.

On another occasion Peter, together with John, was sent by the apostles to preach the Gospel in Samaria (Acts 8:14). Imagine the pope today being sent by the cardinals or bishops on any such mission. It is well known that today the popes seldom if ever preach. They do issue statements, and they address select audiences which come to them. But they do not go out and preach the Gospel as did Peter and the other apostles.

The important church council in Jerusalem (Acts 15) reveals quite clearly how the unity of the church was expressed in apostolic days. Differences had arisen when certain men from Judaea came down to Antioch, in Syria, where Paul and Barnabas were working and insisted that certain parts of the Jewish ritual must be observed. Had the present Roman Catholic theory of the papacy been followed, there would have been no need at all for a council. The church in Antioch would have written a letter to Peter, the bishop of Rome, and he would have sent them an encyclical or bull settling the matter. And of all the churches the one at Antioch was the last that should have appealed to Jerusalem. For according to Roman Catholic legend Peter was bishop in Antioch for seven years before transferring his see to Rome! But the appeal was made, not to Peter, but to a church council in Jerusalem. At that council not Peter but James presided and announced the decision with the words, "Wherefore my judgment is..." (v. 19). And his judgment was accepted by the apostles and presbyters. Peter was present, but only after there had been "much questioning" (v. 7) did he even so much as express an opinion. He did not attempt to make any infallible pronouncements although the subject under discussion was a vital matter of faith. In any event it is clear that the unity of the early church was maintained not by the voice of Peter but by the

decision of the ecumenical council which was presided over by James, the leader of the Jerusalem church. Furthermore, after that council *Peter is never again mentioned in the book of Acts.*

It is an old human failing for people to want to exercise authority over their fellow men. We are told that the disciples disputed among themselves which was to be accounted the greatest. Jesus rebuked them with the words: "If any man would be first, he shall be last of all, and servant of all" (Mark 9:35). On another occasion the mother of James and John came to Jesus with the request that her two sons should have the chief places in the kingdom. But He called the disciples to Him and said, "Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall 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" (Matthew 20:25-28). And even on the night in which Christ was delivered up to die they contended among themselves "which of them was accounted to be greatest" (Luke 22:24). In each instance Jesus taught them that they were not to seek to exercise lordship, but rather to excel in service. But in no instance did He settle the dispute by reminding them that Peter was the Prince of the Apostles. In fact they could not have argued that question at all if Peter had already been given the place of preeminence, as the Roman Church holds.

Christ alone is the Head of the church. "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Corinthians 3:11). The church is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone" (Ephesians 2:20). Paul says that God "gave him [Christ] to be head over all things to the church, which is his body" (Ephesians 1:22-23). Besides Him there can be no earthly foundation or head of the church. Only a monstrosity can have two heads for one body.

## **7 Was Peter Ever in Rome?**

According to Roman Catholic tradition Peter was the first bishop of Rome, his pontificate lasted twenty-five years, from A.D. 42 to 67, and he was martyred in Rome in A.D. 67. The Douay and Confraternity versions say that he was in Rome before the Jerusalem council of Acts 15, and that he returned to Jerusalem for that council, after which he went to Antioch, and then returned to Rome. In the Confraternity Version we read:

"After the resurrection the primacy was conferred upon him and immediately after the ascension he began to exercise it. After preaching in Jerusalem and Palestine he went to Rome, probably after his liberation from prison. Some years later he was in Jerusalem for the first church council, and shortly afterward at Antioch. In the year 67 he was martyred in Rome" (Introduction to the First Epistle of St. Peter).

The remarkable thing, however, about Peter's alleged bishopric in Rome, is that the New Testament has not one word to say about it. The word Rome occurs only nine times in the Bible, and never is Peter mentioned in connection with it. There is no allusion to Rome in either of his epistles. Paul's journey to

that city is recorded in great detail (Acts 27 and 28). There is in fact no New Testament evidence, nor any historical proof of any kind, that Peter ever was in Rome. All rests on legend. The first twelve chapters of the book of Acts tell of Peter's ministry and travels in Palestine and Syria. Surely if he had gone to the capital of the empire, that would have been mentioned. We may well ask, if Peter was superior to Paul, why does he receive so little attention after Paul comes on the scene? Not much is known about his later life, except that he traveled extensively, and that on at least some of his missionary journeys he was accompanied by his wife—for Paul says, "Have we no right to lead about a wife that is a believer, even as the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas" (1 Corinthians 9:5). (The Confraternity Version here reads "sister" instead of "wife"; but the Greek word is *gunē*, wife, not *adelphē*, sister.)

We know nothing at all about the origins of Christianity in Rome. This is acknowledged even by some Roman Catholic historians. It was already a flourishing church when Paul wrote his letter to the Romans in A.D. 58. Quite possibly it had been founded by some of those who were present in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost and heard Peter's great sermon when some 3,000 were converted, for Luke says that in that audience were "sojourners from Rome, both Jews and proselytes" (Acts 2:10). In any event there is nothing but unfounded tradition to support the claim that Peter founded the church in Rome and that he was its bishop for 25 years. The fact is that the apostles did not settle in one place as did the diocesan bishops of much later date, so that it is quite incorrect to speak of Rome as the "See of Peter," or to speak of the popes occupying "the chair" of St. Peter.

Legend was early busy with the life of Peter. The one which tells of his twenty-five years' episcopate in Rome has its roots in the apocryphal stories originating with a heretical group, the Ebionites, who rejected much of the supernatural content of the New Testament, and the account is discredited both by its origin and by its internal inconsistencies. The first reference that might be given any credence at all is found in the writings of Eusebius, and that reference is doubted even by some Roman Catholic writers. Eusebius wrote in Greek about the year 310, and his work was translated by Jerome. A 17th century historian, William Cave (1637-1713), chaplain to King Charles II of England, in his most important work, *The Lives of the Apostles*, says:

"It cannot be denied that in St. Jerome's translation it is expressly said that he (Peter) continued twenty-five years as bishop in that city: but then it is as evident that this was his own addition, who probably set things down as the report went in his time, *no such thing being found in the Greek copy of Eusebius.*"

Exhaustive research by archaeologists has been made down through the centuries to find some inscription in the Catacombs and other ruins of ancient places in Rome that would indicate that Peter at least visited Rome. But the only things found which gave any promise at all were some bones of uncertain origin. L. H. Lehmann, who was educated for the priesthood at the University for the Propagation of the Faith, Rome, tells us of a lecture by a noted Roman archaeologist, Professor Marucchi, given before his class, in which he said that no shred of evidence of Peter's having been in the Eternal

City had ever been unearthed, and of another archaeologist, Di Rossi, who declared that for forty years his greatest ambition had been to unearth in Rome some inscription which would verify the papal claim that the Apostle Peter was actually in Rome, but that he was forced to admit that he had given up hope of success in his search. He had the promise of handsome rewards by the church if he succeeded. What he had dug up verified what the New Testament says about the formation of the Christian church in Rome, but remained absolutely silent regarding the claims of the bishops of Rome to be the successors of the apostle Peter (cf., *The Soul of a Priest*, p. 10).

And, after all, suppose Peter's bones should be found and identified beyond question, what would that prove? The important thing is, does the Church of Rome teach the same Gospel that Peter taught? Succession to Peter should be claimed, not by those who say they have discovered his bones, but by those who teach the Gospel that he taught—the evangelical message of salvation by grace through faith.

Furthermore, if mere residence conferred superiority, then Antioch would outrank Rome; for the same tradition which asserts that Peter resided in Rome asserts that he first resided in Antioch, a small city in Syria. It is well known that during the time of the apostles and for generations later the Eastern cities and the Eastern church had the greatest influence, and that the Roman church was comparatively insignificant. The first councils were held in Eastern cities and were composed almost altogether of Eastern bishops. Four of the patriarchates were Eastern—Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople, and Alexandria. Rome did not gain the ascendancy until centuries later, after the breakup of the Roman empire. If any church had a special right to be called the Mistress of all the churches, it surely was the church in Jerusalem, where our Lord lived and taught, where He was crucified, where Christianity was first preached by Peter and the other apostles, where Peter's great Pentecostal sermon was delivered, and from which went forth to Antioch and Rome and to all the world the glad tidings of salvation. Long before the Reformation Rome's claim to be the only true church was rejected by the eastern churches, which were the most ancient and in the early days much the most influential churches in the world.

Another interesting and very important if not decisive line of evidence in this regard is the fact that Paul was preeminently the apostle to the Gentiles while Peter was preeminently the apostle to the Jews, this division of labor having been by divine appointment. In Galatians 2:7-8 Paul says that he "had been intrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter with the gospel of the circumcision (for he that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for me also unto the Gentiles)." Thus Paul's work was primarily among the Gentiles, while Peter's was primarily among the Jews. Peter ministered to the Jews who were in exile in Asia Minor, "to the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia" (1 Peter 1:1), and in his journeys he went as far east as Babylon, from which city his first epistle (and probably his second) was addressed to the Jewish Christians in Asia Minor: "She that is in Babylon, elect together with you, saluteth you" (1 Peter 5:13). As most of Paul's letters were addressed to churches he had evangelized, so Peter wrote

to the Jewish brethren that he had evangelized, who were scattered through those provinces. While there is no Scriptural evidence at all that Peter went west to Rome, here is a plain statement of Scripture that he did go east to Babylon. Why cannot the Roman Church take Peter's word to that effect?

