

**General Topics :: Jesuits****Jesuits - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/2/18 17:15**

I have started into many of the books recommended by Leonard Ravenhill, and stumbled upon this statement which surprised me:

‘Now Satan having thus intelligence, lets him alone to act his part. He sure cannot be at a loss himself, when his scholars, the Jesuits I mean, have such agility of mind, to wreath and cast themselves into any form becoming the persons they would seduce.’

From ‘The Christian in Complete Armour’ by William Gurnall, p. 76

This caught my interest so I looked for quotes about Jesuits by other giants of the faith. Wesley wrote of the Jesuits quite a few times in his letters and in his journals:

‘But the Church of Rome has sent out preachers among us, such as Thomas Heath, a Jesuit;...And what do you infer from hence? that my brother, who was thought a student of Christ Church in Oxford, was really a Jesuit... Even to hint at such absurdities as these is an insult on common sense.’

John Wesley’s letter to George L. Fleury, May 18, 1771

Also, I found that Spurgeon spoke of Jesuits quite a few times in his publication, ‘The Sword and the Trowel.’

I have also read a letter by Ravenhill where he described a Jesuit being converted in a revival.

It just seems as if many Christians today either would tend to deny the work of Jesuits and their goals, or at least tend to downplay the reality of Jesuits working to promote Roman power. Example: Ian Paisley is looked upon by many as extreme by being an outspoken enemy of the Jesuits and what they stand for. But I don’t see how Paisley’s view on this matter is extreme when you have a 17th century Puritan writer calling Jesuits the scholars of Satan.

Just wondering what you guys think about the topic.

Re: Jesuits, on: 2006/2/19 1:02

The Jesuit conspiracy has always been interesting to me. They even teach of the Jesuits in many college history classes today. I took two history classes in college that brought up the Jesuits. I do believe they are working to bring the world, once again, under the thumb of the vatican. I also believe they are primarily responsible for the attack on the word of God. The KJV that is. They brought out their corrupt texts that came straight from the catholic church and started to make bibles out of them in the 1800’s. That’s why we have so many bibles today. When for 200 years the Authorized Version was blessed by God and used by the Philadelphian church. They even in our seminaries, teaching our future ministers their false doctrines.

Re: Jesuits - posted by andres (), on: 2006/2/19 20:13

In the history books that they use in the highschools that I am student teaching at, list the 3 main objectives of the Jesuits:

1. set up schools
2. to convert non-Christians to Catholicism.
3. Prevent Protestantism from spreading
i bet their goals are still the same today.

Re: - posted by phebebird (), on: 2006/2/19 21:31

It is really ironic to me that I am, apparently, the only person interested in defending Catholics on this entire forum--since I am not a Catholic and never have been one and have no intentions of being one.

I really do like sermonindex and many of the forums and ideas and encouragement, but I am increasingly disturbed by the Catholic-bashing and the spiritual arrogance it shows. I have never met a protestant-bashing Catholic, but I meet Catholic-bashing Protestants all over the place. Now, before you jump to arms and quote me something from some 17th century scholar, let me point out that I am talking about your run-of-the-mill everyday modern Catholic. I realize that the Jesuits probably have some shady history the Catholic church was responsible for the Crusades, etc, etc; but the Catholic Church does so much good and has so many very sincere Jesus-loving Christians in it these days. I just don't understand why protestants are so arrogant (I am protestant myself) and unable or unwilling to love their Catholic brothers and sisters in Christ. I think I've had far more experience with hypocritical Protestants than with hypocritical Catholics.

When I was in college in the Bible Belt, all the girls would go bar-hopping all night long on Saturday night and then get up and go to Second Baptist church in the morning. When I was in Africa, it was a well-known Protestant denomination that was mixing witchcraft and Christianity, not the Catholics. When we worked with Vietnamese refugees, it was the Catholics that were willing to help them in practical ways--the protestants just talked.

Now, I don't agree with all of their doctrine, but I don't agree with every other denomination's doctrine either. What I DO know is that they believe in the basics of the Apostle's Creed which is what we all believe.

I think that many of us will be amazed and humbled at all the Catholics we find in heaven and realize that God does not have a "No Catholics Allowed" sign at the pearly gates.

Phebe

Re: To Phebebird, on: 2006/2/19 21:52

I think you may have taken my post the wrong way. I was not bashing the people who are catholic but the system as a whole. We can't forget what history teaches us about this system of hierarchy. It is wretched and corrupt and it places the ir people in bondage of which many are never able to be freed.

