

# Jesuit “Moral Theology” and the Destruction of Western Morality

by Shaun Willcock

## *Introduction*

Do you want to know why the West has become a moral cesspool? A major reason is Jesuit “moral theology”, which has been taught for the past four centuries and has spread through western society like leaven. For this order of Roman Catholic priests has worked, since its inception, to conquer Protestantism, and the Protestant-influenced West, for the pope of Rome. And to do that, it has worked to destroy, indeed annihilate, western morality, which was so largely the product of the influence of Protestantism.

What you are about to read will shock and horrify every true Christian! This is not to say that the Jesuits are solely responsible for the collapse of the western world’s morals; but they are most definitely a major cause of it.

In order to analyse the various immoral, vile, perverted and utterly anti-scriptural Jesuit doctrines in the light of the Bible, quotations from the works of Jesuit theologians themselves will be given. These are taken from two books which powerfully expose the Jesuit Order: *History of the Jesuits*, by Theodor Griesinger,<sup>1</sup> and *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, by Charles Chiniquy.<sup>2</sup> Protestants of previous generations were well aware of the Jesuits and their intrigues, thanks to books like these; but alas, today the situation is very different. Very little is known about them at all, which has had devastatingly tragic results within the ranks of Protestantism, and within western society in general. For this very purpose I wrote my own book, *The Jesuits: the Secret Army of the Papacy*.<sup>3</sup>

As this pamphlet will show, Jesuit “moral theology” has (for the most part unknowingly) been absorbed into western society, including into what has been called the “Protestant West”. And the results are to be seen all around us. It is no exaggeration to say that *the Jesuit Order has played a huge role in altering the morals of the western world*.

May the Lord be pleased to use this present pamphlet to open the eyes of many to the disgusting “moral theology” of the Jesuits.

It must be pointed out that although Griesinger refers to these Jesuit priests by their title of “Father”, Christians are commanded not to give this title to any man, in a spiritual sense (Matt. 23:9); and in this present pamphlet I only do so in the imaginary exchanges between a Roman Catholic and a Jesuit in the confessional, where the Roman Catholic will of course call the priest, “Father.”

## *Lying and Perjury*

Regarding lying and perjury, the Jesuits have taught plainly that these sins are allowable whenever a man’s honour, property, or health might be harmed if he spoke the truth.

Alphonsus de Liguori was an influential Jesuit priest and theologian, extremely valuable to Rome, so much so that Rome made him into one of her “saints”. But seldom, if ever, has a more immoral man put pen to paper than he. This is what he taught concerning lying: “Notwithstanding, indeed although it is not lawful to lie, or to feign what is not, nevertheless it is lawful to dissemble what is, or to cover the truth with words, or other ambiguous and doubtful signs for a just cause, and when there is not a

necessity of confessing. It is the common opinion [*Moral Theology*, tom. ii. lib. iii. cap. iii. p. 116, n. 12. Mech. 1845].”<sup>4</sup>

“Liguori, in his treatise on oaths, Question 4, asks if it is allowable to use ambiguity, or equivocal words, to deceive the judge when under oath, and at No. 151 he answers: ‘These things being established, it is a certain and a common opinion amongst all divines that for a just cause it is lawful to use equivocation in the propounded modes, and to confirm it (equivocation) with an oath.... Now a just cause is any honest end in order to preserve good things for the spirit, or useful things for the body’ [*Moral Theology*, tom. ii. lib. iii. cap. iii. p. 116, n. 12. Mech. 1845].”<sup>5</sup>

“‘The accused, or a witness not properly interrogated, can swear that he does not know a crime, which in reality he does know, by understanding that he does not know the crime, concerning which he can be legitimately enquired of, or that he does not know it so as to give evidence concerning it’ [Liguori, *Moral Theology*, tom. ii. n. 153. Mech. 1845].”<sup>6</sup>

“‘Make an exception in a trial where the crime is altogether concealed. For then he can, yea, the witness is bound to say that the accused did not commit the crime. And the same course the accused can adopt, if the proof be not complete, etc., because then the judge does not legitimately interrogate’ [Liguori, *Moral Theology*, tom. ii. n. 154, p. 320. Mech. 1845].”<sup>7</sup>

“Liguori asks himself, ‘Whether the accused legitimately interrogated, can deny a crime, even with an oath, if the confession of the crime would be attended with great disadvantage.’ The [Romish] saint replies:— ‘Elbel, etc., denies that he can, and indeed more probably because the accused is then bound for the general good to undergo the loss. But sufficiently probable Lugo, etc., with many others, say, that the accused, if in danger of death, or of prison, or of perpetual exile, the loss of all property, the danger of the galleys, and such like, can deny the crime even with an oath (at least without great sin) by understanding that he did not commit it so that he is bound to confess it,— only let there be a hope of avoiding the punishment’ [*Moral Theology*, tom. ii. n. 156, p. 321. Mech. 1845].”<sup>8</sup>

“‘He who hath sworn that he would keep a secret, does not sin against the oath by revealing that secret when he cannot conceal it without great loss to himself, or to another, because the promise of secrecy does not appear to bind, unless under this condition, if it does not injure me.’

“‘He who hath sworn to a judge that he would speak what he knew, is not bound to reveal concealed things. The reason is manifest’ [Liguori, *Moral Theology*, tom. ii. p. 340. Mech. 1845].”<sup>9</sup> Yes, well, to a Jesuit it may be.

And Liguori was not the only Jesuit who taught such wickedness. “J. De Cardenas says [in his *Crisis Theologica*]... ‘It is allowable to take an oath, as well in important as in unimportant matters, without having the intention of keeping it, as soon as one has good grounds for so acting.’ ‘To make use of words of double meaning and to falsely deceive the judge, is allowable in certain cases,’ as Father Castropalos writes (tom. iii. of his work, Tract 14), ‘when one can only find a worthy excuse in concealing the truth. For instance, dissimulation might be necessary, in order not to pronounce sentence of death against one’s self, where instant destruction is in question; thus canst thou deny the truth and take refuge in dissimulation in such a case without being guilty of the least transgression. It is, indeed, allowable in such instances to take an oath of equivocation, as every man has a right to preserve his life by any means in his power... To this view of mine our most learned theologians agree.’ Castropalos then adds, after some further discussion, ‘and for this I refer to the works of Navarra, Tolet, Suarez, Valencia, and Lessius.’ Sanchez and Bonacinus also teach the same thing, and the latter says: ‘Interrogated as to a crime committed, it is not at all incumbent on you to confess, as long as you can find for your advantage any tolerable excuse. And when judicially interrogated, or when a great and important injury would accrue to you from a confession of your misdeed, you may boldly affirm that you have not committed it; only you must so form your words that you may afterwards be able to explain them according as you wish... Thus writes the learned Castropalos, and the greatly admired Father Filliutius expresses himself in a precisely similar way in his great work on theology (vol. x., Treatise 25, chap. 12). He writes: ‘one asks whether it is allowable at times to take an equivocating oath, a secret mental reservation being kept concealed. I answer, Yes, only the chief

thing is that the answer must be so framed according to the question, that afterwards another interpretation may be given to it, if it be found necessary, and difficulty be not occasioned by so doing.”<sup>10</sup>

It is very evident that the bottom line, according to Jesuit teaching, is that self-preservation is the most important thing. Lying and perjury are absolutely justified and acceptable, if this is the only way to ensure one's own self-preservation.

