Chuck Baldwin's Jesuit Preterism Debunked



Chuck Baldwin abandoned the Protestant Historicist interpretation of the book of Revelation for the Jesuit based preterist view which aids and abets Rome!

Futurism – Leapfrogging History – The Wiles of the Devil



Futurism denies that the dynasty of Popes is the Antichrist and points instead to a future individual world ruler at the end of the age. It thus postpones most of the prophetic predictions of Scripture including almost all the Book of Revelation into a fragment of time in the indefinite future.

The Historical View of Prophecy and

Antichrist



Two great truths that stand out in the preaching that brought about the Protestant Reformation—the “just shall live by faith” and the Papacy is the Antichrist.

“Summary of My Research” – By Darryl Eberhart



Jesuit-controlled Papal Rome is the greatest geopolitical-financial-religious juggernaut that the world has ever seen. She controls many nations on planet Earth.

A Description of the Antichrist – By Darryl Eberhart

the identity of the Antichrist] is proclaimed in II Thess. 2 as BOTH a system AND a person: the 'man of sin' and the one who would sit in the 'temple [Ed.: Greek: "naos"] of God' calling himself God. And the only one in the pages of history who has done this is the Pope.

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, there fore, 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 be 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 is 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 *gune*, wife, not *adelphe*, 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 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

---

The Purple and Scarlet Robes of the Bishops of the Church of Rome

And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication.

Who are the Kings of the East

Mentioned in Revelation 16:12?

This is the continuation of the series, **Antichrist And His Ten Kingdoms** – By Albert Close and the previous post in the series, The Final Revelation to Men by Jesus Christ: The Apocalypse.

And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared.

Little doubt the Kings of the East are the independent Kingdoms or Republics which have arisen out of the ruins of the Eastern Roman Empire, and of the Turkish Empire, during the last 140 years (up to 1944), due to the steady drying up of that great Empire symbolized in the Apocalypse (Book of Revelation) as the Great River Euphrates. The following are their names, with the dates when each broke from Turkey: GREECE 1820; EGYPT 1840; BULGARIA 1877; ROMANIA 1878; LEVANT 1867; CYRENACIA 1912; PALESTINE 1917; ALBANIA 1919; YUGOSLAVIA 1919; IRAQ 1923; HEJAZ (a region in the west of Saudi Arabia, containing Mecca and Medina) 1926; YEMEN 1927; PERSIA 1923. All of these Kings of the East have ceased during the last century and a quarter to own submission to the Sultan of Turkey at Constantinople. All of these 12 kingdoms belonged to the Mohammedan Eastern Roman Empire, which has now dried up.

The Turkish Empire dried up at the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923, when she was completely stripped of all these countries at the close of the 1914-18 War.

The Pope's Temporal Power over the Ten Kingdoms of the Western Empire dried up also in 1870, when the Temporal Power fell. Today (1944) the Pope rules over the Vatican City only, of 800 people and 108 acres of territory; but he rules spiritually as the False Prophet over 300,000,000 (now 1.2 billion) worshippers. Herein lies his world-wide power through his 500,000 (now decreased to 407,872 according to https://www.vaticannews.va/en/church/news/2023-10/fides-catholic-church-statistics-world-mission-sunday.html) Latin Priests.

A false prophet is one who proclaims as Divine Truth a false Gospel in Christ's Name. See Revelation 17 and 18.

GROWTH IN INTERPRETATION OF SYMBOLS.

As already stated, if we translate the symbolic scenes in the book of Revelation into plain non-figurative ones, by comparing them with the symbols and emblems of other Scriptures, and also with the symbols and emblems employed by the nations and great religions which have arisen and played their part in the history of the last 1900 years within the bounds of the Roman Empire, they become the religious and political history of that great period, so far as it affects the Church of Christ.

Papal Rome corrupted for centuries the Western Roman Empire, whilst the Mohammedan religion corrupted the Eastern Empire. Both as political and religious powers are now nearing their end.

The Napoleonic Wars of 1789–1815, and the Great War of 1914–19, are both regarded by expositors as having been fulfilled as Divine retribution on Papal and Mohammedan Europe and Asia, within the area of the Roman Empire. Revelation 16:1-11.

Both have been equally important as it is shown on the Map of the World, when read in conjunction with the history of the past 140 years. Both religions have been cruel persecutors of God's people.