Actually, I have family that are catholic. Before I was saved I thought about converting to catholicism because, like you said, there was so much hypocrisy in our protestant churches. My uncle actually, who is catholic, told me not to convert to catholicism, he told me it would be a mistake.

The people are usually very good people. But you have to remember, they have a works based salvation formula. I do think there will be catholics in heaven, but I believe there will be few. But for that matter there will be alot less protestants in heaven than we think also. Many are deceived this day and age. I sat in church for twenty seven years of my life in a SBC. Warmed the pew every sunday. I was convinced I was on my way to heaven because I said a little prayer and was baptised. Then God revealed to me the truth and I was soundly saved.

The Heart of the Matter... - posted by ccchhrrriiss (), on: 2006/2/19 23:23

Hi phebebird...

I understand what you are saying. I live in an area that is definitely in the "Bible belt." Most businesses in my town do not open on Sunday -- and even many restaurants are closed on Sunday. And of the restaurants that are open, many do not open until noon (after most Church meetings finish). From 10am to noon, this town looks like a ghost-town. And most of the churches in the area are catholic.

When I first became a believer (and even before I became a believer), I had alot of preconvinced ideas about catholicism. Much of this came from having read those *Alberto* comics from *Chick Publications* (which I later learned were not true). But as time went on, and as I grew in the Lord, I learned that most catholics living here do not consider themselves "catholics." They just state that they attend a Catholic Church. They are mostly unaware of the origins of the Roman Catholic Church, or the errancy of the doctrine of the Church. Many of them do not even know what a "jesuit" is.

I believe that this is a deciding factor to consider. Do people merely consider themselves "Catholics," "Baptists," or "Methodists?" Or do they consider themselves followers of Christ?

Do I believe that there are true Christians that attend Catholic Churches? Yes. God is able to reach into the Catholic Church (which I consider to be just as errant as the Mormons or Jehovah's Witnesses) and reach the heart of a person that diligently seeks Christ. As that person continues to seek the Lord, as they fellowship with Christ, and as they hunger for the Word and then read it, they will eventually stop practicing the customs and then leave the Roman Catholic Church.

It is interesting to note that many Catholics in this town seem to have a reverence for spiritual matters -- much more than some protestants (or everyday people on the east coast where I was raised). Like you say, there is a lot of hypocrisy in many protestant churches. I know guys in Bible School that can lift their hands, speak in tongues, and pray for the sick -- but they curse like sailors (and not just explicitives -- their mouths are often completely dirty!). I know a few of the most "spiritual" guys in a local church that recently admitted to me that he doesn't even know God at all. But somehow, he got caught into the popular clique at the Church. The pastor brags about him from the pulpit, and he does a lot of things for God -- but he doesn't even know Him!

We should be careful about passing final judgment on people. Yes, as believers, we can judge all matters of action or sinfulness. But only God can know the heart. And I have learned that most people that often claim to have a "gift of discernment" are really just "suspicious" -- and they are not really hearing from the Lord. Why would God tell you that someone is "not really saved" if they will not play a part in reaching them for the Lord? And why would God "warn" you about someone if you are supposed to not have your trust or faith in man anyway? If we were to go under the same scrutiny that people are so eager to pass on people that currently attend a Catholic church -- we might find that someone on this message board is willing to pass us off as "heretics" just as quickly.

"What -- you read the 'NIV?!?"

"What -- you believe in 'tongues?!?"

"What -- you believe in the 'Rapture?!?"

"What -- you attend a 'home church?!?"

"What -- you watch football games?!?"

"What -- you voted for a Republican?!?"

"What -- you own a credit card?!?"

"What -- you listen to what music?!?"

"What -- you believe in eternal security?!?"

These matters can be judged both ways -- for and against. Sadly, someone somewhere will judge you in even the most ridiculous matters. Some believers are willing to dismiss your "faith" by something just as silly. God help us to put our eyes off of the temporary, meaningless things of this life -- and put our eyes on Him.

:~)

Re: The Heart of the Matter... - posted by phebebird (), on: 2006/2/20 1:33

Thank you, Chris. So well put!

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2006/2/20 2:15

Quote:

.....comics from Chick Publications (which I later learned were not true).

:~o They're not?

