

# Transdnistria and Moldova Affirm Russian Preference Alarm Globalists

[New Era World News](#)

**GLOBAL LIBERALISM CONTINUES TO UNRAVEL** as nation after nation questions its moral, economic and or political agenda and resets formal relations with Russia. This week it is Transdnistria, the eastern neighbor of Moldova, which also recently elected an anti-liberal and pro-Russian President, Igor Dodon, on November 13, 2016. Since pro-Russian Dodon defeated pro-World Bank and pro-European Union Maia Sanduhis, the election heralded a significant shift toward Russia and away from the European Union (EU).

*“Speaking to Russian television after the vote, President Dodan said [Moldovans had voted for “friendship with Russia, for neutrality, for our orthodoxy, for the country’s union.”](#)”*

Dodan is aware that “a very serious combat is ahead”, a combat between EU liberal globalists leaning westward and Moldovan patriots leaning to the east. However, he said, “we are ready for this combat.”

To aid him in this battle, eastern neighboring Transdnistria has also elected a pro-Russian president, Vadim Krasnoselski, who garnered 62% of the vote in the December 11, 2016 presidential election. Since 1991 Transdnistria has sought independence from Moldova, which had affiliated itself with its western neighbor, Romania, a member of the United Nations and the European Union, while Transdnistria, which has a large Russian and Slavic population remained committed to Russia, a move that helped it attain and retain its autonomy from Moldova in 1992. During this period Russian troops were stationed in the breakaway region of

Transdniestria against the wishes of the Moldovan government, which insisted that they leave “completely and unconditionally.”

To this day, Russia continues to support Transdniestria, which permits it to retain a small but significant military presence on its soil as an eastern buffer zone bordering the Black Sea. As Moldova moved further into the ambit of the EU and threatened to pull Transdniestria with it, diplomatic relations between Moldova and Russia became so strained that Russia imposed economic sanctions (primarily agricultural) on Moldova. With pro-Russian presidents elected by clear majorities in both countries, it now appears that Moldova and Transdniestria may resume cooperative efforts beneficial to each other and to Russia, which has a strong geopolitical and cultural interest in the region.

Moldovan President Dodon has already indicated his willingness to pursue improved relations with Transdniestria. Since Krasnoselski campaign included reaching a negotiated settlement with Moldova, the process, facilitated by Russia as peacemaker, should proceed steadily. However, since such a development is another blow to EU globalists, they can be expected to step up their game, promote internal dissent and rev up a furious propaganda campaign; these events are most certain in the short run.

The globalists, however, are facing too many challenges around the globe and will have to soon become more selective, there are not enough resources to fight them all simultaneously. France, England and Poland are prime allies, whom the EU must keep in its ambit if it is to survive. A tremendous outlay of resources will be heading towards Eastern Europe as the Slavic nations one after another unhinge from EU influence: Those already in separation mode include Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, Moldova, Belarus, Transdniestria and Estonia. [The key is Poland, which has recently proclaimed Jesus Christ as its King.](#) If Poland unhinges, it can be expected that all the Slavic nations, including Ukraine, will join in tandem to form an “*Intermarium*” consisting of East European nations geographically spread from the Baltic Sea in the northwest to the Black Sea in the southeast.

Therefore, Moldova is a global hot spot; the EU globalists cannot afford to let the dominoes keep falling,

they must stop here!

## **WHAT CARDS CAN THE EU BE EXPECTED TO PLAY?**

Moldova is already a member of NATO and aspires to join the EU. The strongest card the EU has in Moldova is the large number of people still in favor of EU integration including foreign embassies, think tanks, NGOs, media outlets, political beneficiaries and common men and women who have benefited from EU subsidies and economic advantages. Perhaps the globalist's greatest advantage is the continued existence of the EU-leaning Prime Minister and Parliament. Moldova, moreover is a member of the World Trade Organization, which hand in hand with the EU could cripple or promote its financial sector and economic well being.

Interestingly, Moldova also has several Russian media outlets and news agencies, has a strong Russian cultural influence, 93% of its citizens are members of the Orthodox Church with many having strong ties to the Russian Orthodoxy, nearly 20% of the population declares Russian as their native tongue, Moldova imports over 90% of its energy from Russia; and 54% of its population is of Ukrainian and Russian Slavic descent. Moldova was also once part of the Soviet Union and is also a member of the Russian led [Commonwealth of Independent States](#) and thus in the Russian ambit as well.

To the extent that Russia can continue to promote Christian and family values while it slashes away at the amoral cultural tentacles of liberalism and simultaneously provide economic benefits and trade stimulus to Moldova while propping up its infrastructure through investments from Russian-Chinese sponsored financial institutions, it might be able to counterbalance the effect of western liberal propaganda, especially at a time when EU institutions are experiencing unprecedented and severe cultural and political pressures that

are wrenching them apart along with the significant financial burden of supporting Mediterranean nations states relying on the European Central Bank in Germany to sustain their failing economies.

Despite EU tribulations, they cannot afford to loose this region to the Russians. Either way, with two pro-Russian presidents and large segments of their populations favorable to increased relationships with Russia along with aid from the EU, economic and trade relations between Transdniestria and Moldova can be expected to improve. The two countries can also be expected to increase cultural ties as globalists continue attempts to acculturate Transdniestria and Transdniestria to influence Moldova. Most importantly, a rapprochement with Russia and Moldova can be expected. This time it is voluntary and, assisted by cooperative efforts between President Dodan and President Krasnoselski, it should proceed further than before.

As the United States moves to disengage itself from over-extension in foreign affairs thereby leaving a failing to fend for itself militarily at a time when its economies are reeling and social -cultural dissatisfaction is at an all time high, less essential Eastern European nations will receive less economic help. Since it is unrealistic to expect the larger Eastern European nations, such as Poland, will assume responsibility for the economic challenges and mange the economic needs of their poorer neighbors, further anti-liberal Russian influence can be expected.

---

# Fatima – Divine Mercy and World News for an Era of Peace and Hour of Mercy

[New Era World News](#)

*This series is being written because of the immense importance of Fatima for the modern world.*

**THIS YEAR THE CHURCH IS CELEBRATING** the centenary of the appearance of the Mother of God at Fatima, Portugal in 1917. Since that time Fatima has become the world's most prominent center of Marian devotion, a place that John Paul II referred to as the "Marian capitol of the world." Given the fact that the Our Lady of Fatima precisely foretold the outbreak of World War II, the rise of communism and the persecution of the Church, Her other prophecies concerning the conversion of Russia to be correlated with an "Era of Peace" are of especial relevance since, unlike the former that have already occurred, these prophesied events are in the process of occurring. Any impartial observer of global events can discern the Hand of God at work in the world as [Russia is being converted](#) and the **nations of the world are one by one in the process of rejecting global liberalism while many are reasserting their Christian patrimonies** ([Western Europe](#), [Eastern Europe](#), [Africa](#), [Poland](#), [France](#), [Asia](#), [Argentina](#), [Middle East](#)).

While New Era has been reporting on these changes since its inception, secular and liberal pundits have also begun to observe the many changes occurring world-wide. They are, however, **misinterpreting, and thus misrepresenting, them as a *political movements***, movements referred to as "[Populist](#)", when in fact these are primarily moral, cultural, spiritual and religious movements. Unlike other populist movements that have

focused on economic and social justice, equal rights for the little guy etc. **this new “populist movement” differs from previous populist movements because of its global scope and because it is characterized by moral and spiritual dimensions including the frothy rejection of liberalism** that, all taken together, indicate or hint at its religious nature. Although the movement has profound political ramifications, it is not political in essence. At its core, the populist movement [sweeping the globe](#) is related to Our Lady’s promises made at Fatima, promises pertaining to the “[Conversion of Russia](#)” and a corollary “[Era of Peace](#)”. This highly unusual global movement has a religious or theological etiology that intersects with politics, what New Era refers to as theopolitical or “[Theopolitics](#)”.

**It behooves everyone, Catholic, Protestant and non-Christian to know the Fatima Message due to the import of its contents, contents that are unfolding in front of our eyes on a daily basis.** The current spiritual movement was foreseen by St. Louis Marie de Montfort. De Montfort is a highly significant saint for our times. His evangelical work is so exceptional, that another saint, Saint John Paul II, exhorted the “apostles of today” to draw inspiration from his life and work:

*“Now that the need for a new evangelization has become imperative in most parts of the world, Fr de Montfort’s zeal for the Word of God, his solicitude for the very poor, his ability to make himself understood by the simplest folk and to stimulate their piety, his qualities for organizing, his initiatives to sustain fervour by founding spiritual movements and to involve the laity in the service of the poor, all that, with practical adaptations, can inspire the apostles of today” ([Letter on 50th anniversary of de Montfort’s canonization](#)).*

De Montfort’s facund treatises on the Virgin Mary are so exceptional that John Paul II (in his [Encyclical Redemptoris](#)

[Mater](#)) recommended de Montfort's Marian spirituality to all the faithful:

*"Marian spirituality, like its corresponding devotion, finds a very rich source in the historical experience of individuals and of the various Christian communities present among the different peoples and nations of the world. In this regard, I would like to recall, among the many witnesses and teachers of this spirituality, the figure of Saint Louis Marie Grignion de Montfort, who proposes consecration to Christ through the hands of Mary, as an effective means for Christians to live faithfully their baptismal commitments".*

One of the main reasons for De Montfort's contemporary relevance is his perspicacious understanding of the role of the Virgin Mary in the "End Times", times which we are entering.

How do we know we are entering the end times? One complex and difficult way is the study of sacred scripture especially eschatological literature. A more simple approach is the fact that Jesus promised to be with His Church until the end of time:

*"Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" ([Matt 28:20](#))*

And that the Holy Trinity would reveal to the Church all that was going to happen:

*"I have yet many things to say to you: but you cannot bear them now. But when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will teach you all truth. For he shall not speak of himself; but what things soever he shall hear, he shall speak; and the things that are to come, he shall shew you" ([John 16: 12-13](#)).*

Then, years after His Ascension, Jesus appeared to Saint John

on the island of Patmos and He has continued to appear to His saints at special times throughout history.

*“And I turned to see the voice that spoke with me. And being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks: And in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, **one like to the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the feet, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle.** And his head and his hairs were white, as white wool, and as snow, and his eyes were as a flame of fire, And his feet like unto fine brass, as in a burning furnace. And his voice as the sound of many waters. And he had in his right hand seven stars. And from his mouth came out a sharp two edged sword: and his face was as the sun shineth in his power.”*

*“And when I had seen him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he **laid his right hand upon me**, saying: Fear not. I am the First and the Last, And alive, and was dead, and behold I am living for ever and ever, and have the keys of death and of hell. Write therefore the things which thou hast seen, and which are, and which must be done hereafter” ([Revelation 1: 12-19](#)).*

In the 20th century Jesus revealed Himself to a highly regarded Polish saint, Saint Faustina Kowalska, a poor Polish nun to whom He appeared prior to World War II. Among other things, He confided to her His love for humanity and His desire to bless the world with an outpouring of Divine Mercy before His final coming as “Just Judge”. He also revealed His special love for the nation of Poland from which He said would come the “spark” that would prepare the world for His Second Coming.

## **Saint Faustina Divine Mercy Message and the End Times**

The Divine Mercy Message and Devotion is based on revelations given by Jesus Christ to Saint Faustina who



recorded the revelations she received about the Mercy of God in a [voluminous diary, which contains the Message of Divine Mercy \(PDF\)](#), mercy that God intends for all humanity, especially for those most steeped in sin. Thanks to the love and work of Saint Faustina, Devotion to the Divine Mercy has spread throughout the world.

#### (c) Knights of Columbus Supreme Council

Devotion to Divine Mercy has gained the highest approbation of the Catholic Church. It has been placed on the universal liturgical calendar of the Church as the **Feast of Divine Mercy** celebrated on the first Sunday after Easter, also the day on which Pope John Paul II, the “Pope of Mercy” breathed his last breath as the Vicar of Christ and “Apostle of Mercy.”

#### **JESUS SPOKE TO SAINT FAUSTINA ABOUT HIS SPECIAL LOVE FOR POLAND**

*“I bear a special love for Poland, and if she will be obedient to My will, I will exalt her in might and holiness. From her will come forth the spark that will prepare the world for My final coming” (Diary, 1732).*

The **spark of fire** that would come forth from Poland began with the pontificate of Saint John Paul II and is spreading around the globe. [Poland is the first nation in the 21st century to actually declare Jesus Christ as its king](#) and the [Mother of God as its Queen](#), acts that were carried out by the nation’s president, prime minister, parliament and princes of the Church including the Primate of Poland.

*In the presence of President Andrej Duda, Prime Minister, Beata Szydło, and other ranking state officials the bishops prayed: “We entrust to you the Polish people and Polish leaders. Let them exercise their power fairly and **in accordance with Your laws.**”*

*“Rule us, Christ! Reign in our homeland and reign in every*

*nation – for the greater glory of the Most Holy Trinity and the salvation of mankind.”*

The Polish Parliament (Sejm) announced its conviction that the Mother of God has a place of “special importance” for the nation, so special that they, the Polish Parliament itself, have officially declared 2017 as a jubilee year in honor of Mary whose coronation they have formally recognized as Queen of Poland.

*“The Polish Sejm, convinced of the special importance of Marian devotion for our homeland – not only in the religious aspect, but also social, cultural and patriotic – establishes 2017 (as) the Year of the 300th anniversary of the Coronation of the image of Our Lady of Czestochowa,”*

The world press is only now beginning to take notice of the special tenor of the events happening in Poland and related events happening around the globe. *The liberal establishment is being shaken to its foundations* as Poland is being joined by Hungary, Slovakia, the Philippines, Nigeria, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Uganda, Malaysia, France, Austria, Moldova, Bulgaria and Russia *et al.* A general global uprising of Euro-skeptic Christian political parties and social movements is rapidly gaining momentum throughout the continent as well as in Asia and Africa. Increasing numbers are rising to challenge secular liberalism and reasserting their Christian or native patrimonies.

Russia is being converted as promised at Fatima, but Poland has stepped forward igniting the flame of love promised by Jesus. From Poland is coming forth the spark of spiritual renewal, of life giving and cleansing mercy, that flows from the Heart of Christ the King.

Jesus told Saint Faustina that **Poland would be the instrumental “spark” that would prepare the world for His “final coming”**. Images of that spark that is igniting a fire

across Europe and beyond can be viewed in the video below (be sure to activate English subtitles by pressing "CC").

[https://youtu.be/dpC2\\_BUCTS0](https://youtu.be/dpC2_BUCTS0)

We are living in or about to enter into the "Hour of Mercy", the time preparatory to Christ's final coming, a time foreseen by St. Louis Marie de Montfort, a time, in his words, when

*"...great men filled with the Holy Spirit and imbued with the spirit of Mary" ...will destroy sin and establish the kingdom of Jesus Christ."*

*"They are the "great souls filled with . . . zeal" ([True Devotion 48](#)), "superior to all creatures by their great zeal" ([True Devotion 54](#)). The action of the "true apostles of the end times" ([True Devotion 58](#)) consists of spreading "the fire of divine love" everywhere; they are themselves "a flaming fire" ([True Devotion 56](#)). In the battle against evil and the enemies of God, these great saints "will become, in Mary's powerful hands, like sharp arrows," and they will leave "an odor of death" among the worldly ([True Devotion 56](#)). Their work will not be limited to reforming the Church, but will include extending it to "the idolators and Muslims" ([True Devotion 59](#)).*

De Montfort wrote of the Second Coming of Christ to "reign over all the earth and to judge the living and the dead". Prior to His coming, he foresaw "great men filled with the Holy Spirit and imbued with the spirit of Mary", men whom he said will "destroy sin and establish the kingdom of Jesus Christ." Poland has already taken the first steps in bringing this eschatological vision of De Montfort to fruition. As of November 1, 2016, Jesus Christ is the King of Poland.

*“These great souls filled with grace and zeal will be chosen to oppose the enemies of God who are raging on all sides. They will be exceptionally devoted to the Blessed Virgin. Illumined by her light, strengthened by her spirit, supported by her arms, sheltered under her protection, they will fight with one hand and build with the other.”*

De Montfort concludes:

*“Towards the end of the world ... Almighty God and His holy Mother are to raise up saints who will surpass in holiness most other saints as much as the cedars of Lebanon tower above little shrubs...Mary scarcely appeared in the first coming of Christ...”*

*“But in the second coming of Jesus Christ, Mary must be known and openly revealed by the Holy Spirit so that Jesus may be known, loved and served through her.”*

All the above provide strong reason to believe that the world is entering (or has already entered) into a graced moment of sacred history, a time that Jesus, Himself, said was preparatory to His final coming, a time that has been confirmed by the highest authority in the Church, a time in which the Virgin Mary’s Fatima prophecies pertaining to the conversion of Russia and a corollary Era of Peace are being fulfilled. Since there is strong reason to believe what Our Lady foretold at Fatima is upon us (during this 100th anniversary year of Her 1917 appearances), it is through this “Fatima Lens” that we can correctly discern what is happening around the globe – the so-called global populist phenomenon is a prodigious phenomenon related to Fatima and the coming Christian renewal during an Era of Peace prior to the final onslaught by the anti-Christ at the end of the world.

It is the purpose of this “Fatima Series” to familiarize the reader with the Fatima Message beginning with the **three visits**

by the archangel Michael in 1916, followed by six visits of Our Lady in 1917 and other visits to Sister Lucia at Tuy and Pontevedra, Spain and Rianjo. The series will also include an article on the Three Secrets of Fatima and another about the Consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart. This later article will conclude the series; it is also the most contentious issue in Fatima circles. There are many strong Catholic traditionalists who argue that the consecration requested by Our Lady has not been fulfilled because She specifically asked for the [consecration of "Russia"](#), but John Paul II, who made the consecration in 1984, did not mention Russia.

Specifically, instead of "Russia", John Paul II consecrated ["individuals and nations"](#) and the ["world" but not Russia](#).

*"In a special way we entrust and consecrate to you those individuals and nations which particularly need to be entrusted and consecrated."*

*"In entrusting to you, oh Mother, the world, all individuals and peoples, we also entrust to you this very consecration of the world, placing it in your motherly Heart."*

Because he did not mention "Russia" specifically, many have *wrongly* concluded that the consecration is invalid – even though affirmed by every pope since John Paul II and by Sister Lucia herself.

New Era will demonstrate the erroneous nature of this false contention. Using the formal Fatima literature accepted by both parties (those who accept and those who reject the validity of John Paul II's 1984 consecration) it will be demonstrated that **Pope John Paul II's 1984 Act of Consecration accurately fulfill's Our Lady's requests** and that the far-right Fatima detractors are not only disobedient but also in

gross error.