The world-wide preaching of the Gospel by the Missionary Societies was in 1,053 languages as contrasted with only 71 languages in 1800 A.D.

(Matthew 24:14) "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come."

The drying up of the Euphrates in Revelation 16:12 symbolized the drying up of the Turkish Empire, by the loss of 14 Provinces, thus leaving Turkey with a population of 16,000,000 and a loss of 95,000,000 since 1820.

Revelation 16:12 And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared.

In Revelation 16:13,14, the three unclean Spirits of Devils, the Dragon, the Beast and the False Prophet acting through their human agents, gather the nations of the whole world to battle as never before in all history. These three may prefigure the Nazi, Fascist and Papal Powers at War today. They are all against Christ.

(**Note:** I believe today an alternate interpretation could be Papal, Fascism (extreme right) and Communism / Socialism (extreme left). The common denominator of all three is totalitarianism. The Devil is a control freak and denies us any independent thought or action outside of his governance. But an even simpler interpretation would be, the Dragon is Satan, the Beast is Satan's kingdom on earth, and the False Prophet is Satan's spokesperson, aka the Pope and his priests.)

In 1922 Mussolini founded the Fascist Movement and became Dictator of Italy. In 1929 by the Lateran Treaty, he made the Pope a Temporal Sovereign over the

Vatican City and grounds, with a population of about 450 and a territory of 108 acres! Mussolini then voted the sum of £19,000,000 in settlement of the Roman dispute since 1870, when the Pope was dethroned as a Temporal Sovereign. Mussolini then made the Pope a puppet Sovereign.

In 1934 Hitler met Mussolini in Venice, and on Aug. 2nd, 1934, Hitler succeeded Hindenburg as President. These three Evil Spirits then entered on a European career of conquest and invasion, with the Jesuits in the background.

In 1935 Hitler and Mussolini united with General Franco, with the connivance of the Pope and the Jesuits in overthrowing the Democratic Government in Spain.

THAT GREAT DAY OF GOD ALMIGHTY.

In Sept. 1943 Mussolini was deposed and his dream of a Revived Roman Empire came to an end.

Mussolini also attacked and overran Abyssinia with the most revolting cruelty. Here again the Pope and the Jesuits supported Mussolini in all these abominations. They also expelled all Protestant Missionaries.

Here we have the 3 Evil Spirits mentioned in Revelation which in 1939 drove Europe and the whole 5 other continents into this World War.

These three great World-disturbers have all originated within the realms of the old Roman Empire.

There can be no question that these three are world figures today and all are Roman Catholic. The False Prophet undoubtedly prefigures the Pope as a pseudo-Christian prophet or leader as distinct from the other two, who are purely wicked political imposters. Mussolini was a pseudo-Caesar, and Hitler worships the Nordic Pagan intuition cult. These three are all enemies of Christ.

Revelation 16:12-14, seem to be fulfilling before our very eyes. Are not the Kings of the whole world gathering to battle today as predicted in Revelation 16:12-14, led by three wicked Powers, which have already drawn in a total of 134 countries, large and small, embracing almost the entire globe. Verse 14 reads "*For they are the spirits of devils working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth, and of the whole world to gather them to the Battle of that great day of God Almighty*."

Notice the sharp distinction between "**the kings of the earth**" and in the next sentence, "**and of the whole world**." These clearly refer to two different groups of nations and spheres of action. The one refers to the kings within the bounds of the Roman Earth, or old Roman Empire, and the other to the whole of the nations of the entire globe which includes the Far East, India, Burma, China and Japan, etc.

This great World War is the first great war in which all six Continents have been involved at the same time. That seems to explain verse 14 exactly. Are not the kings or rulers of the whole world gathering to battle today, as

predicted here, impelled by three wicked Powers, viz : the Nazi, Fascist and Papal. The Fascist was a Political party, the Papacy a combined Religious and Political
Power masquerading as Christian. These three Powers have undoubtedly caused this World War. Russia, it must not be forgotten, is a Power outside the Roman Empire. Russia is a Power belonging to the "WHOLE WORLD" Area as distinct from THE KINGS OF THE EARTH, ie., the Roman "Earth" of the Apocalypse.

When the Western Roman Empire fell in 476 A.D. it was succeeded by the Western Papal Ten Kingdoms with the Pope at the head.

