

# **Biblical Forensics ©**

## **“Jesuit Deception on the Rapture”**

### **Part 3**

In Part 2 we took a deeper look at the underlying circumstances behind attempts relating to how critics of the Pre-Tribulation Rapture doctrine operate to scuttle it. One way is by using a “Straw Man” argument designed to give the appearance of authenticity while misleading the world with regards to the true background of Dispensationalism, and the Pre-Tribulation doctrine. If you have studied the Bible for any length of time, you know that much of the church does not believe in the Pre-Tribulation Rapture.

Opponents of the Pre-Tribulation Rapture teaching attempt to deceive others by telling people that the Rapture originated as a Jesuit lie. Even such a statement as this accusation is errant, and too distant or off the mark from what Fr. Francisco Ribera wrote about especially when one takes into consideration that the Jesuits did not even remotely invent the Rapture teaching. In Part 2, the points that were noted was that the work of Fr. Francisco Ribera who was also a Jesuit specifically intended to redirect any criticisms or accusations away from the pope that could implicate him as the Antichrist of the Bible. Fr. Ribera merely reached the conclusion from his own personal study of Scripture that the Antichrist was a “futurist” event but he did not teach Dispensational theology, nor did he teach the specifics associated with Pre-Millennialism.

This series is not by any stretch of the imagination meant to be an apologetic piece for or on behalf of the Jesuits. However, by way of acknowledgement, we do owe the Jesuit, Fr. Francisco Ribera a debt of gratitude and can at the very least show appreciation for the research he did accomplish, which eventually led to further studies produced by other scholars and theologians, resulting from his preliminary hermeneutical study on the Antichrist.

Pope Alexander IV established the Office of the Inquisition in Italy in 1254 A.D. The Holy Office of the Inquisition was a system of tribunals instituted by the Roman Catholic Church for the discovery, examination, and conviction of heretics and their punishment by the secular arm. Lest the ordinary church authorities should be remiss in carrying out this system Gregory IX named monks or friars from outside as “pontifical inquisitors”, chiefly Dominicans.

Shortly after the pontifical inquisitors were chosen exclusively from the order of the Dominicans. Three centuries later after Pope Paul III sanctioned the Society of Jesus, the Office of Inquisition was revived and the pope gave

free reign to the Jesuits to run this office. The inquisitor generals were granted exceptional powers in carrying out their mandate to root out all Protestant “heretics”. This led to and caused the martyrdom of millions of non-believers and Christians. Today, the Office of the Inquisition is known as the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, a more passive term. Before Cardinal Ratzinger was elected as Pope Benedict XVI, he held this office of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

Prior to Vatican II which was held in the mid-1960’s, non-Catholics were called “heretics” and following Vatican II we are now called the “lost brethren”. Believe me, this contemporary term is a ruse, and in the mind of the Papacy, or the Jesuit-controlled Vatican we are still “heretics”. I routinely monitor several Roman Catholic websites. One of them is the “Vortex” hosted by Michael Voris, who is a regular critic of non-Catholics. In his broadcast of December 1, 2016, he repeated once again that “outside of this faith, salvation is not possible”. The faith he refers to is the Roman Catholic Church! Since 2006 when I began receiving his website’s newsletters, Michael Voris has continued his rant declaring Catholicism the only true church. This serves as a wakeup call and a reminder that “Rome never changes!” For those who have been captivated by the idea that the Roman Catholic Institution has changed from its original historic reputation involving ‘correctional’ solutions, I suggest you listen for a couple weeks to Michael Voris who hosts “Church Militant” dot com. Listen randomly to what Mr. Voris and his guests discuss. You will find it quite surprising, and eye opening to say the least.