In fact, ***for the first time*** it will be shown from the Fatima documents themselves that it was the “world” not “Russia” that should have been consecrated. In other words, John Paul II after studying the literature brought to him in Gemelli Hospital (where he was treated and recovering from assassin’s wounds) acted correctly: The “world” not just “Russia” needed to be consecrated. The pope was not derelict in his papal duties; he was not hemmed in by diplomatic agreements (*ostpolitik*), nor did he suffer from fear of Communist retaliation as maintained by many ultra-traditionalists. John Paul II acting in his role as Supreme Pontiff understood the Fatima Message and its cultural and historical contexts, the contexts in which it was given in 1917 and in which the Church was living in 1984. **After conducting an exhaustive and prayerful study of the documents, graced by wounds he united to the blood of Christ, he purposefully worded the consecration the way it was delivered because it was the correct prayer formula as requested by both Our Lord and Our Lady as will be shown.**

## **UNDERSCORING THE IMPORTANCE OF FATIMA FOR THE MODERN WORLD**

Beginning with Pope Pius XII, every modern pope has either pointed out the importance of Fatima, visited Fatima, or consecrated “humanity”, the “world”, or “Russia” to Our Lady of Fatima. Modern papal consecrations include:

- **Pope Pius XII October 31, 1942** consecrated all of humanity over Vatican radio in Portuguese to the Immaculate Heart of Mary
- **Pope Pius XII December 28, 1942** repeated the consecration at St. Peter’s
- **Then on July 7, 1952**, the same pope consecrated all the

- people in Russian lands to the Immaculate Heart of Mary.
- **Pope Paul VI November 21, 1964** renewed in the presence of the Fathers of the Vatican Council (but without their participation) the consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart.
  - **Pope John Paul II May 13, 1982** on a trip to Fatima to thank Virgin for miraculous recovery, consecrated the world to the Mother of all Peoples.
  - **Then on March 25, 1984, Pope John Paul II** conducted a worldwide collegial consecration to the Immaculate Heart of Mary at St. Peter's Square before statue of Our Lady of Fatima flown in from Fatima.

**Later Sister Lucia, the last survivor of the three children to whom Our Lady appeared in 1917, confirmed the validity of the March 25 consecration made by Pope John Paul II.**

#### **WHERE IS FATIMA AND WHY IS IT SO IMPORTANT?**

Fatima is situated in the foothills of the *Serra de Aire* Mountains about one hundred miles north of Lisbon, Portugal. It has become a worldwide pilgrimage destination and international shrine visited by every modern pope as a place of human spiritual and social renewal. Saint John Paul II referred to Fatima as the, "Marian capitol of the world." Fatima was once a little known Portuguese village, until a series of three angelic apparitions prepared the way for a visitation by Blessed Virgin Mary to three small children thereafter drawing more than four million visitors annually to the site. Fatima is of such contemporary importance that **one of the first actions taken by newly elected Pope Francis was to consecrate his entire pontificate to Our Lady of Fatima.** This was followed by World Youth Day in Rio de Janeiro, which he also entrusted to Our Lady of Fatima. **Then, on Oct. 13, 2013 he entrusted the entire world to Our Lady of Fatima** followed by conversations with Vladimir Putin relevant to

Christianity in the modern world and the role of Russia in defending Christians in the Middle East as will be detailed in this series of articles on Fatima.

The first apparition of Our Lady took place on May 13, 1917, just prior to the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. On this date the Mother of Jesus appeared at Fatima to three shepherd children, Lucia Santos and her cousins Jacinta and Francisco Marto. She came to turn the nations embroiled in world war back to God and to make an appeal for world peace.

Thereafter, she visited the children on the 13th of every month for six consecutive months making a number of prophecies now popularly known as the "Three Secrets of Fatima." According to the official Catholic interpretation, the three secrets involve Hell, World War I and World War II, and the attempted assassination by gunshot of Pope John Paul II. The apparitions culminated with the unprecedented "*Miracle of the Sun*," which she performed before a gathering of some 70,000 pilgrims and skeptics (including atheists and Free Masons) on October 13, 1917 as she had said she would so that "all might believe".

The Virgin Mary told the children that Holy Mother Russia, the bastion of Orthodox Christianity, would become a communist nation and that it would lead a world-wide persecution of the church and that various nations would be annihilated.

She also told the children that in the end Russia would be converted if and when the pope in union with all the bishops of the world consecrated Russia to her Immaculate Heart.

After much stalling, intrigue and diplomacy, as mentioned above, Pope John Paul II finally made the requested consecration on March 25, 1984. He was moved to do this for several reasons, chief among them **the would-be assassin's bullets that struck him landed on May 13, the Feast Day of Our Lady of Fatima**, which he was celebrating in Rome. In his own



words,

*“It was a mother’s hand that guided the bullet’s path and in his throes the Pope halted at the threshold of death” (Pope John Paul II, Meditation from the Policlinico Gemelli to the Italian Bishops, 13 May 1994).*

While recovering in Rome’s Gemelli Hospital he had the Fatima texts removed from the Vatican Archives and personally presented to him. **Lying in the hospital, prayerfully studying the Fatima dossier, he recognized himself as the pope “dressed in white”** spoken about in the “third secret”, the pope whom Our Lady referred to when she told the children that the “holy father” would have much to suffer, implicitly at the hands of the communists.



**Pope John Paul II Recognized Himself as the Pope Dressed in White in the Third**

## Secret of Fatima

Subsequently, he had the bullet removed from his body sent to Fatima to be placed in the crown of the Virgin statue. Then, on March 25, 1984, he proceeded to consecrate the world to Our Lady of Fatima in union with the bishops. Following that collegial act he then also decided to publicly reveal the much guarded “Third Secret of Fatima” for the first time since it was given to the children in 1917.



**Pope John Paul II Consecrating the World to Our Lady of Fatima**

Following the 1984 papal consecration, as promised, communism was toppled, the Solidarity movement gained momentum in Poland, the Berlin wall came down and one after another the nations behind the “Iron Curtain” were given political and then religious freedom – [Russia was being converted as Our](#)

## Lady of Fatima had promised.

The granting of religious freedom in Russia was followed by an increasing number of significant events including the removal of the communist flag from over the Kremlin for the last time on *Christmas day, December 25, 1991* thereby symbolizing the end of atheistic communism and foreshadowing the return of Russia as a world power to its ancient Christian patrimony—the rebirth of Christianity on Christmas day.

A new spring-time was occurring in the North. Russia had reemerged as a sovereign nation granting religious freedom to Christians and other world religions. and then Vladimir Putin committed Russia to the protection of Christians throughout the Middle East. On June 1, 2010, President Dmitry Medvedev signed a new law commemorating July 28 as a national holiday thereby officially recognizing the founding of Russia as a Christian nation with the baptism of Prince Vladimir in Kiev in 988. Speaking at the annual celebration commemorating the “Baptism of the Russ,” he said:

*“The continual work of the Russian Orthodox Church will affect the revival of Christianity in our nation. Thanks to the Orthodox faith, Russian culture through the years, has acquired Biblical values on which the system of moral ideals for our nation is built” (US Department of State, 2010).*

It is the purpose of this “Fatima Series” to familiarize the reader with Fatima beginning with the **three visits by the archangel Michael in 1916**, followed by **six visits of Our Lady in 1917** and other visits to Sister Lucia at **Tuy** and **Pontevedra**, Spain and **Rianjo**. In all there were 14 apparitions and locutions: Three angelic apparitions prior to the six consecutive appearances of Our Lady in 1917. These were followed by five more post 1917 apparitions/locutions to Sister Lucia from 1925 through 1931 and several important communications between Sister Lucia and her spiritual director

that are essential to the Message of Fatima.

---

## NOTE

The following articles will focus on the essential communications that took place on each of these dates. Description of the apparitions are borrowed from Sister Lucia's Memoirs: *"Fatima in Lucia's Own Words"* (2007), Fatima, Portugal.

---

# Bulgaria and Moldova Rejecting Liberalism – Tilt Away from EU Toward Russia

[New Era World News](#)

**BULGARIA AND MOLDOVIA** (November 13) elected two new presidents; both men are overtly open to relations with Russia. **Rumen Radev**, the new Bulgarian president decisively defeated the pro-Western candidate, Tsetska Tsacheva. Radev not only called for the EU to cease sanctions against Russia, he also announced his willingness to accept the Crimean referendum that made Crimea part of the Russian Federation. During his victory speech, Radev not only iterated his opposition to sanctions against Russia, he also commended President-elect Trump for ["seeking increased dialogue"](#) with Russian President, Vladimir Putin.

Likewise, the new Moldovan presidential **Igor Dodon**, is also pro Moscow. He defeated World Bank employee Maia Sandu, who campaigned under an EU banner, for the presidency of Moldova. Russia and the EU have hotly contested Moldova, which seems now to prefer the former.

Mr Dodon won the presidential election partly on a promise to scrap a

trade deal signed with the EU in 2014. The promise “is supported by Moldovans who suffered after Russia, in response to EU sanctions, imposed trade restrictions on EU members and affiliates following the agreement.”

*“Speaking to Russian television after the vote, President Dodan said [Moldovans had voted for “friendship with Russia, for neutrality, for our orthodoxy, for the country’s union.”](#)”*

Dodan is aware that “a very serious combat is ahead”, a combat between EU liberal globalists leaning westward and Moldovan patriots leaning to the east. However, he said, “we are ready for this combat.”

Unlike Bulgaria, Moldova is not an EU member (but an affiliate by agreement), nor is it a member of NATO. Despite affiliate status and a push by some for full EU membership, Dodon has indicated interest in joining the Russian sponsored Eurasia Economic Community and [“eliminating the possibility of cooperation with NATO”](#), but he has also [“promised to balance between Russian and the West, a feat that neighboring Ukraine has found impossible.”](#)

[Bogdan Bezpalko, Assistant Director of the Center for Ukrainian Studies at Moscow State University](#), stated that the presidential elections in Moldova and Bulgaria represent,

*“... undoubtedly, positive dynamics. But it (they) should not be regarded as a step toward an ‘alliance’ [with Russia]. . Still, it is clear that the population of the Eastern European states have become disenchanted with the ideology of ‘Euro-integration’; they want to resume normal and pragmatic relations with their neighbors.”*

[Russian parliamentarian Franz Klintsevich](#), First Deputy Chairman of the Committee on Defense and Security explains that the rise of Euro-skeptic parties in the Balkan Peninsula was to be expected:

*“I have come to a conclusion that Russia’s consistent, competent and honest position on the world arena, its aspiration not to seek*

*dominance but to try to solve... the world's problem of international terrorism transparently, honestly and effectively [have played a substantial role in the elections' outcome],"*

[According to the French Daily, La Croix:](#)

*"Already deeply shaken by the Brexit, the European Union has suffered a new warning this Sunday, November 13, this time from the eastern margins of the old continent. Voters in Bulgaria and Moldova have elected to the presidency of their respective countries openly Russophile candidates, the Moldovan Igor Dodon and the Bulgarian Rumen Radev, who both campaigned in favor of a rapprochement with Russia."*

Journalist Roland Oliphant suggests that the election of two pro-Russian presidents "adds to mounting [concern about Western unity](#) following Donald Trump's victory in the US election last week."

[La Croix of France concludes:](#)

*"These elections will ring anyway as a prestigious victory for Vladimir Putin and thunder in the European skies"*

## **ESTONIA**

Within one weeks of the political changes in Bulgaria and Moldova, the pro-Western government in Estonia prematurely collapsed. On November 9, 2016 Prime Minister Taavi Roivas' Estonian Reform Party received a vote of no-confidence from the Estonian parliament. Roivas was replaced by Juri Ratas head of the opposition Center Party founded a mere 25 years ago. Following the vote, the Center Party, a party that has a collaborative agreement with Putin's United Russia Party, has emerged as a significant member of the new coalition government that will lead Estonia. The coalition consists of The centrist Center Party, leftist Social Democrat SDE, and conservative IRL. Together these three coalition partners control 56 out of 101

seats in the Estonian Parliament and have committed to ties with the EU and NATO and have vowed to keep Estonia within the Western EU ambit:

*“We will adhere unconditionally to the current principles of security and foreign policy; our membership in NATO and the EU is the paramount guarantee for our security,” the parties said in the joint statement confirming their cooperation.*

Nonetheless, the new Prime Minister, Juri Ratas is a member of the Center Party, which in the past has had strong ties with Russia. With the Center Party heading the coalition, it is likely that Estonia will adopt a more balanced relationship with Russia and the EU. The Center Party has the strong support of Estonia’s Russian minority, which it must retain so as to keep its hands on political power. Besides, the Center Party has previously signed an agreement committing it to work collaboratively with *Putin’s United Russia Party* into the future.

The Center Party’s agreement with United Russia states that the two share common goals and interests and should cooperate in the areas of information exchange relative to professional party building, legislative processes, financial professionalism, international relations, cultural exchange and work among youth. [The agreement exists to deepen the “good-neighborly cooperation between Estonia and Russia.”](#)

The document of collaboration was signed by Mailis Reps, current Deputy Chairman of the Center Party.

Bulgaria and Moldova are tilting away from the EU toward Russia, and Estonia is in the process of normalizing its relationship with the East. All three will endeavor to maintain a balance between Brussels and Moscow. But it is clear, Russia is no longer an outsider but an alternative to Western Liberalism, a liberalism that is wearying the nations of Eastern Europe and even those of Western Europe such as France and Britain who are making their voices heard in a rising symphony reaching even Asia and Africa and America too.

---

# Beware False Apostles of “Americanism” – Part Two

[New Era World News](#)

[PART ONE OF FALSE APOSTLES](#) of Americanism ended with these these words of Pope Saint Pius X applied to so-called “Christian Ministers” who distort Sacred Scripture to defame the Catholic Church. It should come as no surprise that anyone who can pervert the Scriptures is fully capable of distorting historical documents to present the country’s “Founders” as Christian men intent on building a Christian nation, when in fact, their program was to destroy the Catholic Church and Protestant denominations that did not join the Framers in their subterfuge and efforts to establish a secular commonwealth built on the economic, political and moral principles of “Liberalism”. Pope St. Pius X saw through the charade:

*“We must repeat with the utmost energy in these times of social and intellectual anarchy when **everyone takes it upon himself to teach as a teacher and lawmaker – the City (any country) cannot be built otherwise than as God has built it; society cannot be setup unless the Church lays the foundations and supervises the work; no, civilization is not something yet to be found (Novos Ordo Seclorum), nor is the New City to be built on hazy notions; it has been in existence and still is: it is Christian civilization...It has only to be set up and restored continually against the unremitting attacks of insane dreamers, rebels and miscreants.**” (St. Pope Pius X, [Notre Charge Apostolique](#), April 15, 1910).*

Because many of [“Framer” were trying to establish a new Commonwealth](#)



[without Christ](#) (He is not mentioned once in the Constitution, religion and God's Laws are excluded and relegated to the private sphere – see note 1 below), because many were at war with His Church, because the American Revolution was a phase of the French Revolution and the broader Liberal Revolution sweeping the globe, the Catholic Church, according to Framers like John Adams, was a “monster that had to be annihilated:

*“Cabalistic Christianity, which is catholic (sic) Christianity, and which has prevailed for 1,500 years, has received a mortal wound, of which **the monster must finally die**” ([John Adams](#), (July 16, 1814) Letter to Thomas Jefferson).*

It was not just Catholics, many Protestants were opposed to the liberal program of the “Framers”:

One of America's *unsung* founders was Elias Boudinot. Boudinot was a president of the Continental Congress, a United States Congressman and from 1795 to 1805 he was the Director of the U.S. Mint, an Evangelical and a Co-Founder of the American bible Society. [Boudinot was alarmed by the disregard for Christian principles](#) by many leaders of the new American government;

*“But has not America greatly departed from her original (17th century) principles, and left her first love? Has she not also many amongst her chief citizens, of every party, who have forsaken the God of their fathers, and to whom the spirit may justly be supposed to say, “ye hold doctrines which I hate, repent, or else I will come unto you quickly, and will fight against you with the sword of my mouth.”*

**By the time that Protestant divines woke up to what was happening, it was already too late.** [Pastor Timothy Wright, President of Yale Seminary](#) was one of the first to take note (1812):

*“The nation has offended Providence. We formed our Constitution without any acknowledgment of God; without any recognition of His*

*mercies to us, as a people, of His government, or even of His existence. The [Constitutional] Convention, by which it was formed, never asked even once, His direction, or His blessings, upon their labours. Thus we commenced our national existence under the present system, without God."*

Since Protestants such as these were opposed to the liberal charade of light being directed by the Framers, they too were belittled. John Adams referred to the Protestant ministers as "yahoos" the great enemies of "free inquiry" who should be endured no longer.

*"And ever since the Reformation, when or where has existed a Protestant or dissenting sect who would tolerate A FREE INQUIRY (Adams' own emphasis)? The blackest billingsgate, the most ungentlemanly insolence, the most yahooish brutality, is patiently endured, countenanced, propagated, and applauded."*

Jefferson concurred, the **Christian clergy** (Protestant and Catholic) are:

*"... the greatest obstacles to the advancement of the real doctrines of Jesus, and [do in fact constitute the real Anti-Christ.](#)"*

James Madison, the "Father of the Constitution", also harbored hostility for the clergy (Catholic and Protestant), "spiritual tyrants" who "subvert the public liberty"; they had to go!

*"What influence, in fact, have ecclesiastical establishments had on society? In some instances they have been seen to erect a **spiritual tyranny** on the ruins of the civil authority; on many instances they have been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny; in no instance have they been the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wish to **subvert the public liberty** may have found an established clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just government, instituted to secure and perpetuate it, **needs them not**" ([James Madison \(1785\) "A Memorial and Remonstrance"](#)).*

The Framers steeped in the Craft of esotericism might have fooled the people, but they did not fool Protestants such as Boudinot and Timothy Wright, not did they fool the sagacious Pius X:


*“Society cannot be setup unless the Church lays the foundations and supervises the work; no, civilization is not something yet to be found, nor is the New City to be built on hazy notions; it has been in existence and still is: it is Christian civilization....It has only to be set up and restored continually against the unremitting attacks of insane dreamers, rebels and miscreants.”* (St. Pope Pius X, [Notre Charge Apostolique](#), April 15, 1910).

Since many of the Framers were in Pope Pius' words “*miscreants*”, “*rebels*” and “*insane dreamers*”, it should come as no surprise that many so-called ministers, contemporary men and women who are supposed to be lovers of the truth and “ambassadors” of Jesus Christ, the way and the truth and the life”, seem to have no problem repeating the tale (about the Christian Founders) in order to improve their financial portfolios, or worse, in order to advance a nefarious hidden agenda that makes them guilty of that which they accuse others: being unchristian.

The truth is, many of the so-called conservative fundamentalists and dispensationalists ministers who claim that “liberals” are distorting the facts about the Christian roots of American government are the real ones that are doing the distorting. Perhaps you have seen their websites, or read their books and media tracts claiming that the Unites States Constitution was written by stalwart Christian men totally committed to Christ and the building of a Christian nation.

*What sundry readers are unaware of is that many of the quotes they use to defend their claims are fabricated, misunderstood, or misrepresented.*

**David Barton “Christian” Spokesman for America’s Christian Founding:  
Guru of **Americanism****



Among the most popular spokesmen is a Pentecostal minister by the name of David Barton, a Christian fundamentalist and founding president of a popular website called “Wall Builders”, a site devoted to defending America’s Christian foundations. Barton has been interviewed several times by Glenn Beck and is noted for tours of the capitol pointing out Christian heritage of the country to new congressmen and senators.

