

PART III:WHEN PEOPLE PROTEST 1300-1870

THIRTY-SEVEN: THE CALL "OUT OF HER" BEGINS

The *light* which manifests itself to many individuals within the church slowly becomes such a burning glow that, combining with the loss of prestige of the Papacy, and the growing political tensions, it can no longer be contained within *Babylon* proper. Light cannot be comprehended by darkness.

Rome's response? Based on its past philosophy, of course: I quote" St." Bernard: "The death of an infidel pleases God."

However, the Holy Spirit says: "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His SAINTS." and "God is not willing that *ANY* should perish..."(Psalm 116:15,II Peter 3:9).

Who is able to write off a human soul and claim that it shall *never* repent? Only God. To whom has been committed eternal judgment? Only God. Worse, who dares resist the workings of the Holy Spirit when men are grieved by that Spirit? And godly men are grieved when unrighteousness rules the church, when all her holy ways have been perverted by unholy men, her teachings have been buried by the traditions of men. Who dares come against this angry God?

Rome.

Some preliminary thoughts about the "Reformation."

(1)With the apostles and Jesus we have the fulness of Light. With the later church leaders, we have a gradual clouding of that light. With the Imperial Roman spirit of Babylon infused into the church we have the "mixture", which in God's eyes is darkness, the Dark Ages. With the reformers comes Light again, but not fulness of Light. Let us be patient with these men who have just awakened from the bad dream of Romanism, and not expect them to be fully cleansed from their ways in a day. Later reformers do greater works. And to you and me is committed the task of completing the work of perfection handed down to us by their Spirit-filled energies. **Whatever we do, let us not go back the way we came...**

(2)All Protestants began as Roman Catholics, most as priests, friars, monks. This was not a move of the "rabble," but of the elite. Men upon whom Roman hands had been laid, and therefore by Roman definitions, men in whom great amounts of wisdom dwelt.

(3) We who have been raised Protestant cannot imagine the courage it takes to stand against the prevailing doctrines and ways of 1000 years. The guilt, the shock, the pain of suddenly being a castaway, a reject.

(4)There have always been those in the church who wanted to follow Christ first.DeRosa, op. cit., pp.118-119:

"Martin Luther was not the first to take onions to Rome and bring back garlic. In fact, the severest critics of the papacy have always been not enemies but friends [De Rosa would include himself in this number], including many saints - and some popes! Their witness goes back a long way."

DeRosa then goes back that trail to Adrian IV (1154-9) and his friend John of Salisbury, later a Bishop. John suggests that people of his day thought of the church as a "stepmother" rather than a mother, of its leaders as Scribes and Pharisees, and of its Pope as "burdensome and scarcely to be borne."

60/ SCARLET THREADS

He travels to the thirteenth century, when one Cardinal Hugo blasts the sitting Pope Innocent IV as most immoral. Cardinal Bonaventure in the same century likens Rome to the harlot of the apocalypse, 300 years before Luther says it! He says that Rome corrupts prelates, who corrupt clergy, who corrupt the people.

Still following DeRosa, we see devout Catholic Dante (1265-1321) assuming that many popes and cardinals are hell-bound, or already there.

Catherine of Siena (1347-1380), hardly a Protestant either, tells Gregory XI (Pope) that, frankly, the Papal administration *stinks*. Her actual word.

But with John Wycliffe(1320-1384), a new chapter of the church begins. And for nearly 700 years now, voices like his have sounded the warning about Babylon. These voices have all drawn fire from Rome, and many have been silenced. But the *protest* continues, and must continue until the Lord of the Church comes for His own.

I now follow in these comments about reformers a very helpful volume put together by the late Harry Emerson Fosdick in 1952, Great Voices of the Reformation, Random House, NY.

Wycliffe, a Catholic Scholar of Oxford University, becomes the most influential preacher of his day in England. He bluntly refers to Roman government as "antichrist," and accuses it of laboring to do away with the Scriptures in his Antichrist's Labour to Destroy Holy Writ. It is obvious why we today honor this man, and have named the great Bible translation organization after him. It is equally obvious why he did not endear himself to Rome, and why in 1414 the Council of Constance orders his bones to be dug up and burned. The ashes are thrown in the Avon River. But as one poet observes:

"The Avon to the Severn runs,
And Severn to the sea;
And Wycliffe's dust shall spread abroad
Wide as the waters be."

John Huss, priest in Bohemia (later Czechoslovakia), discovers Wycliffe's writings, and defends much of them, suggesting his parishioners feel free to read them also. Rome's philosophy, of course, is that one who condones what she has condemned must likewise be condemned. Huss approaches life a little differently, saying that "only to the Holy Scriptures will I maintain ...reverent obedience." Here he refers to Wycliffe's writings, saying that even a great one like Wycliffe could have been in error in places. As to the Roman hierarchy:

obey "So far as they are according to the rule of Christ, I intend most certainly to obey them. But if I find them to be at variance, I will not obey them..."

That's simple enough. After all, he continues,

"The pope is not fallible," and "to rebel against an erring pope is to obey Christ."

No, I simply will not obey,

"even if you put before my eyes fire for the burning of my body."

Always wanting to oblige a heretic, Rome does just that, by the same Council that digs up Wycliffe's bones in 1414. He is burned at the stake.

John Knox, of whom we will say more later, gives us insight on the nature of the accusations being leveled at believers. In 1494, the Lollards, an earlier group of which

WHEN PEOPLE PROTEST/ 61

are associated with Wycliffe, are accused of 34 articles of their faith. Note which ones would condemn *you*, dear reader, whether you be Protestant or Catholic, to the flames:

Please understand, *these statements are condemned by Rome*:

- 1) images are not to be had, nor yet to be worshipped.
- 2) the relics of saints are not to be worshipped.
- 6) Christ ordained no priests to consecrate.
- 7) After the consecration of the Mass, there remains bread. There is not the natural body of Christ.
- 10) Every faithful man or woman is a priest.
- 12) The pope is not the successor of Peter, except where he said, "Go behind me, Satan."
- 17) The pope exalts himself against God, and above God.
- 20) Excommunication from the church is not to be feared.
- 22) Priests may have wives...
- 26) The pope forgives not sins, but only God.
- 28) We should not pray to the glorious Virgin Mary, but to God only.

Are you with me? Do you understand that if you believe *any one* of the above items, you are guilty of heresy, should Rome ever gain power again?

It is clear that Martin Luther, born in 1483, is *not* the first of the reformers. For over 300 years the pot has been simmering. With Luther, though, one could say it boils over.

Luther begins his career in Erfurt, Germany, as a law student, but later decides, and we are grateful, to give his life to the service of God. To this end he becomes an Augustinian monk.

Luther continues his studies, though, and begins to feel very uncomfortable with the theology he is discovering. In his day, the "scholasticism" of Aristotle-Aquinas, the systematizing of religious doctrines into a neat science, was wearing thin. This approach to God obviously produces no power for living, and after awhile it also sets itself up against the wisdom of men, and in fact sounds much like it. Thus intelligent men find a way to attack it, even ridicule it.

While most men of his day are laughing, though, Luther weeps, knowing there has to be more than this sterility. Though he continues to rise in the Roman structure, becoming a prior over 11 monasteries, and wearing a few other titles, by 1517 he has made his first formal objection to scholastic theology.

The shock waves don't ripple too high or too far, though, before another issue arises, one which draws enough fire to catapult the "Luther thing" to visibility, but one which in itself is not as critical to reformation thinking. The issue is *the indulgence*.

Catholic theology, through its evolution of tradition, has come up with the concept of a place somewhere between here and the presence of God (though the Scripture still says that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord, II Corinthians 5:8) called *Purgatory*. The name comes from the idea of "purging" or "cleansing." Thus it is a place where we go through that final purging we need so we can stand before a holy God.

Or so goes the story. Well, the less time spent in this awful place, of course, the better. To lessen the time of a loved one gone on, one can obtain an *indulgence*, a shortening of the sentence, from a qualified Roman agent. In Luther's day, money is always attached to the formula, and indulgences become big business.

Enter one Prince Albert of Hohenzollern, an ambitious young man who wants to

62/ SCARLET THREADS

add some clerical titles to his array of prestige. He's willing to pay. Leo X, present Pope, is willing to receive, as he has decided to re-do St. Peter's Basilica and raise a monument to himself, that is, to St. Peter, for all future generations to glory in.

The huge fee is assessed, but Albert just doesn't have enough on hand. No fear, Albert, your credit is good, if you don't mind another huge sum of money for interest. *And*, to repay your debt, just sell this indulgence. Albert agrees and hires the infamous *Tetzel* to do the salesmanship.

Tetzel. You no doubt remember the little rhyme, which in English says, "As soon as the coin in the coffers rings, a soul from Purgatory springs." And, he really means it. Worse, the people *believe* it.

Here is the actual (English) wording of the indulgence for sale:

" I, by virtue of the apostolic power entrusted to me, do absolve thee from all ecclesiastical censures, judgments, and punishments which thou must have merited; besides this, from all excesses, sins, and crimes thou mayest have committed, however great and shameful they may have been, and for whatever cause, even in those cases reserved for our most Holy Father the Pope. I obliterate every taint of unvirtues, all signs of infamy, which thou mayest have received. I release thee from all punishments which thou wouldst have endured in purgatory. I permit thee again to participate in the sacraments of the Church. I incorporate thee again in the community of the sanctified, and replace thee in the state of innocence and purity in which thou wert at the hour of thy baptism. So that in the moment of thy death, the door through which the sinner enters the place of torture and punishment will be closed, and that will be open to thee which leads into the paradise of joys. If thou shouldst not soon die, so shall this grace remain unshakable until the end of thy life. In the name of the Holy Father. Amen."

Note here how Rome *sells* to the believer what the believer has already been *promised* by Christ!

As to Pope Leo, with whom Luther will later clash, according to DeRosa (p.113 ff) he is...

"for reasons not at first understood, chaste. That is he had no mistresses and no "nephews" (or bastards). The reason was probably that he was an adventurous homosexual. Guicciardini said the new pope was excessively devoted to the flesh, especially those pleasures which cannot, with decency, be mentioned... Instead of giving up everything to follow Christ, Leo grabbed all he could in Christ's name for himself. A gambler and a big spender, he was said to obey Jesus in only one thing: he took no thought for the morrow... he was an enthusiastic builder and patron of the arts. The contemporary historian Sarpi said of him, 'He would have been a perfect pope, if to these (artistic) accomplishments he had even the slightest knowledge of religion'."