But his testimony, of course, must be circumvented by those who are so anxious to place him in Rome, and they take a curious way to do it. The Confraternity edition has an introductory note to 1 Peter which reads: "The place of composition is given as 'Babylon'... a cryptic designation of the city of Rome."

But there is no good reason for saying that "Babylon" means "Rome." The reason alleged by the Church of Rome for understanding Babylon to mean Rome is that in the book of Revelation Rome is called by that name (Revelation 17:5, 18:2). But there is a great difference between an apocalyptic book such as the book of Revelation, which for the most part is written in figurative and symbolic language, and an epistle such as this which is written in a straightforward, matter-of-fact style.

In regard to Peter's assignment to work among the Jews, it is known that there were many Jews in Babylon in New Testament times. Many had not returned to Palestine after the Exile. Many others, such as those in Asia Minor and Egypt, had been driven out or had left Palestine for various reasons. Josephus says that some "gave Hyrcanus, the high priest, a habitation at Babylon, where there were Jews in great numbers" (Antiquities, Book XV, Ch. II, 2). Peter's assigned ministry to the Jews took him to those places where the Jews were in the greatest numbers, even to Babylon.

## **8 Paul's Epistle to the Romans**

The strongest reason of all for believing that Peter never was in Rome is found in Paul's epistle to the Romans. According to Roman Church tradition, Peter reigned as pope in Rome for 25 years, from A.D. 42 to 67. It is generally agreed that Paul's letter to the Christians in Rome was written in the year A.D. 58, at the very height of Peter's alleged episcopacy there. He did not address his letter to Peter, as he should have done if Peter was in Rome and the head of all the churches, but to the saints in the church in Rome. How strange for a missionary to write to a church and not mention the pastor! That would be an inexcusable affront. What would we think of a minister today who would dare to write to a congregation in a distant city and without mentioning their pastor tell them that he was anxious to go there that he might have some fruit among them even as he has had in his own community (1:13), that he was anxious to instruct and strengthen them, and that he was anxious to preach the Gospel there where it had not been preached before? How would their pastor feel if he knew that such greetings had been sent to 27 of his most prominent members who were mentioned by name in the epistle (Ch. 16)? Would he stand for such ministerial ethics? And if he were the most prominent minister in the land, as allegedly was the bishop of Rome, such an affront would be all the more inexcusable. This point alone ought to open the eyes of the most obdurate person blinded by the traditions of the Roman Church.

If Peter had been working in the church in Rome for some 16 years, why did Paul write to the people of the church in these words: "For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the and ye may be established" (1:11)? Was not that a gratuitous insult to Peter? Was it not a most presumptuous thing for Paul to go over the head of the pope? And if Peter was there and had been there for 16 years, why was it necessary for Paul to go at all, especially since in his letter he says that he does not build on another's foundation: "making it my aim so to preach the gospel, not where Christ was already named, that I might not build upon another man's foundation" (15:20)? This indicates clearly that Peter was not then in Rome, and that he had not been there, that in fact Paul was writing this letter because no apostle had yet been in Rome to clarify the Gospel to them and to establish them in the faith. At the conclusion of this letter Paul sends greetings to the 27 people mentioned above, including some women, also to several groups. But he does not mention Peter in any capacity.

And again, had Peter been in Rome prior to or at the time when Paul arrived there as a prisoner in A.D. 61, Paul could not have failed to have mentioned him, for in the epistles written from there during his imprisonment—Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon—he gives a complete list of his fellow workers in Rome, and Peter's name is not among them. He spent two whole years there as a prisoner, and received all who came to visit him (Acts 28:30). Nor does he mention Peter in his second epistle to Timothy, which was written from Rome during his second imprisonment, in A.D. 67, the year that Peter is alleged to have suffered martyrdom in Rome, and shortly before his own death (2 Timothy 4:6-8). He says that all his friends have forsaken him, and that only Luke is with him (4:10-11). Where was Peter? If Peter was in Rome when Paul was there as a prisoner, he surely lacked Christian courtesy since he never called to offer aid. Surely he must have been the first absentee bishop on a big scale!

All of this makes it quite certain that Peter never was in Rome at all. Not one of the early church fathers gives any support to the belief that Peter was a bishop in Rome until Jerome in the fifth century. Du Pin, a Roman Catholic historian, acknowledges that "the primacy of Peter is not recorded by the early Christian writers, Justin Martyr (139), Irenaeus (178), Clement of Alexandria (190), or others of the most ancient fathers." The Roman Church thus builds her papal system, not on New Testament teaching, nor upon the facts of history, but only on unfounded traditions.

The chronological table for Peter's work, so far as we can work it out, seems to be roughly as follows:

Most Bible students agree that Paul's conversion occurred in the year A.D. 37. After that he went to Arabia (Galatians 1:17), and after three years went up to Jerusalem where he remained with Peter for 15 days (Galatians 1:18). That brings us to the year A.D. 40. Fourteen years later he again went to Jerusalem (Galatians 2:1), where he attended the Jerusalem council described in Acts 15, in which Peter also participated (v. 6). This conference dealt primarily with the problems which arose in connection with the presentation of the Gospel in Jewish and Gentile communities. Paul and Barnabas presented their case, and were authorized by the council to continue

their ministry to the Gentiles (Acts 15:22-29); and this quite clearly was the occasion on which Paul was assigned to work primarily among the Gentiles while Peter was assigned to work primarily among the Jews (Galatians 2:7-8), since this same Jerusalem council is spoken of in the immediate context (Galatians 2:1-10). So this brings us to the year A.D. 54, and Peter still is in Syria, 12 years after the time that the Roman tradition says that he began his reign in Rome.

Sometime after the Jerusalem council Peter also came to Antioch, on which occasion it was necessary for Paul to reprimand him because of his conformity to Judaistic rituals (Galatians 2:11-21). And the same Roman tradition which says that Peter reigned in Rome also says that he governed the church in Antioch for seven years before going to Rome. Hence we reach the year A.D. 61, with Peter still in Syria! Indeed, how could Peter have gone to Rome, which was the very center of the Gentile world? Would he defy the decision reached by all the apostles and brethren from the various churches who met in the famous first Christian council in Jerusalem? Clearly the Scriptural evidence is that Peter accepted that decision, and that his work was primarily among the Jews of the dispersion, first in Asia Minor, and later as far east as Babylon—that in fact his work took him in the opposite direction from that which Roman tradition assigns to him! And even if Peter had been the first bishop of Rome, that would not mean that the bishops who followed him would have had any of the special powers that he had. The apostles had the power to work miracles and to write inspired Scripture. Even if Peter had been granted special powers above those of the other apostles, there is nothing in Scripture to indicate that those powers could have been transmitted to his successors. In his second epistle he makes a reference to his approaching death (1:14), and surely that would have been the appropriate place to have said who his successor should be and what the method of choosing future bishops should be. But he gives no indication that he even thought of such things. Peter as an apostle had qualifications and gifts which the popes do not have and dare not claim. The fact of the matter is that with the passing of the apostles their place as guides to the church was taken not by an infallible pope but by an inspired and infallible Scripture which had been developed by that time, which we call the New Testament, through which God would speak to the church from that time until the end of the age.

We may be certain that if the humble, spiritually-minded Peter were to come back to earth he would not acknowledge as his successor the proud pontiff who wears the elaborate, triple-decked, gold bejeweled crown, who wears such fabulously expensive clothing, who is carried on the shoulders of the people who stands before the high altar of worship, who is surrounded by a Swiss military guard, and who receives such servile obedience from the people that he is in effect, if not in reality, worshipped by them. The dedicated Christian minister who serves his people faithfully and humbly, and not the pope, is the true successor of Peter.

## **9 Conclusion**

Let it be understood that we do not seek to minimize or downgrade but only to



expose the preposterous claims that the Roman Church makes for its popes and hierarchy. Peter was a prince of God, but he was not the Prince of the Apostles. He, together with the other apostles, Mary, and the early Christians, turned from the religion in which they were born, Judaism, and became simply Christians, followers of Christ. Not one of them was a Roman Catholic. Roman Catholicism did not develop until centuries later.


The doctrine of the primacy of Peter is just one more of the many errors that the Church of Rome has added to the Christian religion. With the exposure of that fallacy the foundation of the Roman Church is swept away. The whole papal system stands or falls depending on whether or not Peter was a pope in Rome, and neither the New Testament nor reliable historical records give any reason to believe that he ever held that position or that he ever was in Rome.