Imagine if parents raised their children according to such Jesuit doctrine! The child would constantly find excuses as to why he could not tell his parents the truth for something he had done.

But take a look at the world's governments; what do we find? Politicians lie, they lie all the time, they lie without compunction and without remorse. When they are caught red-handed in some crime, they lie. Roman Catholic politicians – and there are a great many of them throughout the West – have been taught, by their Jesuit confessors and other priests greatly influenced by the Jesuits, that this is perfectly acceptable; and gradually, over the centuries, this monstrous doctrine has filtered down into the skulls of all kinds of non-Papist politicians as well, until it has become an absolutely acceptable way of life for perhaps the majority of them.

Is it any wonder that we see the fruits of such teaching all around us today?

The Lord Jesus Christ said, in Jn. 8:44: “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it”; and Rev. 21:8 says, “But... all liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.”

### ***Fornication (Today Commonly Called “Living Together”)***

Listen to the vile teaching of these Jesuits, these bachelor-priests of Rome, supposedly sworn to celibacy, who not only commit fornication themselves, but readily teach others to commit it – and then excuse it.

“‘He,’ says Father Francis Zaver Fegeli (in his *Practical Questions regarding the Functions of Father Confessor*, Augsburg, 1750, p. 284), ‘who leads astray a young maiden with her own consent, is not guilty of sin, because she is mistress of her own person, and can dispense her favours according as she wishes.’ Father Escobar affirms precisely the same in his *Moral Theology*, which he caused to be printed at Lyons, in folio, in the year 1655, and also Father Moullet expresses himself in a similar manner in his *Compendium of Morals*.”<sup>11</sup>

The Jesuits do not care at all that what they teach is the *very opposite* of what the Word of God teaches! For they say it is no sin for a man to have sex with a young woman, if she consents to it; whereas the Bible distinctly calls a sexual relationship between two unmarried people the sin of fornication (e.g. 1 Cor. 6:13-20). And in fact, the Jesuit Fegeli's words, quoted above, prove that he himself *knew* it was a sin! – for although he says it is not, he speaks of a man “leading astray” a young maiden. Well now, if she is “led astray” by him, this must be a sin. To “stray”, after all, is not to do right, but to do wrong!

And note, too, how this slippery Jesuit serpent says the young maiden is free to “dispense her favours as she wishes”. But the Word of God teaches virginity before marriage (e.g. Deut. 22:13-21; 1 Cor. 7:25-28,34) – the *very opposite* of the moral filth which this wicked man spewed out!

Now consider the western world today. Marriage is considered “old-fashioned” and unnecessary, and everywhere young people shack up together, either with no intention to ever marry, or to “test the waters” to see if they want to marry each other eventually. And society has departed so far from biblical truth that this is fully accepted. Jesuit “morality” has so permeated western society that this is now considered normal, even preferable. And even very many “churches” (unworthy of the name!) accept it by turning a blind eye to it.

I say this is the fruit of Jesuit “moral theology”. Some might argue and say, “But the western world is not solely Roman Catholic, and there are multitudes who were not raised by Jesuit educators, or even

by Roman Catholic educators in general! How then can you say that what we are seeing in the West is the fruit of Jesuit teaching?” But the one who asks such a question does not understand the nature and power of Jesuitism in society. The Jesuits, themselves, are hardly understood by most people today. The majority, in fact, do not even know who the Jesuits are. But when one studies and understands the true nature and power of Jesuitism; the vast influence it has had on western societies for over four centuries – *yes, even non-Papist ones*; the vast influence of the Jesuits over Hollywood, which has vomited out this kind of twisted “morality” for decades, as I show in my book, *Jesuit Hollywood*;<sup>12</sup> etc., etc. – when one has carefully studied Jesuitism in the world, and in particular the West, then it is easy to understand that it is no exaggeration whatsoever to say that the way young people in the West live is the fruit, to a very extensive degree, of Jesuit “moral theology”.

## *Adultery*

“Father Moullet further teaches [in his *Compendium of Morals*]: ‘If anyone enters into a guilty relationship with a woman, not on account of her being married, but on account of her being beautiful, the sin of adultery is not chargeable in such a case, even although she may be married, but simply that of impropriety.’”<sup>13</sup>

Here we see, again, that although this Jesuit claims it is not a sin, he nevertheless states that it is a “guilty relationship”. If the couple are in a “guilty relationship”, then it is a *sinful* relationship! One is not guilty if what one does is right, but only when it is wrong. This is Jesuitism at work.

And note: the sin of adultery is not committed *if the woman is beautiful*! How is that for an example of the sheer wickedness of Jesuit “morality”? Has the reader ever come across such outright evil being passed off as “Christian doctrine”?

We may imagine the following exchange taking place in the confessional, when a Roman Catholic confesses to a Jesuit priest:

“Forgive me, Father, for I have sinned. I committed adultery. The woman was married.”

“Was she beautiful, my son?”

“Oh, very beautiful, Father.”

“Then, my son, you have nothing to fear and nothing to confess. You are innocent. After all, is it your fault that she is beautiful? Of course not. She was a temptation to you, and you could not resist.”

How opposite to the teaching of God’s Word, in Prov. 6:25: “Lust not after her beauty in thine heart”. God’s Word views adultery in a very different light to how the Jesuits view it (Exod. 20:14; Prov. 6:32; 1 Cor. 6:9).

And with this kind of Jesuit “moral theology” being pumped into Roman Catholics the world over for centuries, in their confessionals as well as in their educational establishments, and considering the vast influence of the Jesuits and their stooges in the western world, is it any wonder that this attitude to adultery is displayed night after night on TV screens throughout the West, in the so-called “soapies”? These are one of the most popular genres on television. The actresses are all considered beautiful, and adultery is frequently committed and excused. These shows have had an immense influence on the morals of the western world, for decades! In addition, the same kind of “morality” plays itself out in all kinds of other TV shows, and of course in the movies. Considering the huge Jesuit influence in Hollywood<sup>14</sup> and other forms of “entertainment”, we should not be surprised that Jesuit “morality” has so thoroughly permeated society. It is significant, too, that so many of these films and TV shows depict Roman Catholic priests, who are frequently the close friends of the “heroes” and “heroines” of the stories, and yet who either turn a blind eye to their adulterous affairs or give some mild rebuke. Anything to keep them all as “good Roman Catholics”, attending their “church” and – above all – paying their dues.

No wonder one in two marriages in western countries end in divorce today. Adultery is considered nothing more than the “sin of impropriety”. No longer is marriage “till death do us part”; now it is, “Till someone more beautiful comes along.”

