

PART IV: RIDING 20th-CENTURY 1885-1948

B

FIFTY: THE JEWS AND DREYFUS

In Part III, I left dangling a thread that needs to be pulled tight now. Let's quickly visit Catholic France in the latter part of the 19th century. Our guide is Weinberg, op.cit., pp. 70-71.

"In the late 1800's, French Catholics, especially the clergy, became the soul of French anti-Semitism. They published anti-Semitic newspapers and financed others...students from Jesuit schools, which had practically a monopoly over entrance into the military schools...were especially bitter enemies of the Jews..."

Here in France during this period is where the infamous Dreyfus matter appears. The 1990 Britannica tells us that Alfred Dreyfus was the son of a wealthy Jewish textile manufacturer who entered the military and was accused of selling secrets to the Germans (1894). The legal proceedings which followed were "highly irregular," and he was pronounced guilty. The public, and an anti-Jewish led press, welcomed the verdict.

More investigation. In 1904, after ten years of trials and retrials, during which an entire nation confronted this Babylon-inspired anti-Semitism and made its several stands on it, Dreyfus was fully exonerated.

A happy ending. But I tell the story to remind my readers that we live in a world behind which lurks ever the influences of Nimrod, who hated the God of Shem. You see, to hate a Jew is not a "normal" thing. There is no "reason" for it. And the Britannica writers won't tell you these things, nor the daily news, because they don't know the reason. May God take the scales off our eyes that we may see what God sees, and act accordingly.

FIFTY-ONE: IMMORTALE DEI

It is November of 1885. We will move into the twentieth century with yet another Pontiff making an attack on the American way of life. As you read the following excerpts from the encyclical *Immortale Dei* by Leo XIII, it will be necessary to keep some things in mind. First, the America alluded to in this passage has become quite wicked. Our beloved country is not the Promised Land, nor are its ways necessarily God's. Secondly, *monarchy* is not all that bad. The monarch JESUS will one day rule this planet. How I long for that day!

It is not Godly government or even monarchy that is to be feared. It is *Roman*

monarchy, with its emphasis on a perverted Godliness, false teachings, un-Christian methods, human traditions, anti-Semitic biases, elevation of power-hungry mortals - *that* we fear like the plague!

But Roman monarchy, with all the trappings, is the subject of this century-old statement, addressed to the "faithful" by the "Holy Father."

One more thing, concerning encyclicals. We are told by Rome that an encyclical is far more than just an "opinion" of a Pope, but less than a papal *ex-cathedra* pronouncement. Such pronouncements become binding on all Catholics of all times, and cannot be reversed. Thus a loophole, a way out, exists when discussing encyclicals. One can easily brush them off as obsolete, non-binding, a reflection of the church that *was*, not to be taken seriously.

I suggest however, that in the mind of the Pope who issues such documents, there is no desire to be taken lightly or temporarily. I suggest that the purely human or Satanic - or both - origins of these documents lend themselves to change when it suits the purposes of the ones giving them. I suggest that the teachings of the Roman church, exemplified by these encyclicals, are in a constant state of evolution, adapting themselves to changing needs and demands of humanity. This, in opposition to the solid and *unchanging* nature of the ROCK upon which the true CHURCH is founded, the WORD OF THE LIVING GOD.

So you will find Romanists today who will swear by the following statements, but secretly so in this age of democracy. Others you will find denying the authority of Leo's words for our day. And both camps will be considered "good Catholics." Thus does Satan continue to confuse the world with his doubleminded ways.

The fact remains that, when it was politically allowable to promote such teachings, Leo XIII was calling the demand for "equality," the demand for freedoms of speech, religion, and press, a movement of "unbridled liberty." It was to be *condemned*.

"Of their (democratic) principles this one is the most important: that all men are understood to be equal by birth and by nature, so that in reality they are equals throughout the course of their lives...that he should be free to think what he likes in every matter..."

A horrible idea this, says Leo.

"In a society guided under such rule, there is no other legal authority than the consent of the people, who, as the power is vested exclusively in them, so they alone govern themselves...thus they transfer not so much the right as the function of the government to themselves, and that to be exercised in their name."

Terrible!

"Divine rule is passed over in silence...as if there could be any government whose whole cause, power and authority was not vested in God himself. In this manner, as we see, the State is nothing else than a MOB as its own master and governor."

So, America is rule by the *mob*. And what was Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's

Germany, not to mention Catholic Croatia of the 40's, all of them governments in league with the Vatican?

You understand of course that Papa is speaking of God in Catholic terms, and his idea is that Rome should rule the world and each of its governments. We're not talking here about the Spirit of God given to the Body of Christ and each of its members individually. We're talking about the god of this world, Satan, the present ruler of all things outside the church.

Back to Leo's complaints:

"Hence the following principles have been born: the judgment of every man's conscience is above the law...No consideration is given to ecclesiastical laws: the church is ordered not to interfere in anything...Thus they bring under their own jurisdiction the marriages of Christians...They start out with shouting that the affairs of the Church must be separated from those of the State. Natural reason alone proves that such principles concerning the government of a State are very far removed from the truth...A certain fear of mass-reactions hangs forever over our heads. Such doctrines the Roman Pontiffs. by no means suffered to go without condemnation."

One such Pontiff was Gregory the 16th, in a similar letter in 1832: He

"denounced in very grave terms these doctrines...namely that in matters of divine worship no preference should be shown; that it is right for individuals to judge matters of religion as they see it; that the conscience of each man shall be his sole guide..."

"Neither can we expect," said Gregory, "more favorable results for the government from the wishes of those who plan to separate the Church from the State...It is evident that such a concord is naturally feared by the lovers of the most shameless liberty..."

You got *that* right, Gregory! We fear *greatly* the total union of *beast* and *she who rides him*. When the two are given their full reign, the world is a dark place to live. Give us "shameless liberty," over your *shameful bondage*.

The encyclical of Leo continues:

"From these verdicts of the Popes it must be absolutely understood that the origin of public power is to be sought from God himself and not from the mob.

...it is a crime for private individuals and a crime for states...to treat different kinds of religions in one and the same way; the unabridged power of thinking and of publicly sounding off one's opinion is not among the rights of the citizens..."

Peter J. Doeswyck, in his Catholic Victory in 1960? comments on these extracts from the popes:

"...none of the various forms of governments is per se condemned so long

as they have nothing which is repugnant to Catholic doctrine...As the government of the U.S. upholds the validity of civil marriages contradicted by Christians; as it believes in government of the people (mob), by the people and for the people; as it believes that men are created equal and endowed with unalienable rights; as it believes that government derives its power from the governed; as it upholds freedom of religion, freedom of speech and freedom of the press, American democracy is contrary to Roman Catholic doctrine and, therefore, is condemned."

Living in such a pagan place as America, what is the Catholic's duty? The encyclical continues:

"Therefore in such a complicated course of events, Catholic men, if, as they should, they will listen to Us, will easily see what are their own and the others' duties both in matters of thought and of action.

"And so, in general, it is proper and honorable that the concern of Catholic men should be directed beyond this narrow field and that it should embrace the entire field of public administration. We say here, in general, because these Our precepts reach unto all nations.

"Wherefore it is clear that there is a just reason for Catholics to seek public office for the reason that they may approve that which is morally wrong in the present form of government, but in order that they may change this very form, as far as possible, for the common good, pure and true; keeping in mind this goal: to infuse into all the veins of government the most healthy sap and blood, that is, the wisdom and virtue of the Catholic religion.

"This same method was employed in the early centuries of the Church...by this method Christian principles found their way not only into private homes, but into the army, the senate and into the royal palace itself."

Oh really? Is it your conception that early Christians deliberately sought public office, to infiltrate? Or did people merely seek their own calling and allow God to make *salt* and *light* of them? There is a major difference, you know. When the Christian seeks power and influence of the worldly variety, he is on the Devil's ground and risks losing a purely *Christian* influence, which is nothing more than the Spirit filled life, viewed by the public. Christians are told by early church leaders to be good *slaves*, if that is all life brings them. The pope continues:

"Now, in our times it is fitting that we renew these examples of our forefathers. Catholics indeed, as many as are worthy of the name, must before all things be and be willing to show themselves to be, most loving sons of the Church; all things inconsistent with this honor, they must without hesitation reject; they must use public institutions...and must labor to this end that the whole State shall be transformed into what we have called a christian image and likeness."

Of course you may read "christian" here as *Catholic*.