(Continued in [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Section Two Chapter VI The Papacy.](#))

## **All chapters of Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner**

- [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter I Introduction](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter II The Church](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter III The Priesthood](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter IV Tradition](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter V Peter](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Section Two Chapter VI The Papacy](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter VII Mary Part 1](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter VII Mary Part 2](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter VIII The Mass](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter IX The Confessional](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter X Purgatory](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Section Three Chapter XI The Infallibility of the Pope](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter XII Penance, Indulgences: Salvation by Grace or by Works?](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter XIII Ritualism](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter XIV Celibacy](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter XV Marriage](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Section Four Chapter XVI The Parochial School](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter XVII By What Moral Standard?](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter XVIII Intolerance, Bigotry, Persecution](#)
  - [Roman Catholicism By Lorraine Boettner Chapter XIX A System Tested by its Fruits](#)
-

# False Interpretations of Divine Prophecy



Two Jesuits published their respective but quite counter interpretations, Ribera in 1591 published *Babylon and Antichrist*, the Futurist scheme; the other, Alcasar, the Preterist; that the prophecies have all been fulfilled in the fall of Pagan Rome.

---

## Is it Biblical to Question Our Pastor's Teaching?



I was blessed to have found Christ in January 1971 through the ministry of [the Navigators](#), a Christian outreach ministry that started in 1930 when young Dawson Trotman took up the challenge to memorize Bible Scriptures on salvation from a Sunday school memorization contest. Though he wasn't saved yet, he won the contest! Within the following week, the Holy Spirit used the scripture verses he memorized to lead him to Christ! He continued to memorize Scripture and then won a disciple who won another disciple for Christ. I'm writing this from memory what I heard 50 years ago. The things I heard when young in Christ have stuck with me.

After I received Christ as my Lord and Savior when attending an evening church service the Navigators brought me to, I began to attend the Navigators' weekly Bible studies. After three months I came to the conclusion

based on the Bible studies that I no longer needed to go to Catholic Mass. I realized from Navigator Bible study that what the Catholic priest was teaching and the very practice of the Mass was not in accordance with the Bible.

The Navigators were not preachers, they were teachers. Their Bible studies consisted of Bible verses and questions about the verse with multiple-choice answers. Reading and understanding the Bible verse led me to choose the right answer! I attended the Navigator fellowships and Bible studies in California and Japan from 1971 to 1973.

The Navigators put a great emphasis on knowing the Scriptures, memorizing Bible verses, and basing doctrine solely on what the Bible says, not on what some preacher says it says. I sometimes met some high-ranking leadership in the Navigators and never felt uncomfortable in their presence. They did not come across as know-it-all preachers but as simple followers of Jesus Christ. The good things I learned from the Navigators and the practice of [memorizing and reviewing Scriptures continue with me to this very day](#). And my wife Tess is like-minded with me about the Scriptures being the basis of all sound doctrine.

We are thankful to have had a good pastor when we lived in Guam. He said some things we didn't agree with, but they were very minor things. And he didn't preach any Endtime doctrines from the pulpit, things we would not have *not* agreed with, things such as a 7-year Endtime scenario of the rise of the Antichrist who makes a peace-pact with Israel and allows them to rebuild their Temple. He may have believed that based on the doctrines of the church in the US mainland that sponsors him, but he didn't teach it. And he did not demand that we hold to the eschatological doctrines of his home church for us to be a member of his church.

Is it within the authority of the average believers in Christ to question things that Bible teachers, pastors, and evangelists are teaching? The Bereans in the book of Acts sets the precedent to do so.

Acts 17:10 And the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea: who coming thither went into the synagogue of the Jews.  
11 These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.

The Bereans didn't just take the word of Paul or Silas, they checked it out with the Scriptures! If they took the time to check out if the great Apostle Paul's teaching was correct or not by going to the Scriptures, I think it certainly behooves us to do the same. Do most Christians do that today? If they did, I don't see how so many false doctrines can abound in present-day churches!

Let's give some examples of incorrect doctrines of preachers I like before I get into ones I don't like.

- John MacArthur in a sermon only 11 days ago at the time of this article

gave a talk about "The Coming of a False Peace." There is no phrase, "false peace" anywhere in the Bible! I know where he got that doctrine. It's Dispensational Futurism from John Nelson Darby and C.I. Scofield. It's what I was taught when still young in Christ. Former hippies called the first 3.5 years of the reign of a future Antichrist a "plastic peace." It's based on a [false interpretation of Daniel 9:27](#). My hat is off to John MacArthur for many of his other sermons exposing sin in America, and for his defiance of unconstitutional COVID medical mandates and keeping his church open. But he's off on his eschatology.

- Charles A. Jennings of [Truth in History](#). We like his stance on Israel, eschatology, and the fact he believes all the gifts of the Spirit are relevant today. But last night we heard him teach the "Anglo-Israel" doctrine which says that the English are descendants of the tribes of Israel. How can they be when the Bible clearly says Israel is descended from Shem? The white European peoples are all descended from Japheth! English people are white! It was the descendants of Japheth, not Shem, who populated white Europe. It surprises me how pastor Jennings could teach such an error when he knows the Bible so well.
- Steve Gregg of the YouTube channel The Narrow Path. My wife and I think he's a great Bible teacher, and he came out of Dispensationalism, but nevertheless, he doesn't teach the Historicist interpretation of the Book of Revelation! I heard he even mocked it. That tells me he has not read the commentators of the Protestant Bible teachers of the past.
- Chuck Baldwin of Liberty Fellowship. My wife and I used to listen to him every week but we stopped when he began to teach the Preterist view of the Book of Revelation, namely that the Book of Revelation is all about the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in 70 AD! This is much worse than Steve Gregg's view because it ignores the Great Whore, the Scarlet woman who rides the Beast of Revelation chapter 17, the Vatican's worldwide covert government, the "Holy See", the murder of Bible-believing followers of Jesus Christ through the centuries, the Woman who claims to be the true Bride of Christ but is actually a whore working for Satan! How Chuck Baldwin could be so misled as to not see that despite all his knowledge and education is shocking! He's so right on other things including his views on the modern nation of Israel, and the correct interpretation of the Olivet Discourse of Matthew 24, Mark 13, and Luke 21.
- Christian J. Pinto of Noise of Thunder Radio. Tess and I love to listen to his podcasts, but sad to say he's wrong about Israel. I heard him once say the 1948 restoration of Israel was a fulfillment of Bible prophecy. I hope he changed his position on that. We are excited to see his new documentary when it comes out, Jesuits in America.

And then there's a bunch of popular preachers I don't like and never listen to. Everything they teach is questionable. I'm talking about all the prosperity Gospel preachers such as Kenneth Copeland. You know who they are.

You might question me too and that's fine with me. Today a man said a reference I quoted on an article did not have the information I said it has. I proved it does by taking a [screenshot of the article and posting it as my reply](#).

I stand with the majority of the Protestant Reformers on all my views of the Bible on this website. There are some things from Calvin I don't agree with, but I think his view of the Catholic Church was the same as mine.

Nobody's perfect, right? I don't claim to know it all. I like to listen to what others have to say, and then I test it with the Scriptures. I still like to listen to the above mentioned Bible teachers, but only on subjects I believe they are teaching correctly.

*1 John 4:1 Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.*

For more on this subject, please see an article on an external website, [Is it Wrong to Question My Pastor?](#). It contains many insights not covered here. Here are a couple of quotes from that article I like:

It is important for every individual in the church to have growing familiarity with the biblical word. We are to trust that the Holy Spirit will "guide us into all truth" (John 16:13). Posing questions about a pastor's teaching is to take ownership of our spiritual growth. As Christians, we are to ensure that we can differentiate between "the spirit of God and the spirit of falsehood" (1 John 4:6). Authentic pastors, committed to their congregation's spiritual growth, welcome such questions. Questions are seen as invitations to look at the biblical word in a deeper way. Authentic pastors see questions as an opportunity to journey together in faith and learning.

Toxic or abusive pastors, however, refuse to answer questions pertaining to their teaching. It is suggested that questioning a sermon is tantamount to questioning his or her spiritual authority. After all, they are the ones who have the biblical education (and understand the bible rightly); *they* are the ones charged with declaring God's voice; *they* are the ones who God has called to the ministry. Instead of an invitation for growth, questions are considered obstructive. Abusive pastors equate God's voice with their own.

This is no different than the attitude the priests and bishops of the Catholic Church have. I believe they are the Nicolaitans of Revelation 2:6.

*But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate.*

One interpretation of the Nicolaitans I heard is the clergy who oppresses the laity. Not even the Apostles Peter or Paul had that authority. They wrote letters to the churches in various cities to advise them, but if those churches didn't heed the apostle's advice, they suffered the consequences of their choice. They weren't bullied and forced to obey by an ecclesiastical

hierarchy.

To sum up, the answer to the question in the title of this article is, absolutely yes!

---

## [The Great Harlot's Daughters](#)



The Church of Rome's daughters: Ritualistic and apostate Churches, and especially to the High Church sections of the Churches of England and Scotland, and to the Greek and Eastern Churches, which all teach and practice many of the Church of Rome's doctrines and abominations.

---

## [The Root Of Antisemitism](#)



### **Foreword from the Webmaster:**

As Christians, we should not support Zionist Antichrist Israel, but neither should we hate the Jews as a people! The Apostle Paul loved his people the Jews and went out of his way to preach the Gospel to them. I believe all antisemitism comes from non-Christians, those who don't know true salvation by grace in Jesus Christ.