And there is still more. “Liguori asks whether a woman, accused of the crime of adultery, which she has really committed, may deny it under oath. He answers: ‘She is able to assert equivocally that she did not break the bond of matrimony, which truly remains. And if sacramentally she confessed adultery, she can answer, “I am innocent of this crime,” because by confession it was taken away. So Card, who, however, here remarks that she cannot affirm it with an oath, because in asserting anything the probability of a deed suffices, but in swearing certainty is required. To this it is replied that in swearing moral certainty suffices, as we said above. Which moral certainty of the remission of sin can indeed be had, when any, morally well disposed, receives the sacrament of penance’ [*Moral Theology*, tom. ii. p. 322. Mech. 1845].”<sup>15</sup>

Let the reader make certain that he has this straight: if the woman who committed adultery is still married, she may assert equivocally that she did not commit adultery; and if she went to confession and the priest absolved her of her adultery, she may say that she is innocent of adultery because confessing it to a priest removed it. *This* is Jesuit “morality”.

## ***Prostitution***

One would think that, at least when it comes to prostitution, the pious Jesuit priests would take a firm stand and call it sinful. But no – as unbelievable as it may seem at first, the documentation reveals that the very opposite is, again, the case.

“Father Etienne Bauny expresses himself (in his work *De la Somme des Péchés*, Paris, 1653, p.77) in the following manner:– ‘It is allowable to all descriptions of persons to visit disorderly places in order there to convert sinful women, although it is very probable that one may even one’s self fall into sin, as one may but too easily be seduced by the sight and endearments of these women. This, however, is no *stuprum*, but merely *fornicatio*, as a *stuprum* infers force; *fornicatio*, on the other hand, depends on mutual consent, and thereby no injury takes place.’”<sup>16</sup>

He *calls it sin*, even though he also tries to make light of it by splitting hairs over Latin terms. The Latin *stuprum* refers to illegal sexual intercourse, usually with a virgin or a widow, and involves force (as in rape). The Latin *fornicatio*, on the other hand, refers in particular to sexual intercourse with prostitutes. But note what this Jesuit says: that it is *merely fornicatio*! In this way he brushes off the sin of sexual intercourse with prostitutes as being a small thing, because there was mutual consent in the committing of it! No heed whatsoever is paid to Holy Scripture, which has so much to say about “playing the harlot” or “whore”, and which teaches plainly: “For a whore is a deep ditch; and a strange woman is a narrow pit” (Prov. 23:27). And Paul wrote to Christians: “Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid. What? know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? for two, saith he, shall be one flesh. But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit. *Flee fornication*. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body” (1 Cor. 6:15-18).

And note that a man may visit a brothel, this good Jesuit says, for the purpose of “converting” the prostitutes there – even though he says it is *probable* (not merely “possible”, but *probable*) that he will fall into sin while there! This is just like those falsely-called “Evangelicals” today, those “I can have the pleasures of the world and Jesus too” types who say, “I go to bars and nightclubs to be a witness for Christ there, and while there I have a few drinks with the boys, because this opens doors for me to witness to them!” After centuries of the influence of this kind of Jesuit “morality” in the West, here is the result – the acceptance, even by multitudes who are not Roman Catholics, of Jesuit doctrine and “moral theology”!

In innumerable “churches” today, especially of the Charismatic variety, this is what is taught: “Don’t be like those fuddy-duddy fundamentalists, those old-fashioned Evangelicals who say it is sinful to drink, or shack up, or go to nightclubs, or whatever! We’re in the world to win the world! Go out into the world, dance, drink, have fun – and the people of the world will respect you for it, and they’ll begin to ask you about Christ, and then you can witness to them!” No, the people of the world do *not* respect

such hypocritical, false “Christians”, and they are *not* drawn to the true Christ of God by such worldly examples. If they go to the church of such a “Christian” afterwards, it is only because they love the fact that his “church” lets them play with the world.

Perhaps not many “churches” say, as yet, that their members may even go to brothels to “witness” – but do not be surprised when this permission is one day given, or at least, if attendance at such places is winked at and overlooked.

Falling for the wiles of a harlot is not a sin, according to Jesuit “moral theology”. But when it comes to the issue of taking money in payment for prostitution, the Jesuit theologians give the appearance of not being unanimous on this point. Yet what they have stated is shocking enough, and it is as plain as day that these men are under the direction of the devil!

“Father J. Gordon, a Scottish Jesuit, writes (*General Moral Theology*, vol. ii. book v.): ‘A girl of pleasure is justified in receiving payment, only she must not make the price too high. The same holds good in the case of every young maid who pursues her calling secretly. A married woman, however, has not the same right to receive payment, seeing that the gain from prostitution has not been previously stipulated for in the marriage contract.’ The celebrated Escobar... says: ‘What a married woman gains by adultery she may look upon as well earned property, only she must allow her husband to participate in her gains.’”<sup>17</sup>

So a prostitute “*pursues her calling*” – as if prostitution is a legitimate business to be engaged in! A wife, however, may not make money from prostitution if there is nothing in the marriage contract which said she can! On the other hand, as long as man and wife are in it together, no sin is committed! This is the doctrine of Jesuitism. Has there ever been a system of “morality” on the face of the earth so utterly disgraceful?

“Father Tamburini goes still further than this (*Confession aisée*, from which I allow myself to quote the following passage): ‘How dear can a woman sell the pleasure of the enjoyment of her charms? Answer: In order to form a correct judgment one must take into consideration the nobility, beauty, and deportment of the woman, as a respectable woman is of more value than one who opens her door to the first comer. We must distinguish; it depends upon whether the matter concerns a girl of pleasure or a respectable woman. A damsel of easy virtue cannot demand more from one than she has taken from another. She must have a fixed price, and it is a contract between her and her visitor. The latter gives the money, and she her favours, exactly as the host the wine and the guest the drink-money. But a woman of respectability and condition can demand what she pleases, for in matters of this kind, which have no fixed price in general, the person who sells is mistress of her wares. She has thus the right, like an innocent girl, to sell her honour as dearly as she values the same, and no one can, on that account, accuse her of usury.’”<sup>18</sup>

Note that this Jesuit does not say prostitution itself is sinful – the only sinful part of it is if she charges her customer too much! It is nothing more than a straightforward business contract, says this wicked man. And even though he calls it “selling her honour”, he insists she has the full right to do so – at least, that is, if she is a “*respectable woman*”.

Let it never be forgotten that such vile “morality” as taught in these books, was (and is) taught by men falsely claiming to be Christians, servants of Christ, and faithful expositors of the will of God. They are liars and deceivers of the worst kind.

And consider: today, throughout the western world, prostitution is increasingly being legalised; prostitutes are claiming “rights” – and are being given them; and instead of being called prostitutes, they have been re-labelled as “sex workers” (because it is a “calling”, remember – the Jesuit said so)! Yes, the West has swallowed Jesuit “morality”, hook(er), line and sinker.