"The means to obtaining these ends cannot easily be regulated by one and the same method, because they must fit particular places and circumstances, which differ considerably from each other. Nevertheless, let unity of planning be maintained and let uniformity of action be sought above all things. And both will be best attained if all regard the orders of the Apostolic See as the rule of life and take orders from the Bishops...

"...And this Precept must be kept unconditionally by those who are wont to commit their thoughts to writing, especially by those who write for newspapers. In their contention for the higher things there is no room left for internal conflicts or preferences of parties...If therefore there existed some dissensions before, let them be voluntarily done away with and forgotten...**and especially by obedience to the Apostolic See.**

"These then, Venerable Brethren, are the teachings which We hold and which We hereby transmit to all nations of the Catholic world concerning the Christian Constitution of States and concerning the duties of their individual citizens..."

In Biblical terms, though, these are the instructions for women who ride beasts. Why they ride, how they ride, and to what extent they ride. And reading those last words, let no one doubt that the teaching was meant for all Romanists of all times.

So, roughly one hundred years ago, a man who says he "holds on this earth the Place of Almighty God," who pronounces Protestants "enemies of the Christian name," and who proclaims that the only method of cooperation is complete submission to the Roman Pontiff (all in Halley, p.783), speaks to the American people his opinion of our government. In speaking, he represents about one-fifth of the human race. Would you not consider this a serious matter?

What does the Bible have to say about human governments? That we should obey them. That their ultimate controller is God Himself. That Satan is their temporary manager. But other than that, precious little about how they should govern themselves. The Bible addresses itself to the people of God, and gives a beautiful picture of the church's simple government, plus the coming reign of Messiah.

But as often, where the Bible is eloquently silent, Rome has a mouthful. Consider these points in review of this chapter:

- 1) whatever your view of America and world government, you must recognize that there is and always has been among us a foreign government, wanting to control us.
- 2) Catholics in this country are encouraged to do everything they can to "infuse" Catholic "sap" into America's "veins."
- 3) it is conceivable, expectable, that that church is going to try to take power when it can.
- 4) though the written goals seem harmless enough, we have seen this church in power before, and would prefer not to see such again.

The present Roman Catholic law puts it precisely and clearly in canons 1404 and

1405, which I here quote in part:

"The First See 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..."

FIFTY-TWO: THE TWENTIETH CENTURY BEGINS

At the turn of our present century, the Roman system is continuing its diatribes against Protestants through men like "Pius" X . He refers to the leaders of the Reformation as "Enemies of the Cross of Christ."

The outright blasphemies and superstitions continue, as Babylon will always seek to confuse those who are of a gullible nature. Some of its fraudulent techniques are recorded by Eveline B. Mitford, writing in the Monthly Review of London, 1906 (vol. 22):

"In the present day there are twenty well-known gowns and seventy veils of the Virgin Mary, each pronounced to be the real one; twelve heads of St. John the Baptist, in tolerably perfect condition, besides numerous large fragments of his skull and seven extra jaws, each of great note, and held in much reverence in different parts of Europe. St. Julienne and St. Pancras each possess thirty bodies, and St. Peter has sixteen. St. Peter the Dominican only possesses two bodies, but he makes up for the deficiency in the number of his fingers, fifty-six of which are scattered throughout Europe."

Not a quote from the Dark Ages, but from the beginning of this century. Many Catholics will agree to the humorous reality of this calamity if not to the exact numbers suggested above. In fact, "many Catholics" are not implicated in most of the indictments of this book. **I hope I have made myself clear that it is a *system*, and not a person, that God has exposed in His Word.** That system needs exposing. Persons within it simply need to hear God saying "come out of her."

Have you heard that voice yet?

Keep reading. The twentieth century, past present and future, should be Rome's *worst*.

FIFTY-THREE: WORLD WAR I

More and more obvious it must be that this little manual will by no means exhaust the subject at hand. My intention to touch down on the most familiar items of church and world history, to see if church and world are somehow linked, leaves out tons of possible material.

Most of my readers know something about World War I. Is Babylon implicated? I think so.

It is most fascinating to discover, in perusing indexes of books on World War I, that you will not find "Catholic," "Pope," or words related. What the Roman Church did was behind the scenes, and was integrated into the mix long before the events of the early 1900's took place.

Take the Hapsburgs. As I mentioned before, and as Avro Manhattan points out in

his Catholic Imperialism and World Freedom, the Hapsburgs had been the Church's "sword" in Europe. Nearly 1000 years of relating to them were at stake. The loss of this huge benefactor was viewed as a major disaster. The Hapsburgs and the Romanists needed each other.

When the Archduke is murdered, Pius X uses the situation to punish Orthodox Serbia through (Hapsburg) Francis Joseph, the Emperor.

It is distressing to note here that the events taking place (92-93) in the former Yugoslavia have as their historical and spiritual ancestry the events which led up to World War I (not to mention episodes that date back to the Middle Ages, already chronicled.)

The political divisions of the first World War: Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey on one side. Slowly forming an alliance against them are recently-alienated France, England, (Orthodox) Russia, (Orthodox) Serbia, and Belgium.

Serbia. Later to become a part of Yugoslavia. A stronghold of the Eastern Orthodox Church, she evolves slowly into the center of the conflict. Serbia, having just emerged from a conflict in the Balkans, begins to draw nationals from other countries, especially Austria, to her borders.

It is in October of 1913 that the reigning Pope, Pius X, makes a remark, now public record, to the effect that Austria-Hungary should have punished the Serbians for all their wrongs. Austria-Hungary is Roman Catholic.

The Hapsburgs are the intended tools of this punishment, and Rome begins to dream of an all-out victory over the schismatic Serbs, which would send repercussions among all Orthodox, the sworn enemies of Rome's domination of the Church.

Into this mix comes a growing Germany (oddly like the present-day mix in Europe). There has been a struggle here from the 1800's. Protestant Prussia, with her leader Bismarck, are making laws unacceptable to Rome. Catholics are being arrested. Papal pronouncements are issued declaring German laws void. A full one-fourth of the Parliament is Catholic.

Pius IX, who cannot seem to get along with Bismarck, is replaced by Leo XIII, who makes some successful compromises. In fact, Bismarck and Leo begin to lean on each other for help, in a mini-beast relationship. Their common enemy: democracy, rule of the people. So the Pope, through the Bismarckian rule, through the hierarchy of the Church, and through the Catholic "Centre Party," has an ally in Germany.

This group then begins a campaign against the "anti-Christian, Jewish, liberal *capitalism*. A hatred for the democratic spirit is fostered, an attachment to authoritarianism is revived. The way for a dictator is being prepared.

One cannot forget also the hatred Rome feels for the Orthodox Church. Through the years she tries to do away with, punish, overcome, or unite with them. All to no avail. Orthodoxy keeps resurrecting. Now she rises in Tsarist Russia, from the days of Peter the Great (1721) until the "Great War."

So the question in Germany becomes, should the Germans (and thus Catholicism) or the Russians (and thus the Orthodox) rule the world? We know Germany's answer.

So the Pontiff is *deeply* involved in the politics of the region. The first Reich, that is, the Hapsburg's intended domination of Europe, is on the wane. The second Reich now becomes the dream. Hitler will try for yet a third.

As stated, the Austrian archduke Francois Ferdinand is murdered in Sarajevo (also of 1992-93 fame). This is June 28, 1914, the beginning of World War I. The crime is committed by a Macedonian student, not a Serb, but Austria has its reason to begin a war, and to, in the process, reestablish Papal Power.

While outwardly detesting the growing conflict, there are other Papal comments heard behind the scenes from the Papal Secretary of State:

"It would have been impossible to detect any spirit of indulgence and conciliation in the words of His Eminence. It is true that he described the note to Serbia (from Austria, a threat to give in to all its demands, or else) as very harsh, but he nevertheless approved of it entirely and, at the same time and indirectly, expressed the wish that the Monarchy would finish the job. Indeed, added the cardinal, it was a pity that Serbia had not been humiliated much earlier..." (Paris, op.cit. , p.118)

The Bavarian charge d'Affaires to the Vatican had written:

"The Pope agrees with Austria dealing severely with Serbia. He doesn't think much of the Russian and French armies and is of the opinion that they could not do very much in a war against Germany..."(Paris, p. 118)

The Pope, Benedict XV (1914-1922) in Ad Beatissimi, November 1, 1914, tells us the

"...true source of the present deplorable conflict. Truly, as soon as the rules and dictates of Christian wisdom, which are the assured basis of stability and peace, came to be disregarded in the ordering of public life, the very structure of the State began to be shaken to its fall..."

Is he speaking of spiritual attitudes of individual Christians, or the lack of submission to Rome? There is a difference.