In Leo's Rome of 50,000 people, 7,000 registered prostitutes live. Syphilis abounds. Priests in particular contract this disease, driven to the whore houses, often convents, by the crying *normality* of the male of our species, a normality forbidden to servants of the Pope.

Luther, the prophet of his day, speaks out. At first, though, the issue is indulgences.

WHEN PEOPLE PROTEST/ 63

The 95 theses that he nails to that special door are meant to challenge anyone who so desires, to a debate. They are not meant to be laws from God, only Luther's studied opinions. And , shockingly enough, for we who study the Reformation, expecting 20th century fundamentalists in 16th century Europe, Luther is at first very supportive of the Pope and Papal ways. I quote: (from Luther's 95 Theses, Concordia, St. Louis.)

- 1)...Jesus...intended that the whole life of believers should be penitence.
- 5)The Pope has neither the will nor the power to remit any penalties except those which he has imposed by his own authority or by that of the canons.
- 13) The dying pay all penalties by death and are already dead to the canon laws and are by right relieved from them.
- 27) They preach human doctrine who say that the soul flies out of purgatory as soon as the money thrown into the chest rattles.
- 28) It is certain that when the money rattles in the chest, avarice and gain may be increased, but the suffrage of the Church depends on the will of God alone.
- 32) Those who believe that through letters of pardon they are made sure of their own salvation will be eternally damned along with their teachers.
- 52) Vain is the hope of salvation through letters of indulgence, even if a commissary - nay, the Pope himself - were to pledge his own soul for them.
- 53) They are enemies of Christ and of the Pope who, in order that indulgences may be preached, condemn the Word of God to utter silence in their churches.
- 86) Why does not the Pope, whose riches are at this day more ample than those of the wealthiest of the wealthy, build the one Basilica of St. Peter with his own money rather than with that of poor believers?
- 89) Since it is the salvation of souls, rather than money, that the Pope seeks by granting indulgences, why does he suspend the letters and indulgences granted long ago, since they are equally efficacious?

Those who put together this little document of Luther's theses mention (p.13) that anyone who dared question Tetzel's statements could be threatened with the heretic's death:the stake.

Thus with these kinds of statements, and a growing number of books and lectures and sermons,in some of which he begins to make personal attacks on the Pope and the Papacy in general,Martin Luther is finally called to account for himself in a series of confrontations with the Pope's men. Finally, in Worms, the classic statements that bring about his final separation from Rome. From the trial:

"If...I should recall these books, I should do nothing else than add to the strength of this tyranny, and should open, not windows only, but doors to this tremendous foe of religion....Because I am a man and not God, I cannot shield my practices with any other defense than that with which my Lord Jesus Christ himself vindicated his teaching...'If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil.'...Whoever can, whether high or low, let him bring forward the proof, let him convince me of errors: let the Scriptures of Prophecy and Gospels triumph, for I will be wholly ready to revoke every error, if I can be persuasively taught; yes, I will be the first to cast my books into the fire.

"Therefore, Your Most Serene Majesty and Your Lordships, since they seek a

64/ SCARLET THREADS

simple reply, I will give one that is without horns or teeth, and in this fashion: I believe in neither pope nor councils alone; for it is perfectly well established that they have frequently erred, as well as contradicted themselves. Unless then I shall be convinced by the testimony of the Scriptures or by clear reason, I must be bound by those Scriptures which have been brought forward by me; yes, my conscience has been taken captive by these words of God. I cannot revoke anything, nor do I wish to; since to go against one's conscience is neither safe nor right: here I stand, I cannot do otherwise. God help me. Amen."

Huldreich Zwingli of Switzerland begins to preach the pure Gospel of Christ "before anyone in (his) locality had so much as heard the name of Luther." Not destined to as much fame, but steering a similar course, Zwingli intends to remain a Catholic, and reform from within. Most of the Reformers were thus minded.

When he begins to "go off course," a nervous hierarchy offers Zwingli promises of ecclesiastical preferment, cash, and outright threats. He gets "worse," driving indulgence peddlars from Zurich. Independently of the other Reformers, Zwingli comes to this conclusion (from The First Helvetic Confession):

"Canonic Scripture, the Word of God, given by the Holy Spirit and set forth to the world by the Prophets and Apostles, the most perfect and ancient of all philosophies, alone contains perfectly all piety and the whole rule of life."

This conclusion, plus the implications that follow such a conclusion, plus the energetic reformation of a *city*, draws the Papal armies to Zurich. In the ensuing battle, Zwingli is killed.

THIRTY-EIGHT: TRENT AND BEYOND

In the midst of all this reforming, the Roman church decides on a counter-attack. It will bring all its people together in Trent, Italy, and discuss the reforms, perhaps suggest a few of its own, but at any event, make a very specific statement to all present and would-be revolutionaries.

When the politics for it can finally be worked out, and this process alone takes 25 years, the council convenes at the Cathedral of Trent, December 13, 1545. (Here I am using facts supplied by The Catholic Encyclopedia of 1967.)

The first point to be attacked was the one which virtually every Reformer held to: *Scriptura sola*, the Scriptures alone are sufficient as a source of revelation. Here Trent defines that the apostolic traditions on faith and custom that have been transmitted in some sense from generation to generation down to our times are to be accepted with as much reverence as Sacred Scripture. Don't have to understand it. Don't need to argue with it. Don't make us define what we mean *specifically*. Just obey. We have now spoken.

Luther and others have begun to teach that original sin is not entirely done away at baptism . He notices that he still has evil desire. Rome says this is not sin in the strict sense, so whether you feel sinful or not, by baptism those sins are gone.

Reformers are preaching grace, through faith, as the means to salvation (Ephesians 2:8). Rome says they agree, in part. It all starts with grace, and faith, but must include our works, too. But Paul says that if works is involved at all in our initial salvation, it is no more grace!(Romans 11:6)

But Trent has decided. Our living tradition is more important than your Scriptural argument.

Though Reformers are split as to what happens at the Communion Table, they all

WHEN PEOPLE PROTEST/ 65

agree that the Mass is *not* an ongoing sacrifice. To this heresy Trent addresses its most voluminous responses, stating the commonly held Roman view in no uncertain terms.

The Catholic notion of Sacrament is defined at Trent. It is said that grace comes to the believer *ex opere operato*, that is, by means of the physical rite *itself*, and not by means of the faith of the one receiving the rite. What horrendous evils this teaching admits is beyond description here. Think of it. Whether one believes or doesn't believe, whether the heart is right or not, if he is willing to submit to a Roman rite, such as Roman-style baptism (which by Greek and Biblical definition is no baptism at all), he is at that moment infused with the grace of God! Is there any wonder now as to how so many pagans could have been admitted to the "church" *in their sins*, bringing their pagan ways with them?

Does Rome bend at all in the Council of Trent? Bishops are to be chosen with more care. They also are to cut back in their pageantry when appointed. They are to become models of humility. But no doctrines change, of course. The Church can not be seen to have been in any error for all these years.

We return now to the reformation battlefield, at a bonfire in England, halfway through the Council of Trent:

It is Bishop J.C. Ryle(1816-1900), priest of the Anglican Church but staunch Evangelical, who writes about the *English* church of his day in an article to that body which asks, "Why were our reformers burned?"

"A very popular history of our English Queens hardly mentions the martyrdoms of Queen Mary's days! Yet Mary was not called 'Bloody Mary' without reason, and scores of Protestants were burned in her reign.

"(Mary's victims) were either to give up Protestantism and receive Popery, or else they had to be burned alive. Refusing to recant, they were one by one handed over to the secular power, publicly brought out and chained to stakes, publicly surrounded with faggots, and publicly sent out of the world by that most cruel and painful of deaths...

"The 6th and 7th leading Reformers who suffered in Mary's reign were two whose names are familiar to every Englishman - Nicholas Ridley, Bishop of London, and Hugh Latimer, once Bishop of Worcester. They were both burned at Oxford, back to back, at one stake, on the 16th of October, 1555.

"Ridley's last words before the fire was lighted were these, 'Heavenly Father, I give Thee most hearty thanks that Thou hast called me to a profession of Thee even unto death. I beseech Thee, Lord God, have mercy on this realm of England, and deliver the same from all her enemies.' Latimer's last words were like the blast of a trumpet, which rings even to this day, - 'Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day, by God's grace, light such a candle in England as I trust shall never be put out.'

"We owe to the Reformation an English Bible, and liberty for every man, woman, and child in the land to read it...

"Nothing seems to have alarmed and enraged the Romish priesthood so much as the spread of English Bibles. It was this which cost the martyred reformer Tyndale his life...

"Shall we in this century talk lightly of the great work which they did? Shall we entertain for a moment the idea of forsaking Reformation principles *and going back to Rome?* ...The man who counsels such base apostasy and suicidal folly must be judicially blind. The iron collar has been broken; let us not put it on again. The prison has been thrown open; let us not resume the

66/ SCARLET THREADS

yoke and return to our chains.

"Let us have no peace with Rome till Rome abjures her errors and is at peace with Christ. When Rome does that, and not till then, it will be time to talk of re-union with her..."

Let's be honest here. When Protestants were in power in England, they too tortured and killed. It was in reaction to this and her complete rejection of Papal rule, that Pius V in 1570 wrote to Elizabeth to inform her of her excommunication from the Church. But in doing so, he says some things that we need to take note of, and consider seriously:

"He who reigns on high...has entrusted His holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, outside which there is no salvation, to one person alone on earth, namely to Peter the Prince of the Apostles, and to Peter's successor, the Roman Pontiff...to root up, pull down, waste, destroy, plant, and build..."
(from Regnas in Excelsis)

I challenge anyone to find hints of such talk in the words of Jesus or Peter.

This same encyclical goes on to call Elizabeth

"heretic and an abetter of heretics...Also we declare that all...who have sworn allegiance to her in any way...are perpetually absolved...from any type of duty in relation to lordship, fidelity, and obedience...We command all ...subjects...that they have not to obey her...We shall bind those who do the contrary with a similar sentence of excommunication."

He says she is not the legitimate Queen of England, that she is not to be obeyed, that to obey her means being kicked out of the church. Yet Paul, living under Nero, tells Roman Christians (Romans 13:1 ff) to obey the present government. Here is another case where the tradition of men finally comes around to a place where it denies the very Word of God.