(Just kiddin' Chris!) :-D

Re: - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2006/2/20 4:53

Quote:

phebebird wrote:
I really do like sermonindex and many of the forums and ideas and encouragement, but I am increasingly disturbed by the Catholic-bashing and the spiritual arrogance it shows. I have never met a protestant-bashing Catholic, but I meet Catholic-bashing Protestants all over the place.

Catholics bash protestants through accusations of ignorance. It's more a matter of looking down on them as Elizabethan Englishmen looked down on "uncivilised natives".

Quote:

I just don't understand why protestants are so arrogant (I am protestant myself) and unable or unwilling to love their Catholic brothers and sisters in Christ. I think I've had far more experience with hypocritical Protestants than with hypocritical Catholics.

Very few Protestants these days are true **Protestants**, but are more **Comply**-ants. The root word of Protestant is the word 'protest', because the Protestant Reformers actively objected to "Papal Christianity". Notice I didn't say "Roman Catholicism", because it was more a matter of declaring the "corruption of the hierarchy" to be their enemy than the people who pledge allegiance to the system.

I would consider myself to be "anti-Catholic" in the sense that I hold a more protestant view of a Church of Rome, with its Vicar of Christ and Sacraments, but I love Catholics as much as I love Buddhists, Latter Day Saints, Jehovah's Witnesses, Evolutionists, etc. Their system lead men to hell. That is the reality of it. However, there are many who belong to the system, and yet have a faith in Christ. But don't be deceived, people like Madame Jeanne Guyon, Bishop Fenelon, Thomas A' Kempis are more the exception than the rule. Many of them suffered under persecution alongside their Protestant counterparts, but note that their persecutor was the Holy See (Pope).

By the way, may I ask if you believe in Baptism by immersion (ie, believers baptism) while rejecting the notion of infant baptism? If that is the case, then don't call yourself a Protestant. Luther would have called you a fanatic, Zwingli would have drowned you, and Calvin would have burned you if you didn't leave town when he ordered you to.

Quote:

I think that many of us will be amazed and humbled at all the Catholics we find in heaven and realize that God does not have a "No Catholics Allowed" sign at the pearly gates.

The issue isn't whether there will be Catholics in God's remnant, but how far away from the truth is the organisation. Art Katz mentioned that he believed that the Sept 11 2001 bombings were a sign from God about the failure of "system". Systems are necessary in government (both church and secular), however system and corruption tends to go hand in hand. to quote Oswald Chambers -

Quote:

Whenever a religious community begins to get organised it ceases to "draw breath in the fear of the Lord"; the old way of talking is kept up, but the life is not there, and men who used to be keen on proclaiming the Gospel are keen now only on the success of the organisation.

You've got to admit, that most Catholics follow this line. Chris has also mentioned that most Catholics don't even know who the Jesuits are. Allow me the following question, how many here know who Luis De Alcazar, Francisco Ribera, Manuel de Lacunza, Edward Irving, John Nelson Darby, Kenneth Hagee, and Tim LaHaye are and what they have in common? Most of us know the the last one, perhaps the last two, even three, but few would know the rest, and yet the story of pre-tribulationism leads back this far and apparently know further. Oh, by the way, the first three were Jesuits. If you believe in a pre-trib rapture, then surprise surprise, you've been influenced by the Jesuits possibly before you even knew of their existence. Am I criticising pre-trib, no (not now at least:-P), I'm simply trying to illustrate something. These Catholics ma

General Topics :: Jesuits

y not know who the Jesuits are, but they are under their influence, if they are a part of the Church of Rome. The question isn't whether they know about the Jesuits, but whether or not they believe in the infallibility of the Pope, because if Jesuits could cause the majority of "Protestant/Evangelical/Pentecostals" in believing in a pre-trib rapture, then how much more could they persuade a Catholic "label-wearer" that another inquisition is necessary?

Also ask the question why so few know their church history anymore, because all this has happened before.

Re: The Heart of the Matter... - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2006/2/20 5:03

Quote:

ccchhrrriiisss wrote:
Much of this came from having read those *Alberto* comics from *Chick Publications* (which I later learned were not true).

Has it been categorically proven false? Consider the nature of the accusations and the fact that Riviera died a mysterious death and that smear tactics are consistent with his story and any refutation must be considered with a parallel scepticism as his actual stories.

Quote:

Do I believe that there are true Christians that attend Catholic Churches? Yes. God is able to reach into the Catholic Church (which I consider to be just as errant as the Mormons or Jehovah's Witnesses) and reach the heart of a person that diligently seeks Christ.