The Jesuits assumed control of the Inquisition, a war that lasted thirty years in Germany and was primarily instigated by the Jesuits to deprive the Protestants of their right to religious freedom of worship which was finally secured for them by the treaty of Augsburg. It officially ended the religious struggle between the two groups and made the legal division of Christendom permanent within the Holy Roman Empire, allowing rulers to choose either Lutheranism or Roman Catholicism as the official confession of their state. Calvinism was not allowed until the Peace of Westphalia. Then came the Irish rebellion, and the inhuman butchery of roughly fifteen million Indians in South America, Mexico, and Cuba, by the Spanish papists. It is calculated by credible historians, that Papal Rome has shed the blood of sixty-eight million members of humanity in order to establish her unfounded claims to religious dominion. These are the remarks published in Dr. Brownlee’s book *‘Popery An Enemy to Civil Liberty’*, page 105.

Bohemia had been an area known to be religiously tolerant. The region was a mixture of Calvinists, Lutherans, Catholics, and Anabaptists. They all lived in relative harmony. About two-thirds of the population was Protestant and just 10% were Catholic. Most of Bohemia’s senior nobility were Catholic. In Bohemia, by 1600 A.D., in a population of 4,000,000, 80% were Protestant. When the Habsburgs and Jesuits had done their work, 800,000 were left, all

Catholics. On page 790 in Henry Halley's *'Bible Handbook'*, 13<sup>th</sup> edition, 1939, it references the ruthless Inquisition led by the Jesuits.

The Jesuits became the predominant group supplying confessors, meaning they heard the confession of European royalty, including the Papacy. As advisor to kings, they influenced political policy. A royal confessor was not slow to tell a king that he had a duty to make the kind of political alliances that would promote the temporal interests of the Church. It was Le Tellier, a Jesuit confessor to Louis XIV, who in the 1660's persuaded that monarch to revoke the Edict of Nantes, which granted religious liberty to Protestants. Protestants today have no idea what they are up against now in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century when it comes to the Jesuits. The Jesuits are the pope's confessors; it must be an ordinary priest, and he must be a Jesuit. He must visit the Vatican once a week at a fixed radio time, and he alone may absolve the pope of his sins.

The far-sighted warning of the Civil War Union General Sherman, is most appropriate to quote today: *"I would remind you of Webster's definition of a Jesuit: a designer, an intriguer. If the Church of Rome prevailed, the pope would be the Universal King. The Jesuits are here to plot and scheme and, if possible, take from us the noble heritage of our civil and religious freedom. The rules of the Jesuit Order justify theft, licentiousness, lying, false-witness bearing, suicide and the murder of parents and other relatives. The greatest crimes in history committed against individuals and nations have been committed by the Jesuits. Wherever Jesuits are they have the torch to burn, the sword to slay, the inquisition to torture. They are enemies of [Bible-believing] Christianity. They live for conquest, fortune and glory."* This quote is found on page 186, of *'General Sherman's Son: The Life of Thomas Ewing Sherman, S.J.'* by T. Durkin, S.J. Thomas Ewing Sherman was a Jesuit Civil War General, and a Union Army General.

After the war, the Union doctor, and Brigadier-General, Thomas M. Harris, wrote two books on the role of the Vatican in the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln; the more important of the two books is *'Rome's Responsibility for the Assassination of Abraham Lincoln'* in 1897. He was a member of the Commission that prosecuted the assassination conspirators. It is one of the most important books ever to have been written in America, for it proves that the Jesuits of Rome were responsible for Lincoln's assassination and death. This is a fact that is almost completely hidden from the world today. It was the beginning of the Papacy's attempt to gain complete control over America.

Per Bible prophecy, a one-world religion that will offer the promise of peace throughout the world is going to commence prior to Christ's return. To most, this global body will seem like a wonderful thing and very possibly will appear to be a pseudo-Christianity (coming in the name of "Christ"). However, contrary to how the masses will perceive this, it will help establish

and set up the antichrist and his one-world government. For this to happen, all religions must come together in an ecumenical plan. Today, as part of the Luciferian scheme, the evangelical and charismatic Protestant church is being seduced into the welcoming arms of the Roman Catholic Church, largely through what we call "The Jesuit Agenda". Most incredibly, while the evidence is obvious to some, most proclaiming Christians are not even aware it is happening. Understanding the Jesuit Agenda is essential if we are to understand how this worldwide deception will come about.