A reminder here that the *heresies* for which reformers were done away, besides those alluded to above, include such things as believing in the Spirit's aid to a believer who wishes to understand Scripture, or believing that the Bible contains all that is necessary for salvation, or not believing that the decretals were apocryphal, not believing in indulgences, and a long list of other such things.

Think of it. If the Roman Church had retained its original power, true believers that *you know* would be annihilated.

A more grisly thought: *When Rome regains its world-wide control, true believers that you know will be annihilated.*

Canon Law states: (1404, 1405)

"The First See (Papa and company) is judged by no one...It is the right of the Roman Pontiff himself alone to judge...those who hold the highest civil office in a state.."

But, we were hoping the church might change. Let's see.

The first half of the 2nd millennium in the year of our Lord, ends with the Pope Nicholas V authorizing African slaves for the King of Portugal; with Pius II fathering several illegitimate children and speaking openly of the methods he uses to seduce women; with Sixtus IV decreeing that money will deliver souls from Purgatory, and making

eight of his nephews cardinals while they are still boys, and becoming more wealthy than the Caesars; with "Innocent" the eighth demanding total extermination of the Waldenses (Protestants of his day), and appointing the infamous Thomas de Torquemada to be Inquisitor General of Spain; and with Alexander the sixth, the "most corrupt of the Renaissance popes" (per Halley), doing most of what the above popes did, with added relishes of his own.

Change eludes us.

In these 1500's appear in greater and greater numbers a group referred to as "Anabaptists." As their namesakes today, that is, the Baptists if one looks at etymology, or the Amish/Mennonites if one looks at lifestyle, there are quite a variety of these peoples, and one description will hardly cover all, but *for the most part* Anabaptists refuse to persecute other believers, and reject any state interference, and such unscriptural practices as infant baptism.

And wouldn't you know it? The other reformation churches, daughters of Rome, just breathing fresh air themselves, refuse fellowship to the Anabaptists!

It is a chilling notion, actually. To think that Bible-believers of our own day would not have felt comfortable *at all* in most of the reform churches. In fact, they would have been run out of town by some, who feared them as much as they hated the Papists!

Menno Simons (from whom Mennonites are later named), is a possible moderate representative of the Anabaptist movement, and sounds the familiar note :

"They (Romanists) appeal to Origen and Augustine and say that these assert that they have obtained infant baptism from the apostles. To this we reply and inquire whether Origen and Augustine have proved it from Scripture. If they have done so, we desire to hear it. But if not, we must hear and believe Christ and His apostles and not Augustine and Origen."

In this same time period lives and ministers John Calvin, who, quite the opposite of Luther, *begins* in the priesthood, and later switches to law. His sphere is French-speaking Switzerland, and he likewise desires that the church be founded on "Prophetic and Evangelical doctrine." In a letter to Cardinal James Scolet, mid 16th century, he accuses the Catholic leadership of:

"overthrowing the ministry, of which the empty name remains with you, without the reality. As far as the office of feeding the people is concerned, the very children perceive that Bishops and Presbyters are dumb statues, while men of all ranks know by experience, that they are active only in robbing and devouring. We are indignant that in the room of the sacred Supper has been substituted a sacrifice by which the death of Christ is emptied of its virtues. We exclaim against the execrable traffic in masses, and we complain that the Supper of the Lord, as to one of its halves [the cup], has been stolen from the Christian people. We inveigh against the accursed worship of images...We lament, that by means of human traditions, Christian liberty has been crushed and destroyed. Of these and similar pests, we have been careful to purge the churches which the Lord has committed to us."

The very heart and soul of Protestantism is this. Not blind hatred, desire for strife, love of division, negativity, but showing God's people their sins, casting down idols, sounding the prophetic alarm.

68/ SCARLET THREADS

Contemporary and admirer of John Calvin, John Knox (1514-1572) dominates the reform in Scotland. Knox's fervor, evidenced by his historic prayer, "Give me Scotland, or I die," gives birth to the strong Scottish Presbyterian Church from which the likes of 20th century greats such as Peter Marshall descend.

A Roman Catholic priest, Knox witnesses early in his ministry the death of a friend and peer, suspected of heresy because he reads a Greek New Testament to his students. The fire that burns this George Wishart at the stake is, within Knox, the fire that finally burns out Roman tyranny in Scotland.

At his own trial, he claims that the Scriptures, rather than fallible ecclesiastical councils or the pope, are the test of truth; that salvation is by faith, not by sacramental observances; that all believers are priests; that purgatory, priestly celibacy, compulsory confession to a priest, the worship of saints, all are of human, not divine, origin. He utterly rejects the Mass as idolatrous.

It was said of Knox, that while "others snip the branches of the Papistry, he strikes at the root, to destroy the whole."

Perhaps he would have literally destroyed if he could have, for there still was within him the Roman desire to do away with his enemies. Oh it was a barbarous age, and in every Catholic Kingdom Protestants are being tortured, beheaded and burned. Tolerance is not in vogue. Nevertheless, we cannot condone what Christ does not condone.

Knox promotes the Lollard belief, and his own, that the pope is the head of the church of antichrist, that the pope and his ministers are murderers. It is thus not a happy day for him when the representatives of that government touch down in his beloved land. It is August 19, 1561, in the early morning, and Knox remembers it as a gloomy day.

Marie (Mary Queen of Scots) was the new sovereign, and she has brought her priests with her. The very next Sunday, preparation begin to be made for

"that idol the Mass to be said in the Chapel; which pierced the hearts of all.

The godly began to bolden, and men began openly to speak, 'Shall that idol be suffered again to take place within this realm? It shall not.' "

The ensuing struggle finally does result in Protestantism being established in Scotland.

So for 300 years a consistent plea is heard rising from the pit of man-made religion. "Give us God's Word! Away with hypocrisy! Lord cleanse your church!" Those who seek find, and those who seek more find more. Those who don't seek either hang on to what they have for their own reasons, or get out of religion altogether, to see if there are other alternatives. In these centuries, those other alternatives are summed up by the term "renaissance."

THIRTY-NINE: THE RENAISSANCE

The word means "rebirth." It refers to the fact that, for a while, some of the shackles of Babylon-Rome are broken. People begin to think for themselves and to act accordingly. The entire Christian faith is rethought. Science, the arts, you name it, all sense the wave of freedom passing over the earth as Babylon retreats and regroupes.

On the downside, though, is the fact that much of the "rethinking " is being done because of the horrid image of Christ that men have seen for these thousand years

reflected in its so-called leaders. The Reform movement sometimes doesn't fare much better in men's eyes, as now there are several "papacies" to deal with. This lack of light drives men back to the time when the human spirit was supposed to have had its "day", in the era of pagan Rome and Greece.

Is it not a shame to the "people of God" that they seem to have nothing better to offer than that out of which they came?

So the renaissance is the rebirth of man, whereas the reformation is the beginnings of the rebirth of the Church. They cover roughly the same period of history.

Also in this time period is the age of exploration, when entire continents are discovered by Catholic Europe. A map drawn during that day shows just how vast is the Catholic Empire. Though Europe is about to be divided by Protestantism, the "New World" is almost exclusively Catholic, to begin with.

Missionaries and explorers totally overwhelm South America, and force the Pope to divide it between Catholic Spain and Catholic Portugal (Brazil). North America is similarly subjugated by Catholic France and Catholic Spain, interrupted later by Protestant countries.

A new day is dawning. What will Rome do with it?

FORTY: THE LEGS OF ROME

I have shown how Rome has ruled the earth from the days of the Caesars until about 1600 A.D. She has torn and plundered and deceived her way to power by use of Roman swords, German kings, Spanish Inquisitors, French "missionaries." The Mistress riding every known power on earth to the heights of wealth, success, and pre-eminence is, I believe, a manifestation of the woman of the Revelation of John.

But wait. Almost 400 years left in the story. Can she not change, even yet? After all, even most Catholics agree with what I have recorded so far. Let us give her a chance to prove herself, to make things right, to repent.

We shall indeed give her that chance.

And now the story takes more and more of a multi-dimensional flavor. We slow our pace to view as many aspects as possible in our walk. And when it is finished - may I give you a preview? -

-much more bloodshed

-much greater deception

which will bring Babylon to

-much greater power than she now has, for a short time. I refer readers once more to the interpretation of the vision by Daniel:

The leg begins, on its way to the foot, as a substantial amount of flesh and bones. At the knee it has grown somewhat less substantial. And after the knee, a slight resurgence. Then it becomes quite thin at the ankle, and soon after joining the foot it loses its identity as a leg.

The Pagan Roman Kingdom was a super-power, as was the original Papal Kingdom. Through the years the substance, that is, the extent, of that Kingdom, has waned. But it still is identifiable as *Rome*, the only world power to be expected from the days of *Greece* until the days of *antichrist*, from whose Kingdom it will one day be severed.

70/ SCARLET THREADS

Before we move on let us see how Jesus' countrymen, the Jews, are doing: a bull is issued in 1555 by Pope Paul IV. It becomes one of the landmarks in human persecution. There is to be, under the conditions of the bull, only one synagogue in every city. All others are to be destroyed. Jews are to own no real estate. What they presently own is to be sold to Christians. They are to wear a badge. Converted Jews who secretly continue to observe their faith are to be burned alive. Printed Hebrew books are to be burned.

The power, the greed, the Babylonian style religion, the enmity to the people called by God's name or seeking a deeper walk with God...the same identifying traditions - threads -continue, though names and faces change.

In the category of names that change: the term "inquisition" is changed to the "Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office"(1542). Though given a new name, the job is still the same, even to our present day (though its name has been changed again!): to protect faith and morals (Catholic-style faith and morals) to judge heresy (and to turn those condemned over to the secular arm, when nations involved will allow it) to examine and prohibit dangerous books, etc.

We'll meet the *Holy Office* again a little later.

FORTY-ONE: THE JESUITS

Thousands and thousands of books have been written about the Jesuits. If in the mouth of two or three (reputable) witnesses it can be said that a thing is established, it is probable that the Jesuits have a lot of explaining to do.

Adolphe Michel, quoted in such a book, says,

"As long as there are Jesuits, books will have to be written against them. There is nothing new left to be said on their account, but new generations of readers come every day...will these readers search older books?"