I once heard someone say, "What about Catholics who turn to Christ in repentance?" To which came the reply, "They called ex-Catholics." I once believed that Catholicism and Christianity were compatible due to a priest in training that I met (funnily enough, he was training to be a Jesuit) who had such incredible vibrance, and spoke of God constantly with such obvious intimate affection. I was so impressed that I overlooked a comment he made to another catholic, "Man, the host is **God**." I know loving Freemasons who are so generous that it brings shame to all around them. But they still think that all roads lead to God.

Re: Jesuits - posted by CJaKfOrEsT (), on: 2006/2/20 5:09

May I submit this story into the discussion? It comes from ("https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id2411&forum40&19") Edgar F. Parkyns on Church History - 10 Sessions. (Link to forum thread which contains links to audio).

THE WAGON TRAIN

An Allegory
By Edgar Parkyns

“It's a beautiful letter but the middle part puzzles me so badly I can't make head or tail of it.”

Introduction By Rick Porritt

Many and varied are the interpretations of the Book of Revelation. Some would admit to not really understanding the meaning and purpose of this book at all, whilst others will state with confidence that thus and thus is unquestionably the message and interpretation thereof. It is not at all my intention to enter into debate on this subject here, I would though like to share with you this delightful allegorical story, which when I first heard it was a great blessing to me.

This story has been told in the context of teaching what is known as the Historic Interpretation of the Book of Revelation (as with other interpretations there are doubtless several variations on this theme). One element that is of informative interest in this allegory is the mention of the origins of two other perspectives that have been offered as interpretations of the Book of Revelation. It may be helpful if I just mention in advance the names connected with these views, and what those views are.

Luis De Alcazar, (1554-1613) of Seville, Spain – taught that all the events of the Book of Revelation occurred in the first

t century A.D. In other words, it essentially has nothing to teach us today. This view is known as preterism. So far as I know there are few who still hold to this belief today (?).

Francisco Ribera (1537-1591) of Salamanca (also in Spain) taught that the central events of the Book of Revelation were all yet to come. Such happenings would take place during a special seven-year period after the 'rapture' of the Church. This view is known as futurism.

It was my personal experience for some years into my Christian life that the only view I ever heard of (from books, tapes and conversations with other Christians) was the futurist view. Many are the variants on this theme including: pre, mid and post tribulation rapture etc. It was only in listening to some tapes on the subject of Church history (by Edgar Parkyns) that I came across the historic teaching on Revelation.

If preterism says that it is all done, and futurism says it is all to come, then historicism says: It started to happen from the time that the Book of Revelation was first written, it has continued to happen throughout the Church's history, it is still happening now, and (finally!) it will continue to happen until Jesus returns (and some parts glimpse beyond that to!). In other words (I quote Mr Parkyns from memory) "Revelation is a love-letter written to The Church, for The Church, concerning The Church."

I have no wish to argue, battle or cajole on this subject. I only hope that if you are unaware of the historical understanding of this Book that this following piece may give you some feel for it. If you are someone who is already determinedly futurist in your outlook then maybe, just maybe, you are yet unaware of the origins and reasons for why this interpretation was first taught. This narrative alludes to those origins. Either way I do hope that all will appreciate the simple picture that this story illustrates. It has been transcribed from tape.

The Wagon Train, Edgar Parkyns

During the years 1850 to 1890 there was a tremendous trek westwards across the plains from the eastern United States to the far west as folks looked for new homes in that magnificent territory. I want you to imagine that a young bridegroom has gone out west to prepare a home for himself and his bride, and in due course he is going to receive her. This is an analogy of Jesus going to prepare a place to receive His Bride, the Church.

The bride stays in New York for some time getting ready, and then she joins a wagon train going west. It's rather a mixed wagon train, with all kinds of people in it; but the only way to cross that area is in such company. Her bridegroom has sent her a letter from away out west, but the letter doesn't arrive in time to meet her as she sets off. It reaches her after she has begun her journey and has already experienced a few skirmishes with Red Indians in the Great Lakes area. She finds that her letter has been opened - those responsible in the camp have examined it but, not being able to understand much of it because it is written in code, they let her have it.

As soon as camp is formed for the night and she can get away into her covered wagon, she lights the paraffin lamp and reads her beloved's letter. How her heart thrills to the glorious description of him on the opening page. And then there are some very straight words of exhortation to her, how she is to behave and keep herself pure, and she takes all that to heart for she realises that there are many temptations as well as dangers on this journey.