The Eastern Roman Empire fell at the storming of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 A.D. This was the complete end of the Roman Empire, both East and West, From 1453 to 1923 A.D. the Turkish or Mohammedan Power ruled most of the nations of the former Eastern Roman Empire—now the Kings of the East.

Today Turkey rules none but her own homeland. The Pope rules over 108 acres and about 450 subjects.

In the first verse of the Revelation St. John tells us the book is written in symbols, i.e.: in a language of signs.

Revelation 1:1: The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him, to show unto His servants **things which must shortly come to pass**; and He sent and **signified it** by His angel unto His servant John.

Revelation 4:1: After this I looked and, behold, a door was opened in heaven; and the first voice when I heard was as it were of a trumpet talking with me; which said, Come up hither, and **I will shew thee things which must be hereafter**.

To signify is to show by signs, to intimate your meaning, not in plain literal words, but by signs and symbols.

Now in the language of signs and symbols, such for example as that employed by the Navy, Army or R.A.F., or by Merchant ships, when signaling at sea, each sign and symbol has a definite meaning, which can only be discerned and understood by translating it into ordinary language, by means of an explanatory key. In reading Daniel or the Revelation we are bound to do the same.

EACH NATION HAS ITS OWN SYMBOLS.

For example, the Sharp Sword proceeding out of the mouth of the King of Kings in Revelation 19:15, is not a sword of steel, but a symbol only. There is no such creature in nature as a Beast with Seven Heads and Ten Horns, as in Daniel and Revelation. Again they are symbols only.

As stated on page 4 of this book, we must translate the symbolic language into ordinary language, by comparing these symbols and emblems with the other Scriptures where the same are employed and explained. We must also be familiar with the symbols and emblems employed by the nations and religious

systems which have arisen on the theater of the Roman world since the book of Revelation was written. The Roman Catholic and Mohammedan religions have unconsciously employed in their national and religious life and history, the very symbols and emblems used in Revelation to prefigure the events. Especially is this true of the Church of Rome and of the Papal nations of Western Europe, and also of the Mohammedans of Eastern Europe and Western Asia. The Great Revealer foresaw the use of these national and religious symbols by these powers and revealed them to St. John, for the guidance and comfort of His people down the ages. See Papal and Mohammedan emblems, medals, coins, etc., in this book as evidence.

(Continued in The Revelation an Acted Prophecy – Western Europe and Asia the Stage.)

All sections of Antichrist And His Ten Kingdoms by Albert Close

---

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 Character of Antichrist and Papal Persecution of the Saints



Futurists overlook the fact that the Antichrist is not to be an open and avowed antagonist of Christ, but one professing to be a Vice Christ, a rival Christ; one who would assume the character, occupy in the human heart the place, and fulfill the functions of Christ.

Revelation 17 – The Prophetic Portrait of the Church of Rome

The images before which Roman Catholics bow down, the Mass, worship of the Eucharist, prayers to saints show the Church of Rome as the biggest idolatrous system.

What is “MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT” of Revelation Chapter 17?

History identifies Mystery Babylon in its current form as the Vatican. The Jesuits say Jerusalem is Babylon to deflect blame from the Pope and Roman Catholic Church.

“And the Woman Was Arrayed in Purple and Scarlet Colour…” – Revelation 17:4

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

The Antichrist Is Hidden In Plain

Sight

Without exception all the leaders of the Protestant Reformation looked at the Popes of Rome as the man of sin who sits as God in the temple of God – the Church – shewing himself that he is God.

Antichrist Powers on the Rise

The European Union is not even trying to represent Christianity. They are trying to overthrow Christianity. They hate Christianity. That's why they're promoting sodomy and Sharia law and trying to advance the Muslims and fill up all the countries with as many Muslim migrants as they possibly can to sabotage Christian civilization. So what had been for centuries, the Christian standard is going to be done away with and replaced by something else, some kind of socialist, Sharia form of government.

Babylon the Mother Church – By Henry Grattan Guiness

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?

Fallacies Of Futurism – by Henry Grattan Guinness



The doctrine of Futurism exposed as pure speculation and a false interpretation of the 70th Week of Daniel.

The Ten Horns of the Books of Daniel

and Revelation

The Ten Horns of the Book of Revelation identified as 10 modern nations!