He goes on to pledge absolute impartiality. Publicly it would seem he kept this promise. But look again. Catholic Austria is beating up on Orthodox Serbia.

I ask you to consider, in the light of all I have shared so far, do you think it is possible that the Roman Pontiff, wishing to strike at "Orthodoxy," and other traditional enemies, might unleash the horror of a world war on the nations? Or is he merely riding the sure winner -or so he thinks -, the "beast" of the day, to victory and resultant expansion of power? The answer to such a question is academic and will be contested for some time. But what cannot be denied is the intricate binding of the War with the Holy See, as it maneuvers its will via Austria -Hungary and Germany.

Paris (op. cit.) documents what would seem to be contradictions of the Pope's "neutrality." He states that the Pope made public "prayers for peace," just as Germany was

about to be defeated (Jan. 1915), that the Pope hindered food supplies, dissuaded neutrals from joining the Allies, and was perhaps involved in the poisoning of the neutral Vatican Secretary of State.

My, there seems to be no light at the end of this Babylonian tunnel.

I must state that a perusal of a short history of World War I from a secular source gives a much different slant to things, not mentioning the Pope, and stressing Germany. Fair. And there are other factors that could be emphasized, depending on the author's world-view. Let me suggest that a careful blending of all these varied causes is legitimate, as long as one notes the following:

- 1)The Vatican has been world-power-conscious since it inherited the throne from Caesar. I believe I have documented this.
- 2)Austria-Hungary and the Hapsburg Rulers are the main ally of Rome in 1914.
- 3) Germany, though having its Lutheran element, still is strongly Catholic.
- 4)There is nothing Papal Rome would have enjoyed more than the re-empowerment of Central Europe, traditionally the stronghold from which Papa rules.
- 5)Both pro- and anti-war sentiments of the Popes can be documented.

Knowing these things, readers can work the rest out with the historians. And while working, it will be interesting to weave in yet another thread: Fatima.

FIFTY-FOUR: "OUR LADY"

In every part of this story so far we have run across what Ken Samples calls, "The Cult of the Virgin." In 1992, Ken wrote a book by this title which summarizes well the issue before us. I want to share that summary before I introduce the apparition of Fatima. I weave Ken's writings with my own comments in the following paragraphs.

It is no longer appropriate, I believe, to say that Catholics "over"- exalt Mary, and Protestants "under"-exalt her. In fact we are never told to exalt or honor her in Scripture! She certainly knew that all nations would call her blessed, and so she was, but no express command comes from God to venerate her! What we see in the world today is the same worship of the "lady" as has been common since the days immediately following Nimrod.

Though there was a lull in lady-worship shortly after Vatican II, to help draw in Protestants , we are now experiencing a revival of the cult that is alarming, and should be!

Whence the doctrines of Mary in the "Church"?

In 451 A.D., Mary is defined as the *Theotokos*, the "God-bearer," later "Mother of God." Though at first a shocking title, this one is at least logically defensible, since Jesus *is* God! Elizabeth calls her "the Mother of my Lord" in Luke 1:43.

Seldom mentioned, though, is Jesus' own response to her as an equal among all the believers! Absolutely *no prominence* is given her by any Bible author! Not one *word*

about her after the Book of Acts!

Now, in A.D. 553, at the Second Council of Constantinople, she is called "ever virgin." Here Rome is clearly in error, and comes against the Scriptures she claims to be passing on...

The Greek word *adelphos*, "brother", is always used when referring to the male relatives of Christ. Though footnotes in Catholic translations have *changed the word* to "cousin," it is necessary to point out that there *is* a Greek word for "cousin," namely *anepsios*, as in Colossians 4:10.

This is deceit. Call it nothing else. Mary was a virgin **until** Jesus was born. After that Joseph took unto himself his lovely bride and with her had children, *the brothers and sisters of Jesus!*

Each deception builds on the past ones. Mother of God, ever virgin, she must have had an immaculate conception, that is, she must have been spared original sin. At least that's what we're told now. Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Peter Lombard, to name a few, opposed this heresy on Biblical grounds.

Biblical grounds were buried by John Duns Scotus (1264-1308), but even he did not convince the entire church of his day. Finally, in 1854, the doctrine was defined by Pope Pius IX. So, officially, the church taught *nothing* about this doctrine for its first 1800 years.

Mary was indeed "highly favored", "graced", if you will, and was chosen to be so for God's special purpose. She was a willing, obedient servant, who like John the Baptist, was full of the Holy Ghost, equipped for the task. But like John, and all others before the cross, and all of us after the cross, she was made of flesh, was imperfect before a Holy God, and needed a Saviour. (Romans 3:23,6:23,Luke 1:47) We, like her, are filled with God's grace!

If she was conceived without sin, certainly death cannot hold her, reasons the Roman Catholic mind. In the 5th century, to help this reasoning along, a writing written by a supposed apostle begins to circulate. It has no historical validity, but people begin to believe it. It talks of Mary's assumption into heaven. (Remarkably like the original "ladies" of paganism.)

The teaching lays among the Catholic nations for over 1000 years, until in the latter 19th and early 20th centuries a campaign begins to have this teaching accepted as from God. Interesting way of doing business, don't you think? *From among the people* there is a stirring which the hierarchy must decide upon! Is this humanism or what?

Eight million "lay" and one million "religious" vote the assumption in, so Pope Pius XII in 1950, knowing his political base is solid, says, yes, God really wants us to believe that Mary ascended to Heaven like Jesus, body, soul, and spirit.

Through the years, building on these falsehoods, Rome has termed Mary the coredemptrix (since she assented to the birth of Jesus who died for us), the mediatrix (who makes her son more open to our prayers), the dispensatrix (who gives to us what Jesus gives to her for us), and the intercessatrix (who goes to Christ on our behalf.)

In other words, everything Jesus is, Mary is. My heart hurts to write these words.

How far can this go? Jerome's Vulgate translation renders Genesis 3:15 in the feminine gender (*she* shall bruise your head). Mary is called the *neck* through which

everything from Christ to the body of Christ flows. And on and on and on.

Refresh yourself in the Scripture a moment before you read on. Rome notwithstanding, there still is only **one God and one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus.** (I Timothy 2:5). Mary is blessed? **Those who hear and keep the Word of God are blessed more!** said Jesus. Yet make no statue of me, please. When I die, I'll be with Jesus, but my body won't meet my spirit until yours does. And I'll not be visiting you in ghost-fashion. Necromancy is forbidden by my God.

Do you realize that this one called "Queen of Heaven" ,as were the Assyrian and Babylonian goddesses, would have to be omniscient and omnipresent to hear all the prayers addressed to her?

If Mary really is weeping right now, the real Mary, it must be because of all that is being claimed in her name.

She has supposedly "appeared" over 200 times since the 30's, in 32 different countries. Some say there have been over 20,000 sightings throughout history.

In 1531, Guadalupe, Mexico, she told Juan Diego to tell the bishop to build her a "sanctuary", which he did in 1533. Why the bishop was not informed directly we aren't told. In 1709 and 1976, basilicas were built to honor the event.

In 1858, Lourdes, France, one Bernadette Soubirous receives 18 apparitions which instruct her to pray (especially the rosary), walk on her knees, eat grass, and of course, get the message to someone that a chapel is to be built in her honor. (Remember Peter after the mount of transfiguration? "Let's build three tabernacles." Jesus ignores him! The holy temple Jesus wants built in His honor is *you*.)

In Bernadette's 16th revelation, the apparition identifies itself: "I am the Immaculate Conception." Here was a convenient confirmation of the heretical dogma defined by the Church only four years earlier!

And that brings us to 1916. Two outstanding events happen that year, actually. Alexander Hislop carries on the tradition of speaking out against the Roman menace by publishing Two Babylons; and the world is made to focus once more on Mystery Babylon, via some occurrences in Portugal.

The subjects: several young children.

The preview: three visits by an angel calling itself "the angel of peace." The angel proceeds to announce that Mary, the mother of Jesus, will be making several appearances.

The schedule: on the 13th day of the following months, for six months, Mary is to deliver special messages for these special children.

The messages:

May 13. A preliminary introductory greeting, encouraging the children to say the rosary.

June 13. I quote:

"He wants to establish the devotion to my Immaculate Heart...(say the rosary every day) to earn peace for the world...my immaculate heart will be your refuge and the way that will lead you to God."

What saith the Word of God? Again I quote.

"The Eternal God is your *refuge*." Deuteronomy 33:27

"Jesus says to him, ' I am *the way*...NO ONE comes to the Father, EXCEPT BY ME.' " John 14:6

Regarding the rosary there simply IS NO Scripture to quote!