## ***Theft***

“Father Pierre Aragon (in his *Abrégé de la somme theologique de Saint Thomas d’Aquin*, p.365),

asks: 'Is it allowable for anyone to steal in consequence of the straits in which he finds himself? Answer: Yes, this is allowable, let it be either secretly or openly; but only when a man has no other means of meeting his wants. There must also be no question of either oppression or robbery, because, according to the rights of nature, all things are common property, while everyone is obliged to preserve his life.'"<sup>19</sup>

No wonder, then, that stealing is considered a very small thing, by most people in today's Socialist/Communist-dominated world. From politicians to the poor, stealing is now widespread in western society. Everyone is stealing from everyone. Jesuit "moral theology" has had a huge impact.

For centuries, the Jesuits have been teaching their followers that stealing is permissible for the poor. Communism teaches the very same thing about "common property"; about the poor rising up and taking from the rich so as to remove the injustices in society; and about the need for all men to be economically equal – and the Jesuits were up to their dog-collared necks, behind the scenes, in the creation of Communism<sup>20</sup> and in its growth throughout the world. They have zealously supported Marxist revolutions throughout Latin America, Africa and Asia!<sup>21</sup> The Jesuit pope, Francis I, preached about "the common good", and how the rich must share their wealth with the poor.<sup>22</sup> No wonder, then, that throughout the western world today, after centuries of this sort of iniquitous Jesuit teaching permeating society like leaven, when Communist-inspired mobs go on the rampage and loot everything in their path, we are told that this is simply "the anger of the poor spilling over, because of the huge divide between the haves and the have-nots." This is not just Communism, it is first and foremost *Jesuitism*!

When, therefore, the poor and downtrodden rise up in revolutions, and plunder and steal from the rich, the Jesuits piously declare, "It is their just due. It is their right." The western world is being torn apart by such revolutions. If you want to know the source of such mob chaos, look no further than the leaven of Jesuitism, which has worked its way into all corners of western society.

"Father Benedict Stattler takes quite the same view, as he expresses himself as follows in his celebrated work *Allgemeine Katholisch-christliche Sittenlehre, oder wahre Glückseligkeitslehre, aus hinreichenden Gründen der Gottlichen Offenbarung und der Philosophie für die obersten Schulen der pfalz-bayrischen Lyceen auf höchsten, Kurfürstlichen Befehl verfasst München, 1790*, in the first volume, p.427: 'When a needy person, on account of sickness or lack of employment, is not in a position to supply his wants by his own work, he has the right to abstract from the rich, by secret or open force, the superfluity of the latter.' Anton de Escobar, also... is of the same opinion, only he adds (*Theologica Moral*, Tract v. Exempl. v., No. 120), that the person robbed must necessarily be a rich man. 'Therefore,' it is further stated, 'when thou findest a thief who has the intention to rob a needy person, thou must restrain him from doing so, and point out to him another rich person whom he may plunder instead of the needy one.'"<sup>23</sup>

And all this time we thought that if we found a man about to steal from another man, we should prevent the theft from happening, or, if unable to do so, we should report the matter to the authorities! How naive we were! We thought that "pointing a man in the right direction" meant turning him from a wrong course to a right one, when all the time it really meant (according to Jesuit "moral teaching") just pointing him to a different victim, a richer one and therefore more "worthy" of his plunder!

Has the Protestant reader ever come across such "morality" as this?

"Antoine Paul Gabriel goes still more into detail, and he fixes the sum which one may steal at one time at three francs, and in his *Theologie Morale Universelle*, p.226, he gives the following opinion: 'A man may repeat the theft as often and as long as he finds himself in want; also, a person is not at all bound to replace what, from time to time, he has taken, even when the total may amount to a very large sum.'"<sup>24</sup>

The Jesuit Liguori appears to contradict the Jesuit Gabriel, when he writes: "If any one on an occasion should steal only a moderate sum either from one or more, not intending to acquire any notable sum, neither to injure his neighbour to a great extent by several thefts, he does not sin grievously, nor do these, taken together, constitute a mortal sin; however, after it may have amounted

to a notable sum, by detaining it, he can commit mortal sin' [*Moral Theology*, tom. iii. p. 257, n. 533. Mech. 1845]."<sup>25</sup> Gabriel says that essentially no sin is committed; Liguori says that it is. Presumably, then, it would depend upon which Jesuit confessor the thief spills the beans to – one who is more up on his Gabriel than his Liguori, or *vice versa*. What God's Word says is of absolutely no consequence to such men. And anyway, see what Liguori says immediately after his words just quoted: "But even this mortal sin may be avoided, if either then he be unable to restore, or have the intention of making restitution immediately, of those things which he then received."

As long as he can say, then, "I wanted to restore it, I really did; I had the best intention in the world of doing so; but I was simply unable to do it" – then he has not committed a mortal sin! What is the old proverb? "The road to hell is paved with good intentions."

Such is the labyrinthine doctrine of Jesuit "moral theology". It would be impossible for a learned Roman Catholic theologian to unravel this confused jumble, let alone an uneducated thief!

As for how much may be stolen before a sin is committed, the Jesuit Gabriel, quoted above, fixed the figure (in his day) at three francs at one time. What does the "great" Liguori say? "Liguori, in *Dubium II.*, considers what may be the quantity of stolen property necessary to constitute mortal sin. He says:– 'There are various opinions concerning this matter. Navar too scrupulously has fixed the half of regalem, others with too great laxity have fixed ten aureos. Tol., etc., moderately have fixed two regales, although less might suffice, if it would be a serious loss' [*Moral Theology*, tom. iii. p. 248, n. 526. Mech. 1845]."<sup>26</sup>

Presumably the amount one may steal without sinning "mortally" has kept up with inflation since this was written, and is expressed in the currencies of various countries. We wonder: do the Jesuits revise the figure every few years? What utter arrogance and blasphemy, to think that they can settle what constitutes a "mortal sin" in the eyes of God!

"This opinion of Bus. is most probable, viz., if many persons steal small quantities, that none of them commit grievous sin, although they may be mutually aware of their conduct, unless they do it by concert: also Habert, etc., hold this view; and this, although each should steal at the same time. The reason is, because then no one person is the cause of injury, which, per accidens, happens by the others to the master' [Liguori, *Moral Theology*, tom. iii. p. 259, n. 536. Mech. 1845]."<sup>27</sup>

Only hell could spawn such "morality" as this – that if a number of thieves steal small amounts from the same person, even if they know that others are stealing from the same person (and even if it is at the same time), this is just a "small" sin, because each one is only stealing a small amount. The fact that the man who loses his property loses a lot of it, because he is being robbed by a number of men, is entirely beside the point as far as the sons of Loyola are concerned!