Barton wrote a book, *“The Myth of Separation”*, that was so full of errors and misquotes that it caused scholars across the country to leap into action; it was too outrageous to ignore, too opposed to expected standards of research and norms of scholarly writing, which are the hallmark of men and women who love truth, men and women who consider honest scholarship a mark of honor and dishonest a mark of reprobation. Consequently, numerous savants quickly engaged in research to verify the validity of Barton’s quotes. Unfortunately for Barton, many true scholars such as, Professor Robert S. Alley (University of Richmond) the man who authored *“James Madison on Religious Liberty”*, got involved. Prof. Alley received assistance from the editors of *“The Papers of James Madison”* at the University of Virginia who helped verify all of Barton’s quotes and misquotes.

Moreover,

*“Firms devoted to Madison and Jefferson became involved, universities got involved and ultimately the Library of Congress was the final resting place for these quotes*[\[viii\]](#)*.”*

Barton’s book does *not* contain an *occasional* error, the kind that are easily forgiven and which cause honest writer’s to etch deeply in their memory so as to avoid repeating them. Barton is either a dishonest minister playing scholar or an uneducated one making so many mistakes that no one should consider him a learned man and therefore

avoid him as a teacher and historical spokesman. True scholarship is time consuming and very difficult, every piece of evidence is verified, every source double checked and cross referenced. No one becomes learned or wise by simply reading; every time an in earnest student comes across information that he cannot verify or that he does not understand, he stops and does not continue again until he has mastered the content or idea. Every specious or questionable piece of information is cross-referenced and double-triple checked for accuracy and veracity. Apparently, Barton did not know that such men and women exist; there really is no such thing as a “lazy scholar”, qua scholar. Like most charlatans, Barton, although himself not necessarily a charlatan, was eventually caught for poor scholarship. When presented with the evidence, he

*“...admitted to fabricating the quotes. He was (then) ordered to create a pamphlet that listed all his bogus quotes. Unfortunately that pamphlet has had almost zero impact on those who use the quotes daily in newspapers around the United States.”[\[ix\]](#)*

Below are some of his more egregious misquotes. Fortunately, many people have become involved and this kind of scam scholarship is being exposed.

1. “Whosoever shall introduce into the public affairs the principles of primitive Christianity will change the face of the world.” – Benjamin Franklin
2. “It cannot be emphasized too strongly or too often that this great nation was founded, not by religionists, but by Christians; not on religions, but on the gospel of Jesus Christ!” – Patrick Henry
3. “The only assurance of our nation’s safety is to lay our foundation in morality and religion.” – Abraham Lincoln
4. “Our laws and our institutions must necessarily be based upon and embody the teachings of the Redeemer of mankind. It is

impossible that it should be otherwise. In this sense and to this extent, our civilizations and our institutions are emphatically Christian.” – Holy Trinity v. U. S. (Barton claimed this was a United States Supreme Court landmark case—in fact, the actual author is *not* the **United States Supreme Court**, but the **Illinois Supreme Court** (Richmond v. Moore, 1883). We are not concerned about state constitutions, which in many cases were influenced by Christianity, but with the secular federal Constitution. Not only is the quote misrepresented, Barton distorts the meaning of the Illinois court by omitting other text from the same decision, text such as, “...a total severance of church and State is one of the great controlling foundation principles of our system of government.”

5. “The philosophy of the school room in one generation will be the philosophy of government in the next.” – Abraham Lincoln
6. “A general dissolution of principles and manners will more surely overthrow the liberties of America than the whole force of the common enemy. While the people are virtuous they cannot be subdued; but when once they lose their virtue they will be ready to surrender their liberties to the first external or eternal invader.” – Samuel Adams
7. “I have always said and always will say that the studious perusal of the Sacred Volume will make us better citizens.” – Thomas Jefferson
8. “There are two powers only which are sufficient to control men, and secure the rights of individuals and a peaceable administration; these are the combined force of religion and law, and the force or fear of the bayonet.” – Noah Webster
9. “It is impossible to rightly govern the world without God and the Bible.” – George Washington
10. “The principles of all genuine liberty, and of wise laws and

administrations are to be drawn from the Bible and sustained by its authority. The man therefore who weakens or destroys the divine authority of that book may be assessor [sic] to all the public disorders which society is doomed to suffer.” – Noah Webster

11. “We have staked the whole future of American civilization, not upon the power of government, far from it. We have staked the future of all of our political institutions upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves ... according to the Ten Commandments of God.”– James Madison[\[x\]](#)

**The only problem with these quotes is that none of them have ever been found among any of Founder’s authentic writings.** Barton tried to excuse himself by blaming it on “secondary sources”. Perhaps this is a good excuse; however, any cross referencing or simple attempt to confirm the quotes should have raised a flag in Barton’s mind; *perhaps he was cherry picking quotes as Pentecostals cherry pick scriptures to fabricate tales about the Catholic Church.*

Barton, has earned rebuke from “*Church and State Magazine*”, which ran an article by Robert Boston who insisted that Barton’s fabrications were so egregious that they warranted a “Consumer Alert”.[\[xi\]](#) Barton has also received criticism from the “right” for “shoddy workmanship”. The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs (BJCPA) issued a critique of a Barton movie that highlighted most of the quotes. The BJCPA took Barton to task and hammered his video.[\[xii\]](#) They stated that his work is:

*“... laced with exaggerations, half-truths and misstatements of fact.”[\[xiii\]](#) The Texas Freedom Network calls him “a pseudo-intellectual fraud whose twisted interpretations of history are little more than propaganda.”[\[xiv\]](#)*

According to “people for the American Way”[\[xv\]](#)

*“Such dim views of Barton’s work are based on repeated instances in which Barton cites quotes attributed to Founding Fathers that appear*

*to support the right-wing view that the current model of separation of church and state was not at all what the Framers intended, only to have those quotes turn out to be unverifiable, if not utterly false.”*

*“Barton claimed that the phrase “wall of separation between church and state” originated in a speech made by Thomas Jefferson in **1801**. Barton also claimed that Jefferson went on **to say** that “That wall is a one directional wall. It keeps the government from running the church but it makes sure that Christian principles will always stay in government.” [\[xvi\]](#)*

*“Such a claim would be powerful, provided it was true. The only problem was that Barton was [wrong](#) on all accounts: the phrase regarding church and state came out of an **1802** letter Jefferson wrote to the Danbury Baptist Association and the letter says absolutely nothing about keeping “Christian principles” in the government.”*

## **The Jefferson Lies**

*Barton’s book, “The Jefferson Lies” was as objectionable as his book, “The Myth of Separation”. The former was hammered so hard that it had to be withdrawn from publication. Hard as this might be to swallow, **apparently, it is Barton and not the “liberals” who has been telling the lies about Jefferson** (please do not say that this makes the author of this article a liberal):*

*“In 2012, Barton’s New York Times bestseller, *The Jefferson Lies: Exposing the Myths You’ve Always Believed About Thomas Jefferson*, was voted [“the least credible history book in print”](#) by the users of the History News Network website.[\[xvii\]](#) A group of [10 conservative Christian professors reviewed the work and reported](#)*



*[negatively](#) on its claims, saying that Barton has misstated facts about Jefferson.”[\[xviii\]](#)*

“In August 2012 [Christian publisher Thomas Nelson withdrew the book](#) from publication and stopped production, announcing that he had “lost confidence in the book’s details” and “learned that there were some historical details included in the book that were not adequately supported.”[\[xix\]](#)

### **According to Wikipedia**

*“In 1995, in response to criticism by **historian Robert Alley**, Barton conceded, in an online article titled “[Unconfirmed Quotations](#)”,[\[xx\]](#) that he had not located primary sources for 11 alleged quotes from James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and U.S. Supreme Court decisions (hence, the title of Alley’s article), but maintained that the quotes were “completely consistent” with the views of the Founders. ([By 2007, the article listed 14 unconfirmed quotations.](#))[\[xxi\]](#)*

According to Texas Monthly,

*“[Honesty has been a problem for Barton](#) over the years and still is. After he issued his “unconfirmed quotes” retraction in 1995, for instance, a group of independent researchers went over *The “Myth of Separation”* with a fine-tooth comb and found more than one quote that Barton apparently fabricated through the **flagrant misuse of ellipses.**[\[xxii\]](#)*

In the past, you could find Barton’s bio online ([Endnote 2](#)) where it says he’s an “author and historian.” The bio says he has a degree in Arts from Oral Roberts University and an honorary doctorate from the Pensacola Christian College. In his official bio at Ecclesia University, he refers to himself as [Dr. Barton](#). A bachelor’s degree does not qualify a person as a “historian” (a bachelor is a certified apprentice of learning – certified to have the necessary qualifications to begin taking the next step leading to the title of

“master”), nor does an honorary degree make one a doctor. There is a reason why there are peer-reviewed journals, and why some men and women are authorized to place Dr. in front of their names. The degree signifies the highest attainable level of scholarship and academic respectability, which Mr. Barton and those who support his ideological travesty – the Christian Founder Project – have not earned.

**David Barton cannot help himself – First he says that he does NOT have a Ph.D and then he says that he does???**

The fact is, Dispensationalists and Pentecostals, along with their allies in the not so secret “Secret Societies”, are losing the battle to men and women who love the Truth, the truth who is a Divine Person, the truth who is also the Way and the Life. Men and women around the world are waking up and beginning to rally around His Church, the Church He established as the Light of the World and the City Set on a Hilltop; there is no other.

The Mother of God promised a victory, the “Triumph” of her “Immaculate Heart”. Those who honor Her and follow Her Son (Catholic and Protestant) are getting in cadence because the *“Truth is marching on.”* Adept falsifiers so dread falling behind that they are forced to misquote and offer shoddy scholarship to hold on to their false dreams of freeing the world by global diffusion of anti-Christian principles in the guise of Enlightenment (because [the devil and his agents, come as “angels” and “ministers” of light](#) -DRB-), principles that in fact are intended to make them masters of the world, which is now in the process of turning against them (Review news articles at [newera.news](#) for details). These were the type of men Pope Francis was speaking about when he recently (November 30, 2015) stated:

*“Fundamentalism is a sickness that is in all religions (even Catholic fundamentalism). Such people “believe they possess the absolute truth and go ahead dirtying the other with calumny, with disinformation, and doing evil.” “We have to combat it,” he said. “Religious fundamentalism is not religious, because it lacks God. It is idolatry (in his case, the idolatry of nation or of Gnostic*

fraternity), *like the idolatry of money.*"[\[xxiii\]](#)

The following links are provided for more information about this topic:

[David Barton Falsely Claims He's Been Labeled A Hate Group By The FBI](#)

[Does David Barton Have A Ph.D.? Even He Doesn't Seem To Know](#)

[David Barton Falsely Claims Justice Breyer Acknowledged That 'The Bill Of Rights Came Out Of The Bible'](#)

[David Barton: The Declaration Of Independence And Bill Of Rights Came Directly Out Of The Bible](#)

[David Barton Falsely Claims He's Been Labeled A Hate Group By The FBI](#)

[David Barton and Bogus Ph.D](#)

[Videos a Common Sense Rebuttal](#)

---

## END NOTES

1. The specious AD argument does not work. Some Christian ideologues who prefer ignorance to truth have scoured the document looking for just one reference to God. Finding none, they resort to the signature date which contains the words "In the year of Our Lord". And then mockingly proclaim that the "secularists" are obviously wrong, as if this one miniscule thread redeems the entire document from being secular. This is a ridiculous argument, one worthy of only a footnote. By this logic, Hilary Clinton is a card carrying Christian because she heads or closes her correspondence with the Christian date. Or, conversely, the Portuguese who live before 1700 are *not* Christians because they did not begin using the AD style until the 18th century. Using the in conventional date is *nothing but standard practice*; it is not evidence from which to draw conclusions about such deep seated beliefs as faith in Jesus

Christ, and all that He taught. **New Agers even claim that Jesus is Lord** along with a host of other gods and lords. Thomas Jefferson called himself a “Christian” because he believed in the morals taught by Jesus. But he denied His divinity, incarnation, and resurrection; most especially, he denied the Trinity, which disqualifies him from being a Christian no matter how much he might protest: “Who is a liar, but he who denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is Antichrist, who denieth the Father, and the Son.” (1 John 2:22). AD, moreover, is one of several dating mechanisms used throughout Masonry and Masons are not Christians because they deny the divinity of Christ as Jefferson did. ([http://grandlodgeofiowa.org/docs/Masonic\\_History/AnnoLucis.pdf](http://grandlodgeofiowa.org/docs/Masonic_History/AnnoLucis.pdf))

[\[iii\]](#) All legitimate nations do derive authority and power from God through the natural law. The Church, is the only society conferred power and authority be means of the divine law and also by means of the natural law.

[\[iv\]](#) John Adams, Letter to John Taylor

[\[v\]](#) Thomas Jefferson (1810) *Letter to Samuel Kercheval*

[\[vi\]](#) Letter to Dr. Benjamin Rush, September 23, 1800

[\[vii\]](#) The Evangelical Founding Father:  
[http://www.patheos.com/blogs/anxiousbench/2015/11/the-most-evangelical-founding-father/?ref\\_widget=related&ref\\_blog=anxiousbench&ref\\_post=what-can-we-learn-from-the-david-barton-controversy](http://www.patheos.com/blogs/anxiousbench/2015/11/the-most-evangelical-founding-father/?ref_widget=related&ref_blog=anxiousbench&ref_post=what-can-we-learn-from-the-david-barton-controversy)

[\[viii\]](#) The Barton Chronicles  
<http://candst.tripod.com/bartchron.htm>

[\[ix\]](#) Blair Scott Michigan Atheist  
<http://michiganatheists.org/2015/04/27/david-barton-and-fake-quotes/>

[\[x\]](#) *ibid*

[\[xi\]](#) <http://www.positiveatheism.org/writ/founding.htm>

[\[xii\]](#) Scott

[\[xiii\]](#) J. Brent Walker, “A Critique of David Barton’s Views on Church and State,” Baptist Joint Committee for Religious

Liberty, April 2005

[xiv] Texas Freedom Network Education Foundation, "The Anatomy of Power: Texas and the Religious Right in 2006," p.19

[xv]

[http://www.pfaw.org/media-center/publications/david-barton-propaganda-masquerading-history#\\_edn21](http://www.pfaw.org/media-center/publications/david-barton-propaganda-masquerading-history#_edn21)

[xvi] Rob Boston, "Sects, Lies and Videotape," *Church & State*, Volume 46, No. 4, April 1993, pp 8-1

[xvii] Wikipedia, Schuessler, Jennifer (2012-07-16). "[And the Worst Book of History Is](#)". *New York Times*. 2012-07-19.

[xviii] Wikipedia, Kidd, Thomas (August 7, 2012). "[The David Barton controversy](#)". *World* (God's World Publications, World News Group). Retrieved April 9, 2013.

[xix] Wikipedia, Kidd, Thomas (August 7, 2012). "[The David Barton controversy](#)". *World* (God's World Publications, World News Group). Retrieved April 9, 2013.

[xx] Blakeslee, Nate (September 2006). "[King Of the Christocrats](#)". *Texas Monthly* **34** (9): 1. [ISSN 0148-7736](#). Retrieved 2008-11-10.

[xxi] Barton, David. "[Unconfirmed Quotations](#)". *WallBuilders website*. Archived from [the original](#) on September 28, 2007.

[xxii] (On page 248, for example, Barton pulled this quote from a Supreme Court of New York case called *People v. Ruggles*: "This [First Amendment] declaration ... never meant to withdraw religion ... and with it the best sanctions of moral and social obligation from all consideration and notice of the law." In the unedited version, however, it is abundantly clear that the "declaration" referred to is not the First Amendment, as Barton indicated in brackets, but an article of the New York state constitution.) In the vault, I finally got to take a closer look at a piece of plastic-sheathed parchment Barton had been waving around on the pastors' tour in D.C., which he claimed was an example of Jefferson signing a document "In the Year of Our Lord Christ." It was already pretty flimsy evidence that Jefferson was a Christian, but on closer inspection it appeared that Jefferson himself had not even written the words; the document was the nineteenth-century

equivalent of a form letter. (Texas Monthly: <http://www.texasmonthly.com/articles/king-of-the-christocrats/> ). [\[xxiii\]](#)

<http://www.catholicherald.co.uk/news/2015/11/30/pope-francis-says-he-is-not-losing-any-sleep-over-vatican-leaks-trial/>

---

# Beware The False Apostles of “Americanism” Part One

[New Era World News](#)

*“I join you, therefore, in sincere congratulations that this den of the priesthood is at length broken up, and that a Protestant Popedom is no longer to disgrace the American history and character.”*

[Thomas Jefferson to John Adams upon the disestablishment of religion in Massachusetts \(Works, Vol. iv., p. 301\).](#)

**BEWARE OF THE SPECIOUS CLAIM** that America was founded by Christian men on Christian principles. The claim has long been touted by ideologues men (and women) who are in the business of falsifying information to suit their “noble” agenda. Their agenda includes other similar unsubstantiated and false claims made about the Catholic church.

These men and women (primarily Christian ideologues who correlate Christianity with the United States, capitalism, and the constitution) seem to have no problem distorting, changing, and twisting the Church’s sacred documents just as they mangle and pervert American historic documents so that they can present an untrue picture, a picture that matches their distorted script about God, history, current events and even the end of the world and a supposed pre-

tribulation rapture.

False prophets such as these have difficulty distinguishing their religion from their politics. Somewhere along the line they conceived the idea that America is the “light of the world”, a nation with a God-given destiny to establish a “New Order of the Ages” or as it says on the nation’s currency, “*Novus ordo seclorum*”. Men such as these place their political philosophy in front of their moral and spiritual theology. Then disguised as disciples of Christ, they attempt to foist their false political and messianic agenda on the world in the name of Christ. They are so convinced by the righteousness of their cause that they are willing to distort the truth in order to advance their highly cherished but fallacious world views.

Somehow, they seem to think that it is the will of God, the *Supreme Law Maker* and *Omnipotent Ruler of the Universe*, that Americans should draft laws without Him, that He endorses the separation of church and state whereby He is shut out of the political, economic and social arenas, effectively denied a voice in the public affairs of the nation leaving it to elected officials to promulgate their own secular-statutory laws in disregard of the divine law given by God to mankind in both the Old and New Testaments.

Almost every American man, woman, and child has accepted this idea (the secularization of the state and promulgation of man-made laws rooted in the supposed ***sovereignty of the people*** rather than in the ***sovereignty of God***). Popular sovereignty and the separation of church and state are liberal political slogans that have become sacred American dogma. Neoconservative politicians, who give requisite lip service to Christ, act like it is their sacrosanct duty to spread political, economic and social “Liberalism” aboard as if it were derived from God, when in fact, on many points, “Americanism” is antithetical to the laws given by God to govern His people – antithetical and deadly.