July 13. "Mary" says:

"In October, I will perform a miracle so that all may believe..."

The Bible: "These are WRITTEN so that you may believe."

"Faith comes by HEARING THE WORD OF GOD."

She goes on: "sacrifice yourself for sinners [but JESUS loved us and gave Himself for us.] and say often, ' My Jesus, it is for love of you, for the conversion of sinners, and in reparation for sins committed against the Immaculate Heart of Mary.' "

So it is against *Mary* we have sinned? How utterly blasphemous!

On this same July day, the children are treated to a vision of Hell and demons. To save people from Hell,

"God wishes to establish in the world the devotion to the Immaculate Heart. [so much for the plan of salvation] If they do what I tell you, many souls will be saved, and there will be peace. [But Mary, the *Bible's* Mary, said, "Whatever *HE* says to you, do it!"] The war is going to end. But if they don't stop offending God, another and worse one will begin in the reign of Pius XI. [sure enough, WW II begins at the end of his reign. Where does Babylon get its information? And what does this tell you about the value of the prophetic gift? Can false teachers give true prophecies? Check your Bible dictionary for the name "Balaam."]

"When you shall see a night illuminated by an unknown light, know that this is the great sign that God will give you, that He is going to punish the world by means of war, hunger, and persecutions of the church, and of the Holy Father. [a Roman Catholic term meaning the Pope. Also a Biblical phrase meaning GOD ALMIGHTY. Oh beware! Rome, you have gone too far!] To prevent this, I shall come to ask for the consecration of Russia to my Immaculate Heart...If they listen to my requests, Russia will be converted, and there will be peace. If not she will scatter her errors throughout the world, provoking wars and persecutions of the Church...various nations will be annihilated. In the end, my Immaculate Heart will triumph. The Holy Father will consecrate Russia to me, and she will be converted, and a certain period of peace will be granted to the world."

Still think we're dealing with a lightweight here? These prophecies are documented facts. Their fulfilments are obvious. Their messenger, however, asks you to follow "her," to trust "her." No mention is made of a revival of the Spirit of God, or of people being born into the Kingdom. In the Satanic context of which she speaks, Russia and the Pope getting

it together, "she" is right on. Or mostly so. And through the years *many*, like Jeanne Dixon for example, have been able to see into the future, but never with 100% accuracy.

A true prophet is right *all* the time, and speaks God's words in their fullness. He is not a fortune-teller, but a messenger of God. If he misses once, OR denies revelation already given, he is a false prophet. But false prophets *are right much of the time*. Church, awake!

August 13. Announcing....Joseph AND the CHILD JESUS will be appearing in OCTOBER. Don't miss it!

September 13. An "eyewitness" account of the events of that day:

"At midday there was complete silence. One only heard the murmur of prayers. Suddenly there were sounds of jubilation and voices praising the Blessed Virgin. [official Roman line: "We don't WORSHIP her, we only HONOR her." Not!] Arms were raised pointing to something in the sky. 'Look, don't you see? 'Yes, yes I do...' There had not been a cloud in the deep blue of the sky, and I too (Msgr. John Quaresma) raised my eyes and scrutinized it in case I should be able to distinguish what the others, more fortunate than I, had already claimed to have seen. With great astonishment I saw, clearly and distinctly, a luminous globe, which moved from the east to the west, gliding slowly and majestically through space. My friend also looked, and had the good fortune to enjoy the same unexpected and delightful vision. Suddenly the globe, with its extraordinary light disappeared. Near us was a little girl dressed like Lucia [one of the recipients of the visions] and more or less the same age. She continued to cry out happily: ' I still see it! Now it's coming down...!' "

An old lady on that day cried bitterly because she had seen nothing.

Well, what do you think you would have seen? Was this mass hysteria? The Emperor's New Clothes syndrome? Deceiving Spirits? An Angel of Light? Signs and wonders meant to deceive - if it were possible- the very elect? One thing we can rule out: a revelation from God. God never contradicts Himself! The teachings surrounding this whole series of events are so blasphemous as to let true believers know that God is not a part of it.

October 13. I quote, as in all the above passages from the book by Christopher Rengers, written in 1986, published by Alba House in New York, The Youngest Prophet.

"Many newspapers in Portugal sent reporters to cover the events of October 13. Descriptions of how the throng of 70,000 converged on the Cova da Iria are colorful and graphic. *O DIA* of Lisbon reported: ' For days prior to the thirteenth, groups of pilgrims traveled toward Fatima. They came on foot...food bags on their heads, across the pine groves...people from everywhere whom the voice of the miracle had reached, left their homes and fields, and came on foot, by horse or by carriage...over the plateau, over a hill, or filling a valley, there was a wide and shuffling mass of thousands upon thousands of souls in prayer...' "

To Lucia, Mary is reported to have said:

" I want to tell you to have them build a chapel here in my honor. I am the Lady of the Rosary. Let them continue to say the rosary every day. The war is going to end, and the soldiers will soon return to their homes...Let them offend Our Lord no more, for He is already much offended."Then she opened her hands, from which light emerged, and ascended to "where the sun ought to be. And while she was arising, her own radiance continued shining towards the sun. This the children saw. It was the moment of the miracle of the sun the people saw in the Cova and in a radius of 30 miles...When our Lady disappeared in the immense distance of the sky, next to the sun we saw St. Joseph holding the child Jesus and Our Lady dressed in white with a blue mantle..."

Those readers who know God and His Word are immediately aware of the false suppositions thus bound on a spiritually illiterate people. They will recall that the founders of Islam, Mormonism, and other false religions all have their convenient miracles. No one denies that the supernatural has occurred for any of these false prophets. But discerning Christians understand that the demonic is also supernatural.

So, in the midst of a world gone mad with war and fear, Babylon, whether by its human or superhuman agents one cannot be sure, attempts to manipulate the minds of men with a well-timed sign. How many suffer the torments of Hell in this hour because they believed the lie rather than hear the truth which saves?

In the final historical section of this work, I will return to the documentation of the Mary phenomenon.

FIFTY-FIVE: THE RISE OF COMMUNISM

Following World War I, the attention of the world is directed to Orthodox/Czarist Russia. It must be noted that the Czar and the Orthodox Church are as united as the Holy Roman Emperor and the Catholic Church. They are a mirror image of what is happening in the other *leg* of Babylon, Rome.

You remember, I hope, that "orthodoxy,"[an ambitiously incorrect title for this group], is nothing more than Catholicism's long lost sister, cut off from Rome's blessing because of her refusal to recognize the Pope. There are some other minor differences, but Rome has a way of conciliating itself with all who will bow the knee to Papa. Sister will not do that, at least not as of this writing, though approaches are being made.

Orthodoxy helps make Russia the mess that it is at the turn of the century. The Czar gets too much credit for this by the incoming communists. Those who begin to plan the overthrow of the Russian monarchy are well aware of the effects of religion on this vast nation, though, and their descendants wage a relentless war against what is thought to be worship of God. (while the true worshippers secretly gather in homes and meet God daily!)

1870 has already been noted as the year of the temporal losses of Rome, the year of Papal infallibility. It is also the year in which Vladimir Lenin is born.

Lenin, Marx, Engels, Stalin. The founders of Communism are well known. A few further facts might be helpful:

Some of Communism's leaders are trained by the "church." Stalin, for example, studies for a time in the Theological Seminary of Tiflis. Some have gone so far as to say that Communism is a "Christian heresy," a spinoff of our own faith. It does indeed have many Christian elements in it. But how would Satan deceive the world if he did not include truth with his errors?

Communism has a decidedly UN-Christian side. In fact, one could compare it to the greatest heresy of all, Romanism. Bernard Shaw calls communism the "lay form of Catholicism," which "never had its lack of chaplains."

More. When one compares, piece by piece, the Vatican structure to the Moscow structure (lately defunct), one begins to be suspicious of a single author to both groups' manuals. Consider:

- The extensive use of the color red.
- The presence of a major hierarchy.
- The worship of the top man.
- The priesthood of a select few who run all.
- The blind zeal.
- Attempts at mind control.
- Censorship.
- Unquestioned obedience, loyalty

Blanshard (op. cit.) describes all these items in his book. I would add: anti-Semitism, and anti-EVERYTHING spiritual that is not proscribed and defined by the hierarchy.