"Father Longuet... says (Question IV., p.2): 'Is a man so poor and another so well-to-do that the latter is bound to assist the former? In this case the destitute person may take the goods of the other without sinning and without being bound to restore them again, only he must do it secretly and not in an open way.'"<sup>28</sup>

Liguori wrote: "'But the Salmanticenses say that a servant can, according to his own judgment, compensate himself for his labour, if he without doubt judge that he was deserving of a larger stipend. Which indeed appears sufficiently probable to me, and to other more modern learned men, if the servant, or any other hired person, be prudent, and capable of forming a correct judgment, and be certain concerning the justice of the compensation, all danger of mistake being removed' [*Moral Theology*, tom. iii. p. 246, n. 524. Mech. 1845]."<sup>29</sup>

"When masters,' says J. De Cardenas (*Crisis Theologica*, p. 214), 'deduct something from the pay of their servants, the latter can either appeal to justice, or take the law into their own hands and make use of secret compensation.' Father Zaver Fegeli (*De Confessore*, p. 137), teaches the same thing; he adds, however, 'It is, indeed, allowable to steal, by compensation, from one's master, but under the condition



that one does not allow one's self to be caught in the act.' Also, according to the information of Jean de Lugo (*De Incarnatione*, p. 408), a man may steal from his debtor, when he has reason to believe that he will not be paid by the same; 'Only,' adds Valerius Reginald, 'one must take the exact compensation, and not steal anything more than that for which one has a claim.'"<sup>30</sup>

In a nutshell, this is the Jesuit teaching: steal by all means – just don't get caught! This is the "morality" of naughty boys raiding an apple orchard, but it is not the morality which the divine Master teaches in His precious Word!

"'A poor man,' writes Liguori, 'absconding with goods for his support, can answer the judge that he has nothing. In like manner an heir who has concealed his goods without an inventory, if he is not bound to settle with his creditors from them, can say to a judge that he has not concealed anything – in his own mind meaning those goods with which he is bound to satisfy his creditors' [*Moral Theology*, tom. ii. p. 321, n. 158. Mech. 1845]."<sup>31</sup>

The mind reels at how the conversation must go in the confessional box, when a man confesses his sins to a Jesuit priest:

"Forgive me, Father, for I have sinned. I have stolen from my employer, a rich man, because I am poor."

"Did you steal from him only to meet your own needs, my son?"

"Oh, yes, Father, only to meet my own needs. He only paid me X amount, but I feel my labours for him were worth XX amount, so this is how much I took from him. I wasn't able to purchase that new TV I had my eye on for some time, and I couldn't afford my wife's beauty treatments at the spa, but now I'm able to afford these things and more – I feel I'm entitled to a just compensation for my work, and to be able to afford such things is what I consider just compensation – oh, and of course I'm now able to feed my poor little children. We weren't able to eat out at our favourite restaurant every week on the salary that miser was paying me, but now we're able to do so again. We were destitute, Father, just destitute, but now we're slowly getting back on our feet."

"And did you steal from him secretly, my son?"

"Yes, Father! No one saw me, it was a nice clean job, in and out of the window of his house at night, without any fuss."

"Well then, my son, you have not sinned, and you do not need to replace what you stole. That rich man was bound to assist you and when he did not, you were entitled to take what you need from him. Only, my son, be sure to make a donation to Holy Mother Church. Specifically, to the Jesuit House. But beyond that, go in peace and enjoy the fruits of your nocturnal, illicit and secretive labours. You have earned them."

According to Jesuit teaching, children may even steal from their parents without sinning very much! "Liguori, speaking of children who steal from their parents, says:– 'Salas, etc., say that a son does not commit grievous sin, who steals 20 or 30 aurei from a father possessing yearly 1500 aureos, and Lugo does not disprove of it. If the father be not tenacious, and the son have grown up and receive it for honest purposes. Less, etc., say that a son stealing two or three aureos from a rich father does not sin grievously; Bannez says that fifty aureos are required to constitute a grievous sin who steals from a rich father; but this opinion, Lug, etc., reject, unless perchance he is the son of a prince; in which case Holzm. consents' [*Moral Theology*, tom. iii. p. 262, n. 543. Mech. 1845]."<sup>32</sup>

Imagine a body of men, professing to be servants of Christ, teaching such evil as this! Actually permitting children to steal from their own parents! Yet there is no need to imagine such a thing, for it actually exists upon the earth, and is blasphemously called the "Society of Jesus", or the Jesuit Order. A theology born in the pit of hell, yet foisted on mankind as if it was the doctrine of Christ!

And again we have to wonder: have the figures above been adjusted to reflect modern currencies and inflation? And if so, who determines such things? On this point, as seen above, even the Jesuits

themselves had differing opinions and doubtless, therefore, still do, although on one point they are agreed, namely, that children may steal from their parents without committing grievous sin.

Clearly the Jesuits never read (or rather, as good Papists, never bother with) what the divine law says: “If a man shall steal an ox, or a sheep, and kill it, or sell it; he shall restore five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep” (Exod. 22:1); “If the theft be certainly found in his hand alive, whether it be ox, or ass, or sheep; he shall restore double” (v.4). And they never bother with Prov. 6:30,31 either: “Men do not despise a thief, if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry; but if he be found, he shall restore sevenfold; he shall give all the substance of his house.” Nor do they bother with what Paul the apostle taught: “Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators... nor thieves... shall inherit the kingdom of God” (1 Cor. 6:9,10). Nor do they bother with what Peter the apostle taught: “But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief” (1 Pet. 4:15). Roman Catholics are taught that Peter was the first pope. This is entirely false,<sup>33</sup> but still it is what they are taught. Well then, if Peter was, supposedly, their first pope, why do we find him teaching *against* such sins as theft and murder, and the Jesuits teaching the very opposite?

## ***Commercial Fraud***

“[T]he Jesuit Tolet expresses himself in relation to a small commercial fraud as follows (in his book on the *Seven Mortal Sins*, p. 1027): ‘When one cannot sell his wine at the price he considers it to be worth, because it is considered to be too dear, he can give smaller measure and mix with it a small quantity of water, in such a way, of course, that everyone believes he has the full measure, and that the wine is pure and unadulterated.’”<sup>34</sup>

What does the Word of God matter to such men as these? It says: “Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight, or in measure. Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have: I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt” (Lev. 19:35,36); “Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small. Thou shalt not have in thine house divers measures, a great and a small. But thou shalt have a perfect and just weight, a perfect and just measure shalt thou have: that thy days may be lengthened in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee. For all that do such things, and all that do unrighteously, are an abomination unto the Lord thy God” (Deut. 25:13-16); and: “A false balance is an abomination to the Lord: but a just weight is his delight” (Prov. 11:1).

Roman Catholic politicians and businessmen have imbibed such Jesuit teachings, as have so many non-Papists. With “morality” such as this permeating western society, we should not be surprised at the rampant commercial and business fraud which we hear about almost daily. It is perfectly acceptable to lie, to “cook the books”, to cheat the customer, to be utterly dishonest in business – if one may profit thereby. And also, doubtless, if one is not caught (see under “Theft” above). Politicians are expert at this, as could so easily be shown by numerous examples, from Europe to Africa to America to Asia. But what need is there to do so, when the evidence is so well known? And when politics and business team up, then there are almost daily examples of fraud on a vast scale.