Initially named the Society of Jesus (gasp!), their founding father is don Inigo Lopez de Recalde, born in 1491 in Spain. "Inigo" later becomes "Ignatius" and his place of birth, the castle of Loyola, becomes his "last name," as we look at it.

As a young man, Ignatius becomes a soldier, but is handed a broken leg for that effort. The highly emotional saint-to-be suffers a nervous breakdown following the wound, and the surgeries, which must be administered without anaesthesia.

Forever slightly crippled, Ignatius devours the melancholy aspects of the life of Christ during his pain. He seems to have become a mystic at this time, and shortly afterward he embarks on the life of a *Christian* soldier, wanting to serve God in the best way he knows.

Through a series of alleged visions, Ignatius is confirmed in the dogmas of Rome, thus his intention to serve God *in* Rome, not outside her, as his contemporary Luther. The "visions"

include subjects such as the trinity, the creation, the descent of Christ into the Eucharist, the Virgin, and Satan.

A close-up study of these visionary activities would be very worthwhile for the earnest student of these matters. I will rely on the *fruit* of the Jesuit work for my refutation.

The actual founding of the Company is in 1524, and Loyola is 44. Teaching, hearing confessions, preaching, and charity are the first goals of the new group. But,

WHEN PEOPLE PROTEST/ 71

little by little, the Society gets the attention of the Popes. The Society of Jesus soon enters the political machine.

We must use the word political when referring to Jesuit interaction with Rome, because it has been they, of all the orders, that have championed the causes of the Papal Kingdom, including the Pope's "infallibility," his authority, etc. To this day their aim is the submission of the world to the "holy father."

As the Jesuits grow in power through the years, they become a threat to the other orders and eventually to the Pope himself! Their philosophy has become, "We know what's best for the pontiff."

In the 18th century, Clement XIV abolishes "forever" the Society of Jesus. (Dominus Ac Redemptor Noster, 1773)

"Now , we [the royal "we" used exclusively by popes and kings] have perceived that the ...Society of Jesus [can] no longer produce the abundant fruits and advantages for which it was instituted...if it existed it [would be] almost impossible that the Church could have true and permanent peace...we...suppress and extinguish the said society...we suppress all its statutes, customs, decrees and constitutions, even when fortified by an oath [some power this man has!]...We declare...that it is perpetually broken up and dissolved..."

No fear. In Rome there are no real forevers. Pius VII, at the beginning of the 19th century, *restores* the Jesuits! As Halley comments:

just "one infallible pope restoring for all time what another infallible pope before him had abolished forever..."

Now, infallibility in Catholic terms only applies to statements of official church teaching, but still, it does seem rather strange to see such double-mindedness in the "highest office" of "holy church."

Back to the 1500's: The Jesuits soon become Rome's answer to the Lutheran difficulty. They take over what the Dominicans have heretofore handled so well, the killing of heretics.

Halley enumerates the methods of Jesuits, then and now, to gain Catholic power:

"1) Schools, seeking especially the children of the ruling classes.

"2) The confessional [Babylonian practice] especially with kings, princes, and civil rulers, indulging them in all kinds of vice and crime, for the sake of gaining their favor.

"3) Force, persuading rulers to execute inquisition sentences."

And, continuing with Halley:

"In France they were responsible for the St. Bartholomew's massacre [August 24, 1572, 70,000 French Protestants massacred. Rome rejoiced, had a great 'praise' service, and congratulated all who partook in the killings], and the French revolution."

And,

"in Spain, Netherlands, South Germany, Bohemia, Austria, Poland, and other countries, they led in the massacre of untold multitudes. By these methods they stopped the reformation in southern Europe, and virtually saved the Papacy from ruin." (Halley, p.781)

72/ SCARLET THREADS

At various times throughout their history, the Jesuit leader (nicknamed the *black pope* because of his apparel) will seem to be the real head of the church, working behind the scenes, but obviously to those in the know.

Their intrigues in the political world continue to get them kicked out of country after country. Their lay group, "Catholic Action," also is considered by some a threat to men of peace.

More on the Jesuits later. For now, perhaps readers can understand why it is not necessary to be concerned about Ignatius's visions...nor the visions of *any man* or angel not lined up with God's Word, bearing God's fruit. Though we or Ignatius or an angel or a vision preach *any other gospel*, let him be accursed.

STILL no great winds of positive change in Rome...we're running out of centuries!

FORTY-TWO: OF WAR AND PEACE

The Roman Empire ruling now in the name of the Church for about 1300 years is in trouble. People have gotten the idea that it is possible to *come out of Babylon*, and *survive!* Others try it. Many of them, labeled *protestants*, are killed, but greater and greater numbers are finding the light of day and rejoicing in it.

In times like these, Babylon has appealed to the god of force always available to it in one form or another. For example, in Bohemia and Hungary, as a new (17th) century begins, Protestants are in the majority. But the Emperor - the secular arm- a man educated by Jesuits, Ferdinand II, with those Jesuits begins a campaign to suppress the Protestants. The Protestants, knowing mostly what "mother" has taught, unite their military forces to defend themselves. Thus begins the Thirty-years War. And from 1618 to 1629 the Catholic powers prevail.

(Interesting, if even a bit frightening, to note during this time period is the use of a certain group of fierce fighters that the Pope employs to help in his victories over non-Catholics: the Croats. As in the ex-Yugoslavian province of our day, that is almost daily in the news. German Protestants so fear these fighters that they develop the prayer: "from cholera, hunger, and the Croats may the good Lord deliver us." We will discuss Croatia later in a different *-but very much the same-* context.)

In Sweden, Gustavus Adolphus, the King, is persuaded to join the struggle, knowing that it will only be a matter of time before Protestant Sweden will be likewise attacked. When his armies enter the war, the tide is turned, and Protestantism is saved.

France, for its part, takes on the powerful House of Hapsburg, and emerges as the leading power in Europe.

(For the curious, "Hapsburg" is the name of the royal Austrian-Catholic- family that holds most European power during these centuries. Some of the more well-known members of the family include: Fredrick V, the King of Germany and the Holy Roman Emperor(1452); his son Maximilian who ruled Spain; Charles I of Spain; Marie Antoinette; Maximilian of Mexico (1800's); Franz Joseph of Austria-Hungary. These powers are used in the typical whore-beast position by the Vatican.)

In this seventeenth century, after such a grueling war experience, it will be good to hear of a late reformer who is a man of peace. He is Roger Williams (1604-1684), and he is a priest of the English Church who later immigrates to New England. Fellowshiping with the Puritans there, he soon arouses their ire because of his stance against violence, among other things. Moving from Massachusetts to present day Rhode Island, he

WHEN PEOPLE PROTEST/ 73

establishes there the first state where freedom of religion is an established fact.

Williams thus becomes a reformer *of* the reformers, and takes the church one step closer to its original purity by defying The Bloody Tenet of Persecution :

"My ears have long been filled with ...the cry of those...whose blood has been spilt like water upon the earth, and that because they have held fast the truth and witness of Jesus, against the worship of the states and times, compelling to an uniformity of state religion...(and) the cry of the whole earth, made drunk with the blood of its inhabitants, slaughtering each other in their blinded zeal, for conscience, for religion, against the Catholics, against the Lutherans, etc. That doctrine ...that a magistrate may punish an heretic will not here avail; for what is Babel if this be not confusedly to punish corporal or civil offense with spiritual or church censures, or to punish soul or spiritual offenses with corporal or temporal weapons proper to delinquents against the temporal or civil state."

Another peace-monger of the day is George Fox, the famous Quaker. From his Journal, we extract this conversation between himself and a known Romanist, on how to find the ultimate peace, peace with God:

"Said I, 'What is it that doth bring salvation in your church?' He answered, 'A good life.' 'And nothing else?' said I. 'Yes,' said he. 'Good works.' 'And is this it that brings salvation in your church, a good life and good works? Is this your doctrine and your principle?' said I. 'Yes,' said he. 'Then,' said I, 'neither thou, nor the Pope, nor any of the Papists know what it is that brings salvation.' Then he asked me what brought salvation in our church. I told him, 'That which brought salvation to the church in the apostles' days, the same brings salvation to us, and not another; namely, the grace of God, which, the Scripture says, brings salvation, and hath appeared to all men...'

Though this grace has indeed appeared to all men(Titus 2:11), "mystics" in and out of Rome continue to seek more than God has offered. Those who have no desire for the truth revealed are bound to be deceived by other revelations. One such mystic receives in 1673 a confirmation of the "sacred heart" devotion sponsored for so long by Rome. Her name is Margaret Mary Alacoque.

The Catholic Encyclopedia says that the Lord Himself appeared to Margaret on three separate occasions, telling her to spread devotion of the "sacred heart," and telling her specifics of the ritual that was to be developed on earth, including a new feast day.

The Jesuits are singled out to help spread the word.

In tracing "sacred heart" history, that same Encyclopedia quotes Pius XII as saying that

"nowhere in the Sacred Scriptures is there clear mention of any veneration or love for the physical heart of the Word Incarnate, considered precisely as the symbol of His ardent charity."

For a man of the Word, that's the end of such talk. It's not in the Book, let's forget it. Not so in Rome. Even though it is not until the late Middle Ages that there is specific documentation for such a practice, the Church carries on with it today as though it were indeed a direct revelation from Christ. Which means that the people of God must believe the Bible PLUS any private revelation approved in Rome. Does not sound consistent with

74/ SCARLET THREADS

their anathema on Protestant *private interpretations*.

There are traces of the "Sacred Heart" devotion on down to Alacoque's time, but it is she who is destined to bring it into sharp focus and great popularity in the Catholic world.

Based on the fact that Jesus' heart was indeed broken for mankind, and his love poured out as physical blood, we are told that , therefore, Jesus wants us to honor his *physical heart* by various ritual prayers and adoration of certain icons, both at mass and in the home. Those who will thus "enthron" Jesus, and yes, attempt to model their lives after his attributes, are promised certain specific blessings.

No Christian will object to following the attributes of Jesus, patterning our lives after Him, walking in His steps. These are revealed truths. I call into question the rest of the story, the *private revelation* reportedly given to this "saint." (for such she is called, now.)

Let's examine her life, first, from her own autobiography, published by Tan Books and Publishers, Rockford, IL, in 1986. (first published, with Imprimatur, in 1930.)

As a good Catholic girl growing up, she

"did not dare address " herself "to the Son, but only to [Mary], and I often presented her with the little crown of the rosary, which I said on my bare knees, or genuflecting and kissing the ground at every Ave Maria."