But then she comes to a section of the letter, which absolutely bewilders her, about beasts and horns and mountains and all kinds of horrors. It just doesn't make sense, and so she hurries through that and comes to the closing part. She is very thrilled with what she reads there - it describes the time when her beloved will meet her. He comes riding onto the scene and takes her to be with himself. There is a description of the heavenly home, and the glories that will follow. She is thrilled with her letter and puts it away with a thankful heart.

At the earliest opportunity, next time they've formed camp, the wagons drawn into a ring, she gets away and looks into her letter again; and it puzzles her, all that middle section. Whoever is this woman in scarlet? Whatever is that terrible beast? "I hope I don't meet him", she thinks. Day after day she puzzles over the letter, and becomes more and more separated from the rest of the camp. They wonder whatever is happening to her, until someone says "Look here, there are a couple of Jesuit priests in the camp, why don't you go to one of them and tell him what's troubling you?" She says, "Thank you, I think I'll do just that."

She goes across to meet one of the Jesuit priests. He says he's been waiting for her to come to him as he's seen that she's very troubled, and asks what it is that she wants to say. "Well", she says, "it's like this - I have a letter..." "You'd better

give me your whole confession", he says, "then I can put you right." "Oh no", she replies, "it's not that. It's a letter from my husband. It's a beautiful letter but the middle part puzzles me so badly I can't make head or tail of it."

He says "My dear, I know your husband quite well, and the leader of our whole party knows him very well, he's one of his closest friends. So let me have a look at your letter, I'll be able to explain it for you." So this Jesuit, whose name happens to be Alcazar - he's a Spaniard - takes the letter and looks at it. In due course he comes back to her and tells her there's nothing to worry about as her husband was writing about the skirmishes with the Red Indians that took place just as they were leaving New York, only the letter didn't reach her in time.

When she requests her letter back, the priest replies, "Well, I don't think it's good for you, it's obviously been making you ill" and it is with great difficulty that she finally gets it back with half a promise not to read it any more. But still she is not content. She thinks, "What on earth did my beloved write this long letter to me for, if it was all about those few little fights with Indians that we had at the beginning of our journey?"

Eventually she goes to the other Jesuit priest, whose name is Ribera, and tells him the story and he again offers to hear her confession. She explains about her letter and how the other priest said it covered things, which had already happened, and she gives her reasons why she doesn't feel that's a sensible explanation. He takes her letter, and when in due course he returns it, he tells her that the middle part is all about the future - after her husband has met her and taken her away. He says "You'll be raptured; I know it's not written plainly in the letter, but then of course it's one of those letters; you'll be caught away before any of these things happen."

"But what about the great beast that comes out of the sea?" she asks. "You'll never see him, he lives in a lake on the far side of the Rocky Mountains. Now come along and enjoy yourself with the rest of us."

So she thanks him and accepts this very reasonable explanation, especially on such strong authority, and presently joins in the fun. There's a magnificent woman in scarlet there, who introduces her to the leader of the group, who has been longing to meet her. They have some grand parties together and soon she's in the thick of the fun and wondering why she ever moped away trying to understand that letter when it didn't really concern her at all.

She gradually forgets the promises she made to her beloved; they fade into the background. She becomes more and more enamoured with the leader of the party. He tells her about her husband and says, "In fact, I'm his very best friend, I know all his secrets, and I'm here operating on his behalf so you can trust me." And she does trust him, until one night after the revelry she's almost seduced, and flees shaken and in tears. She rushes out to the perimeter of the camp and sees against the skyline two men keeping guard. She watches them for some time and then they see her and, drawing near, they say "You should be back in camp you know, it's not safe for you out here."

She says she can't go back as she can't trust anybody. The guards reply "You must go back, your husband told you to go this way - you'll just have to go." "But I don't know what to do, can you help me? It's my husband's letter that puzzles me." "Well" they say, "I dare say we could explain that letter to you. We know your husband well and we promised to keep guard of this camp and look after you. But wouldn't it be better if you found out the meaning for yourself? If we explain it to you, you may not believe us. Have you got any of your husband's old letters?" "Yes", she says "a whole bundle full!"

"Right - re-read your husband's old letters and look for clues, and we think you'll find the meaning of this one you're holding. Read them, Genesis to Jude, the old letters - the clues are all there."