Just before the beginning of the Communist Revolution, the Secretary of State of the Vatican is heard to say:

"The victory of Czarist Russia, to whom France and England have made so many promises, would constitute for the Vatican a disaster greater than the Reformation!" (The Vatican in World Politics, p. 16)

So when Bolshevism -Communism - defeats the Czar, there is for a while great rejoicing in Rome. Kerensky, leader of the short-lived first Communist government, even offers religious liberty. The hopes of the Vatican grow!

Later, things change drastically. The church is thrown out, and Vatican Rome becomes the formidable enemy of Moscow. Something about "like" repelling "like."

So now the Vatican is the friend of democracy, and the enemy of the Reds? Even the limited scope of this book has answered that one. Blanshard embellishes the answer:

"The Vatican has always scorned democracy for itself, but it permits its priests to believe in a limited form as long as the power of the Vatican is not affected...the democracy of the US or a dictatorship in Spain is equally acceptable if its attitude toward the Vatican remains positive. Likewise,

democracy in Sweden and dictatorship in Poland has been denounced for reasons that negative attitudes toward the Vatican surfaced...The Vatican is on the democratic side only for the duration of the emergency because the Kremlin is on the other side."

Don't you find it interesting that Rome and the Babylonian way continue to prosper in our world, even with all its setbacks, but Communism, that we all feared so much, has practically gone out of business? God, through Daniel, foretold the constant prosperity of a world power. This is no accident. Rome, for over 2000 years, has not been replaced by any attempted world domination. Napoleon, Great Britain, Hitler, Mussolini, Hirohito, the Communists. All dead, gone, or limited. But Rome? One out of every five people on earth gives at least lip service to this terrible beast that Daniel saw taking the reigns from the Grecian period until the end, and that John saw mounted by a lovely lady of the night.

Rome becomes the great champion of "freedom" from communism. Rome, that tied the world in knots for hundreds of years now decries the atrocities of Moscow. And Moscow eventually falls.

Oh, please hear and understand. An enemy of our enemies is not necessarily our friend. Rome has also attacked, decried, the *American* atrocities. If it takes the election of a Communist-country Pope to set in motion the domino-effect that cripples the Communist world in the 1980's and 1990's, who might we expect to sit on the Throne of Rome next? America and the Middle East continue to be thorns in the Vatican's side. Will the next Pope come from one of these areas?

Once more I have far surpassed the bounds of our present chapter to make a point. We now return to the early years of the century, but reserve the right to discuss this matter again in a different setting.

FIFTY-SIX: AL SMITH, CATHOLIC CANDIDATE

Let's come back to America for a while.

In the 20's is heard the prophetic voice of Dr. Henry Ironside, hailed by Bob Jones University and Wheaton College as a mighty giant of the faith, given by them honorary degrees. He publishes in 1920 a commentary on Revelation, which states premises about Roman Catholicism not unlike the conclusions of this book:

"There is no mistaking her identity. Pagan Rome was the lineal successor of Babylon. Papal Rome absorbed the Babylonian mysteries; and the Rome of the beast in the last days will be the seat of the revived satanic system that began with Nimrod and his infamous consort Semiramis, which has from that day to this been opposed to everything that is of God..." (p.299)

He goes further:

"It is a lamentable fact that Babylon's principles and practices are rapidly but surely pervading the churches that escaped from Rome at the time of the Reformation. We may see evidences of it in the wide use of high-sounding ecclesiastical titles..., in the revival of holy days and church feasts

such as Lent, Good Friday, Easter and Christ's Mass [Christmas]...I quite admit that some of these festivals if divested of any ecclesiastical character may be observed in innocence in the home, but when they are turned into church festivals they certainly come under the condemnation of Gal. 4:9-11...All of them...are Babylonish in their origin, and were at one time linked with the Ashtoreth and Tammuz mystery-worship...We do well to remember that Babylon is a mother, with daughters who are likely to partake of their mother's characteristics." (p.301)

Eighteen years he pastored the Moody Church of Chicago. Only two Sundays in all those years was no one found at the altar seeking to know Christ. He was a man of faith, fruit, and conviction. But this one conviction, regarding Rome, might keep him from pastoring at most "great " churches of our day.

In 1927, another Henry, Henry Halley, publishes his Bible Handbook, from which I have, with Hislop, quoted freely. This book also is not quoted quite so much in many Protestant, even evangelical, circles these days.

But in the first 20 years of our century, at least, a strong witness against Romanism abounded.

For the first time in U.S. history, a Roman Catholic is running for President. It is still 1927.

We have already considered the Papal attitudes toward Americanism, and the philosophy of involvement foisted upon the American Catholic population. We know why Catholics want to come to power in any land.

So we are not surprised to see Al Smith challenged by Protestants, who quote from the *Syllabus of Errors* (1864), the Papal statement which attacks the separation of church and state among other American-held ideals. Smith's reply is that he has never *heard* of any "Syllabus." Later, he *has* heard of it, but he labels it "obsolete." Sounds familiar.

Smith goes on to put in print his personal creed, to set everyone at ease. As you read his "confession of faith," the natural question is, "Is this a true Catholic? Does his religion mean anything to him? If he takes his religion so lightly, do I want him as my president? Or is he just lying to me?"

So he's either fabricating this whole viewpoint, or being false to his convictions. And after he is elected? Will he change his views suddenly? Can we read his lips and believe it when he says, "I will not be an instrument of Rome to take over this country." ?

The actual statement:

"I recognize no power in the institutions of my Church to interfere with the operations of the Constitution of the United States or the enforcement of the law of the land. I believe in absolute freedom of conscience for all men and in equality of all churches, all sects, and all beliefs before the law as a matter of right and not as a matter of favor. I believe in the absolute separation of Church and State...I believe that no tribunal of any church has any power to make any decree of any force in the law of the land...I believe

in the support of the public school as one of the cornerstones of American liberty." (Atlantic Monthly, April, 1927)

One wonders if the original version added, "and the holy father approves of this whole statement." Was Papa in on this statement? So that the good "sap" could be infused into America's veins? Or was Papa somewhere weeping as he read of one of his sons so blatantly *denying* standard Catholic policy?

There is another option to all of this. Maybe AI really believes that his church's power structure is no threat to the security of the United States. Maybe he is a typical American Catholic who doesn't bother to look behind the scenes at what Rome really is about, or read the history books about Papal domination of past eras. Maybe he is just as shocked at America's response as many readers of this book will be. It is to the *average Catholic* that I appeal. Do you *really* know what the ROMAN (that is, initiated and headquartered in Rome) CATHOLIC (that is, universal in its appeal and *reign*) "church" is all about?

Maybe Mr. Smith is similarly unfamiliar with the Manual of Christian Doctrine, published in 1926 in Philadelphia. It is an official Catholic book, approved by one Cardinal Dougherty.

Catholic children growing up in these United States during the days of Smith's candidacy are led through this catechetical inquiry:

Q. Why is the Church superior to the state?

A. Because the end to which the Church tends is the noblest of all ends.

Q. In what order or respect is the state subordinate to the Church?

A. In the spiritual order and in all things referring to that order.

Q. What right has the Pope in virtue of this supremacy?

A. The right to annul those laws or acts of government that would injure the salvation of souls or attack the natural rights of citizens.

Knowing which "church" the above refers to makes this an irksome series of responses. I can think of some questions and answers of my own:

Q. Who, though Lord of all, became a man, dwelt among us, and submitted to every human authority placed over Him?

A. Jesus, the Messiah.

Q. Did this Jesus *ever* try to pit the church against the world's governments?

A. No.

Q. Were the followers of Jesus likewise exhorted to obey earthly authority except when the preaching of the Gospel was at stake?

A. Most assuredly!

Q. When challenged, imprisoned, beaten, and otherwise tortured by these governments, did the true followers of Jesus ever rebel against secular authority?

A. Not once!

The manual's implications have to do with the ROMAN church, not *all* churches.

Catholic teaching is that the "rights of citizens include the right of all men to be *Roman Catholics* and promulgate *Catholicism*."

Equality for all churches? Nonsense! In 1929, the Catholic institution has itself named the *state religion* of Italy. Would it accept a similar position in the United States?(Is the Pope Catholic?)

So, Al Smith, do you really believe what you're saying? All churches equal? And as to the separation of church and state: (back to the *Manual*)

Q. What then is the principal obligation of heads of state?

A. Their principal obligation is to practice the Catholic religion themselves, and as they are in power, to protect and defend it.

Q. Has the state the right and the duty to proscribe schism or heresy?

A. Yes, it has the right and the duty to do so both for the good of the nation, and for that of the faithful themselves...religious unity is the principal foundation of social unity.