"It happened once that, being seated while reciting the rosary, she appeared to me and gave me the following reprimand...'I am surprised, my daughter, that you serve me so negligently!'"

Thus Margaret Mary first perceives her guilt and unworthiness. Later, upon hearing of the sufferings of Christ, she too desires to suffer. Unwilling to allow Christ to bring her through whatever trials and fire may come to purge her, she brings the suffering on herself. Offered many proposals of marriage, she resists them as from the devil. (Bible students are now understanding what is being described here.)

She considers herself a martyr by refusing marriage. Underlying all of this is a message that she really did want to marry, unlike Paul and others who seem to have had a particular gift for continence.

Her guilt grows. Knowing how much Christ has suffered, and how little she has,

"In order to some extent to be avenged on myself for the injuries I did Him...I bound this miserable and criminal body with knotted cords, which I drew so tightly that I had difficulty in breathing and eating. I left these cords so long that they were buried in the flesh which grew over them, and I could not extract them without great violence and excessive pain...I also slept on a plank or on sharply notched sticks..."

But, alas,

"the humiliations and contradictions were...continually increasing rather than decreasing...The fear that I had of offending God was a greater torment to me than all the rest..."

Obviously this is not the way to peace with God. But she doesn't give up, and tries to "mortify" her flesh by doing things she previously hated, such as looking at wounds. Not only does she look at and dress them, but kisses them. Not content merely to clean someone's vomit, she now partakes of it...

WHEN PEOPLE PROTEST/ 75

Enough. To this woman, sick much of her life, told by her superiors that she is possessed by a demon, guilt-ridden, "Jesus" appears with some rather startling revelations:

"...thou shalt possess the treasures of My heart...and I will permit thee to distribute them as thou wilt, in favor of souls that are ready to receive them."

"I have willed to use thy heart as a channel for conveying them into souls according to my designs; by this means many shall be saved from the abyss of perdition."

"Learn that I am a holy Master, and one that teaches holiness, I am pure, and cannot endure the slightest stain...I cannot endure the least want of straightforwardness...I cannot bear tepid and cowardly souls..."

"Henceforth I will make My abode in thee so as to hold familiar converse with thee."

"I constitute Myself the Guardian of My Gifts, and will render thee powerless to resist me."

"I have chosen thy soul to be a paradise of rest to Me on earth, and thy heart shall be a throne of delight for my divine love."

[in response to her request as to what she should say to Him, the wording of her prayers] "Nothing but these words: 'My God, my only Good and my All, Thou art wholly mine, and I am wholly Thine.' They will preserve thee from all kinds of temptations, will supply for all the acts thou wouldst make, and serve as preparation for all thy actions."

At the end of a book of sayings by the "saint" published by the same company in the same year, are specific prayers, and other rituals which the Lord is said to have instituted. It is promised to all those who are faithful to the sacred heart devotion (Communion on the first Friday of 9 consecutive months, honoring Christ under a picture of the sacred heart, making "33 visits to the Lord on the cross," for examples) that Christ will be pleased with them, bless them with material and spiritual blessings in abundance, and grace their homes.

Now, Roman Catholics often warn the Protestant of the dangers of privately reading the Word and forming his own conclusions under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. My dear Catholic friend, the woman described above illustrates the far greater danger: That of blindly following the precepts of a religion given to one at birth, without seeing what God has to say in His Word.

Is there any hint of the lifestyle mentioned above, in Scripture? Does Christ anywhere call his followers to *self*-persecution? To guilt? To fear? To isolation from the world? Christ's command is to "Go into all the world," knowing that Satan, the persecutor, will follow, and yes, do damage at times. But God gives Satan only enough permission to do what He, God, wants done. Those who pray for the purging of the Holy Spirit will receive it at *His hands*, not their own.

But how could she know this, following Rome?

76/ SCARLET THREADS

So what of the revelations? I have struggled with this, never wanting to take a chance of coming against the Lord myself. But there are a few things we know:

Satan is able to be transformed into an angel of light, and a voice. He is known especially in these last days as one who is looking for *channels* through which he can work; he is referred to as "Master" in occult circles. It is interesting to me that in the quotes I found in these books, none of the revelations identify *Jesus the Son of God* as their source, but rather a "Master."

This explains the unorthodox teachings of the "Master." He can't endure imperfection? He endures me. And you, dear reader. If Jesus cannot endure imperfection we are all lost! "Powerless to resist?" Never. Always the dove, the Spirit of God, presents Himself gently, so much so that the non-listening cannot hear. To my shame I say, I have resisted, refused, rebelled. Still He loves, and tries again. She is to be exclusively the "abode" of the Christ on earth? What new teaching is this? And Jesus is now, after 1600 years, giving out specific prayer-formulas, feast days, rituals, to keep him pleased and bring us blessing. Sounds like Catholic merit-salvation again, and is not unlike Protestant prosperity teaching of the 20th century. (Send an offering, God will bless you.)

Anyone who preaches any other Gospel, remember? *Let him be accursed.* The thought that the spreading of a particular devotion to a particular picture will bring the grace of God into a person's life is *another gospel* and must be repelled with the whole package of Babylonian garbage we are unwrapping piece by piece.

Oh hear the heart of God! Come out of her!

FORTY-THREE: PROTESTANTISM

This book is not meant to be an endorsement of "Protestantism" over Catholicism. It is not quite that simple. For example, "Protestant" England comes about in part as a result of the love-life of Henry VIII. Henry refuses to submit to Rome in the area of marital matters. He then seizes control of the church, a la Constantine. The history of the church of England is also filled with Babylonian deception, political intrigue, and much bloodshed, as true followers of Jesus are asked to pay with their lives.

A true daughter of the Roman abomination.

Nevertheless, there are steps taken toward Biblical Christianity during those days, not the least of which is the King James Bible, authorized by England's reigning monarch in 1611.

But Babylon has taken its effect on its daughters, and this influence is passed through the English Church to the Puritans, who, on our shores, become a similarly repressive and intolerant bunch. (Ever heard of the Salem witch trials?)

Babylonian ways have cropped up in other churches descending from Rome, or infiltrated by Rome. Oh, Babylon is truly with us, and God's clarion call to come out must be heeded by most *Protestants* today as well as the Roman-dominated people.

No one knows this better in the 18th century than the Wesley brothers, John and Charles, whose godly mother Susanna nurtures them in the ways of the Lord and makes them hungry for the things of God. This hunger is still manifest when as young men they are students at Oxford University, and become a part of a group of young seekers who are scorned, and called, among other things, "Methodists."

The Wesleys belong to the Church of England, but this Roman-style religion does not fill their hearts with joy. After the Oxford days they come to America's shores, and there experience the grace of God. Their books, songs, and testimony have become classic church history. I call them in here to testify to *Protestants* reading this work, and charge them with a solemn word from God.

WHEN PEOPLE PROTEST/ 77

From, A Word to a Protestant, by John Wesley:

"Among the errors (of Rome) may be numbered their doctrine of seven sacraments, of transsubstantiation, of communion in one kind only, of purgatory, and praying for the dead therein, of veneration of relics, and of indulgences. It is thought by some that these errors, great as they are, do only defile the purity of Christianity; but it is sure the following strike at its very root, and tend to banish true religion out of the world:

"First, the doctrine of merit. The very foundation of Christianity is that a man can merit nothing of God, that we are justified freely by His grace...not for any of our works or of our deservings, but by faith in the blood of the covenant. But the papists hold that a man may by his works merit or deserve eternal life...

"Second, the doctrine of praying to saints and worshipping of images. To the Virgin Mary they pray in these words: 'O Mother of God, O Queen of Heaven, command Thy Son to have mercy upon us.' And, 'The right use of images,' says the council of Trent, 'is to honor them by bowing down before them.'

"This is gross, open, palpable idolatry.

"Third, the doctrine of persecution. The papists in general still maintain that all heretics ought to be compelled to receive what they call the true faith; to be forced into the church or out of the world...this tends to bring in blind, bitter zeal, anger, hatred...

"So plain is it that these grand popish doctrines of merit, idolatry, and persecution, by destroying both faith and the love of God and of our neighbor, tend to banish true Christianity out of the world."

Pause. Let none say that the loving Wesleys could not cry out against Rome. But take a deep breath and listen again...

"Well might our forefathers protest against these. Hence it was that they were called Protestants... You publicly protest against these horrible errors of popery. But does your heart agree with your lips?

"First, how do you hope to be saved? By doing thus and thus? By doing no harm and paying every man his own and saying your prayers and going to church?...Alas!Alas! Now have you thrown off the mask. This is popery barefaced...where is Christ all this time?Why, He is not come in till you get to the end of your prayer; and then will you say, "for Jesus Christ's sake," because so it stands in your book. ..your very foundation is popish...you trample upon the blood of the covenant...

"Second, are you clear of idolatry? They set up their idols in their churches; you set up yours in your heart...they worship the picture of the Queen of Heaven; you, the picture of the Queen or King of England...How small preeminence has the money-worshipper at London over the image-worshipper at Rome, or the idolizer of a living sinner over him that prays to a dead saint!

"Does the pope force another man's conscience?...Do you not wish the government would put down such and such people? You know what you would do if you were in their place.

"Be a real Protestant. By the Spirit of God assisting you, cast away...all hope

78/ SCARLET THREADS

of being saved by your own works, put away your idols out of your heart, and if
you love God you will love your brother also; you will be ready to lay down your
life for his sake, so far from any desire to take away his life or hurt a hair of his
head...be zealous for God, but remember that the wrath of man worketh not
the righteousness of God; that angry zeal, though opposing sin, is the servant of
sin; that true zeal is only the flame of love."

FORTY-FOUR: AMERICA'S BEGINNINGS

We will talk more specifically later of the confusion of spiritual tongues in the big world called Christendom. But now, to America, which henceforth will be an intricate part of the story.

Native Americans and Roman missionaries aside for the moment, we are aware that our nation was founded in part by those who sought refuge from Babylon and her daughters.

Nevertheless, the refuge is not total. America accepts in its midst, because of its stance for freedom, those who are totally opposed to that freedom. Every election year, the Socialists, the gay lobby, the abortionists, all have their freedom to be.

So it is not surprising that Rome also is permitted to sell its wares in the fledgling colonies. The city of Baltimore early becomes Catholic Central in America, but it is not granted its charter until promising to grant freedom of religion to all. This is a bitter pill for *Marylanders* to swallow.