So she goes back, thanking them, keeping herself separate from the revelries of the camp, especially from that scarlet woman. She looks in the old letters and begins to find clue after clue. She looks again at her husband's letter and it begins to make sense. She realises that the very people who deceived and almost seduced her were written about in the letter and she failed to recognise it.

From then on, she begins to notice the terrain as they cross a river, as they reach a mountain, as they meet a dangerous party of Indians, and she looks in the letter and there they are fitting into place one after another. Oh the excitement of it! She's getting near the end of the journey; she can keep herself pure now as she looks at the letter and watches events as they pass by so rapidly; her whole attitude is changed. She now has a new joy and assurance and feels that she is in control of the situation. She watches those two men on the exterior of the camp and signals to them happily. They can see now that she is going to endure to the end.

Situations grow tense, the enemy is drawing in and the evil in the camp is coming to light. Disaster seems to be rushing in

on every hand. Suddenly, over the horizon, comes her beloved with a thousand cavalry, riding across the hills to her rescue to take her home. At last her troubles are over - the letter has done its work.

THE END

The following is some further explanation on this subject given by Edgar:

A Message for the Church Age

Now, I suggest that the above allegory illustrates what the Book of Revelation is about. It was to show the early Church things that would shortly come to pass, but is also to show us things that will lead right up to the Second Coming. Those who follow the Bible will get to know what it is about and will be warned in their time.

The early Church realised this and from their martyrs' memoirs it is clear that they drew much of their strength from the Book of Revelation. If you had asked them in the 3rd century where they found themselves in Revelation they would have replied "Under the fifth seal (Revelation 6.9) - we're the first company of martyrs but there's another company to follow".

The early Church was guided through her bitterest hours of suffering with the help of the letter that Jesus wrote. There are many references to it in their writings. They thought that Christ would come soon, as indeed He intended every generation of Christians to think, and this hope is present in all the New Testament. All Christians should be like those who stand with loins girded and lamps trimmed - those who watch for their Lord. He didn't want any generation to fall asleep and say "The Lord is not coming in our time".

The Book of Revelation was written with concealed meanings, to unfold its secrets little by little as they were needed down through the centuries until that blessed time when He shall appear. If we can see history as I believe God foresaw it then it begins to make a glorious pattern and piece by piece it fits into place. We will find where we are and what is expected of us in our day.

Remember Revelation 1.19, where God gives John a threefold vision, "Write the things which you have seen" (i.e. the vision of the Lord Jesus Christ in chapter 1) "and the things which are" (i.e. the condition of the seven churches of Asia) "and the things which will take place after this" (i.e. things that were mostly in the future for John, but have in many cases passed into history from our standpoint). Jesus time and again pointed out to His disciples how prophecy had already been fulfilled, often under their very noses, when they were looking for the answers in the future. It is a common failing not to recognise prophecy already fulfilled in history. Our natural tendency is to make guesses about the future - it's hard work to look into history and see whether the wonderful pattern given in Revelation can be overlaid onto history and give meaning to it. I believe it can.

Futurists and Preterists

The concept of everything in Revelation being in the future has been widely held since the middle of the 19th century. But before then, from about the 11th century, the historical (or 'historicist') interpretation of Revelation was prevalent. This view sees the prophecies of Revelation 6 to 19 as relating to the whole of the Church age from apostolic times to our Lord's coming. This interpretation views the Roman Catholic church system as the fulfilment of the visions of the beasts, the prostitute and Babylon (Revelation chapters 13,17 and 18), and it names the papacy, heading that Church system, as the predicted Antichrist, or man of sin. This view was held with conviction by the Reformers of the 16th century. Before long this historical understanding of the Book of Revelation was received as a self-evident and fundamental truth among Protestant churches everywhere. For example, the Epistle Dedicatory printed at the front of our King James (Authorised) Version of the Bible refers to the pope as 'that man of sin'. King James thought it quite safe and in agreement with popular opinion to allow the translators to have this printed at the front of the Bible.

Now during the Reformation, the Bible began to be freely circulated - more and more people were reading the Book of Revelation, and seeing these things for themselves. The Roman Catholic Church couldn't prevent this, so they had to produce their own alternative interpretations of Revelation to deflect the witness of the Bible against them.

The Roman Catholics began the Counter-Reformation to try to rescue their Church from the ruin facing it during the Reformation. The Jesuits were devoted servants of the papacy, and they tried several ways to bring the people of Europe back to the Roman Church - by education, persecution, diplomacy; such gross diplomacy, in fact, that they were turned out of every country in Europe for political intrigue. And it was Jesuits who put forward alternative explanations of Revelati

on to mislead people, and thus relieve the papacy of its condemnation by Scripture.