Once again, returning to the topic of the two Jesuit theologians Fr. Francisco Ribera and Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, we pick up with their incredible effort geared towards deflecting accusations pointing to the pope as the Antichrist. About 1791, Manuel De Lacunza, a Jesuit from Chile, also wrote a manuscript in Spanish and under the pen name of Juan Josafa [Rabbi] Ben-Ezra. It was titled '*La Venida del Mesias en Gloria y Magestad*' ('*The Coming of the Messiah in Glory and Majesty*'). Lacunza wrote under an assumed Jewish name to obscure the fact that he was a Roman Catholic in order that to (deceive) and to give his book better acceptance among Protestants who were his intended audience. Also, an advocate of "Futurism", like Ribera and Bellarmine, Lacunza was deliberately attempting to take the pressure off the Papacy by proposing that the Antichrist was still far off into the distant future. His manuscript was published between 1811 and 1826 in London, Spain, Mexico, and Paris.

It is at this point in history that Protestant churchmen began to translate Lacunza's work as well as others. We also encounter a second thread of Protestant leaders who began to study and analyze the writings of the Jesuits. The other thread line of "Futurism" had progressed through the early church fathers, some of which were noted in Part 2, and through other European churchmen. Elsewhere in my articles, I noted that from 350 A.D. until the Reformation Era, the Roman Catholic Institution maintained an iron-clad grip on church doctrine. Dissent was not something one dared to undertake. To defy church law and Papal authority, one ran the risk of facing church discipline, persecution, and even worse, possible imprisonment, or death if the "heretic" did not tow the Roman line. We know that many men dared to teach the concept of a "Futuristic" understanding, despite what it might mean for their lives and their ministry.

Edward Irving, (1792-1834), a Scottish Presbyterian and forerunner of the Pentecostal and Charismatic movement, translated Lacunza's work from Spanish into English in 1827. At the time, he pastored a church of over a thousand members.

Almost always, those opposed to the Pre-Tribulation Rapture will point to Margaret MacDonald, a 15-year old Scottish girl, and a member of Edward Irving's congregation. They will errantly claim she is responsible for the Pre-Tribulation Rapture. She had visions of a Secret Rapture of believers

occurring before the appearance of the Antichrist. She shared her visions with Edward Irving, and he in turn shared her visions with prophecy conferences that began in Dublin, Ireland in 1830. Those who continue to attack the Pre-Tribulation Rapture for some reason choose only to go as far back as 1830, and completely ignore the wealth of evidence that exists for the period from the first century up to the time of Edward Irving. I suppose they conclude that 1830 is back far enough in time, therefore it supports their view that the Pre-Tribulation Rapture began with this young 15-year old girl.

Samuel R. Maitland (1792-1866), a lawyer and Bible scholar, became the librarian to the Archbishop of Canterbury. He found Fr. Francisco Ribera's writings and began to widely publish and advocate Fr. Ribera's so-called "deceptive" writings. He concluded that the 3-1/2 times, 42 months, and 1,260 days of Daniel and Revelation were all intended to be a literal 3-1/2 years and not 1,260 years.

In 1826, he published a book attacking the Reformation view and supported Fr. Francisco Ribera's theory of a future one-man Antichrist. For the next ten years, in tract after tract, he continued his anti-Reformation rhetoric. Consequentially because of his zeal and strong attacks against the Reformation, the Protestants of England received a crushing blow.

John Henry Newman, an Anglican priest, promoted the Jesuit concepts of "Futurism" in England. Newman was a member of the Church of England and a leader in the Oxford Movement, which ultimately led to several hundred pastors returning to the Church of Rome. For his efforts in influencing Protestant churchmen, he was rewarded by being given the position of a Cardinal in the Roman Catholic Church. During this time, there was a concerted effort waged by the Jesuits to regain control over the Church of England.