Q. When may the state tolerate dissenting worship ? [note: the *church* never does!]

A. When these worships have acquired a sort of legal existence consecrated by time and accorded by treaties or covenants.

Q. May the state separate itself from the Church?

A. No, because it may not withdraw from the Supreme rule of Christ.

Q. On what conditions are civil laws binding?

A. ...that the legislating power has no law contrary to the natural law, or to the positive divine law. Otherwise a civil law is entirely null, and should not be observed.

Informed citizens of the 1928 election refused Al Smith the right to lead America. Thirty-two years later, misinformed Americans threw caution to the wind. John Kennedy, raised in an era when the afore-quoted *Manual* was still being taught as Gospel truth in Catholic schools, somehow convinced us that he too was *above* Papal edicts.

We were not really allowed to find out what might have been....

But, times change. People forget. That is the reason for books such as this one.

FIFTY-SEVEN: MUSSOLINI AND THE POPE

Rome is on the verge of undoing the shame caused her in 1870, when all her property is ruthlessly stripped away. Now, a naked sovereign is still a sovereign, but normally not quite so proud. I have already documented the pride of the naked period. Now for some clothing.

And who shall take us to the clothing store? He must be Italian. He must hate what the Vatican hates, namely the present government of Italy. He must be a strong leader upon whom we can depend. He must have a world vision.

Yes, Mr. Mussolini, *Il Duce*, you will do fine. From this day on, I, Papa, will recognize you and your government, if you will help make me the Ruler I used to be. You

will be my new Charlemagne, my new Constantine! Welcome to Italy!

Can it really be that one feared and hated the world over for his atrocious dictatorial style, second only, perhaps, to Hitler, his peer and ally, could be so warmly accepted by the "church?" Oh yes. As Pius XI in 1922 is condemning democracy on this side of the Atlantic, fascism and naziism are being blessed into being on the other side. At the head of the Italian form of the disease is one hailed by the Vatican as a man "sent by Divine Providence, " Benito Mussolini.

This well-documented history is often a shock to those who have not taken the time to check it out . I give you in the next paragraphs actual excerpts from, first, the treaty between Italy and the Holy See, 1929, and then from the "concordat," the Vatican's formalization of relationship with a secular power.

The treaty:

Article I: Italy recognizes (that) the Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion is the sole religion of the State.

Article II: Italy recognizes the sovereignty of the Holy See in the international field as an inherent attribute of its nature [amen!] in conformity with its traditions and the exigencies of its mission in the world.

Article IV...there cannot be any interference whatsoever on the part of the Italian government...within Vatican City there will be no other authority than the Holy See.

Article VIII: Italy considers the person of the Supreme Pontiff as sacred and inviolable, and declares attempts against him, or incitement to commit them, punishable by the same penalties established for attempts or incitement to commit them against the person of the King...[Jesus: they hated Me, they will hate you also. They persecuted Me, they will persecute you. My Kingdom is not of this world, or my servants would fight.]

Article XXIV...in consequences of this declaration, Vatican City will always and in every case be considered neutral and inviolable territory.

Article XXVI: The Holy See agrees (that)...the Roman Question (is) definitely and irrevocably settled and therefore eliminated, and recognizes the Kingdom of Italy under the dynasty of the House of Savoy, with Rome the capital of the Italian State. Italy in her turn recognizes the State of the Vatican City under the sovereignty of the Supreme Pontiff.

The Concordat:

Article I: Italy, according to the terms of Article I of the treaty, assures to the Catholic Church free exercise of spiritual power, free and public exercise of worship...

Article V:...apostate priests or those incurring censure cannot be employed in a teaching post or any office or employment in which they have immediate contact with the public.

Article XI: The State recognizes the holidays established by the Church, which are: All Sundays, New Year's Day, Epiphany, St. Joseph's Day,

Ascension Day, Corpus Domini, the Feast of the Apostles Sts. Peter and Paul, the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, All Saints' Day, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, and Christmas Day.

Holy See shall communicate the name of the chosen person to the Italian government, in order to be sure that the government has no objections of a political nature against such person...

Article XXXVI: Italy considers the teaching of Christian Doctrine according to the forms received from Catholic tradition as the foundation and crown of public education. Therefore Italy consents that the religious teaching now imparted in the elementary schools be further developed in the middle schools...Only textbooks approved by the ecclesiastical authorities will be used in the public schools for religious training.

This is what the Vatican does in any country where the door is open, or, if she can shove hard enough, where the door is *shut*. Is there a catechism in your child's future?

After all, says Pius XI,

"There exists an institution able to safeguard the sanctity of the law of nations. This institution is a part of every nation; at the same time, *it is above all nations...divinely commissioned to lead mankind*. She has great prestige which has...been greatly increased since the close of the war...cannot but succeed...she cannot tolerate that the State...violate the rights of God Himself over civil society..." (Ubi Arcano Dei, December 23, 1922)

Now on to Mussolini's ally and partner, who likewise became the Vatican's.

FIFTY-EIGHT: HITLER AND WORLD WAR II

Let's back up to the end of World War I. The Hapsburg Dynasty has crumbled. Rome is worried about its future prospects. Protestant areas of Czechoslovakia, Orthodox portions of Yugoslavia, Orthodox Russia, all are European threats to the Roman block of security. Can the Hapsburgs revive?

In July of 1917, Austria Hungary sees nothing but negative in its future, and tries for a separate peace with the Allies. Emperor Charles sends a letter of "filial obedience" to Pope Benedict XV, in which he leaves to "his august authority" the decision of the "sacrifices which the Austria-Hungary Empire had to make to obtain a quick peace. "

It doesn't work, but we see here again the involvement of the Papacy in this war.

Charles is defeated but refuses to abdicate, and takes refuge in Switzerland. He is supported by Hungarians who begin the formation of an army. He invades Hungary and almost wins it back. But no, not this time. He is captured, dethroned, and deported to the island of Madeira.

Before he left, Charles had planned a confederation of Catholic States, over which he would reign: In Yugoslavia, Croatia; in Czechoslovakia, Slovakia ; in Germany, Bavaria and Alsace-Lorraine; and all of Austria and Hungary. Some day, he dreams, his son Otto

will reign. Otto is in fact trained for the job.

In June of 1936, he is quoted as saying, "The time for taking a decisive action has come," and "I am ready to enter the country at any time." (Manhattan, op. cit.) Supported by Mussolini and the reigning Pope, Pius XI, he is as good as "in" when another rising star sets him aside temporarily. Rome decides that Hitler may serve its purposes just as well...

Adolf Hitler is born April 20, 1889, in Catholic Austria. He moves to a Catholic part of Germany at age three. At ten, he "temporarily thought of becoming a monk, but the mood passed quickly." (Adolf Hitler, p.61, by Bradley Smith)

His father and mother are essentially cousins and need permission from the Pope to marry. Mother in particular is a faithful Catholic, completely devoted to the faith and teachings of Rome. As to Adolf,

"he was skeptical about the church from an early date and persistently annoyed his religious instructor in the Realschule. His father had long been suspicious of the church." (Smith, op. cit., p.85)

None of these negatives keep him from being confirmed at the age of fifteen. The process had no effect on him, but there can be no question as to the intent of his mother to make young Adolf into a "good Catholic."

The closest thing to religious enthusiasm Hitler experiences is his devotion to (anti-Semitic) Richard Wagner's music. *Parsifal*, the Wagnerian opera which tells of a mythical "Christian" youth who through many struggles does the noble deed he has set out to do, is Hitler's favorite. He even says, "Out of Parsifal I make a religion."

One night, after he has seen another such Wagnerian epic, based on the life of a Roman commoner who became a dictator, and sought to restore the ancient greatness of Rome, Hitler

"burst into rapturous eloquence. His eyes were feverish with excitement. He spoke in a transported way of a future day when he would be entrusted with a 'special mission' " (Hitler, the Path to Power, Charles Flood, p.8)

After the difficulties and rejections through which all world figures pass, Hitler begins his rise to power. During these years he has read much about anti-Semitism. I don't need to tell my readers the prime source of anti-Jewish feeling for a young Catholic boy of that day...

Racism is not merely tolerated in the pre-Hitler era; by many it is promoted as something godly. When Houston Stewart Chamberlain writes The Foundations of the 19th Century, a purely racist view of history, Kaiser Wilhelm II tells him, "It was God who sent your book to the German people."

And rising Adolf Hitler, who sees in Chamberlain a hero of heroes since Chamberlain has married the daughter of his great god Wagner, is given the greatest of acceptances when Chamberlain passes on the compliment:

"My belief in the Germans has always been strong...although it had ebbed...you have changed the state of my soul. That Germany can give birth to a Hitler in a time of direst need is proof of her vitality. May God protect

you."