*The ultimate consequence of this American dogma practically speaking (that is not theoretically, but practically, what in fact has, and is taking place) is the denial that the Gospel and the Church’s*

*social teaching, (drawn from it) have any applicability in the broader political, social, and economic realm. These broad public realms were declared off-limits to the Church. As a result of the Framers privatization of religion, these realms have slowly become secularized and ultimately dehumanized [“structures of sin”](#) that manifest a [“culture of death”](#) (Pope John Paul II ” [\(Sollicitudo Rei Socialis, 36-37-38-39-40\)](#)).*

It is the exclusion of God from the public forum and the corollary rejection of Divine Law, inherent in the system established by the Framers, that are the root causes of the problems that the church has condemned as “Americanism”.

By portraying the Founding Fathers as Christian men who bequeathed the nation a Christian Constitution, and then further insisting that it be treated as a **sacred** document, Americans have mistakenly replaced Divine Authority with human authority and elevated a secular man-made law over and above God-given Divine Law. Knowingly or not, we have exiled the omniscient and omnipresent God from the America political playing field and in the process institutionalized secular rule. This mistake is perpetuated by insisting that Founding Fathers, the “wise” and “virtuous” men who gave us a sacred Constitution, be continually placed on sacerdotal pedestals – including, wherever possible, church pedestals – when in fact, all they left us with is a secular Constitution subject to the whim of the “people” and to be freely interpreted by any political ideology that might suit the Justices.

As long as the Founding Fathers are revered above the saints and the prophets or somehow judged to be equal in stature to them, we will continue to perpetuate the polysemous and ambiguous secular and philosophical ideas on which they founded this nation.

Love of country and patriotism are splendid assets; however, when people raise the Constitution with one hand and tout the bible in the other claiming they are both sacred documents from God, beware “Americanism”. Such people, in the guise of patriotism are often misguided and wayward “nationalists.”



Pope Leo XIII addressed these concerns in his encyclical [\*Testem Benevolentiae Nostrae\*](#) in which he condemned several false ideas that Catholic prelates were introducing to the church in America; thereby slowly transforming her into an institution governed by, and therefore subject to, the same secular and democratic ideas that the United States government was founded upon, ideas such as majority rule, the cherishing of practical action and social work over prayer and contemplation, popular sovereignty, and the separation of church and state and a deficient idea of the “natural law”. Pope Leo was, in effect, attempting to protect the church from the false prophets of Americanism; these were the men (and women) who had blindly subordinated their faith to their politics, and were bringing the latter into the church *rather than the former into the latter*.

They quickly became advocates of “American Exceptionalism”, of liberal ideas such as the separation of church and state, and popular sovereignty. In the nation’s new public schools, curricula were established by **anti-Christian atheists**, such as **John Dewey** (the **grand patriarch of the American Public School System** and Teacher Training Colleges), to overcome the effects of too much Christianity. Due to the increased secularization of American education, virtue was increasingly understood as a civic character trait (something very different than that taught by Aristotle, Aquinas, and Doctors of the Church) manifest in utilitarian excellence and the ability to achieve practical results strengthened by a democratic character whereby tolerance is turned into false-liberty increasing characterized by nihilism, skepticism, and an ever increasing acceptance of moral relativity as logical outgrowths of Dewey’s utilitarian philosophy and disdain for Christian ideas.

*“There is (he said) no God and there is no soul. Hence, there is no need for the props of traditional (Christian) religion. With dogma and creed excluded, then immutable truth is dead and buried. There is no room for fixed law or permanent moral absolutes”* ([\*John Dewey – The Legacy\*](#)).

John Dewey was made the President of the National Education

Association, which facilitated the ideals and liberal values of the new secular government, which were slowly but inevitably incorporated into the curricula of newly created public schools until the privatized religious and moral sphere morphed with and became increasingly congruent with the secular version of morality introduced in the public sphere.

According to Dewey and his disciples who gained control of the public school system:

*“The behavioral sciences are providing **new natural explanations** of phenomena so extraordinary that once their supernatural origin was, so to say, the natural explanation.”*

*“Geological discoveries ...have **displaced Creation myths** which once bulked large.” And*

*“The social sciences have provided a **“radically different version of the historic events** and personages upon which Christian religions have built” (John Dewey, A Common Faith, Yale University Press, 1934, pg 84).*

Making progress on all these fronts *vis a vis* Christianity Dewey, as early as 1908, was able to superciliously proclaim that the new civic religion of America was replacing the Christian religion:

*“**Our schools ... are performing an infinitely significant religious work.** They are promoting the social unity out of which in the end genuine religious unity must grow. ...dogmatic beliefs (articles of Christian faith)...we see disappearing... It is the part of men to... work for the transformation of all practical instrumentalities of education till they are in harmony with these (above) ideas” (John Dewey (1908) The Hibbert Journal, Dennis L. Cuddy, Ph.D. Chronology of Education, pg. 11.).*

The secular “experiment” undertaken by the Framers in 1787 bore its penultimate fruit in 1933, when John Dewey and a group of leading American intellectuals signed the “*Humanist Manifesto*”, which brought the slowly developing secular program into plain view; listed below are its more salient points:

- *Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.*
  
- *Man is a part of nature and that has emerged as the result of a continuous process.*
  
- *The traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected.*
  
- *The nature of the universe depicted by modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values.*
  
- *Man is at last becoming aware that he alone is responsible for the realization of the world of his dreams, that he has within himself the power of its achievement.*

Educational leaders such as John Dewey set the nation’s schools on a secular path on which liberal ideas (and more developed dogmas) in the guise of civic virtue were to replace long held sacred beliefs. After successful implementation throughout the nation, it was America’s God-given task to carry these dogmas throughout the world.

Students therefore imbibed large draughts of “Manifest Destiny”, a toxic brew served up in civics classes throughout the nation, a brew so intoxicating that it was preached from church pulpits thereby successfully giving birth to a new civic-religion containing doctrines that in many ways stood in opposition to the doctrines given them by Jesus Christ. Inebriated and pumped with missionary zeal and love of

country, they welcomed ideas about exceptionalism and zealously manned the ramparts when their teachers told them that it was their sacred duty to spread Americanism abroad. They were so pumped with love of country, with its "Manifest destiny" that they failed to see the blasphemy in their newly acquired views, views that presented America as the "Light of the World" and the "City set on a Hilltop" ordained by God to lead the nation of the world to freedom.

This is nothing but political hype repeated by zealous nationalists, men and women who place the Constitution on a pedestal along with the Holy Bible and then proceed to enthusiastically foist their erroneous political ideas on the rest of mankind; thereby zealously enslaving the world in the name of liberalism while claiming to set it free.

It was Jesus Christ, *not* the American government, that died to make men free; but the Framers had left Him out of the Constitution, had left any mention of God whatsoever out of the Constitution, and Dewey scornfully saw to it that He was excluded from the public schools, which became the vehicles for promoting new and false secular ideas about liberty. Nice as the pursuit of liberty might sound, *no government can advance the cause of liberty without Him* and especially without the Church that He commissioned for this purpose, *viz.*, to set all men free ([John 8:36](#)). Jesus is the way and the truth and the life, there is no other name under heaven by which men are saved; yet the Constitution demands that He remain out of the state's business.

**A secular government can achieve nothing (truly) good for man without God ([John 15:5](#)); yet they demand the constitutional right to do everything without Him.** When Christians put the Framers on a Sacred Pedestal, equate the Constitution with the Bible, and then support foreign policy more than they do Christian missionaries, we have a problem.

*"Unless the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it. Unless the Lord keep the city, he watcheth in vain that keepeth it"*  
[\(Psalm 127:1\)](#).

When Benjamin Franklin proposed that the delegates assembled to draft

the Constitution pray before they continued to work, **51 of the 55 delegates voted against the proposal**. On June 28, 1787, Franklin registered a plea to begin each day with prayer to the “Father of Lights”. A simple and sane request made to a group of supposedly Christian men ended up in an overwhelming rejection. According to Franklin himself, 51 of the supposed Christian delegates did not think prayer necessary. In his own words:

*“With the exception of 3 or 4, most thought prayers unnecessary.”  
(Ferrand, Records of the Federal Convention of 1787, rev. ed., Vol. 1, p. 452.)*

The Lord either builds the house or He doesn't; we either cooperate with Him or we build a city without Him, the “city of man” rather than the “City of God.” Are the words of [Psalm 127](#) just empty words or are they words of wisdom; if they are wisdom than we have acted like fools—it is clear that the Lord did not build the American house, nor was he, according to John Adams, even consulted.

*“It will never be pretended that any persons employed in that service (the writing of the constitution) had interviews with the gods, or were in any degree under the inspiration of heaven...it will forever be acknowledged that these governments were contrived by the use of reason and the senses (not faith and the bible)...Thirteen governments founded on the natural (versus supernatural) authority of the people alone” (John Adams, “A Defense of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America” (1788).*

The fact is that the “God of Nature”, the god known by “reason” was the god of the leading Founders (Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Franklin et al). They preferred the god of nature to Jesus Christ and His Bride, the Church, whom He divinely established to “feed His sheep and to shepherd His lambs” and to “teach all nations” in the name of the Holy Trinity. No, they preferred reason and reason's god, the “God of Nature.” Adams and Jefferson both boasted of this lamentable fact:

*“The question before the human race is, Whether the **God of nature***

*(the Deist, Masonic, Epicurean and Gnostic god) Shall govern the World by his own laws, or Whether Priests and Kings Shall rule it by fictitious Miracles? Or, in other Words, whether **Authority is originally in the People?** or **whether it has descended for 1800 Years in a Succession of Popes and Bishops, or brought down from Heaven by the holy Ghost in the form of a Dove, in a Phyal of holy Oil**" (John Adams)?[\[i\]](#)*

No, the Lord who gave the world His Divine Law (old and new) was *not* consulted when the "Founders" established their own laws without Him; He was purposefully and admittedly ignored. Despite the fact that America was a nation of Christians, Jesus Christ is *not* mentioned one time in our nation's supreme document[\[ii\]](#). Consistent with this American commitment to the "*God of Nature*" is the equally irreverent privatization of the Church under the guise of doing Her and all Americans a big favor. In other words, Christ was "kicked out" and the deed was conducted with cunning arrogance.

Pope Pius XI recognized the absurdity of this kind of social and political arrogance in his encyclical, [Quas Primas](#) (1925) in which he quoted the Prophet Daniel who foretold the universal kingdom founded by Christ. If His kingdom is universal and respected by Christian men, it is to be expected that such men would enshrine it as a beacon for the nation rather than relegate it to the private sphere unsupported by laws, tax dollars, public education, statue or ordinance. **Christ established a kingdom to stand forever, and the Framers were intent on building their own without Him.**

*"The kingdom that the God of heaven shall found, 'shall never be destroyed, and shall stand forever" [\(Daniel 2:44\)](#).*

Pope Pius reminds us that after the resurrection, Jesus solemnly affirmed his omnipotence and conveyed His power and authority to His Church[\[iii\]](#). **He did not confer divine power on any secular nation, nor did He direct any nation to be a "City on a Hilltop" or a "Light to the World". Those are things He delegated exclusively to His Church [\(Matthew 5:14\)](#) to whom He also delegated His own authority and**

power, something the Founding Fathers had a real difficult time understanding and respecting.

*"...when giving to his Apostles the mission of teaching and baptizing all nations he took the opportunity to call himself king, conforming the title publicly, and solemnly proclaiming that all power was given to him in heaven and on earth."*

If, as Daniel foresaw, Christ established a kingdom that will never be destroyed and that will stand forever, why did we exclude Him, why did Jefferson and Adams believe that the Church established by Christ was suffering from a "mortal wound" and would soon die?

*"Cabalistic Christianity, which is catholic (sic) Christianity, and which has prevailed for 1,500 years, has received a mortal wound, of which the monster must finally die. Yet so strong is his constitution, that he may endure for centuries before he expires"* ([John Adams](#), (July 16, 1814) Letter to Thomas Jefferson).

Obviously, many of these men were out of the spiritual loop. They excluded Christ because they envisioned America as His new church, his new kingdom and empire and themselves as a new priesthood. The new nation was to be governed exclusively by them and not by Catholic priests and Protestant clergy, against whom they had vowed "eternal hostility".

*"The clergy...believe that any portion of power confided to me [as President] will be exerted in opposition to their schemes. And they believe rightly: **I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility** against every form of tyranny over the mind of man"* (Letter of [Thomas Jefferson](#) to Dr. Benjamin Rush, September 23, 1800)

John Adams referred to the Protestant ministers as "yahoos" the great enemies of "free inquiry" who should be endured no longer.

*"And ever since the Reformation, when or where has existed a*

*Protestant or dissenting sect who would tolerate A FREE INQUIRY (Adams' own emphasis)? The blackest billingsgate, the most ungentlemanly insolence, the most yahooish brutality, is patiently endured, countenanced, propagated, and applauded."* [\[iv\]](#)

Jefferson concurred, the **Christian clergy** are:

*"... the greatest obstacles to the advancement of the real doctrines of Jesus, and do in fact constitute the real Anti-Christ."* [\[v\]](#)

Catholic priests and Protestant clergy were the great deceivers, the tyrants over the minds of men whom Jefferson had sworn upon the altar of God to eradicate:

The Framers must have thought very highly of themselves. Likewise, Americans who believe the "Christian" myths about them probably believe themselves to be very special people, although more and more people around the world are having difficulty seeing it.

Christ's kingdom is *not* of this world – that is, it is not founded on anyone's political power; it is conveyed fully to His Church; the Church that our "Founders" excluded from public life and left to fend for itself without a dime for His cause and without any public show of support either from the schools from which He we also *excluded* or from the public *dais* from which He was *forbidden*. This was, and is, certainly a funny way for a "Christian nation" to treat its King, an odd way to reverence the one whom you claim to serve.

If the Framers in the name of reason and reason's god (the "*God of Nature*", on whom they built the new nation) removed Christ from the public arena and were at war with the Christian clergy (the so-called "Antichrist")", we can be quite sure who the "*God of Nature*" is and who the men that profess loyalty to him are. How can any authentic Christian clergyman claim that America is a holy nation founded by men who loved Jesus and therefore established a Christian foundation? The fact is (beside clergy who are just ignorant "blind guides"), men who stridently profess such things in the name of Christ are themselves



enemies of Christ, dispensational bigots who have no problem forging documents and distorting facts to push their agenda and catch people unawares in the idolatrous trap of "Americanism".

One of America's *unsung* founders was Elias Boudinot. Boudinot was a president of the Continental Congress, a United States Congressman and from 1795 to 1805 he was the director of the U.S. Mint.

Boudinot was alarmed by the disregard for Christian principles by many leaders of the new American government;

*"But has not America greatly departed from her original (17th century) principles, and left her first love? Has she not also many amongst her chief citizens, of every party, who have forsaken the God of their fathers, and to whom the spirit may justly be supposed to say, "ye hold doctrines which I hate, repent, or else I will come unto you quickly, and will fight against you with the sword of my mouth."[\[vii\]](#)*

The fact is, the foremost founders were *not* Christians. The leading lights among them hated both the Trinity and the Church established by Jesus Christ. The current successors of these men who claim to be Christian ministers, ministers who tell us that the Founders were Christian, and that the Constitution is a Christian document, are wolves in sheep's clothing ([Matt 7:15](#)). Many are deceiving ministers who dress in sheep's clothing; that is, in lay garb rather than clerical garb (because they have like Jefferson and Adams rejected the clergy and set themselves up as guides). Priests do not wear sheep's clothing, *i.e.*, the clothing of the flock they shepherd. They wear clerical garb. Wolves dressed in sheep's clothing are lay ministers who wear business attire rather than ecclesial or liturgical attire. The truth is that these so-called Christian-American zealots do not have Jesus Christ for their God or the Church for their Mother; they have no king but Caesar; that is, their allegiance is to the Republic *before* it is to the Church, even though they claim to be ministers of Christ.

Not all who claim allegiance to Christ have allegiance to Christ, but

only those who do the will of his Father.

*“Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does the will of my Father in heaven. Many will say to me on that day, ‘Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name? Did we not drive out demons in your name? Did we not do mighty deeds in your name?’ Then I will declare to them solemnly, ‘I never knew you.\* Depart from me, you evildoers [\(Matt 7: 21-23\)](#).”*

Pope Saint Pius X saw through the charade,

*“We must repeat with the utmost energy in these times of social and intellectual anarchy when **everyone takes it upon himself to teach as a teacher and lawmaker – the City cannot be built otherwise than as God has built it; society cannot be setup unless the Church lays the foundations** and supervises the work; no, civilization is **not** something yet to be found, nor is the New City to be built on hazy notions; **it has been in existence and still is**: it is Christian civilization....It has only to be set up and restored continually against the unremitting attacks of **insane dreamers, rebels and miscreants.**” (St. Pope Pius X, [Notre Charge Apostolique](#), April 15, 1910).*

Because many of these self-styled “pastors” are “miscreants”, “rebels” and “dreamers”, it should come as no surprise that many so-called ministers, men who are supposed to be lovers of the truth and “ambassadors” of Jesus Christ, the way and the truth and the life”, seem to have no problem telling a lie to gain fame or to make a buck, or worse, in order to advance an agenda that makes them guilty of that which they accuse others, viz., being unchristian.

The truth is, many of the so-called conservative fundamentalists and dispensationalists ministers who claim that “liberals” are distorting the facts about the Christian roots of American government are the real ones that are doing the distorting; their scholarship is often so offensive that it makes an honest man blush and then (as will be shown

in the follow-up article) so incensed that they move into action to expose its falsity). The output of Christian nationalists has become legion. Perhaps you have seen their websites, or read their books and media tracts claiming that the United States Constitution was written by stalwart Christian men totally committed to Christ and the building of a Christian nation.

*What many of their readers are unaware of is that many of the quotes they use to defend their claims are fabricated, misunderstood, or misrepresented.*

**End Part One:**

[Go to Part Two](#)

---

# Vatican Being Vetted Part III: Pope Francis and the Role of Trinitarian Theology

[New Era World News](#)

**Pope Francis and Trinitarian Theology**

[Continued from Part Two](#)

POPE FRANCIS IS ADROITLY applying Trinitarian Theology in the modern context; he is demonstrating that **wisdom** (the truths of dogmatic theology) **by itself though a good**, among the highest and greatest goods, **is a deficient good. Wisdom reaches its perfection in love; wisdom is consummate in love.**

*Without love wisdom cannot reach its telos or end, which is communion with other human beings as the Body of Christ and union with God as sons in the Son.*

God the Father in knowing Himself from eternity begot the Eternal Word born out of His infinite and eternal self-knowledge. The Holy Trinity however is *not* consummate in the begetting of the Word, Divine Wisdom; **the Holy Trinity is consummate in the union of Father and Son by the Love they have for each other, a love from which the Holy Spirit is spirated perfecting the Trinity and making them One. It is not wisdom ALONE, BUT WISDOM CONSUMMATE IN LOVE that is the bond of Trinitarian and therefore perfect Substantial Unity – The Holy Trinity.** The Father first knows the Son, the Son knows the Father and in reciprocal knowing, They are impelled to love each other with the fullness of Divine Love and Divine Life that we call the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Divine Love spirated from the infinite and eternal Love shared between Father and Son.