A Church of Ireland clergyman named John Nelson Darby (1800-1882), who later joined the Plymouth Brethren, also promoted "Futurism" and a secret Rapture. Darby visited the United States several times between 1859 and 1874, where his teaching on "Futurism" was readily accepted. Darby is unfairly scapegoated by those who preach against the Pre-Tribulation Rapture doctrine. In his day, Darby was a brilliant lawyer, pastor, and theologian, who authored more than 53 books on the Bible. He is known to be the "father of Dispensationalism", which is the theory that God deals with mankind in major dispensations or epochs. John Nelson Darby became a strong promoter of the Pre-Tribulation Rapture, and laid much of the foundation for the present idea thereby moving Daniel's 70<sup>th</sup> Week from its historical context which was originally thought to have occurred in the time of Jesus Christ and applied it to a future Tribulation due to follow sometime after the Rapture.

Despite all the positive contributions Darby and his ministry has made, he is still criticized by those critical of the Pre-Tribulation doctrine. He studied the works of Fr. Francisco Ribera and Cardinal Robert Bellarmine even though they were Jesuits and whose research was principally meant to distract Catholics and especially Protestants from viewing the pope as the Antichrist. Contemporary critics have not given Darby a fair hearing, let alone read his writings. Darby was not particularly interested in theology as a student at Trinity College in Dublin. As part of his college education, Darby was required to take courses on the Bible. Scholars at Trinity College taught from a “literal” hermeneutic interpretation and that was a factor behind his reasons for taking the Bible seriously once out of college. Darby entered law school and it was somewhere in the time between his law studies, possibly during June or July of 1820 that Darby experienced a personal conversion to Jesus Christ.

Within two years of his conversion, Darby left his promising future career in the law. His father disinherited him on the spot after learning of his career change and subsequent response to a call to ministry. On August 7, 1825, he was ordained a deacon in the Anglican Church at Raphoe Cathedral in Dublin, Ireland. The following year, he was ordained an Anglican priest and appointed to a large rural church. It should be noted that Darby did not come to his Dispensational view of the Bible in a haphazard way. It was a combination of in-depth study of the Word, study experiences with his peers, and his recognition that God distinctly differentiates between Israel and the Church in Scripture. He was looking for the “True” Church in the world and he did not find it within the Roman Catholic Institution or in the traditional Church of Christ of the day.

While he was convalescing between 1827 and 1828, because of a riding accident, he had lots of time to study the Word and recuperate. Through concentrated studies he underwent a transition from being a Post-Tribulation believer to becoming an advocate for the Pre-Tribulation teaching. During the two months between December, 1827 and January, 1828, Darby came to an understanding that the Bible was dispensationally laid out. He clearly was approaching the transition point between his previously held belief of Post-Tribulation to the conclusion that the Pre-Tribulation was the correct understanding. He said that it was Isaiah 32 that taught him there was an age to come, a future time-period in which God would work out His relations with mankind. With certainty, Darby’s two-months convalescent period sparked his understanding of Dispensationalism, and the idea of a Pre-Tribulation Rapture.

It was the distinction between Israel and the Church in the Scriptures that enabled Darby to gain the kind of clarity he needed to recognize and to achieve a clear understanding of ecclesiology (the doctrine of the church) to fully appreciate the depth of his eschatology (the doctrine of end times). Darby’s clarification of ecclesiology (study of the church) enabled him to see

the larger scope of eschatology (study of end times). It wasn't very long before he identified the conflict in the existing church world which he was part of, and this consequently led him to perceive that the church's doctrinal teaching did not conform to Scripture. He was perplexed and troubled by the Roman and Anglican failures to recognize the importance of what Scripture reveals concerning God's differentiation between Israel and the Church. As Dr. Timothy Ice notes, "*Darby did not just develop an ecclesiology that was isolated from interaction with other areas of theology, rather he clearly set it against God's plan for Israel.*"