So God is involved in this Hitler thing? The Roman Church seems to have thought so. Though for a short time she opposes Naziism, "after Hitler came to power, all this was changed. The bishops revised their attitude. A concordat was signed with the Holy See." (July 3, 1933)

Are we talking about the same Hitler? How can the Lord and His Church be in any way implicated in the Nazi movement? Hitler gives a partial answer in his famous Mein Kampf, p. 118:

"By warding off the Jews, I am fighting for the Lord's work."

Spiritual sentiments from one like Hitler seem unimaginable, but in fact this tyrant did believe he was doing God a service. The world's greatest Jew hater says:

"We must see to it that God's will is not simply talked about, but that God's will is also fulfilled."

My feelings exactly! Sounds very Christian to me. Oh Church, are you listening? Out of the mouth of the great deceiver of Germany comes Gospel truth! Beware!

Rome agreed with the Hitler philosophies, too. And Rome is eloquently silent during much of the massacre we have labeled the *Holocaust* (burnt offering).

DeRosa, op.cit., pp 196 ff:

"When Mussolini began putting pressure on the Jewish community, Pius initiated his habit of saying nothing. On 4 June 1940, Italy entered the war on Hitler's side. By the end of 1941, three-quarters of Italian Jews had lost their livelihood. The scene was set for what many, Catholics included, consider the most shameful of all papal encyclicals...It was the one that was never written...Jews were being systematically victimized, and in many well known cases, killed. Not one unequivocal word of condemnation issued from the Vatican. This silence, many say, was worse than any heresy."

"The mass extermination of Jews were now common knowledge...the Archbishop of Canterbury..said, 'It is a horror beyond what imagination can grasp.' There was one man in the world whose witness Hitler feared, since many in his armies were Catholics. That one man did not speak. In the face of what Winston Churchill was to call ' probably the greatest and most horrible single crime ever committed in the whole history of the world,' he chose to stay neutral.

"head of the German church in Rome, recognizing that the round-up of Jews in Rome was a key moment, informed the German command that the arrests must stop. Otherwise the pope would have to make an open stand 'which will serve the anti-German propaganda as a weapon against us.'...Jews were being snatched practically under the pope's window...he..would have no alternative but to protest...These fears proved groundless. Pius XII said nothing at all."

"Could not His Holiness, who declared infallibly in 1950 that a Jewess was

taken up body and soul into heaven, have said authoritatively in 1942 that her race was not to be annihilated for being Jewish?"

Thus they continued, by this silence, their undying, unabated hatred of the modern-day children of Israel. *Many* individual Catholics were opposed to the Nazis, but the *system* kept its distance, many of the insiders privately rejoicing in the victory over their ancient enemy.

Where does Adolf Hitler get his money? In part, from the Vatican's other ally, Italy. From Who Financed Hitler?, Pool, we read:

"Covert funding to sponsor international fascism was an essential policy of Mussolini's government...The numerous reliable sources which have cited that the Nazis received financial support from Mussolini are more than enough evidence for a sound conclusion."

One big happy family. The Vatican supports Italy. Italy supports Germany. Together it's back to the Age when Rome via Germany ruled the world, i. e., *The Holy Roman Empire*.

Too severe a conclusion? Listen to *The Voice of the Nazarene*, of Finleyville, PA, as it adds other supporting evidence that Rome is once more tied in to a World War:

"The first government that Hitler constituted was 2/3 Catholic. In Czechoslovakia, it was Catholic Slovakia that played Hitler's game. The Austrian Cardinal literally threw himself at Hitler's feet...Von Papen, Privy Chamberlain to His Holiness John XXIII (good old John, they called him), was former vice-chancellor of the Reich, and condemned to eight years hard labor at Nuremberg...escaped death by intervention of the Pope...The Nazi foreign minister was a Catholic...The chief propagandist for the Nazis was Goebbels, also a Catholic...The principal leaders of the Nazi Party were Himmler, Heydrich, Mueller, and Frank. All were Roman Catholic. Frank, the 'Butcher of Poland,' like Von Papen, had an intercessor, this time Pope Pius. But without success. Nuremberg found him guilty and punished him."

The evidence that the fascism of the day was linked to Rome is overwhelming. Italian, German, Spanish, Croatian...When a nation begins to think of itself as *THE* nation, and its religion happens to be Catholic, the world should tremble.

In 1937 the Pope explains in one of his encyclicals that his connection to Hitler is made merely to "preserve the church." Indeed. The Vatican was told that it must give total allegiance to the Regime in order to have a functioning diocese in Germany.

Now the Pope expresses regret. Maybe it was a mistake after all. Hitler isn't what he had expected. He (the Pope) is sorry.

That's one way of explaining it. But in 1936, Cardinal Faulhaber, in Munich, is saying, "...all the civilized world, but especially the Catholic nations, must unite into a holy crusade against atheist Russia..."

Poor usage of words in the light of the *Crusades* of an uncivilized time perpetrated by the same group.

And the Bishop of Munster, 1936: "It is the duty of every Catholic, and of every civilized nation, to defeat and crush Godless communism."

And to do it, we will use Godless Naziism?

In 1942, the German bishops are saying,

"...a victory over Bolshevism would be equivalent to the triumphs of the teachings of Jesus over that of the infidels." (all bishops' quotes from Vatican in World Politics by Avro Manhattan.)

Do late 20th-century Americans realize that a *Holy War* was being fought in the 30's and 40's? Politics was wedded, as always, but deeply *religious* issues were at the heart of it all. So the eventual outcome of the War means more than we ever dreamed!

As you may know, more than Germany and Italy are in this drama. The third mighty member of the Axis trio is Japan. And how strange the connection between that nation and the Vatican, as H.G. Wells points out in his Crux Ansata:

"Having tied himself irrevocably to the Axis, (Pius XII) had to accept, and he accepted all too readily, the assimilation for mutual assistance of Shintoism and Catholicism.

"How far that assimilation has gone let this passage from Professor Karl Adams' The Spirit of Catholicism bear witness:

" ' We Catholics acknowledge readily, without any shame, nay with pride, that **Catholicism cannot be identified simply and wholly with primitive Christianity , nor even with the Gospel of Christ** in the same way that the great oak cannot be identified with the tiny acorn. There is no mechanical identity, but an organic identity. And we go further and say that thousands of years hence Catholicism will probably be even richer, more luxuriant, more manifold in dogma, morals, law, and worship, than the Catholicism of the present day. A religious historian of the fifth millennium A.D. will without difficulty discover in Catholicism conceptions and forms and practices which will derive from India, China, and Japan, and he will have to recognize a far more obvious complex of opposites. It is quite true Catholicism is a union of contraries. But contraries are not contradictions...The Gospel of Christ would have been no living Gospel, and the seed which He scattered no living seed, if it had remained ever the tiny seed of A.D. 33, and not struck root, and had not assimilated foreign matter, and had not by the help of this foreign matter grown up into a tree, so that the birds of the air dwell in its branches.' "

Wells points out,

" It is interesting to consider these conceptions, forms and practices that the Roman Catholic Church is now incorporating...the great assimilation has begun. The crude early Christians, still in the acorn phase, preferred

martyrdom to burning a pinch of incense to the Roman God-Emperors, but the Roman Catholic Church of today has already established friendly relations with the Shinto faith, and the Japanese Catholic bows in the Shinto temples in acquiescence to the local supremacy of the Emperor-Divinity over the Vatican..."

Those are the words of one we call an infidel, one who doubted God all his days. His vision of the church was a Roman one, and he refused it. How the name *Christian* has suffered at the hands of Babylon!

But his point is well taken. In the name of expediency, in the name of anti-communism, in the name of assimilation, and through the logic of men like the above-quoted professor, the church and its Christ are made to join hands with Satan's tools all over the earth.

Before leaving this War, it is important to take another trip to old Yugoslavia, where World War I began, you will recall. The place that is making headlines yet today...and for the same reasons? The extermination of heretics, world control?

In 1941, Yugoslavia is a neutral player in the war efforts of Hitler *et al*. The country is a blend of cultures and religions. The religions are represented by Roman Catholicism, Orthodoxy, Islam, and Judaism.

One section of Yugoslavia, Croatia, quite Catholic, welcomes the German invasion and, with the Germans, begins to turn on its fellow-countrymen.