I mentioned the names of two Jesuits prominent in this area in my introductory allegory. One was called Alcasar (of Seville in Spain), who in 1614 began to teach that everything in Revelation was fulfilled in the days of pagan Rome (this is what is called the 'preterist' view). But he didn't get a lot of success among the evangelicals.

Another Jesuit named Francisco Ribera (1537-1591), of Salamanca (also in Spain), put it all in the future; he was the father of the futurist view, which lay dormant for over 250 years. Ribera's views found their way into the Protestant camp in the early 19th century. J.N. Darby and the Plymouth Brethren were among the early Protestant exponents of this view. Their literal interpretation of Bible prophecy and their ideas on the timing of the rapture and the Lord's Second Coming (which we'll look at later) attracted them to this futurist system of interpretation.

In the early 19th century there was a great spiritual vacuum in Britain and America. In addition, the tremendous upheavals then sweeping across Europe - the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars - were causing many to feel that the Lord's Coming must be very near. All sorts of teachings about the end times sprang up to fill the emptiness that people felt. An outstanding example is the terrible Millerite fiasco in the USA in the 1840s. A man named William Miller (the founder of the Adventists, the forerunners of the Seventh-Day Adventists) fixed the date of the Lord's Return as 22 October 1843. His followers gave property away, left crops to spoil in the fields and climbed into the hilltops to await their rapture. (The disappointed Miller didn't give up and fixed the date a year later, in 1844.) People like J.N. Darby, Edward Irving and others also found in that spiritually starved generation a ready audience for their futuristic ideas. All the cunning of that Jesuit, Ribera, has had its fruit in the publication of lots of extraordinary literature.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/2/20 13:07

To be totally honest had hoped this was one of those posts that might just quietly go away. Reason being the possibilities of all kinds of unnecessary dander getting things off into yet another ugly discussion. But Aaron, Chris, Mike, you guys did a fine job here.

"What -- you read the 'NIV?!?"
"What -- you believe in 'tongues?!?"
"What -- you believe in the 'Rapture?!?"
"What -- you attend a "home church?!?"
"What -- you watch football games?!?"
"What -- you voted for a Republican?!?"
"What -- you own a credit card?!?"
"What -- you listen to what music?!?"
"What -- you believe in eternal security?!?"

:-D

That is just classic...

phebebird, don't think it's fair to couch things as a 'bashing' here, we do attempt to curtail this in all its forms, whether it be a slandering of a member here or anyone else for that matter. It is neither a compromise on the truth nor a hiding from it. Think these gentlemen have stated the case well enough.

Quote:
-----Now, before you jump to arms and quote me something from some 17th century scholar, let me point out that I am talking about your run-of-the-mill everyday modern Catholic. I realize that the Jesuits probably have some shady history the Catholic church was responsible for the Crusades, etc, etc;

The word 'probably' is a bit of a concern, it makes it difficult to have an informed opinion and understand where the concerns lie if one hasn't taken the time to investigate. I won't post it and would suggest a very careful treading to anyone who might, but if you were to do a search on the word that is subject here you will find in their own words, who they are and what they hold to.

Re: Jesuits ?, on: 2006/2/20 19:02

Somehow the thread went off onto "Catholics".

It didn't appear the thread starter had the intent to "go there", but it was 'Brought' there.

I've seen some here go way into the History of just about everything under the sun.

And I do believe that is the purpose or definition of what goes on or is permitted to go on, in "The Lounge". Even those things mentioned above if I read the definition of 'The Lounge' properly.

To discuss the differences between a Jesuit from an average Catholic Church attendee, is as different as (or alike as) discussing those in the lower ranks of the Masonic Orders, to those of the higher Degrees.

Totally different take on 'things'.

Personally, I was sorry to see this thread's initial intent to be side-tracked by over-sensitivities. As the initial post stated, this also was a note worthy topic to many of those we read and promote here.

How Jesuits work, through-out the World and their influence was a topic that concerns even a good portion of the Catholics I know.

I was raised Catholic, and all I've known before Salvation was Catholics. And since I've been saved, I listen to EWTN, etc. and have their books, etc. and it is NOT true that they do not "bash protestants".