## ***Bribery***

“In relation to bribery, Father Taberna says (in his *Sketch of Practical Theology*, which appeared in the year 1736): ‘It is asked whether a judge is bound to repay what a party has given to him, in order that he might record a decision in his favour. I answer that he must restore what he has received if he obtained it in order that he might pronounce a righteous and proper judgment; should he, however, have acquired the money or valuables in order to propound an unrighteous sentence, he can retain the property, as he has deserved it.’”<sup>35</sup>

Is your head swimming, dear reader? Did you imagine that such teaching could ever have fallen from

the lips or pens of men claiming to be servants of Christ?

The Bible teaches the complete opposite of what the sons of Loyola have taught: “And thou shalt take no gift [bribe]: for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous” (Exod. 23:8; also Deut. 16:19); “A wicked man taketh a gift [bribe] out of the bosom to pervert the ways of judgment” (Prov. 17:23).

The western world’s judicial systems are stuffed with those who accept bribes, and who work against the very laws they are sworn to uphold. Judges are mere men, they can be bought, and they often are.

“Respecting another kind of bribe, Benedict Stattler expresses himself in the following words (vol. i. of his *Moral Ethics*, p. 460): ‘When, on account of the selfishness and factiousness of the higher authorities, there is no way left open to our obtaining public offices by our own merit and our own worth, it is not only allowable, but, indeed, serviceable, from the motive of the love of God and of our neighbour, to obtain by presents or flattery the favour of those who have it in their power to bestow these offices.’”<sup>36</sup>

Small wonder, then, that so many men and women rise to positions of high authority in governments by bribery and flattery, men and women who have no true abilities for the office they hold, but ways and means of buying their positions. Numerous examples could be produced from all over the world.

“For there is no faithfulness in their mouth; their inward part is very wickedness; their throat is an open sepulchre; they flatter with their tongue” (Psa. 5:9); “For neither at any time used we flattering words, as ye know” (1 Thess. 2:5).

### ***Abortion (Yes, abortion!)***

“Abortion?” we can hear many say, incredulously. “Surely no Roman Catholic has ever taught that abortion is ever acceptable! Why, the Roman Catholic religion is well known for its strong opposition to abortion!”

No; this is not, in fact, so. Rome “officially” opposes abortion, certainly. But when there is something to be gained by it, she does not oppose it. And the Jesuits are masters at teaching one thing for public consumption, but quite another thing to those whom they feel are in need of being taught something else. Listen to their wickedness on this subject:

“The getting rid of an immature child is likewise considered to be allowable by the sons of Loyola, at least in certain cases, which, however, are of a very flexible character, and Father Airaut writes regarding this (*Proposition sur le Cinquième Precepte du Decalogue*, p. 322): ‘One asks whether a woman may make use of means to obtain abortion. I answer, Yes, if quickening has not taken place, and the pregnancy is not dangerous. But even if there has been quickening already, it may be effected as soon as a conviction is arrived at that she must die by the birth. Under all circumstances, however, a young person who has been led astray may do so, as her honour must be to her more precious than the life of the child.’ Assuredly very peculiar morality!”<sup>37</sup>

Very peculiar indeed, given Rome’s very public stance against abortion. But there it is: for all her talk about a baby being a human being from the moment of conception (as indeed it is, biblically: Psa. 139:13-16; Lk. 1:15,36,41-44, etc.), she has in her midst the most powerful and influential of her priests and teachers, the Jesuits, whose own theologians have stated that it is perfectly right and proper to murder one person (the child) to save another (the mother), or even to murder a child in its mother’s womb if this will preserve the honour of the girl. “Honour is more precious than human life!” So then, it becomes obvious that there must have been many Roman Catholic girls and women, especially those married to an influential man of whom Rome expected much, or those holding influential positions themselves, who have confessed their sin to some Jesuit priest and who have been told to have an abortion, rather than to stain their reputations or that of their husbands.

All Rome’s supposed opposition to abortion on moral grounds is worthless, when she harbours in her midst a society of men, the sons of Loyola, who permit abortion whenever it suits their purposes!

This also explains certain comments by the pope of Rome, Francis I – *a member of the Jesuit Order!* – who at times took a decidedly less rigid stance against abortion than his papal predecessors, playing down Rome’s official teaching on abortion when he felt the need to,<sup>38</sup> and had to backtrack and attempt to explain away his comments when he came under fire for them.<sup>39</sup>

## ***Murder***

“Liguori maintains that one may commit a minor crime in order to avoid a greater crime. He says: ‘Hence Sanchez teaches, etc., that it is lawful to persuade a man, determined to slay some one, that he should commit theft or fornication’ [*Moral Theology*, tom. ii. lib. iii. cap. ii. n. 57, p. 157. Mech. 1845].”<sup>40</sup>

Let us try to get our heads around such “morality”. A friend comes to me and says, “I am planning to murder so-and-so. He did wrong to me and I must kill him.” “No, no, don’t do that!” I beg him. “Murder is a great sin. Don’t become guilty of it. Listen, I have an idea. Direct your anger towards a lesser sin. Go to the man’s house, and steal his possessions; or even, if you like, just go and sleep with some woman – that’s a lesser sin as well. Just don’t commit murder!”

No; try as we might, we cannot get our heads around it, for there is no amount of mental gymnastics, no amount of moral wriggling and squirming, which can possibly support this kind of Jesuit wickedness, put forward, with all the brazenness with which only the Jesuits are capable, as “moral theology”.

Here follows “the manner in which Father Gobat expresses himself in his *Oeuvres Morales* (tome ii., p.228), regarding crime committed during drunkenness, and even in the case of parricide. After coming to the most sophisticated and fallacious conclusion that a drunkard cannot be made responsible for his actions, he concludes as follows: ‘A son who has become intoxicated, and in this state has killed his father, is not merely no criminal, but he may rejoice, indeed, at the circumstances of the murder which he has committed, if, that is, a great fortune which he inherits is in question, as large riches belong in every way to those things much to be desired, especially when one understands how to make good use of them.’”<sup>41</sup>

This is a truly hideous doctrine. Let us look at it more closely:

A drunkard cannot be responsible for his actions, says the Jesuit. And is this not how the judicial systems of the western world now function? They have imbibed this terrible Jesuit doctrine! In courts everywhere today, when a crime has been committed while drunk, this is considered a “mitigating factor”, an “extenuating circumstance”. It should be considered an *aggravating* factor! For two crimes have been committed: the crime of getting drunk, and then whatever crime was committed while drunk. But no; today, when a man commits a crime while drunk, he is considered to have “diminished responsibility”; or “not to be responsible for his actions”. What kind of insanity is this? It is *Jesuit* insanity, plain and simple. And it has infected the West’s judicial systems.