This article is from the Converted Catholic Magazine of which former Roman Catholic priest, Leo Herbert Lehmann (also known as L.H. Lehmann) is the editor. It was first put online in PDF format by the [LutheranLibrary.org](http://LutheranLibrary.org).

IT HAS BEEN ESTIMATED that after the war the Jewish people in Europe, as a result of wholesale slaughter by the Nazi-Fascists, will be so reduced in numbers that they will never recover from their losses. Germany, even if it loses 20 percent of its population, can make up for its losses in another generation. But not the Jews.

This wholesale extermination of a people in the twentieth century, simply because of their religious background, is something that both Protestants and Catholics have much to be concerned about. For anti-Semitism is a religious problem, intimately bound up with the most fundamental belief of Christians. It stems from the death of Christ, the central and essential point of Christian soteriology. **It is only in Protestant countries since the Reformation that Jews have ceased to be regarded as the 'scapegoat' for the responsibility and blame in connection with the crucifixion of Jesus Christ.** Even in the United States, while the ruthless slaughter of Jews has been taking place in Europe, the Catholic press has kept up this accusation that the Jews killed Christ – as the picture (below), syndicated by the American Catholic hierarchy's official N.C.W.C. News Service, shows. Implicit in this false accusation is an "explanation" of the horrors being meted out to Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe at that time.




# STRANGE BUT TRUE

## Little-Known Facts for Catholics

By M. J. MURRAY

Copyright, 1942, N. C. W. C. News Service



### EASTER MESSAGE, 1942 — ROMAN CATHOLIC STYLE

This anti-Semitic way of picturing the death of Jesus Christ belongs to the Middle Ages. The Catholic press revived it for Holy Week in America, 1942. Although the above is reproduced from the Catholic Tablet of Brooklyn. It will be noted that it was syndicated by the N.C.W.C., the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Washington, official organization of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the United States, which has its own world-wide news service.

It is both untrue and unscriptural that the Jews killed Christ. But this has been the Catholic cry against the Jews all through the centuries. Note also the stress on the meaning of the word "saffron" as "bile."

It must seem impossible to Jews, and to Christians themselves if they give time to consider it, that the same death of Christ on the cross could bring the inestimable gift of salvation to one section of the human race, and at the same time be made the curse of another. Yet it has been officially pronounced by the Popes of Rome for centuries that the death of Christ forever made the Jews actual slaves of Christians whom the death of Christ made free. Here is how the great Pope Innocent III, and other popes for centuries after him, put it:<sup>1</sup>

"Although Christian piety tolerates the Jews, whose own fault commits them to perpetual slavery... they must not be allowed to remain ungrateful to us in such a way as to repay us with contumely for favors and contempt for our familiarity... As they are reprobate slaves of the Lord, in whose death they evilly conspired (at least by the effect of the deed), let them acknowledge themselves as slaves of those whom the death of Christ made free."

It must first be asked, is this true Christian teaching? Did Christ so plan that one part of the human race would be saved and made free and another part



be made the slaves of those thus freed – all by one and the same act of his saving work? This teaching was dogmatized into the history of Europe by the Popes of Rome up till the time of the Protestant Reformation, and is the root cause of the slaughter of millions of innocent Jewish people that has taken place under Nazi-Fascist domination of Europe during the past five years. It must further be remembered that this ruthless slaughter was carried out by the Nazi-Fascist regimes to which the Vatican allied itself by solemn concordats – and to which it remains allied to this date. But it is not, and could never be, true Christian teaching.

The Protestant Reformation, out of which came democratic freedoms and equality before God of all human beings, put an end to this Roman Catholic teaching and established it so that the Jews, even while remaining Jews by race and religion, are the equal of Christians in their right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It is thus that Jesus Christ himself would have it, so that by justice, equality, love and kindness, the Jews might eventually be led to accept Jesus Christ as their Savior. Christ himself was born a Jew and all his apostles and followers were Jews. He was put to death by Roman soldiers after sentence by a Roman judge. The priests of the Jewish religion – who played politics with the officials of the Roman government over the heads of their people, much as the Vatican does today – conspired to have Jesus put to death by the Romans. “It is not lawful for us to put any man to death,” they told Pilate (John 18:31). But the Jewish people had no more to do with it than the Roman Catholic people in America have had to do with the political intrigues of the Vatican with Hitler, Mussolini, Franco and other Fascist dictators.

Saint Paul was a Jew, though he claimed Roman citizenship. He taught no such doctrine that Jews were the slaves of Christians because they conspired in the death of Christ. In his desire to bring all to Christ he declared (Gal. 3:28): “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” But that was before the Romans took over control of the Christian church and established their juridical concepts of ‘interdict’, ‘delict,’ and hierarchical authority.

Jesus Christ died to save all who truly accept him as Savior. He died to set all men free, and by his death could have enslaved no one. No true Christian, grateful for having been made free himself by the death of Christ, could ever bring himself to believe that the act that made him free made his Jewish neighbor his slave. But it is only in predominantly Protestant countries that Jews have been able to exercise their equal rights with Christians before the law.

The solution of the problem of anti-Semitism awaits official recognition of similar rights for Jews from the Roman Catholic church and governments of Roman Catholic countries.

1. cf. Migne, Patrologia, Vol. 27, p. 1291. For other decrees of the Popes against the Jews, see our pamphlet: “How the Popes Treated the Jews.”  
[Available from [LutheranLibrary.org](http://LutheranLibrary.org) –Ed]↵

---

# The Excellency of Christ Part II By Jonathan Edwards



Continued from [part I](#).

Having thus shown wherein there is an admirable conjunction of excellencies in Jesus Christ, I now proceed,

**Secondly,** To show how this admirable conjunction of excellencies appears in Christ's acts, [namely:]

- A) in his taking of human nature,
- B) in his earthly life,
- C) in his sacrificial death,
- D) in his exaltation in heaven,
- E) in his final subduing of all evil when he returns in glory.]

A) It appears in what Christ did in taking on him our nature.

In this act, his infinite condescension wonderfully appeared, That he who was God should become man; that the word should be made flesh, and should take on him a nature infinitely below his original nature! And it appears yet more remarkably in the low circumstances of his incarnation: he was conceived in the womb of a poor young woman, whose poverty appeared in this, when she came to offer sacrifices of her purification, she brought what was allowed of in the law only in case of poverty, as Luke 2:24. "

According to what Is said in the law of the Lord, a pair of turtle- doves, or two young pigeons." This was allowed only in case the person was so poor that she was not able to offer a lamb. Lev. 12:8. And though his infinite condescension thus appeared in the manner of his incarnation, yet his divine dignity also appeared in it; for though he was conceived in the womb of a poor virgin, yet he was conceived there by the power of the Holy Ghost. And his divine dignity also appeared in the holiness of his conception and birth. Though he was conceived in the womb of one of the corrupt race of mankind, yet he was conceived and born without sin; as the angel said to the blessed Virgin,

*Luke 1:35. " The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God."*

His infinite condescension marvelously appeared in the manner of his birth. He was brought forth in a stable because there was no room for them in the inn. The inn was taken up by others, that were looked upon as persons of greater account. The Blessed Virgin, being poor and despised, was turned or shut out. Though she was in such necessitous circumstances, yet those that counted themselves her betters would not give place to her; and therefore, in the time of her travail, she was forced to betake herself to a stable; and when the child was born, it was wrapped in swaddling clothes, and laid in a manger. There Christ lay a little infant, and there he eminently appeared as a lamb.

But yet this feeble infant, born thus in a stable, and laid in a manger, was born to conquer and triumph over Satan, that roaring lion. He came to subdue the mighty powers of darkness, and make a show of them openly, and so to restore peace on earth, and to manifest God's good-will towards men, and to bring glory to God in the highest, according as the end of his birth was declared by the joyful songs of the glorious hosts of angels appearing to the shepherds at the same time that the infant lay in the manger; whereby his divine dignity was manifested.

**B)** This admirable conjunction of excellencies appears in the acts and various passages of Christ's life.

Though Christ dwelt in mean outward circumstances, whereby his condescension and humility especially appeared, and his majesty was veiled; yet his divine divinity and glory did in many of his acts shine through the veil, and it illustriously appeared, that he was not only the Son of man, but the great God.

Thus, in the circumstances of his infancy, his outward meanness appeared; yet there was something then to show forth his divine dignity, in the wise men's being stirred up to come from the east to give honor to him their being led by a miraculous star, and coming and falling down and worshipping him, and presenting him with gold, frankincense, and myrrh. His humility and meekness wonderfully appeared in his subjection to his mother and reputed father when he was a child. Herein he appeared as a lamb. But his divine glory broke forth and shone when, at twelve years old, he disputed with doctors in the temple. In that he appeared, in some measure, as the Lion of the tribe of Judah.