If you can pick up EWTN on your radio, I'd advise you look into this allegation. And also look into "why" they have more recently taken on much of our Protestant terms and how they now run their Mass ... in comparison to 40 years ago. There are times NOW, that EWTN actually sounds like you are listening to a Protestant station ... but then Mary will come up and our need of her for Salvation and of course the Need for the "sacraments" for salvation, and allegiance to the Pope, being necessary for Salvation ... the list goes on and we are still Anathema, if we preach by grace through faith alone.

A historically accurate study of the roots and purpose of the Jesuits, right up until the present, 'would' have been something that even my Catholic friends would have been interested in.

I've unfortunately already studied this topic and it does nothing but depress me, but I feel we've done a hurt to the initial posters intent.

With all due respects.

Re:, on: 2006/2/21 14:47

Hi Phebebird, me again.

I just wanted to get back with you. I hope I have not given you a bad impression of myself. I did not want to come on here and stir up controversy. Finney always said "the spirit of revival, is not the spirit of controversy". I do love catholics, and I hope the Lord will open a door for me to be able to minister to my family(who are catholic) the true gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Please keep me in your prayer and my family also. This is a very interesting topic and I hope we can discuss it further without stirring controversy.

Your brother in Christ J-bird :-D

Re: - posted by phebebird (), on: 2006/2/21 19:48

No, I am not mad at you at all. Good luck on the no controversy thing.

Re: - posted by madmatg (), on: 2006/2/21 21:24

LOL :)

Re:, on: 2006/2/21 21:27

It may only be fair to everyone to reread page one and see where the "controversy" began.

This thread 'was' about the Jesuits.

Those who cry peace the most, sometimes stir things up and then yell "controversy".

Please, let's be fair to the person who started this thread and those who wanted to post to his Topic.

phebebird is decieved - posted by BereanMinded, on: 2006/12/31 3:20

Mormons look real good, money, and morality does that mean they are true?

Satan doesn't come against himself he goes for theats.

by they way you called yourself "protestant" what does that mean?

Re: phebebird is decieved - posted by SeanHobson (), on: 2006/12/31 13:03

I recently finished a book about the Jesuits entitled, *The Secret History of the Jesuits*; by Edmond Paris. Though the author had a bias opinion about the Jesuits, the majority of the book is written from an objective point of view. The accusations against the Jesuits were confirmed by quotes from catholic books, newspapers and periodicals.

I learned Ignatius of Loyola founded the Jesuits. I used to hold a lot of reverence for this man because of the oft recommended book he penned, *the Spiritual Exercises*;. The Jesuits started in missions, but have since evolved into a political and militant strong arm for the Vatican. They basically (according to the book) hold all power in the Roman Catholic Churches hierarchy, being above priests, bishops, and even the Pope himself. They were behind both world wars and several others in France and other places in Europe, for the sole purpose, so that when conquered, a countries state religion would be Roman Catholicism.

I was interesting in reading about the Jesuits when most of the above was attributed to them in the Jack Chick Comics (I think the comics are true). It is true the average Roman Catholic does not know about the Jesuits, not even the average person, unless familiar with one of their schools. Nevertheless, I without doubt believe them responsible for many masacres and cruelties.

Does anyone own a Halley's Bible Handbook? Look in the back when it describes the Reformation and The Inquisition, their names (as culprits) come up often.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2006/12/31 17:53

I have done some research into this, and I would have to say that if you would like to get an idea of what the Jesuits are trying to accomplish, you need to understand the "Council of Trent", and why it is still the goal of the Roman Catholic Church to undo all that was accomplished in The Reformation.

I am posting the link to this video, with the warning that it is from a quote unquote conspiracy conference. The man who puts this on is not a quack, but is a godly man.

The video deals with a presentation by the author of a book called "Vatican Assassins" which the gentleman took 20 years assembling, writing, and researching. I would recommend reading it, but there are few if any copies available, and they go for around \$600.00. I have read it, and while there are some things I disagree with, everything is based upon solid historical facts. You cannot argue with history. Especially since he uses many of their own literature to prove the points. The things he discusses will be offensive to some, that is why I issue the warning.

(<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid-5462018011643775425>) Vatican Assassins

Brethren the facts are plain, we know that there is an enemy who longs to destroy souls, and he will stop at nothing to do this. He will use religion and religious organizations.

Be simple concerning evil, but also expose the works of darkness.

The men of old knew the dangers of these men, and tried to warn us. We have grown slothful in understanding just how wickedly crafty our enemy is. But praise our God for the victory is His.