It is clear that Darby gained his views primarily from his own study of the Word of God, the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and the emergence of an outgrowth of Premillennial Biblical literalists, who were moving away from the Historical school of interpreting prophecy to the Futurist position. The year 1828 became a major pivotal point of systematizing what we know as Dispensationalism, the Pre-Millennial and Pre-Tribulational Rapture. As I have noted before, few, if any, have ever bothered to read the 53 volumes of his writings. Critics have been dishonest in their appraisals by defaming a man who surpasses any existing critic today who would infer that Darby was not a true Bible scholar among his peers. To the contrary, Darby was held in great esteem and exhibited huge potential in the Anglican Church in Ireland. The name John Nelson Darby ought not to be viewed with such derision but with appreciation and respect. Those who demean his name are deceivers in the full sense of the word and exhibit immaturity!

The link created between John Nelson Darby - the father of dispensationalism with Jesuit Fr. Francisco Ribera - the father of futurism is clear. Darby visited America six times between 1859 and 1874, preaching in all the major cities and during that time he planted the seeds of Futurism on American soil.

The next person to follow John Nelson Darby's foot steps was Cyrus Ingersoll Scofield, another lawyer from Kansas who was greatly influenced by Darby's writings. In 1909, Scofield published the first edition of his famous '*Scofield Reference Bible*'. I am told it is "the" Bible for Pre-Tribulation believers. I say that only because I personally have never owned a '*Scofield Reference Bible*'. This may come as a surprise to those who have read my posts on the Internet because there is no question about my position on the Pre-Tribulation Rapture. I have 35 other modern translations, but preferred the J.P. Green Interlinear Bible, until my vision started declined a few years ago, and its 5-point type size became a real problem. For those not familiar with Green's Interlinear Bible, it contains the English text, with both a literal word-for-word translation of the Hebrew Masoretic Old Testament and Greek Textus Receptus New Testament.

The Scofield Study Bible virtually reigns supreme in Baptist Churches across America, and to lesser numbers in the rest of the denominations. It

was a big success upon release and remains so. Those who attack the Pre-Tribulation Rapture and Dispensationalism ridicule the Scofield Study Bible, and I would bet few of them have ever looked at a Scofield Bible.

Following C.I. Scofield, Arno C. Gaebelein, a close assistant to Scofield, taught the “Futurist” doctrine. Lewis Sperry Chafer brought Scofield’s teachings to Dallas Theological Seminary. Dallas Theological Seminary is a non-denominational seminary that teaches the Dispensationalism of John Nelson Darby. Lewis Sperry Chafer founded Dallas Theological Seminary in 1924, but it was first called Evangelical Theological College, before it was renamed to Dallas Theological Seminary.

One of the interesting but fraudulent claims, particularly made by the Seventh Day Adventists, is in how they label the “Futurism” doctrine by treating it as so-called: a deceptive Jesuit lie. I cannot begin to count the number of times I heard that statement by opponents of the Pre-Tribulation Rapture, particularly the SDA church and their members. Websites on the Internet attack the Pre-Tribulation Rapture will, without exception, spread that lie about the Jesuit Futurist Rapture doctrine. It is a disingenuous attempt to discredit Dispensationalism, and it is found on most websites that are part of the breakaway splinter groups who followed Herbert W. Armstrong’s Worldwide Church of God when it fell apart following his death. The WCG was a cult that advocated and taught British-Israelism, and still is taught by the breakaway groups. He died in 1986, and his son assumed the mantle of the church until it collapsed as a consequence of his sexual infidelities with female employees at the WCG headquarters. I believe Armstrong’s son died in 2003. The WCG and its hundreds of splinter groups are all Sabbatarian (Sabbath observant). Many of these breakaway churches produce slick-paper monthly magazines, that are always offered free to readers, and are a signature-mark of these groups. Their sole purpose is meant to lure people toward their aberrant theology.