And so, after he entered on his public ministry, his marvellous humility and meekness was manifested in his choosing to appear in such mean outward circumstances; and in being contented in them, when he was so poor that he had not where to lay his head, and depended on the charity of some of his followers for his subsistence, as appears by Luke 8. at the beginning. How meek, condescending, and familiar his treatment of his disciples; his discourses with them, treating them as a father his children, yea, as friends and companions. How patient, bearing such affliction and reproach, and so

many injuries from the scribes and Pharisees, and others. In these things he appeared as a Lamb.

And yet he at the same time did in many ways show forth his divine majesty and glory, particularly in the miracles he wrought, which were evidently divine works, and manifested omnipotent power, and so declared him to be the Lion of the tribe of Judah. His wonderful and miraculous works plainly showed him to be the God of nature; in that it appeared by them that he had all nature in his hands, and could lay an arrest upon it, and stop and change its course as he pleased. In healing the sick, and opening the eyes of the blind, and unstopping the ears of the deaf, and healing the lame, he showed that he was the God that framed the eye, and created the ear, and was the author of the frame of man's body. By the dead's rising at his command, it appeared that he was the author and fountain of life, and that

*"God the Lord, to whom belong the issues from death."*

By his walking on the sea in a storm, when the waves were raised, he showed himself to be that God spoken of in Job 9:8. "That treadeth on the waves of the sea." By his stilling the storm, and calming the rage of the sea, by his powerful command, saying, "Peace, be still," he showed that he has the command of the universe, and that he is that God who brings things to pass by the word of his power, who speaks and it is done, who commands and it stands fast;

*Psalm 115:7. "Who stilleth the noise of the seas, the noise of their waves."*

And Psalm 107:29.

*"That maketh the storm a calm, so that the waves thereof are still."*

And Psalm 139:8.

*"O Lord God of hosts, who is a strong Lord like unto thee, or to thy faithfulness round about thee? Thou rulest the raging of the sea: when the waves thereof arise, thou stillest them."*

Christ, by casting out devils, remarkably appeared as the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and showed that he was stronger than the roaring lion, that seizes whom he may devour. He commanded them to come out, and they were forced to obey. They were terribly afraid of him; they fall down before him, and beseech him not so torment them. He forces a whole legion of them to forsake their hold, by his powerful word; and they could not so much as enter into the swine without his leave. He showed the glory of his omniscience, by telling the thoughts of men; as we have often an account. Herein he appeared to be that God spoken of, Amos 4:13.

*"That declareth unto man what is his thought."*

Thus, in the midst of his meanness and humiliation, his divine glory appeared in his miracles, John 2:11.

*"This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested*

*forth his glory."*

And though Christ ordinarily appeared without outward glory, and in great obscurity, yet at a certain time he threw off the veil, and appeared in his divine majesty, so far as it could be outwardly manifested to men in this frail state, when he was transfigured in the mount. The apostle Peter, 2 Pet. 1:16,17. was an

*" eye-witness of his majesty, when he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; which voice that came from heaven they heard, when they were with him in the holy mount."*

And at the same time that Christ was wont to appear in such meekness, condescension, and humility, in his familiar discourses with his disciples, appearing therein as the Lamb of God; he was also wont to appear as The Lion of the tribe of Judah, with divine authority and majesty, in his so sharply rebuking the scribes and Pharisees, and other hypocrites.

C) This admirable conjunction of excellencies remarkably appears in his offering up himself a sacrifice for sinners in his last sufferings.

As this was the greatest thing in all the works of redemption, the greatest act of Christ in that work; so in this act especially does there appear that admirable conjunction of excellencies that has been spoken of. Christ never so much appeared as a lamb, as when he was slain:

*" He came like a lamb to the slaughter," Isaiah 53:7.*

Then he was offered up to God as a lamb without blemish, and without spot: then especially did he appear to be the anti-type of the lamb of the passover:

*1 Cor 5:7. " Christ our Passover sacrificed for us."*

And yet in that act he did in an especial manner appear as the Lion of the tribe of Judah; yea, in this above all other acts, in many respects, as may appear in the following things.

8. Then was Christ in the greatest degree of his humiliation, and yet by that, above all other things, his divine glory appears.

Christ's humiliation was great, in being born in such a low condition, of a poor virgin, and in a stable. His humiliation was great, in being subject to Joseph the carpenter, and Mary his mother, and afterwards living in poverty, so as not to have where to lay his head; and in suffering such manifold and bitter reproaches as he suffered, while he went about preaching and working miracles. But his humiliation was never so great as it was, in his last sufferings, beginning with his agony in the garden, till he expired on the cross. Never was he subject to such ignominy as then, never did he suffer so much pain in his body, or so much sorrow in his soul; never was he in so great an exercise of his condescension, humility, meekness, and patience, as he was in these last sufferings; never was his divine glory and majesty

covered with so thick and dark a veil; never did he so empty himself and make himself of no reputation, as at this time.

And yet, never was his divine glory so manifested, by any act of his, as in yielding himself up to these sufferings. When the fruit of it came to appear, and the mystery and ends of it to be unfolded in its issue, then did the glory of it appear, then did it appear as the most glorious act of Christ that ever he exercised towards the creature. This act of his is celebrated by the angels and hosts of heaven with peculiar praises, as that which is above all others glorious, as you may see in the context, (Revelation 5:9-12)

*" And they sang a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing."*

9. He never in any act gave so great a manifestation of love to God, and yet never so manifested his love to those that were enemies to God, as in that act.

Christ never did any thing whereby his love to the Father was so eminently manifested, as in his laying down his life, under such inexpressible sufferings, in obedience to his command and for the vindication of the honor of his authority and majesty; nor did ever any mere creature give such a testimony of love to God as that was.

And yet this was the greatest expression of his love to sinful men who were enemies to God; Rom. 5:10. " When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God, by the death of his Son." The greatness of Christ's love to such, appears in nothing so much as in its being dying love. That blood of Christ which fell in great drops to the ground, in his agony, was shed from love to God's enemies, and his own. That shame and spitting, that torment of body, and that exceeding sorrow, even unto death, which he endured in his soul, was what he underwent from love to rebels against God to save them from hell, and to purchase for them eternal glory. Never did Christ so eminently show his regard to God's honor, as in offering up himself a victim to Justice. And yet in this above all, he manifested his love to them who dishonored God, so as to bring such guilt on themselves, that nothing less than his blood could atone for it.

10. Christ never so eminently appeared for divine justice, and yet never suffered so much from divine Justice, as when he offered up himself a sacrifice for our sins.

In Christ's great sufferings did his infinite regard to the honor of God's justice distinguishingly appear, for it was from regard to that that he thus humbled himself.

And yet in these sufferings, Christ was the target of the vindictive expressions of that very justice of God. Revenging justice then spent all its force upon him, on account of our guilt; which made him sweat blood, and cry out upon the cross, and probably rent his vitals—broke his heart, the fountain of blood, or some other blood vessels—and by the violent fermentation turned his blood to water. For the blood and water that issued out of his side, when pierced by the spear, seems to have been extravasated blood, and so there might be a kind of literal fulfilment of Psalm 22:14.

*" I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels."*

And this was the way and means by which Christ stood up for the honor of God's justice, namely, by thus suffering its terrible executions. For when he had undertaken for sinners, and had substituted himself in their room, divine justice could have its due honor no other way than by his suffering its revenges.

In this the diverse excellencies that met in the person of Christ appeared, namely, his infinite regard to God's justice, and such love to those that have exposed themselves to it, as induced him thus to yield himself a sacrifice to it.

11. Christ's holiness never so illustriously shone forth as it did in his last sufferings, and yet he never was to such a degree treated as guilty.

Christ's holiness never had such a trial as it had then, and therefore never had so great a manifestation. When it was tried in this furnace it came forth as gold, or as silver purified seven times. His holiness then above all appeared in his steadfast pursuit of the honor of God, and in his obedience to him. For his yielding himself unto death was transcendently the greatest act of obedience that ever was paid to God by any one since the foundation of the world.

And yet then Christ was in the greatest degree treated as a wicked person would have been. He was apprehended and bound as a malefactor. His accusers represented him as a most wicked wretch. In his sufferings before his crucifixion, he was treated as if he had been the worst and vilest of mankind, and then, he was put to a kind of death, that none but the worst sort of malefactors were wont to suffer, those that were most abject in their persons, and guilty of the blackest crimes. And he suffered as though guilty from God himself, by reason of our guilt imputed to him; for he who knew no sin, was made sin for us; he was made subject to wrath, as if he had been sinful himself. He was made a curse for us.

Christ never so greatly manifested his hatred of sin, as against God, as in his dying to take away the dishonor that sin had done to God; and yet never was he to such a degree subject to the terrible effects of God's hatred of sin, and wrath against it, as he was then. In this appears those diverse excellencies meeting in Christ, namely, love to God, and grace to sinners.

12. He never was so dealt with, as unworthy, as in his last sufferings, and

yet it is chiefly on account of them that he is accounted worthy.

He was therein dealt with as if he had not been worthy to live: they cry out, "*Away with him! away with him! Crucify him.*" John 19:15. And they prefer Barabbas before him. And he suffered from the Father, as one whose demerits were infinite, by reason of our demerits that were laid upon him.