You say, "Of course freedom for all. Everyone knows that that is what this nation is about!" But Babylonians in this country only slowly (some would say *never*) accept American premises for government. And Babylonians in Babylon are opposed to "Americanism" to this day.

Now, time for another pulpit pounding. Are you awake and listening? Hear me well!

Those who find the conclusions of this book revolting (and it is becoming more obvious what those conclusions are) need to consider the following truism. For those in the know, please forgive the obviousness of the statement:

Rome (alias Babylon) only does, but *always* does, what she is permitted to do by the prevailing political powers. She is a back-rider, not always a pace-setter, though she desires both positions.

Americans of the near- 21st century are dumbfounded by charges of world domination leveled at such a "nice," "moral" people as the Catholics.

I ask you to forget for a moment the swell guy next door who rushed your ailing child to the hospital, the lady who watched your house while you were on vacation, the family that offered you a drink when you were sweating from raking your leaves, the ones who invited you to a ball game, even came to one of your prayer meetings...this story is *not* about Catholics!

We're talking about the *system* that grabbed hold of the young church and still will not let go of millions of people all over the world. Tune in to the *institution* that murdered born-again Christians while saving babies from abortion, that despises Jews while weeping over Palestinians, that controls empires, that is in fact an empire itself, that lives lavishly while decrying the world's poverty, that is blatantly immoral when no one speaks out against her, that deceives when there is no one to investigate her claims, that teaches outrageous blasphemies, though much more quietly now that "separated brothers" are talking of unity. That institution still lives and will do what she has always done when given a chance.

Live for awhile in Argentina, or Spain, or any Catholic-dominated land (except lands

like Croatia, please, where you might well be killed for being non-Catholic), and feel up-close the pressure of the enticing, yea, crushing embrace of the Woman atop the beast.

This is the lady who made her way to American shores centuries ago.

FORTY-FIVE: THE MEXICAN PROBLEM

The 19th century, by the time it closes, will bring us within striking distance of the memories of some living today. The story we tell will soon lose the aura of ancient history and become very real. I beg my readers to understand that it is the *same story* which we tell throughout the book. There *is* a connection.

For the following years, we switch to the Americas as a backdrop, and focus on Papal activities here. It may be assumed that other "threads" are intact, though.

For example, in 1826, Pope Leo XII reinstates Pius VI's restrictions on Jewish people. Pius has already resurrected all the former oppressions I have been reporting. Leo goes a step further and bans Jewish students from public schools and universities. Jew-hating is still prominent in Babylon.

And yes, the same Babylonian doctrines are passed on, the same lust for power. But that power finds a growing opposition in the 19th-century world. Following the French and American revolutions, many people will settle for nothing less than freedom.

That map of North America of this period shows "Mexicana" sprawled out over most of the continent. By this century, the Pope's ambitions are curtailed a bit. A man named Juarez has set up a republic (the r-word, to the Papacy) in that country. He has confiscated all Rome's holdings for his people, and Papa is disturbed to no end.

In Roman fashion, he finds his own people to rule Mexico: Prince Maximilian (of the Hapsburgs) and Princess Carlotta are to become the Emperor and Empress there in 1864.

1864 is the same year as the Pope's infamous Syllabus of errors, in which he condemns the *separation of church and state*, and other American-style freedoms. Hello? Are you listening?

With Papal celebration and blessing the handsome couple are sent just south of our borders to overcome Juarez and his republic; and to regain all that the church has lost. The mission is a success, at least for a while.

I share this history to help readers understand that the Popes have interfered in Western civilization in *this* hemisphere only a short time ago. *Whenever* possible, they will do it again. It is within Rome's blood to conquer.

Maximilian's efforts eventually fail in Mexico. Napoleon III, of Catholic France, also withdraws his involvement in the project, and history takes a different turn.

But the all-out Papal-blessed effort to take over Mexico, and perhaps with it the United States, needs to be looked at very carefully, especially when we know of the other major event going on at precisely the same time: America's Civil War. Blinded by our own view of history, most people in America do not realize all that was at stake in the slavery/Lincoln/Civil War episode. I will relate later what southern connections Rome had.

But the evidence was all there, and earnest seekers can find it today. *The Pope wanted this land of ours.*

Pius IX, in his Syllabus, claims that church and state separation is a "principal error of our time." If it is an error, it must be corrected. Who better than Papa to do that?

FORTY-SIX: TEMPORAL POWER ENDS! (temporarily)

Before we continue in the Americas, let's see what happens in Europe only six

80/ SCARLET THREADS

years after this sending forth of the royal pair.

You will recall that the Papal States had been a given in Italy all these years. In fact, Halley indicates that from 754 A.D. the poor management of these states was openly decried.

In 1870, the cries are heard somewhere. During the reign of Pius IX, 10,000 French troops assigned to his Kingdom had to be called back to France, war having broken out there. Seeing the Vatican unprotected, Victor Immanuel, King of Italy, takes possession of all of Rome and its surrounding states, making them a part of Italy's Kingdom. Not only is the Pope without land, he is technically submitted to a secular king. Quite an embarrassment to him who claimed to be *ruler of all kings*.

This state of affairs lasts 59 years, when Mussolini and the Catholic Church come to terms of agreement (you heard it right...more about it later!).

Two things in this connection:

(1) Though having no local real estate for a while (and very little to this day) the Vatican's control over wealth untold is no one's imagination. Wherever there is a Catholic nation, state, county, province, archdiocese, diocese, parish, church, *there is Papal power and wealth*. Hear the wording of the *present canon law, number 1273*:

"By virtue of his primacy in governance the Roman Pontiff is the supreme administrator and steward of all ecclesiastical goods."

(2) PLEASE HEAR THIS: Pope Pius IX gave up his land *against* his will, full of shame. The lessening of *any power* by Rome is never voluntary, but either because of being overpowered, or because of perceived necessity.

By "perceived necessity" I mean that action taken by a child whose hand is unmistakably caught in the cookie jar. The cookies are just as tempting afterwards, just as vulnerable, and soon another attempt will be made on them. But perceived necessity postpones that action until a more opportune time.

It is not as though Pius said in 1870, "It is time we Popes, claiming to be descended from Peter, start doing the works Peter did. Peter was not rich. Peter was not temporally powerful. Peter was not world-famous. Peter's feet were never kissed. Peter as the lead apostle was first and foremost the one to carry out the final mission given by the Master: Preach the Gospel to all the world!

"From now on, we will use no earthly means of getting this good news about Jesus to a dying world. We will sell all we have and turn it into souls for Jesus! Come, Victor, take our lands. Our hearts have been changed, we'd rather have Jesus than houses or land or..."

What an absurd fantasy I imagine coming from the mouth of a true Babylonian king. Hopefully, what a reality for every true child of God.

FORTY-SEVEN: VATICAN I

Vatican II is known to most of us. The original Vatican Council, just 80 years before II, is shrouded in some obscurity that I would like to lessen at this point.

As we trek back to the American side of the water a moment, does it become clear that the Papacy is in desperate need of a win? To gain some new holdings? Losing Mexico, losing to Protestants, losing the Papal States...

In 1870, the same year as that final loss mentioned, to the shock of his closest followers, to the horror of good Catholics everywhere, and to the eternal damnation of even more who will believe in him, his holiness calls the Vatican Council

"for the express purpose of having himself declared infallible...the decree

WHEN PEOPLE PROTEST/ 81

reads that it is 'divinely revealed that the pope, when he speaks (on matters of faith) "ex cathedra" (from the chair, that is, officially), is possessed of infallibility in defining doctrines of faith and morals' and that such definitions are irreformable." (Halley, p.782)

16 years previous to this, the same Pius has declared that Mary was conceived without sin. If he has any doubt as to how Romans will receive this bit of information, he shouldn't have. They love it, accept it, and essentially give him the courage to do what he does at Vatican I.

But "temporal" power still continues to elude him. Though he is becoming a giant in the eyes of his own, the rest of the world still doesn't notice, and he finds it increasingly difficult to marshall the needed forces for clubbing people into the fold, as popes have done in the heyday of the Inquisition.

It's a new world, with new ideas. But let us not be deceived into thinking that those ideas are coming from a new place.

FORTY-EIGHT: THE LINCOLN AFFAIR

So we are now in a time when bloodshed, which is newsworthy and can be reported to generations following, begins to give way to *influence*, which tends to go unnoticed except by the most observant.

As we walk through these years, we walk slowly and deliberately, looking but not touching. Much cannot be proved. Allow me to lay out some observations, you see what sense can be made of it. Having read the following, you may wish to start an investigation of your own.

First to keep in mind is that there is no change in the Papal position about one-world government under Roman supervision. And in the western hemisphere of the 1800's only the United States stands in the way of such dominion.

Let's return to Pius IX, who reigned in Rome from 1846-1878. His statements made in encyclicals of 1863-64 are most illuminating to one who would understand the era. Now, in 1863 was our "Emancipation Proclamation" and in 1865, the assassination of Lincoln (to the two events many can see a link).

"It is necessary to remember again and to condemn the very serious error into which some Catholics miserably fall, who think that men who live in error and are strangers to Catholic faith and unity can reach eternal life..."

"Catholics [should] be always eager to try to free [men] from the darkness of their error,...and bring them back to Catholic Truth, and to their most loving mother, the Church."

Regarding Mary:

"...during the pontificate of Gregory XVI, our Predecessor of happy memory, there was in the entire Catholic world a most ardent and wondrous revival of the desire that the most holy Mother of God - the beloved Mother of us all, the immaculate Virgin Mary- be finally declared by a solemn definition of the Church to have been conceived without the stain of original sin..."

Whence comes this doctrine?

"...the widespread piety of the Christian people so fervently desires to have accorded to the Most Holy Virgin by a solemn decree and by the authority of the Church and the Holy See."

82/ SCARLET THREADS

And where did the people get their ideas? Certainly not from the revealed Word to the apostles. They just "believed " it, because , as I pointed out in Parts I and II, the teachings about "the virgin" were handed down from paganism, and brought into the church when "paganism disappeared."

Why now?

"From our earliest years nothing has ever been closer to Our heart than devotion to the most blessed Virgin Mary."

Nothing? Not even devotion to her Son? What about faith in Jesus?