“An intoxicated son who kills his father is not a criminal.” This same Jesuit, however, who says the son who murders his father while drunk is no criminal, calls what the son has done “*murder*” in the very same sentence! If then it is murder, then the son is a murderer, and murder is a crime; how can he not then be a criminal? Only a Jesuit would attempt to defend what is utterly indefensible.

By implication, also, if murdering one’s own father while drunk is not a crime, then *whatever* evil one does while drunk, it is not a crime. If a drunken man beats up his wife – he is not responsible, he cannot be a criminal! If while drunk a man gets behind the wheel of a car and causes an accident which kills others – he is not responsible, and cannot be culpable! What if a drunken man beats his own child to death? Doubtless the Jesuit would say it is not criminal – *if* some advantage could be obtained by it.

For this is what he says next: “he may rejoice if he inherits a great fortune by killing his father while drunk”! And on what grounds does he say this? “Large riches are much to be desired!” Never mind

that the Lord Jesus Christ had so much to teach about the dangers of riches, and the desire for them (Matt. 6:19-21,24). Never mind that Paul says, “And having food and raiment let us be therewith content. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows” (1 Tim. 6:8-10). What do the Jesuits care about what God’s Word says? They teach the exact opposite, and do so without flinching.

### ***“Self-Defence” by Means of Lies and Murder***

“The sons of Loyola maintain that one is fully entitled to make use of the sharpest ‘reprisals against anyone by whom one may have been insulted, and not merely by means of judicial complaint, but by retaliation, and, before everything, by detraction and calumny, to deprive such person of his honour and good repute. In regard to the latter (detraction of honour and calumny), one may be certain,’ says Tamburin in his *Decalogus* (lib. ix. cap. ii. 2), ‘that a number of people will soon be found who will swear to the calumny, as, naturally, men have much desire for wickedness, and thus the person insulting always falls into greater disgrace, until at length every one points a finger at him.’ Hermann Busenbaum expresses himself somewhat more circumspectly (*Christian Theology*, book iii. part vi. chap. I) when he writes: ‘In the case of anyone unjustifiably making an attack on your honour, when you cannot otherwise defend yourself than by impeaching the integrity of the person insulting you, it is quite allowable to do so. You must, however, tell the truth, and not carry the thing further than is required for the maintenance of your own reputation, while no greater insult must be inflicted on the person than has befallen yourself, an exact comparison being made between your own worth and that of your insulter.’ Leonard Lessius expresses himself far more freely (lib. ii. *De Anst.* cap. 2), as he teaches thus: ‘Has anyone made an attack on your honour, you may then at once make use of retaliation, and you have thereby nothing else to observe than to keep up a comparison as much as possible.’ The language of Benedict Stattler is, however, the most severe, and at the same time the most clear, when he makes use of the following words: ‘It is still more allowable in this case (namely, when one is injured ignominiously) to bring the calumniator to universal notice by a disclosure of his secret transgressions or crimes, by which means people may change their opinion as to his injurious imputations. Also to attribute a false crime to the calumniator is allowable for such an object, if this should be the only sufficient, indispensable, or even serviceable means to deprive him of all belief and credit for his calumnation.’”<sup>42</sup>

Do we not see this Jesuit “morality” playing itself out, almost daily, in the politics of virtually all western countries? We see politicians’ real *or invented* “dirty laundry” being aired before the public; lie upon lie being heaped on one’s political enemies by those equally or more guilty, until the lie becomes accepted as truth; etc., etc.

“Although this kind of morality must, indeed, be termed as partly insane, the sons of Loyola were by no means satisfied with the same, but went considerably further, and affirmed that it was allowable to take the life of the calumniator in the event of its not being possible to save one’s honour in any other way. Thus Father Airaut, already previously referred to, says: ‘In order to cut short calumny most quickly, one may cause the death of the calumniator, but as secretly as possible to avoid observation.’ The Jesuit Herreau, too, dictated the following principle to his pupils at the college in Paris in the year 1641: ‘If anyone, by a false accusation, should calumniate me to a prince, judge, or other man of honour, and I can maintain my good name in no other way than by assassinating him secretly, I should be justified in doing so. Moreover, I should be also justified had the crime of which I was accused been actually committed by me, though concealed under the veil of secrecy in such a way that it would not be easy to discover it through a judicial investigation.’

“Escobar, likewise, in his *Moral Theology*, published in the year 1655, teaches the like thereto: ‘That

it is absolutely allowable to kill a man whenever the general welfare or proper security demands it'; and Hermann Busenbaum elucidates this doctrine still further: 'that, in order to defend his life, preserve his limbs entire, or save his honour, a son may even murder his father, a monk his abbot, and a subject his prince.'

"Father Francis Lamy enters more into specialities when he says, in vol. v. of his work (Disp. 36, Num. 148): 'It cannot be denied that ecclesiastics and members of monkish Orders are compelled on this account to maintain their honour and consideration, which are inseparable from their virtuous life as well as their scientific culture. These cause them to be respected in the eyes of the laity, and if, then, one of them loses the same, he can neither be any longer useful nor deliver spiritual counsel. On that account, is it not an established truth that ecclesiastics must save their honour and consideration at any price, even at that of the life of the persons insulting them? Yes, they are indeed forced to remove their calumniator, when by this means alone they can make themselves secure; and this is especially the case when the loss of their honour would tend to the disgrace of the whole Order.'

"Father Henriques teaches exactly the same doctrine in his *Summa Theologiae Moralis* (Venet. 1600), only in more precise words. 'If an ecclesiastic,' it is said therein, 'caught in adultery by the husband of a woman with whom he has a love affair, kills the man in order to defend his own life and honour, he is not only quite justified in doing so, but he is, on that account, not incapacitated from continuing the exercise of his ecclesiastical functions.'

"The precepts laid down by the famous Sanchez are even still more stringent, as he coolly asserts that it is allowable to murder everyone who advances an unjust accusation or bears false evidence against us, as soon as we are assured that a great injury will thereby be occasioned to us. 'Such acts cannot be properly designated as murders, but merely allowable defences; nevertheless, before perpetrating the deed, one must have a certain conviction as to the offence of the enemy.'