As noted, the vanguard institution that teaches Dispensationalism is Dallas Theological Seminary, founded by Lewis Sperry Chafer. When Scofield died in 1921, Chafer moved to Dallas, Texas to pastor the First Congregational Church of Dallas, where Scofield had been the pastor. Three years later Lewis Sperry Chafer and his friend William Henry Griffith realized their vision of a simple, Bible-teaching theological seminary, when they founded Evangelical Theological College, which as mentioned earlier was later named Dallas Theological Seminary.

Dallas Theological Seminary is known as a center of modern Dispensationalism teaching due to Dr. Chafer’s development of a Scofield-based systematic theology which approaches the Bible with a “Pre-Millennial, Dispensational interpretation of Scriptures”. Dr. Chafer’s eight volume work, *Systematic Theology* was first published in 1948 and it is the required textbook for many courses at DTS. As a former Methodist pastor, I did not



have the benefit of DTS in my theological education. My educational roots were unfortunately from United Presbyterian and Free Methodist academic institutions. I attribute the reason for my becoming a Dispensationalist Bible scholar largely because I found the Reformed/Covenantal teachings to be so lacking in many issues. The majority of what are commonly referred to as the Mainline Protestant denominations that came out of the Reformation are basically not too far afield of present day Roman Catholicism, with only a few differences in some doctrinal areas.

When I came to that crisis point and found myself at a crossroad between choosing between truth over tradition, it took about a year to arrive at that crisis of conscience point where if I was going to remain true to my beliefs concerning biblical truths, it was time to leave the United Methodist Church. Not too long ago, I watched a YouTube clip by a well-respected seminary professor in the United Methodist Church, as he defamed the Dispensational view of the Bible. This man obviously gave support to those claiming Margaret McDonald invented the Futurist doctrine, but in so doing, he only exposed himself to the fact that he certainly knew little or had not read either of the writings of Francisco Ribera (a Jesuit) or John Nelson Darby (an Anglican Church of Ireland pastor).

In recent decades, Dallas Theological Seminary has been joined by Biola University, Talbot School of Theology, and Liberty University, in their beliefs about Dispensationalism and the Pre-Tribulation Rapture, as well as their Biblical hermeneutical interpretation and understanding.

The Dispensational school of theology that holds the view Scripture first and foremost as a literal document, has lost many of its great leaders, particularly in the last ten or fifteen years. They have joined their fellow alum at the great seminary in heaven awaiting the great family reunion of believers. Others have stepped into the arena of truth to help make up for the loss of such great men as Dr. Charles Lee Feinberg, Dr. Dave Breese, Grant Jeffrey, Dr. J. Vernon McGee, Dr. John Walvoord (who became president of DTS). Then, a year or two ago Dr. Charles Caldwell Ryrie was called home. Dr. Tim LaHaye was recently called home in 2016. It is most fortunate that we still have Dr. Chuck Swindoll, Dr. David Jeremiah, Hal Lindsey, Dr. Tim Ice, Dr. Andy Woods, Dr. Ron Rhodes, and Dr. Chuck Missler.

Steve Wohlberg of White Horse Ministry (a Seventh Day Adventist group) is one of the major debunkers of Dispensationalism and the Pre-Tribulation Rapture. Throughout the Internet there are dozens of cloned SDA websites. Steve Wohlberg fabricates his own lies concerning the work of Francisco Ribera, claiming it is the product of a Jesuit conspiracy. He teaches that Futurism came into Protestantism through Edward Irving to John Nelson Darby. But, Dr. Thomas Ice reveals that the part about Irving is pure fantasy. Columba Graham Flegg, an expert on Edward Irving's eschatology, clearly

refutes Wohlberg and states that Irving was a traditional historicist, and not a Futurist.