"Great indeed is Our trust in Mary. The resplendent glory of her merits, far exceeding all the choirs of angels, elevates her to the very steps of the throne of God. Her foot has crushed the head of Satan [to see the measure of deception being leveled at the people of God here, read Genesis 3:15 *for yourself* and see who is to bruise the head of Satan!]. Set up between Christ and His Church, Mary...has always delivered the Christian people from their greatest calamities [look up the word "Jesus" or the Hebrew "Yeshua" and see for yourself what it means!] and from the snares and assaults of all their enemies, ever rescuing them from ruin..."

Blasphemy! A thousand times hear it! He has placed the *woman* above the *CHRIST*. He shows himself here to be a true Babylonian, descended *not* from Peter, but from *Nimrod!*

More to the point at hand, the Lincoln crisis. Pius quotes Gregory's 1832 Encyclical, calling *insane* the notion that

"the liberty of conscience and of worship is the inalienable right of every man, which should be proclaimed by law, and that citizens have the right to all kinds of liberty...by which they may be enabled to manifest openly and publicly their ideas, by word of mouth, through the press, or by any other means."

Is my history sense dull, or did I just hear the Pope of Lincoln's day call the preamble to our Constitution a thing insane? Aggravated, the Pope cries out further against those who dare to believe

"that the will of the people, manifested by what they call public opinion, or in any other way, constitutes the supreme law, independent of all divine and human right...that the Church can decide nothing which may bind the consciences of the faithful in the temporal order of things..."

plenary
by our
"How contrary is this doctrine," he says, " to the Catholic dogma, of the power divinely conferred on the Sovereign Pontiff ...Therefore do We, apostolic authority, **reprobate, denounce, and condemn...[such] evil doctrines.**"(emphasis mine)

The Pope seems worried.

"...Venerable Brethren, you see clearly enough how sad and full of perils is the condition of Catholics in the regions of Europe...Nor are things any better or circumstances calmer in America..."

True. Oh, very true. Things are far from calm in America. Please keep the Pope's words in mind as we talk of that period of American history, immediately following the Civil War.

Is it plausible that a monarch so opposed to American ways, and American interference to his global plans, might try to do something to end that government? Of course, in the final analysis, it doesn't matter who starts something, in Rome's eyes. Recall that Babylon is pictured as *riding a beast*, not necessarily summoning him to his various tasks. Whenever she finds a strong back to support her, she will hop on.

So do plots, conspiracies, actions subtly performed through another's influence, exist?

Is there a reader still so naive as to deny the possibility of such?

You will find in the Congressional Record of 1916, April 25 to be exact, that one Senator Owen inserted in full a copy of the "Secret Treaty of Verona." The subject on the floor that day was "women's suffrage," the right of a woman to vote. The senator on this day suggests that the basis of such suffrage is *representative government* and the *sovereignty of the people*, well-known American ideals. The treaty, written only 40 years before our Civil War, shows the philosophy governing the powers who could easily have been interested in subverting American democracy.

THE SECRET TREATY OF VERONA

"The undersigned, specially authorized to make some additions to the treaty of the Holy Alliance, after having exchanged their respective credentials, have agreed as follows:

"ART. 1. The high contracting powers being convinced that the system of representative government is equally as incompatible with the monarchical principles as the maxim of the sovereignty of the people with the divine right, engage mutually, in the most solemn manner, to use all their efforts to put an end to the system of representative governments, in whatever country it may exist in Europe, and to prevent its being introduced in those countries where it is not yet known.

"ART. 2. As it cannot be doubted that the liberty of the press is the most powerful means used by the pretended supporters of the rights of nations to the detriment of those of princes, the high contracting parties promise reciprocally to adopt all proper measures to suppress it, not only in their own States but also in the rest of Europe.

"ART. 3. Convinced that the principles of religion contribute most powerfully to keep nations in the state of passive obedience which they owe to their princes, the high contracting parties declare it to be their intention to sustain in their respective States those measures which the clergy may adopt, with the aim of ameliorating their own interests, so intimately connected with the preservation of the authority of the princes; and the contracting powers join in offering their thanks to the Pope for what he has already done for them, and solicit his constant cooperation in their views of submitting the nations.

84/ SCARLET THREADS

"ART. 4. The situation of Spain and Portugal unite unhappily all the circumstances to which this treaty has particular reference. The high contracting parties, in confiding to France the care of putting an end to them, engaged to assist her in the manner which may the least compromise them with their own people and the people of France by means of a subsidy on the part of the two empires of 20,000 francs every year from the date of the signature of this treaty to the end of the war.

"ART. 5. In order to establish in the Peninsula the order of things which existed before the revolution of Cadiz, and to insure the entire execution of the articles of the present treaty, the high contracting parties give to each other the reciprocal assurance that as long as their views are not fulfilled, rejecting all other ideas of utility or other measure to be taken, they will address themselves with the shortest possible delay to all the authorities existing in their States and to all their agents in foreign countries, with the view to establish connections tending toward the accomplishment of the objects proposed by this treaty.

"ART. 6. This treaty shall be renewed with such changes as new circumstances may give occasion for, either at a new congress or at the court of one of the contracting parties, as soon as the war with Spain shall be terminated.

"ART. 7. The present treaty shall be ratified and the ratification exchanged at Paris within the space of six months.

"Made at Verona the 22nd November, 1822."

| | |
|--------------|---------------|
| For Austria: | Metternich |
| For France: | Chateaubriand |
| For Prussia: | Bernstet |
| For Russia : | Nesselrode |

Interesting reading, don't you think? Here's an excerpt from Mirari Vos, encyclical of Pope Gregory XVI in 1832:

"...that absurd and erroneous opinion, or better, that product of delirium, that it is necessary to extend and guarantee liberty of conscience to everyone. The path to this most pestilent error is being prepared by the full and unlimited freedom of opinions which is being widely diffused, to the misfortune of religion and civil society, while some keep saying with extreme impudence that religion will derive some advantage from it...Experience has proved from earliest times that states distinguished for wealth, for power, for glory, have perished from this single evil, unrestrained freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and the love of novelties. To this is related that deadly freedom, never adequately to be execrated and detested, the liberty of the press."

But we were speaking of plots. In the case of one Abraham Lincoln, for example, a quick trip to Chicago's Museum of Science and Industry will expose one to a newspaper

WHEN PEOPLE PROTEST/ 85

clipping dated April 15, 1864, the day after Lincoln's assassination, describing how already people were talking about a "plot."

History either "happens" or it is *planned*. In the case of Lincoln, no serious investigator rules out the conspiracy. There are many variations on the theme, but a conspiracy *did* take place. For what reasons and by whom I will leave with you...after I have shared a few lesser-known facts.

Did you realize that on the same night Lincoln was shot, Secretary of State Seward was likewise attacked, while on his sick bed? Others, like General Grant, had also been targeted. These are matters of commonly known but not often reported history. No secrets here. *The complete overthrow of the United States Government was on the agenda.*

And who was involved in this comprehensive plan to overthrow the government? Surely you will recognize the name of John Wilkes Booth. Most know he was an actor, and that he spoke some dramatic words as he pulled the trigger. Yes, those words were in Latin. But jump to no conclusions yet.

A *much* smaller group of Americans have heard the name Surratt. Few have heard of Mary Surratt, and fewer still know of her son John. Now, Mary's name can still be found in a couple of encyclopedias, John's I could not find.

Mary Surratt was a well-known lady of her day. We will say for now that it is only incidental that she was a Roman Catholic. Her home was frequented by quite a mix of people, including Catholic priests, and others implicated in the assassination plot, such as John Wilkes Booth. After Lincoln's death, the evidence brought against her and other conspirators was so convincing that all were *hung*. Did you know that?

After the fact, it is fair to say that many felt the trials were rushed, that the evidence for Mrs. Surratt's guilty sentence was not strong enough. Miscarriages of justice do occur.

So a Roman Catholic was involved in killing the President? If a fact, it is still not terribly conclusive by itself. To my mind, the intriguing thing about that horrid evening is the presence, flight, and especially the route, of her son, John. In an out-of-print book by Burke McCarty called The Suppressed Truth About the Assassination of Abraham Lincoln, John Surratt is named as the master mind of the whole event.

Once more to be fair to subsequent discoveries, witnesses at John's trial "prove" he was in Elmira, New York, on the night of the assassination. Other witnesses swear they saw him outside the theater where Lincoln was shot. But of his flight route, there is no question. And the reason for his flight? Though some say he is not guilty, it is maintained that he fled because of his association with John Wilkes Booth (a very real association, I might add).

All witnesses and evidence can trace John's flight first to Canada, then to England, in both of which places he is housed by Catholic clergy. Then, lo and behold, John turns up in Vatican City, where he is personally received by the Pope! Shortly thereafter we see him dressed in Papal costume, a part of the Pope's military operations, a light infantry corps known as the *Zouaves*.

All of this is traceable fact.

The United States, after a long and costly, not to mention contested, delay, finally requests that the Vatican release Surratt. Outward compliance is immediate.

But wouldn't you know it! He "escapes" from the ones who are bringing him on one leg of the journey home. Later he is caught and brought to trial.

Brought to trial, I say, but you must decide whether he was brought to justice. The records of the trial are available for perusal. Due to one of the many loopholes in America's legal system, the "hung jury", and a later decision to drop the case, Surratt is

86/ SCARLET THREADS

released, and many years later dies in America, a successful businessman.

Let's back up a bit. After staying in Montreal awhile, and supposedly being ordered by the bishop there *not* to return to Washington where his mother is about to be hanged (since there is no justice in Washington), Surratt is shipped off to England. But the ship's doctor, one L.J. McMillan, supposedly seeking the reward being offered for Surratt's capture, befriends John.

Surratt becomes wary, gets off the ship in Londonderry, Ireland, and finds his own way to Liverpool. Meanwhile, McMillan has reported to the vice-consul , Wilding, of his finding. Wilding contacts Washington:

"No. 538 United States Consulate
 Liverpool
 September 27, 1865

Sir: yesterday, information was given to me that Surratt, one of the persons implicated in the conspiracy to murder Mr. Lincoln, was in Liverpool, or expected there within a day or two. I took the affidavit of the person who gave me the information...

A. Wilding,
Vice-Consul"

No response. Let's try again.