And yet it was especially by that act of his subjecting himself to those sufferings that he merited, and on the account of which chiefly he was accounted worthy of the glory of his exaltation. Philip. 2:8, 9. "*He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death; wherefore God hath highly exalted him.*" And we see that it is on this account chiefly, that he is extolled as worthy by saints and angels in the context: "*Worthy,*" say they, "*is the Lamb that was slain.*" This shows an admirable conjunction in him of infinite dignity, and infinite condescension and love to the infinitely unworthy.

13. Christ in his last sufferings suffered most extremely from those towards whom he was then manifesting his greatest act of love.

He never suffered so much from his Father, (though not from any hatred to him, but from hatred to our sins,) for he then forsook him, or took away the comforts of his presence; and then "*it pleased the Lord to bruise him, and put him to grief.*" as Isaiah 53:10. And yet he never gave so great a manifestation of love to God as then, as has been already observed.

So Christ never suffered so much from the hands of men as he did then; and yet never was in so high an exercise of love to men. He never was so ill treated by his disciples; who were so unconcerned about his sufferings, that they would not watch with him one hour, in his agony; and when he was apprehended, all forsook him and fled, except Peter, who denied him with oaths and curses. And yet then he was suffering, shedding his blood, and pouring out his soul unto death for them. Yea, he probably was then shedding his blood for some of them that shed his blood, for whom he prayed while they were crucifying him; and who were probably afterwards brought home to Christ by Peter's preaching. (Compare Luke 23:34. Acts 2:23,36,37,41. and chap. 3:17. and chap. 4.) This shows an admirable meeting of justice and grace in the redemption of Christ.

14. It was in Christ's last sufferings, above all, that he was delivered up to the power of his enemies; and yet by these, above all, he obtained victory over his enemies.

Christ never was so in his enemies' hands, as in the time of his last sufferings. They sought his life before; but from time to time they were restrained, and Christ escaped out of their hands, and this reason is given for it, that his time was not yet come. But now they were suffered to work their will upon him, he was in a great degree delivered up to the malice and cruelty of both wicked men and devils. And therefore when Christ's enemies came to apprehend him, he says to them, Luke 22:53. "*When I was daily with you in the temple ye stretched forth no hand against me: but this is your hour, and the power of darkness.*"



And yet it was principally by means of those sufferings that he conquered and overthrew his enemies. Christ never so effectually bruised Satan's head, as when Satan bruised his heel. The weapon with which Christ warred against the devil, and obtained a most complete victory and glorious triumph over him, was the cross, the instrument and weapon with which he thought he had overthrown Christ, and brought on him shameful destruction.

*Col. 2:14,15. " Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances,—nailing it to his cross: and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it."*

In his last sufferings, Christ sapped the very foundations of Satan's kingdom, he conquered his enemies in their own territories, and beat them with their own weapons as David cut off Goliath's head with his own sword. The devil had, as it were, swallowed up Christ, as the whale did Jonah— but it was deadly poison to him, he gave him a mortal wound in his own bowels. He was soon sick of his morsel, and was forced to do by him as the whale did by Jonah. To this day he is heart-sick of what he then swallowed as his prey. In those sufferings of Christ was laid the foundation of all that glorious victory he has already obtained over Satan, in the overthrow of his heathenish kingdom in the Roman empire, and all the success the gospel has had since; and also of all his future and still more glorious victory that is to be obtained in the earth. Thus Samson's riddle is most eminently fulfilled, Judges 14:14.

*" Out of the eater came forth meat, and out of the strong came forth sweetness."*

And thus the true Samson does more towards the destruction of his enemies at his death than in his life, in yielding up himself to death, he pulls down the temple of Dagon, and destroys many thousands of his enemies, even while they are making themselves sport in his sufferings—and so he whose type was the ark, pulls down Dagon, and breaks off his head and hands in his own temple, even while he is brought in there as Dagon's captive. (1 Samuel 5:1-4)

Thus Christ appeared at the same time, and in the same act, as both a lion and a lamb. He appeared as a lamb in the hands of his cruel enemies; as a lamb in the paws, and between the devouring jaws, of a roaring lion; yea, he was a lamb actually slain by this lion: and yet at the same time, as the Lion of the tribe of Judah, he conquers and triumphs over Satan; destroying his own destroyer; as Samson did the lion that roared upon him, when he rent him as he would a kid. And in nothing has Christ appeared so much as a lion, in glorious strength destroying his enemies, as when he was brought as a lamb to the slaughter. In his greatest weakness he was most strong; and when he suffered most from his enemies, he brought the greatest confusion on his enemies.

Thus this admirable conjunction of diverse excellencies was manifest in Christ, in his offering up himself to God in his last sufferings.

D) It is still manifest in his acts, in his present state of exaltation in

heaven. Indeed, in his exalted state, he most eminently appears in manifestation of those excellencies, on the account of which he is compared to a lion; but still he appears as a lamb; Rev. 14:1. *" And I looked, and lo, a Lamb stood on mount Sion"*; as in his state of humiliation he chiefly appeared as a lamb, and yet did not appear without manifestation of his divine majesty and power, as the Lion of the tribe of Judah. Though Christ be now at the right-hand of God, exalted as King of heaven, and Lord of the universe; yet as he still is in the human nature, he still excels in humility. Though the man Christ Jesus be the highest of all creatures in heaven, yet he as much excels them all in humility as he doth in glory and dignity, for none sees so much of the distance between God and him as he does. And though he now appears in such glorious majesty and dominion in heaven, yet he appears as a lamb in his condescending, mild, and sweet treatment of his saints there, for he is a Lamb still, even amidst the throne of his exaltation, and he that is the Shepherd of the whole flock is himself a Lamb, and goes before them in heaven as such. Rev. 7:17. *" For the Lamb, which is in the midst of the throne, shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."* Though in heaven every knee bows to him, and though the angels fall down before him adoring him, yet he treats his saints with infinite condescension, mildness, and endearment. And in his acts towards the saints on earth, he still appears as a lamb, manifesting exceeding love and tenderness in his intercession for them, as one that has had experience of affliction and temptation. He has not forgot what these things are, nor has he forgot how to pity those that are subject to them. And he still manifests his lamb-like excellencies, in his dealings with his saints on earth, in admirable forbearance, love, gentleness, and compassion. Behold him instructing, supplying, supporting, and comforting them; often coming to them, and manifesting himself to them by his Spirit, that he may sup with them, and they with him. Behold him admitting them to sweet communion, enabling them with boldness and confidence to come to him, and solacing their hearts. And in heaven Christ still appears, as it were, with the marks of his wounds upon him, and so appears as a Lamb as it had been slain, as he was represented in vision to St John, in the text, when he appeared to open the book sealed with seven seals, which is part of the glory of his exaltation.

E) And lastly, this admirable conjunction of excellencies will be manifest in Christ's acts at the last judgment.

He then, above all other times, will appear as the Lion of the tribe of Judah in infinite greatness and majesty, when he shall come in the glory of his Father, with all the holy angels, and the earth shall tremble before him, and the hills shall melt. This is he (Rev. 20:11.)

*" that shall sit on a great white throne, before whose face the earth and heaven shall flee away."*

He will then appear in the most dreadful and amazing manner to the wicked. The devils tremble at the thought of that appearance, and when it shall be, the kings, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains. and the mighty men, and every bond-man and every free-man, shall hide themselves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains, and shall cry to the

mountains and rocks to fall on them, to hide them from the face and wrath of the Lamb. And none can declare or conceive of the amazing manifestations of wrath in which he will then appear towards these, or the trembling and astonishment the shrieking and gnashing of teeth, with which they shall stand before his judgment-seat, and receive the terrible sentence of his wrath.

And yet he will at the same time appear as a Lamb to his saints; he will receive them as friends and brethren, treating them with infinite mildness and love. There shall be nothing in him terrible to them, but towards them he will clothe himself wholly with sweetness and endearment. The church shall be then admitted to him as his bride; that shall be her wedding-day. The saints shall all be sweetly invited to come with him to inherit the kingdom, and reign in it with him to all eternity.

Continued in [part III](#).

---

## [Why Do Jews Not Believe Jesus As Messiah?](#)



A man asks, Why Do Jews Not Believe Jesus As Messiah? I need an answer from the Jews themselves.

---

## [Seven Things You May Not Know about Christmas](#)



There is debate among some Christians about whether we should celebrate Christmas or not. I think we can if we scrape the lies off the Truth and celebrate it as it should be celebrated, as the birth of the Saviour, the Messiah, Jesus Christ, on earth.

Isaac Munter, pastor of a church in Bethel, said there will be no festive Christmas celebrations this year in his church because of the destruction and death in Gaza. But I think we can still praise the Father for sending His Son to earth to be our savior!

Angels of God notified shepherds of the birth of Christ and celebrated the fact.

*Luke 2:11-14 For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. 12 And this shall be a sign unto you; Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger. 13 And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, 14 Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.*

My wife and I are against the trappings of this world related to the Christmas season. We will never put up a tree or use any other symbols we consider to be Roman paganism.