Wohlberg's exaggerations are well known. He is one of the SDA's leading critics of Dispensationalism and the Pre-Tribulation Rapture. One claim he makes is that "Futurism" only began in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century, when it is amply clear that the earliest views of Bible prophecy found in the Ante-Nicene Fathers (till 325 A.D) are Futurist in their totality. Dr. Grant Osborne summarizes the views of the early church's futurism as follows:

*"This was the method employed by some of the earliest fathers (e.g., Justin, Irenaeus, Hippolytus), but with triumph of the allegorical method after Origen and of the amillennial view after Augustine and Ticonius, the futurist method (and chiliaism) was not seen again for over a thousand years. The first to develop once more a literal view of the book was Francisco Ribera, a Spanish Jesuit who wrote in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century to counter the Reformation anti-papal interpretation. While he was not truly a futurist, he turned the attention back to the early fathers, and after him that view returned to prominence and stands alongside the others as equally valid".* I have noted numerous times in different articles that Saint Augustine, through Roman Catholicism, virtually shut down any dissent whatsoever. If one did not adhere strictly to Roman Catholic doctrine, your days were numbered.

As noted before, critics of the Pre-Tribulation Rapture and Dispensationalism fail to realize there is not a single doctrine in the universal church that has been handed to us on a silver platter or wrapped up in a nice neat package. Each and every one of the doctrines defined by Scripture has come to our use through the great effort and work of many scholars who diligently studied the Word of God, to glean textual meanings in the written Word for the purpose of finding the basis of any given doctrine. There are two places in Scripture -(Matthew 24; Daniel 11-12) which strongly indicate that knowledge will increase at the time of the end; particularly with respect to advanced Biblical teachings. ***"Who then is a faithful servant and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to given them meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Verily, I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler over all his goods"***. -(Matthew 24:45-47). What is "meat in due season"? Is the "meat" referring to animal flesh, or is it referring to teachings and doctrine? If meat means doctrine, then the reference to ***"due season"*** is clearly referring to the final days before the Lord returns and that it would be dispensed precisely when it is needed.

Simple teachings in 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians 3 and Hebrews 5, are referred to as milk, and difficult or complex teachings are likened to meat. It is very much like how babies grow, first by drinking just milk, and as they progress, they are introduced to solids, first vegetables and finally meat. Initially babies are not ready for meat.

The book of Daniel clearly points out how knowledge will increase in the time of the end. Read for yourself, and read Daniel 11:32-35; Daniel 12:3-10. Both passages assert that “knowledge shall be increased”. This truth is so self-evident; it stands to reason that with the advent of the computer, and the far reach capabilities of the Internet mankind has increased in not only knowledge of the Bible, but in all areas of understanding. This is particularly so, because access to knowledge that was largely unknown even a few years ago has now available to people for all age groups and from all walks from life. This certainly was not the case before the mid-1990’s.

Many wrongly believe there wasn’t a Rapture doctrine before 1826 when John Nelson Darby began teaching it. Admittedly, Darby popularized the doctrine of the Pre-Tribulation rapture more than any other, and Darby certainly did instruct others. But consider the fact that most of the world believed in a “flat earth” until Christopher Columbus, Vasco da Gama, and Ferdinand Magellan, when they proved the world was round by sailing around the world. Do not be taken in by the “flat earthers” and their recently resurrected scam meant to play with people’s minds. It is nothing more than a Jesuit lie. Not long ago, even President Obama referenced the “Flat Earthers” movement which was spoken about by a black rap musician.

The most amazing thing about people who will level this kind of criticism against new doctrine is their utter hypocrisy. If they TRULY BELIEVE that it is impossible to learn or say anything new, they should stop reading and speaking. The Prophet Daniel’s words more clearly refute the Orthodox view as well as the Catholic view. Both attempt to repudiate any teaching that they believed did not exist centuries ago. Clearly, people who use this kind of criticism (that no new teachings can be correct) are simply showing their utter contempt for knowledge, and are therefore displaying their own wicked foolishness.