Archbishop Stepinac is Vicar General of the Army in Croatia, an army which begins to slaughter mercilessly all enemies of the faith (as you know from modern headlines, this is called ethnic cleansing). Hear Adrian Pigott in Freedom's Foe, the Vatican, p. 44:

"A favorite method was to drive the Serbs inside an Orthodox Church, bolt the doors and then set the building on fire...hundreds of thousands of Croatia's Serbs, Moslems, Jews, and bewildered gypsies were rounded up and condemned to death, torture, or mutilation. Orthodox churches were burnt down; in some cases sons were compelled to assault their own mothers before the altars. In winter, victims were driven onto the frozen rivers and were plunged to death through holes made in the ice. Expectant mothers had their bodies ripped open by Romanist daggers.

"At a place called Nevisinje, a Serb family of father, mother, and four children were captured...The mother and children were kept together and starved for a week, and then a savoury dish of roast meat was brought in to them; naturally they ate ravenously enough - and then they were callously informed that they had just eaten some of their husband and father.

"Peter Brzica, a law student, who had attended a Franciscan college, was a member of the Catholic Order of Crusaders. He was one of the Quislings in control of the concentration camp at Jasenovac...

"Bets were made as to who could kill the largest number of inmates; and with a specially sharp butcher's knife, Brzica cut the throats of no fewer than 1,360 Yugo-Slav prisoners - his own countrymen.

"Having been proclaimed the prize-winner of the competition, he was elected to be 'King of the Cut-throats'...

"These are some of the actions which the agents of the 'Holy Catholic Church' use in their 20th-century efforts to stamp out its rivals...even the Germans and Italians were often nauseated by what the Croats did..."

Politically, Croatia has its roots in Hungary, where for eight centuries it was controlled but legally independent.

Then came the Ottoman rule (1526), Turk rule (until 1699) and the Hapsburgs (until 1868). Then it was back to Hungary, and then in 1918 Croatia joined with the Serbs and Slovenes. Later this amalgamation was known as Yugoslavia.

In April of 1941, through the workings of the Vatican at a most opportune time, Croatia took advantage of the situation and declared itself an independent state. It was *immediately* recognized by Germany and Italy.

Its leader was Ante Pavelic, the head of a fascist terrorist organization called *Ustasa*. Extreme brutality, violence, and priestly involvement were the trademarks of this group.

In 1945, Croatia was joined with Yugoslavia as a "people's" republic, Communist style, under Tito. From then until 1980 it was relatively stable. Then the vacuum of power created by Tito's death led to the predicament we 1990-ers now read about daily.

Colliers of September 1943 paints the picture of Pavelic as a guilty war criminal. Indeed he was, and he fled when Naziism and Fascism collapsed. First he ran to Catholic Argentina, then to Catholic Paraguay. From there he went to Catholic Spain. He lived and died a loyal Roman Catholic. And because of this one man, 700,000 men, women and children lost their lives.

Pavelic was aided by Archbishop Stepinac, also accused as a war criminal. On April 28, 1941, Stepinac writes a personal letter asking the Croatian clergy to support and defend Pavelic's Croatia. When, later, Pavelic is running for his life, Stepinac takes charge of the government himself.

The ethnic cleansing syndrome of the 40's in Croatia is made clear by a statement made by Catholic Minister of Justice Zanitch on June 2, 1941:

"This state, our country, is only for the Croats. There are no ways and means which we will not use to make our country truly ours and to clean it of all Orthodox Serbs."

The ways and means: Bury people alive. Concentration camps run by clergy. Terrorist raids. Starvation. Deprivation. Public hangings. Crucifixions...When you shock a Nazi, you're pretty shocking. The Nazis were aghast.

Any sign of shame over these incidents at the time? No. In fact, the resurrection of Croatia is said to be equal to that of Christ:

"The great son of the Croatian people returned and gave them their liberty and ancient rights. This is the work of God. The Lord *did it all...*

"Christ and the Ustachi and Christ and the Croats march together through history...our Holy Saviour will help us in the future as He has done

until now. That is why the new Ustachi Croatia will be Christ's, ours, and no one else's!"

The Catholic Croatians, allied to Adolf Hitler, are represented by this priestly voice: "Until now, God spoke through papal encyclicals - and? They closed their ears. Now God has decided to use other methods...led by Hitler. The sermons will be heard with the help of cannons, machine guns, tanks and bombers."

Catholic Croatia did not die at the end of World War II. It reappears in terrorist groups all over the world, awaiting its chance to resurface. But the old *religious hatreds* that resurfaced in our decade are not what Croatia had expected. More later.

We are now left with a painful but familiar question. What can we expect of Catholic power in the future? Are there Catholic minorities in many lands, waiting their chance to take power?

Is the Catholic Church, in this 20th century, still willing to be coercive, and force itself on the populations it inhabits? Has it learned from its former conquests that people eventually will not be forced?

In partial answer, I offer the words of one of Britain's "all-time greats" of Romanism, Msgr. Ronald Knox, author, Biblical scholar (d. 1957). Knox was especially strong in Roman ways as he had "converted" from Anglicanism. I quote from The Belief of Catholics:

"Is it just, since thought is free, to penalize in any way differences of speculative outlook? Ought not every church, however powerful, to act as a body corporate within the state, exercising no form of coercion except that of exclusion from its own spiritual privileges? It is very plain that this has not been the Catholic theory in times past. There has been, in Catholic nations, a definite alliance between the secular and the spiritual power. So, to be sure, has there been among Protestant nations. But may it be understood that in our enlightened age Catholics would repudiate the notion of any such alliance in the future?"

"It must be freely admitted that this is not so. You cannot bind over the Catholic Church, as the price of your adhesion to her doctrines, to waive all right of invoking the secular arm in defense of her own principles. The circumstances in which such a possibility could be realized are indeed sufficiently remote. You have to assume, for practical purposes, a country with a very strong Catholic majority, the overwhelming body of the nation. Probably (though not certainly) you would have to assume that the non-Catholic minority are innovators, newly in revolt against the Catholic system, with no ancestral traditions, no vested interests to be respected. Given such circumstances, is it certain that the Catholic government of the nation would have no right to insist on Catholic education being universal

(which is a form of coercion), and even to deport or imprison those who unsettle the minds of its subjects with new doctrines?

"It is certain that the Church would claim that right for the Catholic Government, even if considerations of prudence forbade its exercise in fact. The Catholic Church will not be one amongst the philosophies. Her children believe, not that her doctrines may be true, but that they are true, and consequently part of the normal make-up of a man's mind; not even a parent can legitimately refuse such education to his child. They recognize, however, that such truths (unlike the mathematical axioms) can be argued against; that simple minds can easily be seduced by the sophistries of plausible error; they recognize, further, that the divorce between speculative belief and practical conduct is a divorce in thought, not in fact; that the unchecked development of false theories in ethical aberrations -Anabaptism yesterday, Bolshevism today- which are a menace even to the social order. And for these reasons a body of Catholic patriots, entrusted with the government of a Catholic State, will not shrink even from repressive measures in order to perpetuate the secure domination of Catholic principles among their fellow-countrymen.

"It is frequently argued that if Catholics have at the back of their system such notions of 'toleration,' it is unreasonable in them to complain when a modern state restricts, in its turn, the political or educational liberty which they themselves wish to enjoy. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. The contention is ill-conceived. For when we demand liberty in the modern state, we are appealing to its own principles, not to ours."

The heart sinks to know that this 20th-century scholar of Rome unabashedly proclaims, Malcolm-X style, that Rome is willing to gain power and keep power by *any means necessary*. That Rome equates the great saints of the Anabaptist movement with the Communist menaces. That neither parents or educators would be able to keep a Catholic-dominated nation from forcing its children to learn the Catholic ways in the schools of the land. That to be a Catholic is to have *normal* thinking processes. All other thinking is sub-normal. That all Catholic talk about democracy and liberty is geared only toward the eventual emancipation of *Catholicism*, after which time all democracy and liberty will cease.

I must sound naive. Of course Rome believes this. The planet is dotted with countries where this very state of affairs exists. Oh believers in Jesus, awaken! Come out of her! Do not share in her program lest you share in her eventual condemnation!

Knox's book was criticized in some quarters, but never banned from Catholic thinking. It stands as a warning to us all.

The "great wars" are over, but the battle is far from won. Rome continues to meddle in the affairs of states great and small, one of the smallest -yet one of the greatest

to a true believer- being Israel. Let's see what is going on there.

This is the conclusion of part IV. In the final historical section, part V, we'll trace the Roman Institution from the late 40's through its "transformation" in the 60's to its present state. In later parts I'll give my own experiences among the Romans, and comment about Roman influence among Protestants.