**POINT: Wisdom is consummate in loving.** That is, **wisdom without love is not and cannot be fecund, wisdom without love is incomplete-imperfect.** Divine wisdom, the self-knowledge of God brings forth the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from, and is the “fruit” of, Divine Love the perfection of the Holy Trinity, who is Love. All-Knowing Wisdom and Life-Giving love constitute one integral Divine being – Wisdom and Love belong together; one without the other is deficient. Wisdom is consummate in love; wisdom precedes love in the “order of operation”:

*“For the procession of love occurs in due order as regards the procession of the Word (wisdom); since nothing can be loved by the will unless it is (first) conceived in the intellect” ([Aquinas Q 27, A 3](#)).*

In **human terms**, this means that there must be a unity and profound cooperation between wisdom and love and among the sentient powers and operations of the human soul, passions, intellect and will. This is why the masters of mystical theology have articulated three stages on the road to

spiritual perfection: the *purgative* (having to do with the sentient passions), the *illuminative*, (having to do with the acquisition of wisdom) and the *unitive* (having to do with growth in love by which a person is united to God.) Notice the order of perfection: purgative-illuminative-unitive. **The unitive, which depends on love, is last, the final end, the consummation of discipline of body and enlightening of intellect that ascends to union with God by way of love.**

*Wisdom is not the telos. Love of God that brings about union with God, the divinization of man as the Body of Christ is the telos, the end of human powers and operations assisted by Divine Grace.*

**Love, not wisdom, is the highest attainment of the human mind.** It is an attainment of the human mind because love proceeds from the **will**, which as Aquinas tells us is an **“INTELLECTUAL appetite.”** **This is the key to understanding Pope Francis’ insistence on pastoral theology.** Wisdom, one might say, **represents an attainment of dogmatic theology;** it is an intellectual virtue that remains incomplete unless consummated in unitive love, the love of **God AND neighbor** – the love that is **the work of “pastoral theology.”**

Those who do not like to hear that God is Love must answer to the sacred scriptures wherein Saint John clearly and explicitly informs the universal body, that **“God is Love.”** Moreover those who do not know love, those who do not live love, those who over-emphasize wisdom and dogma to the detriment of love, do not know God because **“God is love.”**

*“Beloved, let us love one another, because love is of God; everyone who loves is begotten by God and knows God. **Whoever is without love does not know God, for God is love.**” ([1 John 4: 7-8](#)).*

Why does Francis want his pastors to “get dirty” to mix with

their sheep so they can “smell” like their flock? Why, because he wants them to discern openings for possible fuller admission into the ministries of the laity and eventual invitation to the sacraments, why because pastoral theology is the work of love:

*“Love is **patient**, love is **kind**. It is not jealous, [love] is **not pompous**, it is not inflated, it is **not rude**, it does not seek its own interests, it is **not quick-tempered**, it does not brood over injury, it does not rejoice over wrongdoing but rejoices with the truth. It **bears all things**, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things” ([1 Corinthians 13:4-8](#)).*

Love moreover, unlike justice, love is not interested in claiming its rights, in counting wrongs done. Love seeks to *pardon* and *excuse*, while the devil looks to *condemn* and *accuse* ([Rev. 12:10](#)). Unfortunately, he is sometimes imitated by some members of the Body of Christ whom the pope is addressing when he often times belittles condemnation and judgmentalism.

*“Love (however) **never fails.**” ([1 Cor 13:8](#)).*

It is by love, not dogma, that priests leave the comfort of their studies, of their offices and rectories, to encounter the world and become “fishers of men.”

*“‘This is what I am asking you’,” [Pope Francis emphasized](#) while looking up from his prepared text, “be shepherds with the smell of sheep,” so that people can sense the priest is not just concerned with his own congregation, but is also a fisher of men.’*

This is rudimentary; it is therefore also **surprising that so many miss this primordial dictum of the faith, so many in the Church who cry for justice, demand condemnation of sinners, look forward to and predict global cataclysms and**

chastisements, while Jesus Christ, is Himself calling for Mercy and asking His Church to proclaim mercy – mercy before justice. However there are those in the Church (those whom Francis is prodding to become pastors) who are content with expressing the faith by straining at the gnat of dogmatic truths and swallowing the camel of mercy and therefore erroneously cry for justice – justice – justice.

*“Many publicans and sinners came, and sat down with Jesus and his disciples. And the Pharisees seeing it, said to his disciples: **Why doth your master eat with publicans and sinners?** But Jesus hearing it, said: They that are in health need not a physician, but they that are ill. **Go then and learn what this meaneth, I will have MERCY and not sacrifice. For I am not come to call the just, but sinners.**”*

HAVE WE FORGOTTEN THIS? THE STUDY OF DOGMA AND REFLECTION ON  
DIVINE LAW LEAD TO  
WISDOM THAT MUST BE ACTUALIZED IN LOVE AND MERCY BECAUSE THE  
DIVINE LAW IS LOVE – AGAPE

As was said in a previous column, those calling for justice and predicting calamities should watch what they are pleading for, they might receive it themselves. Was it justice or mercy that characterized the attitudes of Moses, of Peter, of Paul or of Christ Himself, when He and they interceded for members of their flock? What did the Lord say to James and John when they bellowed for the thunder of justice to be rained down upon sinners?

*“And he sent messengers before his face; and going, they entered into a city of the Samaritans, to prepare for him. And they received him not, because his face was of one going to Jerusalem. And when his disciples James and John had seen this, they said: Lord, **wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them?** And turning, he rebuked them, saying: You know not of what spirit you are. The Son of*

*man came not to destroy souls, but to save” ([Luke 9: 52-56](#)).*

**No, until the “Parousia” it belongs to the state, not the Church, to administer justice and punish sinners:**

*“Let every soul be subject to higher powers: for there is no power but from God: and those that are, are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation. For princes are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good: and thou shalt have praise from the same. For he is God’s minister to thee, for good. But if thou do that which is evil, fear: for he beareth not the sword in vain. For he is God’s minister: an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil”([Romans 13:1-4](#)).*

**It belongs to the Church to tame severity, to put away the sword of vindictive justice and to suffer for the unjust as Christ did ([Matt 26:52](#)).** This is what Our Lady at Fatima asked for: reparation prayer, prayer fructified by suffering for the sins of others borne out of charity and love for lost souls.

*“I Paul am made a minister. [Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you](#), and fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, in my flesh, for his body, which is [the church](#).”*

*God did not come to condemn the world, but to save the world ([John 3:17](#)).*

A priest intercedes for his people; he implores mercy and like Christ the High Priest whom he images (persona Christi), he offers himself as a victim in their place. This is a far cry from judgmentalism, from what Pope Francis refers to as Phariseeism, a Phariseeism that has infected some of his



pastors and turned them into dogmatic theologians. A leader intercedes for his people:

*“But Moses besought the Lord his God, saying: **Why, O Lord, is thy indignation kindled against thy people**, whom thou hast brought out of the land of Egypt, with great power, and with a mighty hand? Let not the Egyptians say, I beseech thee: He craftily brought them out, that he might kill them in the mountains, and destroy them from the earth: **let thy anger cease**, and be appeased upon the wickedness of thy people. **Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou sworest by thy own self**, saying: I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven: and this whole land that I have spoken of, I will give to you seed, and you shall possess it for ever. **And the Lord was appeased from doing the evil which he had spoken against his people**” ([Exodus 32: 11-14](#)).*

God was “appeased” due to the intercession of Moses who chose to plead for, rather than condemn, the sinners in his flock. In this, he prefigured the ultimate and infinite intercession of Jesus Christ the High Priest who offered Himself on the cross for sinners. Applying this lesson and example of intercessory and reparative love to modern-day lay leaders, it might be stressed that Jesus did *not* come to introduce a fashion show and to have medallions hung on His chest as Francis has pointed out to the Knights of Malta when reminding them of their charism of service to the poor. They and all members of the Body of Christ are to serve in humility and simplicity, to save souls by offering themselves in Christ for them. This is love and reparation. Reparation is not something intended solely for the priests. Is not this what Our Lady requested at Fatima – “Communions of Reparation”. Did we somehow forget about reparation, of sacrificial self-giving for love of poor sinners who have no one to pray for them???

Traditionalists who are big on Fatima should be stressing mercy for poor sinners and laying down their lives to win the

grace of conversion for them. But, what we constantly here is an unending refrain about supposed dogmatic abuses and supposed erring formulas of papal consecration for the conversion of Russia, which is essentially none of the laity's business anyway. Our Lady asked the pope to conduct the consecration; it is up to the pope to decide how it should be carried out. If Fatima connotes a battle over the consecration of Russia in your mind, you can be sure that you missed the Message of Fatima: Penance-Penance-Penance in an attitude of reparative love offered to God in union with His Passion in the Sacrifice of the Mass for the conversion of poor sinners and the Triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary!

*What does penance and reparation mean but mercy and love – the mercy and love from which they flow manifest in pastoral care for straying and lost sheep?*

Yet, often instead of pastoral care, instead of mercy, love and compassion bringing life to those in blighted outcast ghettos, on roaring sensual highways, and forgotten lonesome byways, etc, instead of love and mercy manifest in the daily toil of evangelization by means of pastoral care binding up the wounds of the lost and forgotten, instead of this we often find bloated men and women who want to wear military regalia, don titles of nobility and desirous of preferred seats, men and women who spend great swathes of time talking about trying to make things like they used to be in some romantic and unrealistic nostalgic past, while the wolves pulverize the sheep economically, morally and spiritually and the best bloated nobles can do is offer "philanthropy". Pope Francis might be stinging a few consciences, but he is not wrong!

Philanthropy is NOT charity. Philanthropy condescends, philanthropy is a show; it gives far too little while holding the bulk for itself. Charity, on the other hand, gets out of its royal seat on a daily basis; it embraces both poverty and

the poor – it is empathetic and compassionate, not condescending and stooping; charity is humble, it gives in secret ([Matt 6:6](#)) and it gives fully of its assets saddened that it cannot give more; charity expects nothing not even an acknowledgement from men:

*“A poor widow also came and put in two small coins worth a few cents. Calling his disciples to himself, he said to them, “Amen, I say to you, this poor widow put in more than all the other contributors to the treasury For they have all contributed from their surplus wealth, but she, from her poverty, has contributed all she had, her whole livelihood” ([Mark 12: 42-44](#)).*

Charity embraces those who are being served, it lives among them, eats with them, sleeps with them – charity, in short, begins to look and “smell” like the sheep it serves.

This is exactly what Francis is trying to promote. To bring it about, easy-living, worldliness, grandiosity, and vain-glory must be purged. But the enemy of Christ and of His Church is the King of Pride and Vain-glory. He surrounds himself, his followers and numerous others whom he lulls to spiritual sleep, he surrounds them with luxuries and the trappings that come with material abundance, an abundance that feeds pride and kills the soul.

*“And calling the multitude together with his disciples, he said to them: **If any man will follow me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life, shall lose it: and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel, shall save it. For what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his soul?** ([Mark 8: 34-36](#)).*

The “Way of the Cross” is antithetical to the “Way of Perdition” most manifest in the spirit of materialism that has

deeply infected the Church.

*“For the gate is wide and the road broad that leads to destruction, and **those who enter through it are many** ([Matt 7:13](#)).*

Interestingly, in the following line of Matthew’s Gospel, *immediately* following the one just quoted, Jesus warns His Church that those who are on the Road to Perdition are often deceivers who hide behind a veil of good deeds:

*“Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep’s clothing, but underneath are ravenous wolves.”*

Then He further reveals that their spirit can be discerned by their conduct:

*“By **their fruits you shall know them**. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit, and the evil tree bringeth forth evil fruit.”*

That is, the spirit is *not* discerned by the works they do, but by **how they go about doing their works**. Fruits are *not* works *per-se*, but how works are done, for the fruits are:

*“Charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity, Mildness, faith, modesty, continency, chastity. Against such there is no law. And **they that are Christ’s, have crucified their flesh**, with the vices and concupiscences. ([Galatians 5: 22-24](#)).*

All the fruits grow out of Charity, which makes souls joyful, peaceful, patient, kind, long-suffering, chaste etc. That is why even small gifts, such as a few coins from a poor woman, can surpass large donations given by a rich man. One is given in love, the other out of necessity, justice, vanity or some

associated reason. **God regards the heart more than the gift.** Francis, like Christ, is *not* impressed by regalia, by insignia, or material abundance and worldliness, which are often a cover for corrupt spirits. The Holy Spirit is manifest in love, joy and mercy, in those who have “crucified their flesh”.

But there are those in the Church who identify holiness with “Titles of Nobility”, with medallions and regalia that, although not bad in themselves, easily infect the soul, easily corrupt virtue by the allurements of riches leading to vain-glory and the pride of life that result in dullness and ease that flatten virility and make men useless ([Matt 5:13](#)). Francis wants humble and virile men, men full of mercy, compassion love, which is the life of the soul and the light of the world. He therefore wants worldliness and materialism out of Malta, out of the Vatican, out of diocesan chanceries, institutes of religious life, out of deaneries and parishes; in short, he wants worldliness out of the Church.

He has asked the Knights of Malta to focus less on the outer regalia, less on worldly traditions associated with royalty; he wants them to become truly chivalrous by noble deeds of service out of love for Christ’s wounded Body on earth. To be militant, spiritually militant, requires much more than the donning of *beau monde* regalia and sword followed by salutes, hand shakes, and *mondaine* banquets. To be militant, truly militant, requires disinterested love of neighbor, to be ready to die to self out of love for the salvation of souls and the temporal needs of others *esp.* those of poor sinners. This is radical, the radical stuff of authentic Christian militancy.

Apparently the Island of Malta has been under severe material attack and has subcomb in many ways to the materialism that is infecting its prelates and noble men. The fact that it is not just lay leaders but also [the Maltese bishops who are also having a bout with the Vatican](#) is further indication of the serious problems festering on the stalwart island.

[The Maltese bishops' "Criteria for the Application of Chapter of Amoris Laetitia" has been referred to as "disastrous".](#)

They indicate, **against the express critique of Cardinal Mueller** (who will now have to work on correcting the egregious error promulgated by the Maltese Bishops), that it might prove to be "humanly impossible" for some civilly remarried couples to live chastely; nonetheless, a Catholic couple living in an objectively sinful situation may receive Holy Communion if they "are at peace with God."

It appears that some of the English Knights of Malta are bordering on elitist traditionalism and judgmentalism, what Francis refers to a Pharisee-ism, while the bishops have seemingly abdicated their prophetic responsibility and are not judging at all – bedlam on both ends of the theological spectrum. This is the problem, a problem that foments subjectivism in the name of a false pastoral theology that leads to excessive tolerance and false charity on one hand (liberalism on the part of the episcopate) and rigorous objectivism in the name of dogmatic theology and traditionalism leading to judgmentalism (ultra-conservatism on the part of some knights) on the other. There is an apparent and egregious struggle raging on the Island of Malta, a struggle between liberal and conservative knights and between conservative knights and liberal bishops of the State – the perfect dialectical recipe long used by secret societies to hatch discontent, division, and then subversion of both Church and State thereby compromising the works of love carried out by the authentic sons of the Church.

Focusing on the Knights, Francis is concerned that they engage in charitable work, charity that gives up its comforts to assist the uncomfortable, charity that *"comforts the afflicted but afflicts the comforted"*.

Thus according to [Austen Ivereigh](#) writing for [CRUX](#)

*"The president of the order's German Association, Erich*

Lobkowitz, has [described](#) the struggle as “a battle between all that Pope Francis stands for and a tiny clique of ultraconservative frilly old diehards in the Church – diehards that have missed the train in every conceivable respect.”

“The reformers want to focus on the Order’s humanitarian work among the poor, downplay the ceremonial pomp, and align the order more with Francis’s vision of an evangelizing, missionary Church.”

This is how we are to understand the stance Pope Francis has taken with the Knights of Malta. The Church is not a Puritan society of the elect; **the Church is the suffering Body of Christ full of sinners until the eschatological harvest** ([Matt 13:36-43](#)).

Without love no one can enter the Kingdom of God, yet there are a whole host of Catholics who continue to insist that it is wisdom that is the *summa bonum* (the greatest good). This is an error innocently advanced by Aristotle, the pagan philosopher who with the *unaided*-intellect examined the human soul and concluded that wisdom is the greatest human good. Near the end of his “Ethics” he moved close to the mystery of unitive love that he called “friendship”. Nonetheless, not having the benefit of sanctifying grace and the mystery of the Cross to contemplate, he referred to wisdom as the *summum bonum*, the highest intellectual attainment possible for mortal men. As we know, in the light of the Cross, Aristotle was partially correct (an astounding accomplishment for a pagan philosopher): **Wisdom participates in the greatest good, but by itself is not the summum bonum**, Wisdom consummate in love that unites mankind to God and to each other is the *summum bonum*, the highest attainment of the rational spiritual soul aided by supernatural grace- it is love that unites man to God

as one body, the Body of Christ – a body composed of sinners whom Christ came to save.

*“The two, **intellect and will**, work together as an **integral unity**. It is the nature of the mind to know and will to love or to unite that which is known to that by which it is known. The more the known is like the knower, the more the known can be loved because “likeness is the principle of loving” (Aquinas, Q 27, A 4). Like attracts like (Father and Son – Christ and members of His Body – man and wife) and **their union is consummated by way of love**, which is the “impulse” and “movement” that unites the one who loves to the one who is loved” ([Trinitarian Humanism, p 292](#)).*

In the end there are faith (theological virtue of wisdom), hope and love, but the greatest of these is love:

*“Then the King will say to those on his right, ‘Come, you who are blessed by my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me, I was naked and you clothed me, I was sick and you visited me, I was in prison and you came to me.’ Then the righteous will answer him, saying, ‘Lord, when did we see you hungry and feed you, or thirsty and give you drink? And when did we see you a stranger and welcome you, or naked and clothe you? And when did we see you sick or in prison and visit you?’ And the King will answer them, ‘Truly, I say to you, as you did it to one of the least of these my brothers, you did it to me” ([Matthew 25:34–39](#)).*

---



# Traditionalists for Vetting the Vatican Being Vetted Part II

[New Era World News](#)

## Renewal of the Church

[Continued from Part One](#)

Pope Francis has been, and continues to be, adamant about renewal in the Catholic Church. Like his namesake, **St Francis of Assisi**, the Holy Father is leading a movement for restoration of holiness, of Gospel simplicity, an outpouring of love, mercy, compassion and simplicity. Realizing that **the world** is afloat in a sea of materialism, ensconced under a veil of darkness, **imprisoned behind a nearly impregnable wall of cunning artifice**, realizing that **generations have been psychologically and culturally conditioned against logic (Logos) toward aversion for the good, true and beautiful**, realizing these things, the Vicar of Christ, moved by the Holy Spirit, is fully aware that this generation cannot be reached by sophisticated and lengthy appeals to reason – the “old evangelization.”

Consequently, there is another Francis that Pope Francis could just as well emphasize, the Counter Reformation Bishop, and Doctor of the Church, **St. Francis de Sales** (1567-1622). The walls of Geneva, the capitol of Reform Protestantism, the Protestantism that spread to the United Kingdom and to America, these walls were thought to be impregnable, but the saint persisted – not with reasoned arguments, denunciations and calls for divine justice, but with love..