"No. 539 United States Consulate
 Liverpool
 September 30, 1865

Sir: Since my dispatch no. 538, the supposed Surratt has arrived in Liverpool, and is now staying at the oratory of the Roman Catholic Church of the Holy Cross. His appearance indicates him to be about twenty-one years old, tolerably good looking. According to reports Mrs. Surratt was a devout Catholic, and I learn that clergymen of that persuasion on their way to and from America frequently lodge at the Oratory...

I can, of course, do nothing further in the matter without Mr. Adams' instructions and a warrant. If it be Surratt, such a wretch ought not to escape...

Wilding"

Finally the reply. Note it well. Five months has changed the mood of Washington:

"No. 476 Department of State
 Washington
 October 13, 1865

Sir: Your dispatches...have been received. In reply to your No. 539 I have to inform you that, upon a consultation with the Secretary of War, and the Judge Advocate General, it is thought advisable that no action be taken in regard to the arrest of the supposed John Surratt at present...

W. Hunter

WHEN PEOPLE PROTEST/ 87

Acting Secretary

Something fishy here? Later, at the Surratt Trial, Judge Pierrepont is forced to say these words:

"My friends on the other side have undertaken to arraign the government of the United States against the prisoner. They have talked very loudly and eloquently, about this great government of twenty-five or thirty millions of people, being engaged in trying to bring a conviction on one poor young man, and have treated it as though it was a hostile act, as though two parties were litigants before you, the one trying to beat the other.

"Is it possible that it has come to this, that in the City of Washington, where the President has been murdered, that when under the form of law, and before a court and jury of twelve men, an investigation is made, to ascertain whether the prisoner is guilty of this great crime, that the government is to be charged as seeking his blood, and its officers as lapping their tongues in the blood of the innocent? I quote the language exactly. It is a shocking thing to hear. What is the purpose of a government? What is the business of a government?"

"According to the gentleman's notion, when a murder is committed the government should not do anything towards ascertaining who perpetrated the murder, and if the government did undertake to investigate the matter and endeavor to find out whether the man charged with the crime is guilty or not...the government and all connected with it, must expect to be assailed as 'bloodhounds of the law,' and as seeking to 'lap their tongues in the blood of the innocent.' What is government for? It is constituted for your protection...What would you do without it?"

McCarty summarizes the trial proceedings:

"There were eighty-five witnesses and ninety-six in rebuttal...the hearing began June 17th, 1867, and closed July 26th, 1867...the case went to the jury August 7th. The jury brought in a report that they stood about even for conviction and acquittal, with no prospect of reaching an agreement. Surratt was remanded to jail.

"His attorneys asked that he be released on bail which was refused by the court. The following September...he was indicted on the charge of engaging in rebellion. He was admitted to bail on this charge in the amount of \$20,000, which still stands.

"A second indictment was found against him, but the district attorney entered a *nolle prosequi* on this. The prisoner was finally released and permitted to go free on a technicality- an omission of the three words in the indictment, viz.: 'was a fugitive.' "

So *that's* why he's not in the encyclopedias. An amazing story. But the Secretary of War and a host of others disagree with the dissenting jurors, the various judges, the whole legal system.

McCarty's book can be balanced out by Confederate Courier, a novel-style book that weaves the opinion of the author(Helen Jones Campbell,1964,St. Martin's Press) into a

88/ SCARLET THREADS

believable tale that makes the reader sympathize with "Little Johnny." But Ms. Campbell, in her acknowledgements, lists several Catholic priests as the source of her documentation for the story. It would seem that this is not the way to find the ultimate in objective facts. Perhaps the modern jury, called society, will remain divided on John's innocence. But the agreed-upon facts will suffice us:

There was a conspiracy. The Surratts were involved in it, and were close to John Wilkes Booth. Catholic priests protected and helped to escape, one whom they knew to be charged with conspiracy to murder the President of the United States. He was placed in a military position by the Pope of Rome following his escape. At the end of his life, John Surratt burned all the records involving this matter.

What do you make of it? Pure coincidence? An all-out plot by the Vatican to destroy America? A plot *used and approved of* by Rome? Something to think about.

FORTY-NINE: OF DOUGLAS, DAVIS, AND PIUS IX

Slavery. Lincoln's position is classic American history. Rome's? We talked about that in reference to the Jews and others who were the serfs of the Dark Ages. Slavery was a part of Babylonian ways of thinking from its earliest days.

When Chris Columbus first saw a native American tribe, he wrote in his journal about how useful these people would be as servants! It was part of the mentality. I do not mean to be derogatory here, only stating known facts.

On the other side of the great Lincoln-Douglas debates regarding slavery was Stephen Douglas, whose wife was Roman Catholic.

And, in Doctrines of the Jesuits by Gury (p.71) we are told that

"slavery does not really constitute a crime before any law...divine or human...when one thinks of the state of degradation in which the lords of Africa live...the slave trade may be considered as a providential act..."

Oh really? Don't leak this to the NAACP, or to descendants of John Newman, author of "Amazing Grace," whom God saved from a life of *degradation* which included the trading of human lives for profit.

We are all aware that God takes the most horrendous of actions and uses them for His good. That is God's prerogative. But we must never whitewash the ugliness of the human spirit that created that action. That is man's depravity.

Jefferson Davis, who has been given the Presidency of the Confederate Union when the southern states break from the northern Union, is another piece of the puzzle.

A Roman Catholic? Absolutely not! But a memoir of Davis, published by his wife after his death reads thus:

"Mr. Davis's early education had always inclined in the Roman Catholics..."

Then Davis speaks:

"The Kentucky Catholic school called St. Thomas College, when I was there was connected with the church. The priests were Dominicans. They held large property: productive fields, slaves, flour mills, flocks and herds. As an association they were rich. Individually they were vowed to poverty and self-abnegation. They were diligent, in the care, both spiritual and material, of their parishioners' wants. When I entered the school, a large majority of the boys belonged to the Roman Catholic Church. After a short time I was the

WHEN PEOPLE PROTEST/ 89

only Protestant boy remaining, and also the smallest boy in the school. From whatever reason, the priests were particularly kind to me. Father Wallace, afterwards bishop of Nashville, treated me with the fondness of a near relative."

Davis's pro-Catholic attitude led to even stronger ties during his Presidency. The following is a letter from him addressed to reigning Pope Pius IX:

Richmond, Virginia
September 25, 1863

"Very Venerable Sovereign Pontiff:

The letters you have written to the clergy of New Orleans and New York have been committed to me, and I have read with emotion the deep grief therein expressed for the ruin and devastation caused by the war, which is now being waged against the States and the people who have selected me as their president, and your orders to your clergy to exhort the people to peace and charity. I am deeply sensible of the Christian charity which has impelled you to this reiterated appeal to the clergy. It is for this reason I feel it my duty to express personally and in the name of the Confederate States our gratitude for such sentiments of christian good feeling and love, and to assure your Holiness, that the people threatened even on their own hearts, with the most cruel oppression and terrible carnage is desirous as it has always been, to see the end of this impious war; that we have ever addressed prayers to heaven for that issue which your Holiness now desires; that we desire none of our enemies' possessions, that we merely fight to resist the devastation of our country and the shedding of our best blood, and to force them to let us live in peace under the protection of our own institutions and under our laws, which not only insure to everyone the enjoyment of his temporal rights but also the free exercise of his religion.

"I pray your Holiness to accept on the part of myself and the people of the Confederate States our sincere thanks for the efforts in favor of peace.

"May the Lord preserve the days of your Holiness and keep you under His divine protection."

Jefferson Davis

the reply:

"Illustrious and honorable President,

"Salutation.

"We have just received with all suitable welcome the persons sent by you to place in our hands your letter dated the 25th of Sept. last. Not slight was the pleasure we experienced when we learned from those persons and the letter, with what feelings of joy and gratitude, illustrious and honorable president, as soon as you were informed of our letters to our venerable brother, John, Archbishop of New York, and John, Archbishop of New Orleans, dated the 18th of October last year, and in which we have with all our strength exerted and exhorted those venerable brothers that in their episcopal piety and solicitude they should endeavor with the most ardent zeal and in our name, to bring about the end of that fatal Civil War which has broken out in those countries in order that the American people may

90/ SCARLET THREADS

obtain peace and concord and dwell charitably together.

"It is particularly agreeable to us to see that you, illustrious and honorable President, and your people, were animated with the same desires of peace and tranquility which we have in our letters inculcated upon our venerable brothers. May it please God at the same time to make other people of America and their rulers reflecting seriously how terrible is civil war and what calamities it engenders, listen to the inspirations of a calmer spirit and adopt resolutely the part of peace.

"As for us, we shall not cease to offer up the most fervent prayers to God Almighty that He may pour upon all its people of America the spirit of peace and charity, and that He will stop the great evils which afflict them. We at the same time beseech the God of Pity to shed abroad upon you, the light of His grace and attach you to us by a perfect friendship.

"Given at Rome, at St. Peter's the 3rd day of December, 1863, of our Pontificate Eighteen."

Pius IX

Curiouser and curiouser, as Alice (of Wonderland fame) said. Were you ever taught that the South's President was a personal friend of the Pope?

Be assured that the British government, in an ultimatum to the same Davis, did not call him *President*, nor *illustrious*, and not even *honorable*. (They refer to his new responsibility as the "*so-called Confederate States*.") Nor did Mr. Lincoln.

It leads us even further down this entangled side path, from which we must retreat soon.

Is it possible that a pro-Roman south would be advantageous to a Pope even then trying to put Mexico back in his pocket? A block of Catholic power reaching from South America through Central America, through Mexico, through Texas, on up to the Virginias, and someday up to Maine? (By way of Baltimore, of course.) Surely that had to be going through the minds of *some* Catholic elite. Maybe more than a few...

We must avoid trying to sound *sensational* and we must likewise keep far from the undocumentable. We must in fact learn to say, "I really don't know," on a host of issues.

But, let me remind myself and my reader what I have set out to describe:

Her name is *Babylon*. She is the mother of *all* abominations. In her is found the blood of *all* who are slain on earth. And if her daughters are not outright offspring, we can know that they are at least *adopted* for her own purposes.

Satan takes other forms and has other projects going on the planet. But before it is all over, all roads do indeed lead to Rome...that is, Babylon.

This concludes Part 3. As we plod further into the 19th century, and half-way through the 20th, in Part 4, we will trace the Babylonian connection through 2 world wars, discover how both Hitler and Mussolini were politically tied to Vatican City, discuss Communism, Papal attitudes toward the West in our day, and more.