When I lived in Japan, I took advantage of Christian holidays, Christmas and Easter (I'd rather call it Resurrection Sunday), to tell the Japanese about Jesus. It's a great time to share the Gospel in non-Christian nations. Many Japanese have never heard the Gospel even once. One Japanese lady used to think Jesus was born in America!

Some things many people may not know:

1. December 25th is supposed to be a Christian holiday celebrating the birth of the Messiah, Jesus Christ. But the date chosen was in fact based on *pagan tradition*, a Roman custom called "*Sol Invictus*" meaning, **rebirth of the sun!** In other words, the December 25th holiday is really based on **sun worship**. Just think about it: Winter solstice, the shortest day of the year, occurs either on December 21st or 22nd depending on the shift of the calendar. The day starts to get longer finally from the 25th, hence, the "rebirth of the sun." The Bible does *not* specify the date that Jesus was born. He probably was not born in the winter because

Luke chapter 2 says that at the time of His birth were, “shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night”.  
Shepherds usually don’t graze their flocks in winter.

2. People who call themselves Christians do not all celebrate December 25th as the birthday of Christ. The Orthodox Church celebrates it on January 7th.
3. Some dedicated and sincere Christians refuse to celebrate Christmas **at all** because of the materialism the worldly merchants promote at this time.
4. December 25th is the **359th** day of the year. The first time the word Satan appears in the King James version of the Bible is in 1 Chronicles chapter 21 – the **359th chapter!** I have researcher, Al Neal to thank for this fact. But I also confirmed this for myself by adding up the chapters using OpenOffice Calc (the same as Excel). According to Al Neal, the numerical value of the Hebrew word for Satan is **also 359!** See <http://www.jewfaq.org/alephbet.htm> that Hebrew letters can be converted to numbers.
5. Santa is **Satan** when you move the third letter N to the end of the name.
6. Christmas trees, mistletoe, jingle bells, etc. are related to paganism. The trees especially are related to pagan Druidism. The evergreen tree is based on sun worship. The sun’s energy turns plants green. Druids therefore worshiped the sun through the evergreen tree.
7. Many Japanese do **not know** that Christmas is supposed to be the celebration of the birth of the Son of God to earth. They celebrate Christmas by eating some cake with tea on the evening of December 25th. The only reason they acknowledge Christmas at all is because of Western, and especially American influence.

---


## The Benefits of Persecution For Obedience to the Word of God



Seven reasons why persecution is not bad but good for the Body of Christ, the Church.

---

# Deconstructing Dispensationalism



An excellent talk about what Dispensationalism is, the history behind it, and why it is a set of false heretical eschatological doctrines.

---

## 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](http://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.

---

# 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.

---

## Freemasonry, the Occult, and Transgenderism



Christian J. Pinto discusses the dark spiritual forces behind the immoral agenda in America, and how it relates to certain philosophies that are found in the ancient mystery beliefs of Freemasonry, Rosicrucianism and the occult groups that practice the ancient mystery religions.

### **Partial transcription of the podcast**

Okay, praise the Lord you guys and welcome. I'm Chris Pinto. This is [Noise of Thunder Radio](#).

We have those who are in rebellion against God, flaunting their sin like Sodom. And even with all these troubling things, we remember the Lord's promises to us. And one of my favorite promises is in Isaiah, chapter 46, verses 3 and 4, where the Lord says,

*Isaiah 46:3-4 Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel, which are borne by me from the belly, which are carried from the womb: And even to your old age I am he; and even to hoar hairs will I*

*carry you: I have made, and I will bear; even I will carry, and will deliver you.*

We've got to consider how great things God has done for us through the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. We've got to remember the great deliverances that God has given us. This is the thing that encourages me to think about the history of our ancestors, the history that we talk about in some of our films like *Lamp in the Dark*, and also in the *True Christian History of America*. We're talking about how God delivered the saints one generation after another after another.

When we read about the horrible things that have gone on in centuries past with the Inquisition, with things like the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, or the Irish Massacre of 1641, or the Massacre of the Waldensians, etc. and many other terrible things, forms of persecution, far, far worse than anything we've suffered here in the Western world, at least in our lifetimes.

The Holocaust during World War II, of course, was a great, great atrocity. We know that. But as Christians, I say to my fellow Christians, we've got to remember, yes, there is often the mention of 6 million Jews. There is not enough mention of the 5 million non-Jews who were mostly Christians in Western Europe. It's strange how in the churches, how Christianity does not acknowledge the persecution of our fellow believers during World War II.

Part of the reason why they focus on promoting LGBT because they want to sabotage America. And gays who know anything about history, know full well that America has never been a country that promoted or even accepted their behavior at all. We've always been against it, and Americans have been resisting and fighting against the whole homosexual movement going all the way back to (Alfred) Kinsey (who wrote *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (1953), also known as the Kinsey Reports). All the way back to Kinsey where much of this began, where really the groundwork for what we are seeing today was established. Everything that you're seeing right now with homosexuality, transgenderism, the targeting of children, all of this has its point of origin in our country, in our country with Kinsey.

Read the histories on this, the sodomites that are being described there were an ancient transgender cult called the Gali. You go read about them online, but they were a cult that worshipped a goddess and they were effectively transgender. They were men who dressed up like women and put on the garments of women and it signified them being transformed into the image of the goddess that they worshipped. So this whole transgender cult, this is why we have it in the scripture.

Why we have examples of warnings against this lifestyle and this behavior while they claim that they're progressing society. The reality is they are moving our society in a retrograde manner. We're moving backward toward pagan behaviors that have been put aside by the Christian world for centuries.

If you go to Deuteronomy chapter 22 and verse 5, it says, quote, "The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a

woman's garment. For all that do so are abomination unto the Lord thy God." So God is clearly condemning this whole concept of transgenderism, which if you study it going back to the ancient world is a pagan, very Luciferian, very satanic idea.

And it goes to the heart of all of the ancient mystery religions in many ways. If you study the ancient mysteries, in fact, one of the books that we talked about when we did our Secret Mysteries of America's beginning series is the book, The Secret Teachings of all Ages by Manly P. Hall. There's all these different pictures or drawings and paintings and so on that are in the book.

And one of them is called the consummation of the Magnum Opus and it's a Masonic poster. It shows an old sage wearing a robe and his long beard and so on. And he's looking at this container, like a glass container, and inside the glass container are a man and a woman, a male and a female. And in between the two of them is a stone. And that stone is undoubtedly the philosopher's stone or the universal stone. And you've got the woman touching it on one side, the man touching it on the other. And this symbolizes the whole idea that they have in paganism and the occult, that what happened in the Garden of Eden is that man became divided within himself. That is how they interpret the symbolism of Eve being drawn from Adam's rib. This is what creates the conflict in every person is this division of the male and the female or the yin and the yang. You see the yin and the yang. It's the same same idea. They repeat this theme over and over and over again.

You find that throughout the architecture of Washington, DC. So you have the male and the female, they come together and then they produce the divine offspring, which is a perfected being. And it's all symbolic and they repeat this symbolism over and over and over again. But the consummation of the magnum opus, the great work.

And you can find this on the website at [gnosis.org](http://gnosis.org). Obviously, these are Gnostics, modern Gnostics, and all of this ultimately you can trace to Gnosticism. They have an article there that's called When the Two Become One, the Gnostic Apostle Thomas Chapter 24. And they go on, there's another subheading, male and female, into a single one. So at one point, Jesus from the Gospel of Thomas says, quote, "When you make the two into one and when you make the inner as the outer and the upper as the lower, and when you make the male and female into a single one, so that the male shall not be male and the female shall not be female, then you will enter the kingdom."

Then you enter their version of what they're calling the kingdom of God, presumably. Or perhaps they would say it was the kingdom of heaven or who knows, maybe a combination of both, their version of what paradise is. And of course, we believe fully that the so-called Gospel of Thomas is a false gospel. We were warned about it by Irenaeus in the second century that the Gnostics created false versions of the gospel and they corrupted the original Gospels, typically by editing them, by omitting things, cutting things out of them.

The whole idea that the male shall not be male, and the female shall not be

female, that's pure Gnosticism. That is what I believe is ultimately behind all of this stuff with transgenderism. This is the reason why it is important to have at least some understanding of the workings of the secret groups, especially groups like Freemasonry which is directly tied to all of everything that we're talking about here. Gnosticism is the point of origin for the philosophies of Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry. That's where much of this can be traced.

For years when we were working on the Secret Mystery Series, there were those in the Christian community, obviously, that were interested. But then there were others who just waved it off as a conspiracy theory, even though many of the churches, especially your Southern Baptist churches and churches across America, are full of Freemasons, just full of them. And they're often pastors, they're leaders, they're elders and deacons in the churches, and they're not all necessarily bad fellows as it were. You know, they're often upstanding respectable members of the community. But if you talk to some of them, and I've had this experience directly, I've talked about it before, I attended a church out in California where much of the leadership was Freemasons. And yes, they believed New Age, pagan doctrines, while going to what was called a Christian church.