*“Francis became bishop of Geneva, where his patience and mildness became proverbial. He often dared to walk the*

streets of the city where Calvin had his headquarters 50 years earlier. In fact he dialogued with the reformed leader and scholar Theodore Beza. Though ...plagued by doubts, his philosophy was "[Love will shake the walls of Geneva; by love we must invade it.](#)"

In his own words,

*"It is our fault if the name of the Lord is blasphemed among the nations, and of this, God through his prophets bitterly complains. Such are the waters of contradiction, which in my opinion, renews the ardor of heretics. ... I beg of you, fellow combatants, to check the flow of this water; let each one of us watch his own source and prevent it reaching the enemy; let the flow of our sinful actions surge back to their origin, and there evaporate in the heat of our Eternal Sun to deprive our enemy, as well as our people, of the spectacle of our scandals. ... Breach the walls of Geneva with our ardent prayers and storm the city with mutual charity. **Our front lines must wield the weapons of Love**" ([Oeuvres VII:100,107-110](#)).*

Elsewhere in a similar vein he uttered the simple but profound proverbial wisdom:

*["More bees attracted by a \(small\) teaspoon of honey than by an \(entire\) barrel of vinegar."](#)*

Saint Francis One venture Francis de Sales joined Saint Jane Frances de Chantal, to found the Visitation Sisters of Holy Mary.

The Visitation Sisters sole aim was:

*"...the life of charity exemplified in the Virgin Mary's visit to her cousin Elizabeth. This new order was uniquely conceived. It was established **not** on the traditional vows of*

*chastity, poverty and obedience, but always and everywhere on charity: "We have no bond but the bond of love," Francis wrote in the first Book of Profession. And, rather than focusing on stringent practices of mortification behind the walls of the monastery, as was common in religious orders of the time, these sisters would actually go out into the city, to visit and care for the sick."*

Like Francis de Sales, St. Jane de Chantal and St. Paul, Pope Francis keenly realizes that to be successful ambassadors of Christ modern evangelists must often take one, two, three even many steps backward with the view of winning souls to Christ, they must encounter the world with the "weapon of love" becoming all things to all men and women to win them to Christ.

*"For whereas I was free as to all, I made myself the servant of all, that I might gain the more. And I became to the Jews, a Jew, that I might gain the Jews: To them that are under the law, **as if** I were under the law, (whereas myself was not under the law,) that I might gain them that were under the law. To them that were without the law, **as if** I were without the law, (whereas I was not without the law of God, but was in the law of Christ,) that I might gain them that were without the law. To the weak I became weak, that I might gain the weak. I became all things to all men, that I might save all. And I do all things for the gospel's sake: that I may be made partaker thereof" ([1 Corinthians 9: 19-22](#)).*

In today's context Paul might have stated to the gay oriented I became **as if** gay oriented, to the liberal, **as if** liberal, to the oppressed **as if** oppressed. I became **all** things to **all** men, that I might save all. And I do all things for the gospel's sake: that I may be made partaker thereof"

This is not condescension but love, not an attitude of judgement, but one of mercy and compassion, the type of thing

needed for successful evangelization in a very difficult situation, a situation unlike any ever seen before, a situation where the intellect has been progressively dimmed until banished and replaced by systematic conditioning via an intrusive and unprecedented communications media in conjunction with psychological manipulation hinted at by Vladimir Lenin when he told Ivan Pavlov, the Father of Classical Conditioning, that he had "[saved the revolution](#)." What Pavlov discovered about the conditioning of animals could be applied to human beings and to entire societies in the name of the "Revolution" – this is one of the primary reasons Lenin was so interested in the "*Rural Electrification Campaign*" – to bring mass media into the homes of Christian peasants.

Thus, according to Lenin:

*"Communism is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country...Electrification which will provide a link between town and country, will put an end to the division between town and country, will make it possible to **raise the level of culture** in the countryside and to **overcome**, even in the most remote corners of land, **backwardness, ignorance, poverty, disease, and barbarism**" (Lenin "Collected Works", vol. 30, page 335).*

If the human intellect could be reduced to mere memory and imagination, sentient *not* rational powers of the human soul, and if freedom and toleration could open the doors to what was once forbidden until it became common place, if knowledge of alpha and beta brain tempos, of sleep states, dream patterns and hypnotic rhythms induced with light and sound waves, if images and ideas could be subtly conveyed with motion pictures paired with the proper light and sound patterns, associations could be placed in the recesses of the human mind, it could be turned away from truth and toward error until light is seen as darkness and darkness as light. If all this could be done, the mind and emotions could be manipulated, reason dimmed and

intellectual appeals made virtually meaningless in a culture turned against man, [something John Paul II identified as the fundamental problem of the modern world](#):

*“The evil of our times consists in the first place in a kind of degradation, indeed in a pulverization, of the fundamental uniqueness of each human person... To this disintegration planned at times by atheistic ideologies we must oppose, rather than sterile polemics, a kind of “recapitulation” of the inviolable mystery of the person.”*

The attack on the inviolable mystery on the human person is an attack on the Trinitarian mystery of man made in the image of God. Man has a mind capable of acquiring wisdom by rational acts on the intellect followed by a unique ability to love – to know and to love. Wisdom and love **the mystery of the Trinitarian dimensions of human existence rooted in the rational soul** is being decimated, “pulverized” not only by false ideologies but a systematic attack on the human mind. There has been nothing like this in the annals of recorded history, not even Rome in all its decadence was home to anything like this.

**Understanding the unique cultural *milieu* in which the Church must do its work of evangelization in the modern world helps make sense of the pastoral approach conveyed by Vatican Council II.** It helps to recall how the Church handled evangelization in the dark days of the Roman Empire. In those days, **it was quiet witness**, the living of good lives characterized by moral and theological virtue, mercy, long-suffering, obedience to lawful authority and patience with sin which was enculturated and widely accepted as normal. For evidence, of the Church’s *modus operandi* in this environment it is a simple matter of turning to the Epistles and the Books of Acts.

In Acts we find the the Apostles gathered in Jerusalem

discussing how best to deal with evangelization in the context of pagan culture *vis a vis* the more advanced Judaic culture in which the Apostles had been raised. Though raised in strictly religious environment, they had the percipience to recognize what they were dealing with, and the prudence to relax their rigor in order to win souls to Christ:

*“So that the rest of humanity may seek out the Lord, **even all the Gentiles on whom my name is invoked.** Thus says the Lord who accomplishes these things, known from of old.’ It is my judgment, therefore, that **we ought to stop troubling the Gentiles who turn to God, but tell them by letter to avoid pollution from idols, unlawful marriage, the meat of strangled animals, and blood** ([Acts 15: 17-20](#)).*

Of all the [613 Mitzvah of the Traditional Jewish Law](#) only four were applied. Only four were applied because of the effete nature of Roman culture at this time. Saint John Bosco understood the concept well:

*“The perfect is often times enemy of the good.”*

To much too soon, too heavy of a load on weak shoulders can easily break them down and then they will loose heart, rebel and perhaps walk away. As Pope Francis states, in such a situation small steps, what he refers to as **“gradualism”** must be taken. In a society infected with tolerance and excessive false ideas about freedom it takes time to desensitize, time to earn trust and to build a relationship on which truths of the faith can be built one by one slowly. The idea is so far diffused that it is found even in proverbial folk wisdom:

*“It was the straw that broke the camel’s back.”*

What some traditionalists are crying for, the rigor they want to impose upon themselves to attain spiritual perfection is one thing, a very good thing, but to impose it on others who

are no where ready is another thing, a very foolish and dangerous thing. That is why Church discipline has become "minimalist" in the modern context. It is not minimalist for everyone, anyone can walk the road of perfection and embrace the evangelical councils of poverty, chastity and obedience.

These are NOT COMMANDS or MITZVAHS, **necessary for everyone**, like the precepts or MITZVAHS imposed upon the pagan converts to Christianity, poverty, chastity and obedience are COUNCILS, which means they are voluntary. **We are not living in a Christian culture; we are living in a pagan culture acerbated by advanced technology that is being used, willy nilly, to condition people** – it is a very difficult state, one that requires patience and mercy. Too much rigor will break the camel's back; we must learn to be satisfied with the good before we can expect the perfect – gradualism!

Again, this idea surfaces in the Rule of Saint Augustine, it surfaces among men who had decided to seek perfection – even there the idea is still valid: *some are not ready to embrace the rigors* of the human ascent to Golgatha. In Augustine's memoirs we find an account of some monks complaining that others were eating and sleeping too much, lax at work, etc.

The august saint handled this challenge by counseling these brothers to thank God for their strength and ability to embrace a more prayerful and rigorous lifestyle; he counseled them to be merciful toward the others who were still weak, to pray for them and encourage them along the way rather than condemn and scorn them – a very timely lesson indeed! **This is a lesson brought to Fatima by the Mother of God who conveyed Her desire for reparation prayer and sacrifice, that is prayer and sacrifice made out of love for others who are too weak or lost to do it for themselves. Denying oneself out of love for others is antithetical to condemnation and justice.**

*No, reparation is born out of love and mercy, which is the very message Pope Francis is trying to get through our*

*hardened hearts and obdurate cerebra.*

Pope Francis knows very well what a sin is. [In a flight press conference from Azerbaijan to Rome he stated](#) response to questions about *Amoris Laetitia* he stated:

*"Sin is sin."*

*"Tendencies or hormonal imbalances create many problems and we have to take care **not** to say: **"It doesn't make any difference, let's live it up" No, not at all."***

*"But for every case welcome it, accompany it, look into it, discern and integrate it. This is what Jesus would do today."*

In other words, sin must be encountered with discernment, of how best to handle the situation each unique context.

The Pope Continues:

***"Please, do NOT say: "The Pope blesses transsexuals!" Please! Because I can already see the newspaper headlines... No, no. Are there any doubts about what I said? I WANT TO BE CLEAR. IT IS A MORAL PROBLEM. It is a problem."***

What Pope Francis wants is not the excusing of sin but encounter with sinners, openness, dialogue, in short a merciful relationship that opens a person to receive *"prevenient grace"* that step by step leads to healing and eventually, if possible, to the sacraments. A too quick judgment, a simple yes or no is not relational and will not do much for healing. Pastors have to go out of their way to encounter their sheep, esp the wayward ones:



*“If a man have an hundred sheep, and one of them should go astray: doth he not leave the ninety-nine in the mountains, and go to seek that which is gone astray? And if it so be that he find it: Amen I say to you, he rejoiceth more for that, than for the ninety-nine that went not astray” ([Matt 18:12](#)).*

Pope Francis, like Francis de Sales, John Bosco and St. Paul understood the context in which they were preaching the good news, understood the people they were shepherding because they took time to know them rather than simply condemning them. In a cultural context in which a propaganda campaign has become institutionalized, it is clear, people acculturated to this reality cannot be encountered by mere intellect alone – more is needed. Much more is needed in the 21st century than the 16th. In the 21st the propaganda campaign is in the very air that has become a global pestilence daily disseminated by the global media, the near-monopoly of public schools and universities where the infection has become so great as to constitute an unprecedented cultural, moral and spiritual epidemic. Professors who preach tolerance, acceptance, and anti-bigotry are excused by unthinking students who are unable to see past the hypocrisy coming forth from the mouth and manifest in the actions of a new generation of sociology and liberal arts professors who teach tolerance but do not practice it. They are like the Pharisees excoriated by Jesus

*“All things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do: but according to their works do ye not; for they say, and do not...Woe to you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; because you go round about the sea and the land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, you make him the child of hell twofold more than yourselves...Woe to you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; because you are like to whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear to men beautiful, but within are full of dead men’s bones, and of all filthiness. So you also outwardly indeed appear to men just;*

*but inwardly you are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.” ([Matt 23:3-28](#)).*

[https://youtu.be/fb0x\\_aSgjj0](https://youtu.be/fb0x_aSgjj0)

**“I am a Professor: “Fuck YOU” “Fuck that shit” “You should kick the ass of Neonazis.”**

End of Part Two – Go to Part Three (available 2/8/2017)

---

# **Traditionalists for Vetting the Vatican Getting Their Wish – They are Being Vetted**

[New Era World News](#)

**HIDDEN IN THE AFTERMATH OF A TUMULTUOUS THEOLOGICAL TREMOR**, a tremor intended to shake the pontificate of the Pope Francis, hidden in this aftermath can be found [unsubstantiated volatile rumblings such as the following](#) that give an indication what it is all about:

*“On April 8<sup>th</sup>, Amoris Laetitia was published; a document wherein it would appear that the pope had declared that fornication and adultery are not necessarily mortal sins, and what’s more, Almighty God Himself occasionally asks us to persist in committing them! The point apparently being, to open the door to Holy Communion for the civilly divorced and remarried, cohabitators, and perhaps even those who persist*

*in homo-deviant acts.”*

Apparently, there are more than a few who have fallen into the cracks caused by this global convulsion. Either they are sincere members of the Body of Christ being confused by sincere but liberal bishops and equally sincere traditionalist cardinals or there is, as [Pope Francis himself has noted, a cabal at work in the Church](#), a cabal that he is in the process of sweeping away. A cabal that Francis has identified as the “most serious problem he faces:

*“The problem is not having this [homosexual] orientation. No, we must be brothers and sisters. The problem is lobbying for this orientation, or lobbies of greed, political lobbies, Masonic lobbies, so many lobbies. This is the most serious problem for me”* ([CNS News](#)).

This problem has grown so acute that it has apparently penetrated the hallowed ramparts of Malta leading [Pope Francis to order a purge of Freemasons from the Knights of Malta](#).

For a long time, many on the right have been pleading for the popes to clean house; now that the cleaning has commenced many of the supplicants ravenous for a papal crackdown, are finding themselves on the bristles tips.

In the Holy Father’s own words:

*“There are also cases of malicious resistance, which spring up in misguided minds and come to the fore when the devil inspires ill intentions (often cloaked in sheep’s clothing).”*

*“This last kind of resistance **hides behind words of self-justification and often accusation,**” he said. “It takes refuge in **traditions, appearances, formalities,** in the familiar, or else in a desire to make everything personal,*

*failing to distinguish between the act, the actor and the action*

By using words such as *traditions, appearances and formalities*, it is quite clear whom the pope is referring to. [His words are similar to those of Cardinal Ratzinger](#) when he headed the sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith (CDF):

*“It is necessary to be strong in faith and to resist error even when it masquerades as piety.”*

The culprit is then brought into stark relief when the sacred scriptures point their light on the theme or error, piety, tradition etc:

*“And what I do I will continue to do, **in order to end this pretext** of those who seek a pretext for being regarded as we are in the mission of which they boast. For **such people are false apostles, deceitful workers, who masquerade as apostles of Christ**. And no wonder, for even Satan masquerades as an angel of light. So it is not strange that his **ministers** also masquerade as ministers of righteousness” ([2 Corinthians 11: 12-15](#)).*

Strangely, this could apply to “ministers” on the left and the right who have entered into an highly unusual alliance. Usually the two, left and right, are at each others throats, now in a strange set of circumstances they are either consciously or unconsciously working together to unseat the pope before he unseats them. Churchmen of the right are claiming that *Amoris Laettia* is unclear while those on the left are confirming their allegations by implementing specious diocesan guidelines that permit liturgical and sacramental abuses in the name of *Amoris Laetita*.

These obfuscating claims and divisive schema have prompted

Cardinal Mueller to suggest that it is the bishops, not the pope, that are causing the confusion. Recently, to the chagrin of both the right and the left, Cardinal Mueller defended the [doctrinal integrity of Amoris Laetitia](#). Those on the left (those who think the Magisterium has somehow opened the door for Holy Communion to unrepentant adulterers based on a private judgement of their own unformed conscience) are obviously in error – Cardinal Mueller has begun the process of addressing their error. But it is the Churchmen on the right who are unexpectedly sensing the heat. Following closely on the heels of this doctrinal pronouncement, intended to bring clarity, the Prefect for the CDF took measured aim at the Society of St. Pius X (SSPX). Mueller is in the process of revealing that it is not just liberals on the left that are causing confusion – those on the right are equally culpable. To do so he is using the issue of religious freedom.

According to Cardinal Mueller:

*“Religious freedom as a fundamental human right and freedom to protect religion regarding the supernatural revelation in Jesus Christ are recognized by every Catholic without reservation.”*

In response to this verity, some of the “faithful” composing the radical and schismatic far-right are acting like liberal protesters who have taken to the streets to vilify President Trump. Like them, they are engaged in a smear campaign involving false reporting, blatant disrespect, and sacrilege. [Expletives such as the following are rolling off of their tongues:](#)

*“Müller not only made it clear that he is in no way to be taken seriously, **he revealed his Catholic IQ; placing himself squarely in the category of functional idiot.***

Is this how one should speak to the Prefect for the Sacred

Congregation of Faith, the highest doctrinal authority in the Catholic Church? If not, this is a manifest instance of pride revealing what is hidden in the hearts of those who are impelled to speak this way:

*“Do you not understand, that whatsoever entereth into the mouth, goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the privy? But **the things which proceed out of the mouth, come forth from the heart**, and those things defile a man. For **from the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false testimonies, blasphemies**. These are the things that defile a man” [\(Matt 15: 17-20\)](#).*

A wise and well developed man does not revile his enemies – he opposes, but also respects. If the opposition happens to be with superiors, he prays for his superiors knowing that they will receive a stricter judgement and is careful not to offend in word esp. with words delivered to ears that have no business in the matter; that is, those who are not in a position to ameliorate:

*“Be ye not many masters, my brethren, knowing that you receive the greater judgment. For in many things we all offend. **If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man**. He is able also with a bridle to lead about the whole body...Even so the tongue is indeed a little member, and boasteth great things. **Behold how small a fire kindleth a great wood**. And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity.*

So how do we know that wisdom or words presented as wisdom are from the Holy Spirit, are from above? First, those who speak them are not in the business of daily reviling their superiors to an audience incapable of doing anything about it. Such men and women engage in controversies and apparent controversies like the Virgin Mary and like the just man, Joseph: Quietly and Privately; when they do so Loudly and Publicly, we begin to grow suspicious of their motives. When sarcasm and

belittling are added to the mix, our initial suspicions are emboldened because love is *not* sarcastic. The Spirit of God is revealed in “good conversation”, “meekness of wisdom”, it avoid “contentions”, it is “chaste” and “peaceable” and “full of mercy.”

*“Who is a wise man, and endued with knowledge among you? Let him shew, by a good conversation, his work in the meekness of wisdom. But if you have bitter zeal, and there be contentions in your hearts; glory not, and be not liars against the truth. For this is not wisdom, descending from above: but earthly, sensual, devilish. For where envying and contention is, there is inconstancy, and every evil work. But the wisdom, that is from above, first indeed is chaste, then peaceable, modest, easy to be persuaded, consenting to the good, FULL OF MERCY and good fruits (patience, kindness long suffering etc), without judging, without dissimulation. And the fruit of justice is sown in peace, to them that make peace.*

Some members of extreme right groups such as the the Society of St. Pius X (SSPX) wonder why they are having difficulties with the Vatican. When they speak in the following manner, as some of them do, it should not be too hard to figure out.