"But Benedict Stattler, so frequently before quoted, expresses himself most clearly of all when he intimates as follows (vol. I. of his *Moral Philosophy*, p. 337): 'A real injury, bringing disgrace on one, as, for instance, a horsewhipping or blow on the face, may be retaliated by the murder of the insulter, if it cannot be remedied in any other manner; still Christian love counsels forbearance from this mode of defence, as long as such conduct does not occasion a heavy misfortune to us and to others connected with us. Other grievous offences, especially calumniation, need not certainly be obviated in general by the murder of the offender, but it is very allowable in the following cases:— 1. When there appears to be a certainty of the false calumniator finding credence among men. 2. If he cuts off from us thereby all means of saving our honour. 3. If we can remove, by the murder of the enemy, the danger of our suffering shame.'"<sup>43</sup>

Is it any wonder, then, for example, that United States President Bill Clinton, who graduated from the Jesuit-run Georgetown University, whose work in a philosophy class so impressed his priest-professor that he asked him to become a Jesuit,<sup>44</sup> and who once said, "*I love the Jesuits*",<sup>45</sup> as well as his equally evil wife, had such a very murky past with regards to the large number (quite beyond all possibility of mere coincidence) of mysterious deaths of people who had close ties to the Clintons in various ways? So much so that the term, "Arkancide", became quite widely used during the Clinton era and afterwards (Clinton having been governor of Arkansas prior to becoming president, and there being so many strange and unexplained "suicides" of people close to him)? "Arkancide is the favored method of getting rid of political enemies in the state of Arkansas. When the medical examiners explain away two bodies filled with bullets as a case of suicide, it's obvious they caught a case of arkancide."<sup>46</sup> Clinton's mentors, the sons of Loyola, have taught, in their vile "moral theology", that it is perfectly acceptable to murder in order to preserve one's reputation.

And this kind of "morality" has been followed by so many men, particularly those in high office, through the centuries. If some scandal would destroy their reputation; if, say, a mistress were to give birth to their illegitimate child, or some man in the know was about to reveal potentially damning secrets – well then, they would meet with an "unfortunate accident". History is replete with examples,

as is the world of modern politics.

## *Conclusion*

Griesinger concludes all these quotations by saying, “Such and similar doctrines did the sons of Loyola advance in their works on moral theology; and now, O reader, ask thyself, has not mankind just reason to be mortally alarmed on this account? Yes, indeed, it cannot be filled with any common horror when it considers that the youth of Europe, which for the most part was entrusted to the Jesuits for instruction, should have been indoctrinated with such horrible principles?”<sup>47</sup>

The youth of Europe first, but with the passing of time the youth of so many other western nations have been likewise indoctrinated with Jesuit principles. It is true that today the Jesuits do not control the education of almost every child everywhere, as they once did in Roman Catholic European lands; but even so, their global influence over education is vast and sweeping, not only through the over 500 elementary and secondary schools<sup>48</sup> and the over 200 universities which the Jesuit Order has worldwide,<sup>49</sup> but through the thousands of Jesuits who work in the field of education, both openly and secretly, in schools and colleges and universities – and not just Roman Catholic ones.

And not just education. As I show in my book, *Jesuit Hollywood*,<sup>50</sup> the Jesuits are very active in the movie industry, deliberately influencing the morals of multiplied millions of people through the filth which is spewed out by hundreds of movies every year. In this way they push forward the Marxist agenda (which they fully support and which they were involved in creating)<sup>51</sup> for the destruction of the morals of the West.

How successful have they been? The answer is simple:

Look around you. The evidence stares us in the face every single day.

---

**Shaun Willcock is a minister, author and researcher. He runs Bible Based Ministries. This pamphlet was first published in January 2017. For other pamphlets (which may be downloaded and printed), as well as details about his books, audio messages, articles, etc., please visit the Bible Based Ministries website; or write to the address below. If you would like to be on Bible Based Ministries' email list, please send your details.**

---

### **ENDNOTES:**

1. *History of the Jesuits*, by Theodor Griesinger. Translated by A.J. Scott. W.H. Allen and Co., London, second edition 1885.
2. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, by Charles Chiniquy. The Protestant Literature Depository, London, 1886. Reprinted by Chick Publications, Chino, California.
3. *The Jesuits: the Secret Army of the Papacy*, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2012. Available for ordering from our website: [www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk).
4. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pg. 77.
5. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pg. 73.
6. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pg. 73.
7. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pg. 73.
8. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pgs. 73-74.

- 
9. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pg. 74.
  10. *History of the Jesuits*, pgs. 484-485.
  11. *History of the Jesuits*, pg. 480.
  12. *Jesuit Hollywood*, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2015. Available for ordering from our website: [www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk).
  13. *History of the Jesuits*, pg. 480.
  14. *Jesuit Hollywood*.
  15. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pg.74.
  16. *History of the Jesuits*, pgs. 480-481.
  17. *History of the Jesuits*, pg. 481.
  18. *History of the Jesuits*, pgs. 481-482.
  19. *History of the Jesuits*, pg. 482.
  20. See *Satan's Seat*, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, fifth edition 2013. Also "*Holy War*" *Against South Africa*, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, third edition 2011. Both available for ordering from our website: [www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk).
  21. See *The Vatican Moscow Washington Alliance*, by Avro Manhattan. Chick Publications, Chino, California, second American edition 1986.
  22. See the following articles by Shaun Willcock: *The Jesuit Roman Pope Francis I*, and *The Papacy's Sinister "Green" Agenda*, among others; available on our website: [www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk).
  23. *History of the Jesuits*, pgs. 482-483.
  24. *History of the Jesuits*, pg. 483.
  25. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pg. 76.
  26. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pg. 76.
  27. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pg. 77.
  28. *History of the Jesuits*, pg. 483.
  29. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pg. 75.
  30. *History of the Jesuits*, pg. 483.
  31. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pgs. 75-76..
  32. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pg. 77.
  33. See *Pope Peter?* (tract), by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries. Available on our website: [www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk).
  34. *History of the Jesuits*, pg. 485.
  35. *History of the Jesuits*, pg. 485.
  36. *History of the Jesuits*, pg. 485.
  37. *History of the Jesuits*, pgs. 485-486.
  38. *The Moynihan Letters*, 29 September 2013. [MoynihanReport@gmail.com](mailto:MoynihanReport@gmail.com).
  39. *The Southern Cross*, January 22 to 28, 2014.
  40. *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, pg. 75.
  41. *History of the Jesuits*, pg. 486.
  42. *History of the Jesuits*, pgs. 486-487.
  43. *History of the Jesuits*, pgs. 487-489.
  44. *The Southern Cross*, 2 August 1992, and *The Southern Cross*, 22 November 1992.
  45. *The Rock*, Vol. 48, No. 1, February-March 1993. Protestant Publications, Australia.
  46. Urban Dictionary, definition of "Arkancide." [www.urbandictionary.com](http://www.urbandictionary.com).
  47. *History of the Jesuits*, pg. 489.
  48. *The Southern Cross*, May 3 to 9, 2006.
  49. *Rome Reports*, October 14, 2016. [www.romereports.com](http://www.romereports.com).
  50. *Jesuit Hollywood*.
  51. See *Satan's Seat* and "*Holy War*" *Against South Africa*.



---

# **Bible Based Ministries**

[info@biblebasedministries.co.uk](mailto:info@biblebasedministries.co.uk)

[www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk)

**This pamphlet may be copied for free distribution if it is copied in full**

***WORLDWIDE CONTACT FOR BIBLE BASED MINISTRIES:***

## **Contending for the Faith Ministries**

**695 Kentons Run Ave**

**Henderson, NV 89052**

**United States of America**

[BBMOrders@aol.com](mailto:BBMOrders@aol.com)