Part of what convinced me to pursue the research that I've done for more than 20 years now was that experience early on when I was yet a young believer. And there are a lot of things I didn't know back then, but I remember encountering these guys and having discussions and debates with them, and they were promoting things like reincarnation and the idea of many paths to God and interfaith and so on. And at the time I didn't understand why this was the case. But then I came to realize all of this is part of the inner workings of Freemasonic philosophy, Rosicrucianism, you can trace it all back to ancient Gnosticism. This is the heresy that we're being warned about throughout the New Testament. That's why it's so important. That's why it matters. Yes, it is a biblical issue to discuss these things.

And I've said for years when we're reading the Old Testament and we're reading about how Israel fell into idolatry and started worshiping idols over and over again, and they would go out to the grove and there they had their idols. The Scripture says clearly that the children of Israel did secretly those things that were not right in the sight of God. And that is 2 Kings 17, 9. And the full verse says, And the children of Israel did secretly those things that were not right against the Lord their God, and they built them high places in all their cities from the tower of the Watchmen to the fenced city.

Now, the high places were the places where they went to worship the idols. They would worship them presumably up on some hill somewhere and then out in the groves, the trees and that kind of thing. But they were secretly involved. Why? Because it was a violation of the First Commandment. God says, I am the Lord thy God, ye shall have no other gods before me. And Israel fell into idolatry over and over and over again.

But how did it happen? It happened because you had secret groups working behind the scenes. We're reading about this over and over again. This is what

you're reading about in Ezekiel chapter 8, secret society at work, worshipping pagan gods, while still operating within the temple of God. And that's what we have here in America. We have secret groups at work in the churches. And they have as their agenda a plan to radically transform Christianity, so-called Christianity, into something else entirely. Something that will be completely unbiblical. And it's why I continually think about what happened in the days of King Josiah when the Sodomites built up their houses along the walls of the temple. That's what it reminds me of.

So if we search the Scripture, we find that yes, there are warnings concerning these things. And we're told as believers that we are not supposed to be ignorant of the wiles of the enemy, the wiles of the devil. And that's what this is, the deception of the enemy. And using sexual immorality to entrap, to seduce, to undermine and to vex the people of God is a tactic that we find over and over and over again in the Old Testament and the New. This is what happened in the days of Balaam, the false prophet Balaam, where he gave counsel to Balak to send in immoral women and seduce the men of Israel.

This is what we find in the book of Revelation when Jesus is talking about Jezebel. He says to the church, I have somewhat against you, because you suffer that woman Jezebel who calls yourself a prophetess to teach and to seduce my servants. To commit fornication and to eat things sacrificed unto idols. So idolatry and sexual immorality, those are very common weapons of the devil.

We have these secret groups, the Freemasons, the Rosicrucians, you've got Satanists, you've got Skull and Bonesmen, all of these groups at a certain level are unified in their pagan occult philosophies and worldviews. There is a strange unity to the ancient mystery community, where they all speak the same language, even though they might be part of different groups and organizations with different names. But ultimately, they are all aimed in the same direction in terms of believing that their mystery wisdom is far superior to Christianity. And they say, they believe Christianity is arrogant. And they'll openly tell you, they think Christianity is arrogant. I know, because I sat down with these guys and interviewed them, that it's arrogant for Christianity to believe that it is the only true religion.

They want to embrace all the different religions, which they call wisdom traditions. That's what they call them. Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, all wisdom traditions. That's how they choose to interpret them. But at the core of their philosophy is this idea. I mean, this is what symbolized in the Pythagorean theorem.

If you watch [Riddles in Stone](#), we go over this in great detail, because they repeat it over and over and over and over again. And what we're seeing with this transgender insanity is an expression of this that has never before happened to my knowledge, not at this level in history. It's happened in terms of localized cults, like the Galilee in the ancient world and other cults that took part in these things. But the global transgender movement is, I mean, it's, it is a bizarre, disturbing phenomenon that we're watching unfold in modern times. There is a whole occult philosophy behind this.

---

There's a lot I didn't include in the transcription. You can listen to the entire talk below.

---

## [Immigration Warfare](#)



Biden is a globalist knows his job in the White House is to advance and further the global agenda, which includes immigration warfare.

---

## [The Key to Pope Francis's Identity](#)




All about Pope Francis and who he really is.

---

## [The Reformation and the Peace of](#)



# Westphalia



Peace of Westphalia was the treaty that settled the Thirty Years' War which took place between 1618 and 1648. It was a conflict between Protestants & Catholics.

---

# Early Protestant leaders told us who the Biblical Antichrist is!

According to the Bible, which of the below is the Antichrist likely to look like?



Many Christians know a bit of the history of the Protestant Reformation that began with Martin Luther in 1517. But how many know about the Roman Catholic reaction to the Protestant Reformation, also known as the "Counter-Reformation"? How many Christians have even *heard* of the Counter-Reformation? Not many! And why? It's because the leadership of the Counter-Reformation have done a bang-up job of undermining Protestant churches and seminaries with false interpretations of Daniel, Matthew 24 and the Book of Revelation to the point they do not know anymore who the Biblical Antichrist is!



## What early Protestant leaders taught about the Antichrist:

### Martin Luther

"We here are of the conviction that the **papacy is the seat of the seed of the true and real antichrist**. I owe the Pope no other obedience than that I owe to antichrist."

"I am persuaded that if at this time St. Peter in person should preach all the articles of Holy Scripture and only deny the Pope's authority, power and primacy and say that the Pope is not the head of all Christendom, they would cause him to be hanged."

"The *Pope is the very antichrist* who is exalted himself above and opposed himself against Christ because he will not permit Christians to be saved."

"It is nothing else than the devil himself, because above and against God he urges and disseminates his papal falsehoods concerning Masses, Purgatory, monastic life, one's own works, fictitious divine worship, which is the very papacy, and condemns, murders and tortures all Christians who don't exalt and honor these abominations of the Pope above all things. Therefore just as little as we can worship the devil himself as Lord and God we can endure his apostle the Pope. For to lie and to kill and destroy a body and soul eternally, that is wherein his papal government really consists."

### John Calvin 1509-1564

"Some persons think us too severe and censorious when **we call the Roman Pontiff antichrist**, but those who are of this opinion do not consider that they bring the same charge of presumption against Paul himself after whom we speak and whose language we adopt. I shall briefly show that Paul's words in 2 Thessalonians 2 are not capable to any other interpretation than that which applies them to the papacy."

**Thomas Cranmer** (2 July 1489 – 21 March 1556) was a leader of the English Reformation and Archbishop of Canterbury during the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI and, for a short time, Mary I.

"Whereof it follows Rome to be the seat of antichrist and the Pope

to be the very antichrist himself, I could prove the same by many scriptures."

**Cotton Mather** An American Puritan who died in 1728

"The oracles of God foretold **the rising of an Antichrist in the Christian Church: and in the Pope of Rome**, all the characteristics of that Antichrist are so marvelously answered that **if any who read the Scriptures do not see it, there is a marvelous blindness upon them.**"

**Charles Spurgeon**

"It is the bound and duty of every Christian to pray against this Antichrist, and as to what Antichrist is, no sane man ought to raise a question. If it be not the popery in the Church of Rome there is nothing in the world that can be called by that name."



"Popery is contrary to Christ's gospel and is the antichrist and we ought to pray against it. It should be the daily prayer of every believer that the antichrist might be hurled like a millstone into the flood and for Christ, because it wounds Christ, because it robs Christ of his glory, because it puts sacramental efficacy in the place of his atonement and lifts a piece of bread into the place of the Savior and a few drops of water into the place of the Holy Spirit. And puts a mere fallible man like ourselves up as the Vicar of Christ on Earth. IF we pray against it, because it is against him, we shall love the persons though we hate their errors. We shall love their souls though we loathe and detest their dogmas. And so the breath of our prayers will be sweetened because we turn our faces toward Christ when we pray."

"Of all the dreams that have ever deluded men, and probably of all blasphemies that ever were uttered, there has never been one which is more absurd and which is more fruitful in all manner of mischief than the idea that the bishop of Rome can be the head of the church of Jesus Christ."

"A man who deludes other people by degrees comes to delude himself. The deluder first makes dupes out of others and then becomes a dupe to himself. I should not wonder but what the Pope really believes that he is infallible and that he ought to be saluted as "His

Holiness.” It must have taken him a good time to arrive at that eminence of self deception. But he’s got to, I daresay, by now and everyone who kisses his toe confirms him in this insane idea. When everybody else believes a flattering falsehood concerning you, you come, at last, to believe it yourself or at least to think it may be so.”

“Christ did not redeem his church with his blood so the Pope would come in and steal away the glory. He never came from heaven to earth. He never poured out his very heart that he might purchase his people. That a poor sinner, a mere man, should be set upon high to be admired by all the nations and to call himself God’s representative on earth, Christ has always been the head of his church.”

---

## **Babylon the Mother Church – By Henry Grattan Guinness**



Did not Rome Christian became a harlot? Did not Papal Rome ally herself with the kings of the earth? Did it not glorify itself to be as a queen, and call itself the Mistress of the World?

---

## **The Cunning Genius Of The Vatican Papal System – Part I**



The papal system is the most powerful, evil, and longest lasting organization that ever existed on earth!