According to some members of SSPX, both Pope Francis and Cardinal Mueller are “[functional idiots](#)” whose ideas are “laughable” because they are “clowns” and “fools”.

*“Which brings me to Müller’s laughable suggestion that recognition of the Second Vatican Council is “not an unreasonably high hurdle” to overcome with respect to the regularization of the SSPX. Presumably, by “recognition” he means to say that the Council represents “an integral part of the tradition of the Church;” the prerequisite established by Benedict the Abdicator.”*

*“Remember, this Müller is the same German clown that just a few moments earlier said that it’s not acceptable to take one “key statement” of faith and reject others – as if the text of Vatican II doesn’t do exactly that on any number of points; most notably as it concerns the very matters he chose to highlight, religious freedom and ecumenism.”*

By bringing up the issue of religious freedom, which he wants members of the SSPX to “unreservedly recognize” as a “human right”, and “an obligation to ecumenism”, Cardinal Mueller has placed them in an imbroglio. In an attempt to demonstrate their intellectual superiority, some radical members of the SSPX begin to sound like emotionally distraught liberals who believe their ideas to be so extremely sacrosanct that they can impose them on everyone; those who disagree with them in the hierarchy are accused of vile intent, a disorientation that must be combated:

*“Rome has long been Satan’s playground, and only a fool ever imagined that Cardinal Müller may have somehow been spared the diabolical disorientation that has infected the overwhelming majority of those in the sacred hierarchy.”*

As Jesus warned, a man’s worst enemies are from his own household ([Matt 10:36](#)). These are enemies detected by their sarcasm, contentiousness, reviling and sacrilegious audacity; like the Pharisees before them, who accused Jesus Christ of being possessed by demons, they are not afraid to fulfill scripture by saying the same about His apostolic successors:

*“Do not we (Pharisees) say well that thou (Jesus) art a Samaritan, and hast a devil” ([John 8:48](#))?*

Addressing the issue further Jesus hinted that others would follow in the Pharisee footsteps and renounce the leaders of His Church the same way:



*“It is enough for the disciple that he become like his teacher, for the slave that he become like his master. **If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more those of his household!** ([Matt 10:25](#)).”*

Like their forefathers they will bring division into the Kingdom of God, which will be their undoing.

*“This man drives out demons only by the power of Beelzebul, the prince of demons.” But he knew what they were thinking and said to them, **“Every kingdom divided against itself will be laid waste, and no town or house divided against itself will stand”** ([Matt 12:24-25](#)).*

Since the Gates of Hell cannot prevail against the Church, apparently, it is time to drive this divisive force out of the Kingdom of God- something these brash opponents fear more than anything else. Like nation's around the world who have begun to see the pernicious errors of liberalism and have begun to set it aside – [some like Poland have gone as far as declare Jesus Christ to be their King](#) – Francis too has begun the long overdo and arduous chore of papal house cleaning.

[On the issue of religious freedom](#), one adamant accuser who believes he is superior to the Prefect of the CDF speaks with sarcasm containing all the marks indicated above. Addressing Cardinal Mueller's declaration of religious freedom as detailed in [Dignitatis Humane](#) he states:

*“I say, there is no human right to freedom of religion when that religion is false.”*

It is questionable if this critic of Vatican II ever read the document and if he did that he properly understood it. He is already engaging a straw man.

*“So Mr Muller, do you believe these religions are as equally*

*true as the Catholic faith founded by God in the flesh of Jesus Christ? If so, then you must at least tacitly support the above named practices no?"*

*"It seems to me, (and I do not have a degree in philosophy or theology, thank God,) that Catholicism and all the other mentioned "religions" cannot both be true. And, if you believe Catholicism is true, how can you then lend support the above named practices? especially when I really do not see Jesus as approving the above practices anywhere in Scripture."*

*"I am seeing a conflict here buddy, because you say you are Catholic, but you seem to support the right of anybody to do anything in the name of "freedom of religion"*

An outlandish presumption based on obnoxious ignorance, followed by disrespect, calling the Cardinal "buddy" and a silly deduction based on his own straw man argument. The fact is, he does not know what the cardinal thinks; if he does know, his sin is compounded because the cardinal does not believe anything remotely close to his distorted suppositions and conclusions.

Projecting his guilt and hiding behind a shield of feigned piety and sarcasm he then accuses cardinal Mueller of "Satanism" – enough is enough.

*"Actually, your belief in "freedom of religion" sounds exactly like Satanism to me... do whatever you want whenever you want with no restrictions...but again I'm just an ignorant lay Catholic person...not a prince of the Catholic Church."*

Speaking of his reform of the Vatican Curia, Francis told the

curates that his reforms, reforms he has just begun, would require more than surface ironing out; no he intends his reforms to be so deeply penetrating that they will remove ingrained stains, those that are most difficult to get out:

*“Dear brothers, it’s not the wrinkles in the church that you should fear, but the stains!”*

In his annual address to the Vatican Curia, he implied some of those engaged in “malicious resistance” to the reform are inspired by the devil. Resistance, he said is sometimes “open” and sometimes “hidden”, both of which can be constructive if conducted with proper intentions. However, he warned that

*“There are also cases of malicious resistance, which spring up in misguided minds and come to the fore when the devil inspires ill intentions (often cloaked in sheep’s clothing).”*

*“This last kind of resistance hides behind words of self-justification and often accusation...It takes refuge in traditions, appearances, formalities, in the familiar, or else in a desire to make everything personal, failing to distinguish between the act, the actor and the action.”*

Pope Francis means business and they know it. St. Peter *ora pro nobis*.

[Continue to Part Two](#)

---

# America's Foundations: A Secular Masquerade of Light

[New Era World News](#)

**Intelligence Report**

**American Foundations #2**

**GREAT EMPIRES ARE CENTURIES** in the making, “Rome was not built in a day”. Nor is the turbulent modern world something that was born a few short-decades ago out of the turmoil of the psychedelic “sixties”. The youth revolution was merely the artifact of a still-evolving revolutionary paradigm hatched in the 18th century referred to as “classical liberalism” or just plain “liberalism”. Liberalism is a broad-scale modern ideology that rests on three pillars of economic, moral, and political liberty. Universities and libraries across the world hold volumes of difficult books, stack an immense array of specialized journals, and house numerous research institutes dedicated to advancing each of these pillars of liberalism.

Only a few specialists are able to grapple with the complex and oftentimes confusing ideas in each separate subject area. Assessing the full scope of liberalism, economic, moral, and political as an integral paradigm is an even more daunting task; all three fit together in a well-reasoned and well-synchronized package. Unfortunately, intellectuals seem to have a penchant for one pillar, usually the economic. Sometimes they venture out and combine the political. Those who specialize in morality tend to be philosophers of varying degrees. Presenting the three in such a way that they seem to have separate, and oftentimes competing, identities adds to confusion that favors the spread of error.

Due to what seems to be broad scale confusion, many students, researchers, and lay men and women (simply trying to be well-informed), fail to synthesize the three and therefore fail to understand the *program* of liberalism. Consequently, more often than

not, almost everyone who explores the liberal universe ends up an advocate of some aspect, moral, political, or economic. Then they end up in the strange position of arguing for one tenet of liberalism, let us say economic liberalism (capitalism) while reacting against other aspects of liberalism, let us say moral liberalism (free-choice ending in abortion).

Thus, we have Christian thinkers on both sides of the political spectrum. Liberal Christians prefer moral liberalism (female clergy, homosexuality, contraception etc.) and conservatives favor economic and political liberalism (free markets and limited government). Since moral liberalism tends to stress individual free choice, people on the left tend to relativize objective values under the false pretense of "love" (divorced from wisdom) leading to unsavory conclusions such as right to choose an abortion according to the dictates of an unformed conscience; thus, they tend to be viewed as the "bad guys". Christian conservatives, on the other hand, claim to hold Judeo-Christian values and advocate democracy and free trade so they appear, at least in their own eyes, as the "good guys".

Although, liberalism is presented as an economic, political and or moral good by many so-called Christian intellectuals, Protestant and Catholic, on both sides of the political spectrum, "left" and right", the truth is, the entire package of liberalism (economic-moral-political) is rooted in secularism and anti-Trinitarianism and based on the ancient Luciferian idea that the God of Christian revelation is a petty overlord intent on keeping his followers enslaved in their littleness and unaware of their greatness (Genesis 3: 1-1). According to the total *program*" of liberalism as espoused by the leading lights of the American Revolution, human beings must be liberated and free to create economic, political, and social, systems according to human standards uninhibited by Christian ideas. In short, men and women must be free to create a new type of society built on secular values as demonstrated below.

**HOW DID IT GET THIS WAY?**

## The Christian Right

Protestants and Catholics on the political “right” tend to support traditional familial and moral values, which they claim are rooted in their Christian faith. When it comes to economic and political questions, they claim unswerving loyalty to the Constitution, to the Founding Fathers and to the “free market”. In short, they advocate private property, capitalism, and limited government based on the rule of law. Although it all sounds good, especially when placed side by side with nefarious and indolent liberal advocates of abortion looking for a handout with which to buy their next joint, upon closer scrutiny, the fabled “Conservative” story begins to fall apart – the truth is that 2/3’s of the so-called “conservative” program (the *economic* and *political*) is rooted in “liberalism” and an equal 2/3’s of the “Liberal” program (the *moral* and *political*) is likewise rooted in liberalism. In short, both Conservatives and liberals are “liberal”.

Most conservatives are surprised, indeed shocked to find out that the economic and political platforms they fight so hard to conserve are in fact liberal platforms antithetical to the Christian tradition they claim to be protecting. Some have imbibed this liberal economic-political ideology along with strong doses of “God Bless America” for so long that they have failed to distinguish their political, economic, and religious ideas and have consequently become rabid nationalists ignorantly arrayed against the truth or, if exposed to it, either in a state of denial or humbly enlightened. What makes the unenlightened so certain of their “Christian Conservatism” is the radical moral position of their political enemies, the liberals on the left. Because they are so focused on and opposed to each other, they fail to see that they are both caught unaware in a confusing and cunning political game of “*dialectical materialism*” that makes “*progress*” toward Antichristian ends possible. This is a stealthy game first recognized by Engels, formalized by Marx, and then implemented by Lenin and Stalin.

Dialectical Materialism presents *two* alternative paths, each having the appearance of correctness because each contains some strong

elements of the truth. However, neither idea is correct but holders of each believe themselves to be correct due to the perceived falsity of the other. Real truth, that is, the total program of truth as spoken by Jesus Christ, who referred to Himself as the "truth" is kept hidden by creating conflict between partially true and opposing ideas. Communist leader Vladimir Lenin realized that a carefully arrayed political conflict between two erroneous ideas makes "progress" toward a greater evil possible; *i.e.*, in Lenin's case, international communism advanced by promoting conflict between socialism and capitalism and in the unique case of the United States, Anti-Christian secularism advanced by promoting conflict between bourgeois Protestantism on the right or what might be called, "Americanism" and immoral Liberalism on the left. Because they are both incorrect or only partially correct ideas set in opposition, neither can lead to a prosperous Christian future. Partial truths, no matter how well presented, are in fact no truths at all; rather, they are harbingers of future evils.

*"And what I do I will continue to do, in order to end this pretext of those who seek a pretext for being regarded as we are in the mission of which they boast. For such people are false apostles, deceitful workers, who masquerade as apostles of Christ. And no wonder, for even Satan masquerades as an angel of light. So it is not strange that his ministers also masquerade as ministers of righteousness. Their end will correspond to their deeds" (2 Corinthians 11: 12-15).*

Although "liberals" and "conservatives" disagree on the nature of morality and on the economy, they both agree about democracy, **popular sovereignty**, and **rule by secular law**, which they have been taught to revere in the nation's public schools, and even in the private schools, *albeit* to a lesser extent. Rule by law is the bond that unites them while moral and economic ideas divide them against each other until they morph, in this case, into a secular paradigm that includes them both.

## **Rule by Law**

Americans, along with their British cousins, are fond of making the political claim that “*rule by law*” was a newly discovered idea born out a long tradition beginning with the Magna Carta in 1215 culminating and in the 18th century as a liberating invention emanating from the genius of men like John Locke, James Madison, and Thomas Jefferson. The truth is that the highly vaunted “*rule by law*” was in fact nothing new at all. **Three thousand years before Jefferson ever penned ideas about rule by law, Moses (known as the “Lawgiver”) provided the Jews with a complex body of laws that reached into every part of their economic, political and religious lives.** Moreover, rule by law was common to the Greeks and to all the nations of Christendom. The former were ruled by the law of reason known as the “natural law” written into numerous Greek constitutions and the latter, like the Jews before them, were ruled by Mosaic Law, which was amended by Jesus who commanded “*Agape*”[\[1\]](#), the summit of law by which the Mosaic Code is to be interpreted and from which all other laws are to be derived.[\[2\]](#)

Thus, what was innovative to the Framers was *not the rule of law*. Nonetheless, the Framers were innovative men, very innovative. They gave us *not rule by law but rule by secular law* (along with some new ideas about the structures of government). The United States did not give the world its first written constitution, as just stated, both the Jews and Greeks had written constitutions. **What America gave the modern world was its first secular constitution based on human reason and the principle of popular sovereignty.** This shocking American enterprise represented a radical break from the common law traditions regent in the nations of Christendom, which were based on faith and reason respectful of the sovereignty of God. This was indeed a new undertaking, one which prompted John Adams to boast:

*“It will never be pretended that any persons employed in that service (the writing of the constitution) had interviews with the gods, or were in any degree under the inspiration of heaven...it will forever be acknowledged that these governments were contrived by the use of reason and the senses (not faith and the bible)...Thirteen governments founded on the natural (versus supernatural) authority*



*of the people alone.”*

Thus, Thomas Jefferson referred to the whole thing as an “experiment:

*“I am not discouraged by [a] little difficulty; nor have I any doubt that the result of our experiment will be, that men are capable of governing themselves without a master.”* [\[3\]](#)

Christian culture and the rule by Judeo-Christian common law had made its way to the new world in the 16th and 17th centuries. In fact, it was rule by English common law, and by laws newly derived from sacred scripture, that distinguished the Pilgrims and Separatists who insisted that they were God’s chosen people, the “*City on a Hill*” set apart to establish His kingdom under His laws, which were the sole source of light in the New England colonies and throughout all of original colonies. **Rule by law, more specifically, by Christian common law, was simply an ancient artifact.** Indeed, it was a 17th century American artifact before the Framers ever articulated a letter about it. **What was new in the 18th century was the secular idea of “liberty”, which connoted, above all else, liberation from God’s law and ecclesial interference in politics.**

The Founders despised the “Holy Trinity” (known by faith supported by reason); **the Trinity was a God in the process of being replaced by the “God of Nature”** (known by reason alone). **The Framers were turning the philosophical clock back to Classical Antiquity, to a time before the Christian era,** thereby founding the new nation on ancient pagan foundations, Roman foundations to be exact. Because the Trinity cannot be known by reason unaided by faith, Thomas Jefferson belittled the Trinity calling it a

*“Hocus-pocus phantasm of a God like another Cerberus, with one body and three heads”* (Thomas Jefferson, Letter to James Smith, 1822).

Jefferson’s writing buddy, John Adams, in a letter to Jefferson regarding the Holy Trinity stated,

*“Tom, had you and I been 40 days with Moses and beheld the great God, and even if God himself had tried to tell us that three was one...and one equals three, you and I would never have believed it. We would never fall victim to such lies.”*[\[4\]](#)

Men like Adams and Jefferson insisted that reason alone, even if it contradicts revealed truths, must be accepted. Unlike Boethius, Augustine, Aquinas, *et al*, **they were unable to reconcile faith and reason. Thus, rather than understanding faith as a gift from God, they saw it is a poison that will destroy the human mind and leave it a “wreck”.**

*“The Athanasian paradox that one is three, and three but one, is so incomprehensible to the human mind, that no candid man can say he has any idea of it, and how can he believe what presents no idea? He who thinks he does, only deceives himself. He proves, also, that man, once surrendering his reason, has no remaining guard against absurdities the most monstrous, and like a ship without rudder, is the sport of every wind. With such person, gullibility which they call faith, takes the helm from the hand of reason, and the mind becomes a wreck” (ibid).*

**The Framers were involved in an advanced program of replacing Christian common law rooted in *faith and reason* reaching back to the founding of Christendom with constitutional and statutory law rooted in *reason alone*. Starting with Charles the Great (Charlemagne) and Alfred the Great in the ninth century AD, English, French and German law codes were rooted in Mosaic laws, *esp.* the ten commandments and in the *precept of divine love* of the Gospels articulated by Jesus Christ. **When the Pilgrims and Separatists came to the new world, although not particularly fond of the Catholic faith, they were, nonetheless, establishing colonies steeped in Christian common law that had its origins in the Catholic faith propagated by the Catholic kings who had established Christendom. Hence, like Charles the Great and Alfred the Great before them, the Pilgrims and Separatists set about establishing new governments in the 17th century founded on the****

divine law revealed to Moses and amended by Jesus Christ.

**What was new about the 18th century was the radical ideas of a revolution aimed at severing the modern world from its Christian roots. The real revolution as John Adams afterward explained in a letter to his friend, Hezekiah Niles, was a “radical change in the principles, opinions, sentiments, and affections of the people.” [5]**

According to Adams, the Christian political ideas of the people rooted in close to a 1,000 years of Christian *common law* had to be changed from allegiance to the Trinity (the God of revelation) as the source of law to a new allegiance toward a secular constitution rooted in the thoughts of 18th century deists, atheists, Unitarians and Epicureans who had become aspiring revolutionary political leaders taking all who would follow them into a new world order, a “New Order of the Ages”, “Novus Ordo Seclorum”.

Thus, **the real revolution was in Adam’s own words:**

*“...in the minds and hearts of the people, a change in their religious sentiments of their duties and obligations...This radical change in the principles, opinions, sentiments, and affections of the people, was the real American Revolution.” [6]*

And exactly what sentiments and principles were to be altered?

*“Those principles and feelings” that could “be traced back for two hundred years and sought in the history of the country from the first plantations in America.” [7]*

**More precisely, the Christian ideas of divine law and divine sovereignty that the Pilgrims had brought with them to the new world had to undergo revolutionary change.**

Due to economic and political stress leading to intense desires for democratic self-rule, America’s first Christian inhabitants (already well acquainted with religious self-rule and, as a result of the “Great Awakening”, newly acquainted to the need for greater religious

equality and further democratic reform in their churches that preceded and accompanied the revolution) were easily motivated to rally against English tyranny that threatened their religious and political independence. **What many failed to realize was that in wresting the power, or what is called the sovereignty, from the British Crown and passing it directly to the people, the Framers had also wrestled God's sovereignty** ([detailed in the state and colonial charters of the colonists](#)) and replaced it with secular constitutional law, which became the new "supreme law" of the land.