Other Scriptures proclaim that knowledge and understanding will be revealed and increased in the times of the end. Amos 3:7 says: ***“Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but He revealeth His secrets unto His servants the prophets.”*** Luke 8:17 says: ***“For nothing is secret that shall not be made manifest; neither anything hid, that shall not be known and come abroad”.*** Think about that verse and then recall all the evil that has been exposed in the past two decades alone. For example, we know that the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was known by the White House before the actual attack occurred on December 7, 1941. The Roosevelt White House received regular daily intelligence reports on the whereabouts of the Japanese naval task force. The U.S. Navy had cracked the Japanese “Purple” Code in 1940 and were able to know what the Japanese were doing every day of the war. We now know the official story line that 9/11 is also a fabricated lie. We know that President Obama was born in Kenya and not Hawaii, which President-elect Donald Trump backed

away from while he was campaigning for president. We know that the sinking of the RMS Titanic was no accident. The Titanic's sister ship, the Olympic, damaged in an earlier collision, was uninsurable and destined for the scrapyard. The fate of the White Star Line and Belfast Shipyards hung in the balance. The Olympic was disguised as its sister ship, the Titanic, and deliberately sunk. It was really an insurance fraud purposely meant to collect the insurance on a severely damaged ship by passing the Olympic off as if it were the real Titanic and sinking the unfit commercial liner. I could go on but these examples are sufficiently perfect examples of what Scripture implies concerning the increase of knowledge in the end times.

The truth is, the Rapture teaching is not that original. All one needs to do is read the writings of early church fathers such as Polycarp and Clement. The Rapture doctrine was largely ignored for much of Church history. Thus, it is obvious that as more is realized through a deeper study of scripture and taught, much more about it is brought to light. This is to be an expected outcome as "knowledge increases". But let us not forget that the Apostle Paul initially taught the "mystery" of the Rapture doctrine.

When one understands that the Jesuit agenda was to remove or deflect any Biblical understanding that pointed to the pope as the Antichrist, this is what Fr. Francisco Ribera was able to extract from Scripture through his own deep study; he did not invent the idea out of thin air. With his ability, he drew conclusions, based upon the Word of God; and arrived reasonably close to what we know today. He did not fabricate, contrive, or manipulate the text to deceive anyone. This is an important confirmation of Biblical evidence that already existed in the text itself. Anyone today could draw the same conclusion, even if they had no knowledge of what we have today.

Look at these points which pleased the pope:

- The Apocalypse applied to a yet future period
- Most of the Apocalypse applied to a 3-1/2-year period immediately prior to the second coming
- The Antichrist would be a single individual
- The Antichrist would persecute and blaspheme the saints of God
- The Antichrist would abolish the Christian religion
- During that time, the Roman Catholic Church would have fallen away into apostasy
- The Antichrist would be received by the Jews (make a Covenant)
- The Antichrist would rebuild the temple in Jerusalem
- The Antichrist would pretend to be God in the Temple
- The Antichrist would kill the two witnesses of God
- The Antichrist would conquer the world

In devising an interpretation of prophecy that would not incriminate the Roman Catholic Church, Fr. Francisco Ribera interpreted prophecy so that the book of Revelation had no application to the Middle Ages or the Papacy, but only to the future, and mostly to a period immediately prior to the Second Coming. Hence the name "Futurism". Fr. Francisco Ribera differed only, in so far, as he accepted a theory close to what the Pre-Tribulation notes pertaining to the current interpretations of the 1,260 days, 42 months and 3-1/2 years of prophecy. It would have been interesting to learn what Fr. Francisco Ribera might have found if he had lived. He died at the age of 54, the year after he published his work. Ribera's book is particularly relevant when you understand that virtually all the Reformer's believed the pope to be the Antichrist. He extracted only passages that would take the focus off the Papacy and he never added a single idea that was not already in the pages of the Bible. Some of us do not necessarily see that as a Jesuit Lie!

Pastor Bob