In the process of ratifying the new secular constitution (1789), the Christian descendants of the Pilgrims, Separatists, and other denominations devoted to Christ, settled for the separation of the Christian faith from politics and the privatization of religion, which thereafter became a purely individual and private matter. **God was no longer identified as the source of law. As James Monroe, the fifth US president asserted, God is no longer sovereign:**

*"The people are the highest authority in our system, from whom all our institutions spring and on whom they depend." They themselves "formed it."* [\[8\]](#)

**Monroe sounds like Aaron being rebuked by Moses for letting the people turn their back on God.** Aaron, instead of accepting the blame, places it *on the people*; *"They themselves asked for an idol."* And Aaron answered Moses:

*"Let not my lord be offended: for thou knowest this people, that they are prone to evil. They said to me: Make us gods that may go before us...And I said to them: Which of you hath any gold? and they took and brought it to me: and I cast it into the fire, and this calf came out" (Exodus 32:23-24).*

When an abused "people", led by a select group of men who doubted the divinity of Jesus Christ and the existence of the Holy Trinity, are given rhetorical praise against an oppressive king, and by the force of this oppression are led to believe that they are the source of law,

it is not surprising that God's laws are abandoned, forgotten, and omitted and that a secular constitution that contradicts and nullifies His revealed divine laws "came out" of the fires of revolution. For example, **the supreme first commandment to have no other Gods** (no idols or false gods) before the Trinity **is contradicted by the very first amendment of the Constitution that sanctions worship of any god and prohibits congress from implementing any law that names Jesus Christ as God** or that gives preference to divine law, thereby abrogating such law and replacing it by man made law indifferent to revelation and divided from it by an artificial "wall of separation".

In constructing this wall, the Framers *might have been* protecting religious liberty, but they were also manifesting their preference for reason and laws of their own making. **By abandoning revealed divine law, and replacing it with a law based solely on practical reason, they violated the most sacred precept of the divine law,, the first commandment.** Due to their use of reason alienated from faith, they crafted an amendment that opened the door to legalized idolatry, the right to honor, adore, and worship any false god that in the opinion of the people is *morally licit* rather than *patiently tolerated* as a right of conscience, which it should be.

*"And by this we know that we have known him, if we keep his commandments. He who saith that he knoweth him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar" (1 John 2:3).*

**After acting like Aaron, they then acted like Peter who thought that his human reason was superior to the wisdom of God.** To which Christ responded: "Get behind me, Satan. *You are thinking not as God does, but as human beings do*" (Mark 8:33).

Because **the Constitution is the product of human reason alone**, it does not contain any evidence that it is a Christian document inspired by revealed law (the mind of God), or that it is to be interpreted according to precepts of the Christian faith. Rather, **it declares that the "people" are the sole authors and arbiters of law:** "We the People of the United States...do ordain, and establish this Constitution

for the United States of America.”[\[9\]](#)

Since **Article Six** informs us that the Constitution is the “supreme Law of the Land” and that “anything in the Constitution or Laws of any State” that are “contrary” have no standing, clearly the people are supreme, which is a validation of the well known sentiment of the Enlightenment: “*vox populi, vox dei*” (“the voice of the people is the voice of God”).

Here it is of first import to note that **Christian common law** had its origins in the eight and ninth centuries when King Alfred the Great (849-899), compiled the “Book of Doms”[\[10\]](#) or “Judgments” and thereby codified his own laws, and those of his English predecessors, founding them all on the Mosaic Decalogue, various Mosaic precepts, and the *agape* of the Gospels. Alfred ratified the Code and the unity of Mosaic and Christian law by solemnly citing the Gospel: “Do not think that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill.” Alfred finished his introduction to the Code by referring to the divine commandment:

*“As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them”, and then declares, “From this one doom, a man may remember that he judge every one righteously, he need heed no other doom-book.”*

According to the revered English statesman, Sir Winston Churchill,

*“The great Alfred was a beacon-light, the bright symbol of Saxon achievement, the hero of the race.” ... cherishing religion, learning and art in the midst of adversity and danger; welding together a nation, and seeking always across the feuds and hatreds of the age a peace which would smile upon the land.”*[\[11\]](#)

Across the Channel from England, Charles the Great (748-814)[\[12\]](#) the first Holy Roman Emperor, had already done the same thing, or something very similar, issuing royal ordinances rooted in both the Mosaic and new laws recorded in scripture to be the common law of his vast realm. It was **Alcuin, the leading scholar in Charlemagne’s court,**

who cautioned Charlemagne against using the phrase *vox populi, vox dei* because it was an irreverent and false idea and contrary to the laws established on the divine law instituted by Charlemagne:

*“And those people should not be listened who keep saying, ‘The voice of the people is the voice of God,’ for the turbulence of the mob is always close to insanity.”* [\[13\]](#)

Such ideas as *vox populi vox dei*, popular sovereignty, and rule by secular law were radical developments slowly fructifying in the annals of secular history until ready for birth in the 18th century Age of Reason. The apotheosis of *reason* was, in many ways, a reaction to the extreme *faith alone* position of the Reformers, which often times seemed to the *avant garde* of the 18th century, to be opposed to reason. The Protestant Reformation had paved the way for the “mob” to individually interpret the meaning of the most sublime mysteries of faith, thereby democratizing religion, which aided the movement toward political democratization, further strengthened by contract theorists such as Jean Jacques Rousseau, who taught that the voice of the people is always correct especially when it has been prepared by education to say what it has been trained to say or to ask for what it has been conditioned to ask for. Since the people were needed to overthrow the Catholic aristocracy, their voice became increasingly important in the affairs of men.

Thus, throughout the colonies, ideas about the *voice of the people*, being the voice that would ratify the Constitution, became equivalent to the *voice of God*. It found its way into print in the works of Thomas Paine and John Trenchard, both radical Whigs who helped prepare the way for the American Revolution and the new Constitution. **Paine and Trenchard both ridiculed the *voice of God in scripture* and praised the *voice of reason* and the *voice of the people* who would validate reasonable arguments when presented to them.** Because Paine, detested the bible, “I detest the Bible as I detest everything cruel”, he believed that,

*“The Age of ignorance commenced with the Christian system.”*

*Consequently, as he argued in "Common Sense" and "The Age of Reason", Christianity had to be replaced by a religion of reason confirmed by popular sovereignty. Thus, in his "Dissertations on Government" (1786), Paine stated: "In republics, such as those established in America, the sovereign power...remains where nature placed it—in the people."*

The acclaimed *Trenchard* argued in *Cato's Letters* (Number 60), that

*"There is no Government now upon earth which owes its formation or beginning to the immediate revelation of God, or can derive its existence from such revelation."*

It is odd that informed thinkers like "Cato" failed to see that the colonial governments all had their beginning in such a revelation, vestiges of which existed at the time he was writing in all of the founding documents of the original 13 colonies.

For example, the "Original Constitution of the Colony of New Haven, Connecticut (1639) specified that both the origin of law and the system of government were to be drawn from revelation.

*"We all agree that the scriptures hold forth a perfect rule for the direction and government of all men in duties which they are to perform to God and to man, as well in families and commonwealth as in matters of the church... so likewise in all public officers which concern civil order, as choice of magistrates and officers, making and repealing laws, dividing allotments of inheritance, and all things of like nature, we will, all of us, be ordered by the rules which the scripture holds forth... and we agree that such persons may be entrusted with such matters of government as are described in Exodus 18:21 and Deuteronomy 1:13 with Deuteronomy 17:15 and 1 Corinthians 6:1, 6 & 7..."*

Connecticut remained a theocracy until 1818, well after the Revolution, and even then, Christianity remained the preferred religion.



But, new ideas were in the air, a sort of *kulturkampf* against American Protestant culture and forms of government derived from Christian revelation. Men who were able to blend tenets of Christianity along with new liberal ideas of the Enlightenment, thereby making the latter more palatable, began to make their appearance in the colonies. **Men such as Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746) the “Founding Father of the Scottish Enlightenment”, imbiber of Locke, and teacher of Adam Smith and David Hume, joined a long train of others whose ideas were becoming fashionable among the colonial elite. Like Smith, Locke, Hume, et al, Hutcheson was an avid proponent of liberalism.** His works in moral and political philosophy were used as textbooks at Yale, Harvard, and the College of Philadelphia. Three of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were his students. They and a host of others were treated to such anti-Christian ideas as

*“Nor has God by any revelation nominated Magistrates, showed the nature or extent of their powers, or given a plan of civil polity for mankind” (Francis Hutcheson’s Moral Philosophy p. 272).*

**In other words, Leviticus and Deuteronomy were to be ignored;** men were now free to create a new government without consulting the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob whom the Framers were ready to slowly discard.

Later, Chief Justice John Marshall memorialized these sentiments in the landmark *Marbury v Madison* (1803) case whose brief reads:

*“The people have an original right to establish, for their future government, such principles as, in their opinion, shall most conduce to their own happiness is the basis on which the whole American fabric has been erected.”*

**Not God’s law, but any “opinion” validated by the people will suffice. Marshall made no bones about it.** In the same case he outright ruled that any “law repugnant to the constitution is void”.

America may have been a Christian nation committed to the law of God,

the Holy Trinity, but its government was going in another direction; it preferred the "God of Nature" or some other God. It is difficult to say which one, if any, since *none* are mentioned in the Constitution, but *all* are protected. **Cornelis de Witt, a 19th century political historian understood what was going on:**

*"The men who effected the American revolution were not all of them believers. In different degrees, Jefferson, Franklin, Gouverneur Morris, John Adams, were free-thinkers, but without intolerance or display, without ostentatious irony, quietly, and almost privily; for the masses remained believers. Not to offend them, it was necessary to speak with respect of sacred things; to produce a deep impression upon them, it was requisite to appeal to their religious feelings; and prayers and public fasts continued to be instruments resorted to whenever it was found desirable, whether by agitators or the State, to act powerfully on the minds of the people."* [\[14\]](#)

**By the time that Protestant divines woke up to what was happening, it was already too late.** Pastor Timothy Wright, President of Yale Seminary was one of the first to take note (1812):

*"The nation has offended Providence. We formed our Constitution without any acknowledgment of God; without any recognition of His mercies to us, as a people, of His government, or even of His existence. The [Constitutional] Convention, by which it was formed, never asked even once, His direction, or His blessings, upon their labours. Thus we commenced our national existence under the present system, without God."*

A short time later in 1863, interpreting the Civil War as divine retribution for failure to found the Constitution on principles of Christian Law, eleven Protestant denominations from the Union States (not the southern Confederacy) joined hands for the purpose of amending the Preamble taking sovereignty out of the hands of the people and placing it back where it belongs, in the hands of God. Pennsylvania attorney, John Alexander drafted the amendments, which

read:

*“We, the people of the United States recognizing the being and attributes of Almighty God, the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures, the law of God as the paramount rule, and Jesus, the Messiah, the Savior and Lord of all, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”*[\[15\]](#)

The following year, the National Reform Association submitted a similar amendment:

*“We, the people of the United States, humbly acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler among the nations, his revealed will as the supreme law of the land, in order to constitute a Christian government, and in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the inalienable rights and the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to ourselves, our posterity, and all the people, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”*[\[16\]](#)

Some of America’s Protestant leaders were waking up to the fact that their forbears had acquiesced to a *New Order of the Ages* introduced on the tails of a secular document, which dethroned the Holy Trinity and placed the power to rule and to make supreme laws in the hands of men, men who claimed ultimate authority to rule in the name of the people. What the nation needed were God-fearing champions like Gideon who after routing Israel’s enemies refused supreme power and declared allegiance to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob instead:

*“The Israelites then said to Gideon, “Rule over us—you, your son, and your son’s son—for you saved us from the power of Midian.” But*

*Gideon answered them, "I will not rule over you, nor shall my son rule over you. The LORD must rule over you." (Judges 8:22-23).*

If the Framers had been as gallant in serving the Trinity and in recognizing Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as the ultimate and sovereign source of power and authority as Gideon had been, perhaps we would not be experiencing the economic, political and moral malaise, which are the inevitable result of a long train of liberalism rooted in the sovereignty of human reason enshrined in a secular constitution that prefers the rules of men to the rule of God.

---

#### ENDNOTES:

[1] Divine Love not merely human love, but the willingness to die for love of another.

[2] The truth is, that even the Magna Carta, the "poster child" of democracy and rule by law", was rooted in the common laws of Christendom. The Magna Carta was *not* a progressive innovation; if read carefully, it is clear that the Magna Carta is an assertion of ancient Christian rights long established by Christian common law.

[3] Letter to T. B. Hollis (1787)

[4] Stephen Frederick Uhl, (2009) *Out of God's Closet: This Priest Psychologist Chooses Friendly Atheism*, Golden Gate Publishers.

[5] James Q Wilson, American Government, p. 26:  
[https://books.google.com/books?id=AjIaCgAAQBAJ&pg=PA26&lpg=PA26&dq=%22James+Q+Wilson%22+american+government++%22the+real+revolution%22&source=bl&ots=D-CCNk\\_afE&sig=pQTmdPhsSLG\\_4cnQwLdwWtJcoNE&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwioprbr2frKAhUBVSYKHZQWAGoQ6AEIRTAH#v=onepage&q=%22James%20Q%20Wilson%22%20american%20government%20%20%22the%20real%20revolution%22&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?id=AjIaCgAAQBAJ&pg=PA26&lpg=PA26&dq=%22James+Q+Wilson%22+american+government++%22the+real+revolution%22&source=bl&ots=D-CCNk_afE&sig=pQTmdPhsSLG_4cnQwLdwWtJcoNE&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwioprbr2frKAhUBVSYKHZQWAGoQ6AEIRTAH#v=onepage&q=%22James%20Q%20Wilson%22%20american%20government%20%20%22the%20real%20revolution%22&f=false)

[6] Letter to H. Niles (1818).

[7] *ibid.*

[8] James Monroe, May 4, 1822, *Views of the President of the United States*. <http://presspubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/preambles20.html>

[9] The specious AD argument does not work. Some Christian ideologues who prefer ignorance to truth have scoured the document looking for just one reference to God. Finding none, they resort to the signature date which contains the words "In the year of Our Lord". And then mockingly proclaim that the "secularists" are obviously wrong, as if this one miniscule thread redeems the entire document from being secular. This is a ridiculous argument, one worthy of only a footnote. By this logic, Hilary Clinton is a card carrying Christian because she heads or closes her correspondence with the Christian date. Or, conversely, the Portuguese who live before 1700 are *not* Christians because they did not begin using the AD style until the 18th century. Using the in conventional date is *nothing but standard practice*; it is not evidence from which to draw conclusions about such deep seated beliefs as faith in Jesus Christ, and all that He taught. **New Agers even claim that Jesus is Lord** along with a host of other gods and lords. Thomas Jefferson called himself a "Christian" because he believed in the morals taught by Jesus. But he denied His divinity, incarnation, and resurrection; most especially, he denied the Trinity, which disqualifies him from being a Christian no matter how much he might protest: "Who is a liar, but he who denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is Antichrist, who denieth the Father, and the Son." (1 John 2:22). AD, moreover, is one of several dating mechanisms used throughout Masonry and Masons are not Christians because they deny the divinity of Christ as Jefferson did. ([http://grandlodgeofiowa.org/docs/Masonic\\_History/AnnoLucis.pdf](http://grandlodgeofiowa.org/docs/Masonic_History/AnnoLucis.pdf))

[\[10\]](#)

<http://kolbefoundation.org/gbookswebsite/studentlibrary/greatestbooks/aaabooks/alfredgreat/prefacetalfred.html>

[\[11\]](#) From Winston S Churchill: A history of the English speaking peoples, 1956:

<http://charlonteaching.blogspot.com/2010/10/greatest-englishman-ever-king-alfred.html>

[\[12\]](#)

<http://kolbefoundation.org/gbookswebsite/studentlibrary/greatestbooks/aaaprefacepages/charlamagne/charlamagnepreface.html>

[\[13\]](#) In a letter to Charlemagne (800 AD)

<http://www.britannica.com/biography/Alcuin/article-supplemental-information>

[\[14\]](#) Witt, Cornelius Henri De. (2013). pp. 16-7. *Jefferson*

*and the American Democracy, an Historical Study*. London: Forgotten Books. (Original work published 1862):  
[http://www.forgottenbooks.com/readbook\\_text/Jefferson\\_and\\_the\\_American\\_Democracy\\_an\\_Historical\\_Study\\_1000261173/45](http://www.forgottenbooks.com/readbook_text/Jefferson_and_the_American_Democracy_an_Historical_Study_1000261173/45)

[\[15\] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christian\\_amendment](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christian_amendment)

<http://candst.tripod.com/nra.htm>

[\[16\] http://candst.tripod.com/nra.htm](http://candst.tripod.com/nra.htm)

[/restrict]

---

## Continued Attacks on Pope

# Francis – Radical Traditionalists Defaming Pope over Malta

[New Era World News](#)

**CHARACTER ATTACKS ON POPE FRANCIS** from a hand full of far right traditionalists have become common place. A few months ago it was *Amoris Laetitia*, this week it is about scandals and abuses revolving around the Sovereign Military Order of Malta. Interestingly, both cases involve the traditionalist, Cardinal Raymond Burke who in each instance is the man behind the frontal assault on the pope. It is becoming increasingly clear who the real villain is or might be.

What follows will be confusing, if the two major players and their titles are not clearly delineated and distinguished before proceeding.

Major Players:

1. GRAND MASTER – Fra Matthew Festing (British)
2. GRAND CHANCELLOR- Albrecht von Boeselager (German)

Pope Francis is being accused of tyrannical abuse of office, of being a man who cries for mercy yet knows how to play political hardball when it comes to his opponents. Even if true, so what? Is not this exactly what is expected of a virtuous and competent leader, a man rich in mercy yet courageous enough to act with full authority when the situation calls for it? Is not this the model for leadership that the traditionalists opposing Francis have yearned for and have placed before us in the image of Christ the King who will come in power and glory to judge the living and the dead? Some Traditionalist never tire of stressing God's justice: "He is not just love, he judges us too." As stated many times by New

Era, although what the traditionalists are stating might be true, we are living in an Hour of Mercy! Instead of justice, men and women in tune with God's Spirit should be pleading for mercy and performing acts of reparation out of love for poor sinners to spare them from God's justice. As was stated in a previous article, they had better watch what they are asking for because it might soon be falling on their own heads.

Apparently, Cardinal Burke did not learn from the *Amoris Laetitia* imbroglio, which lost steam after Cardinal Mueller, the Prefect for the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, announced that "[there is no problem with its doctrine.](#)" So instead of *Amoris*, the issue is now the handling of a few traditionalists in the Sovereign Order of Malta.

## **Background**

In November of 2015 Cardinal Burke and Grand Master Festing attempted to have Grand Chancellor von Boeselager removed from office using the charge of disobedience after the latter refused to step down at Fester's command. Then according to CRUX, in order to secure his removal, Fester and Burke cooperated with the Lepanto Institute (a traditionalist Institute that does not shrink from acting as critic and guardian of the Church's internal affairs) to further investigate charges that von Boeselager had "signed off" on a program to distribute condoms as part of a Malta medical mission program that he headed. Boeselager had, however, been previously exonerated of those charges. **The Order of Malta had already investigated the issue and had cleared the Grand Chancellor of any wrong doing.** According to [CRUX](#),

*"The Vatican had also been informed at the time."*

Since this is the case, the issue becomes broader in scope. If already cleared, why were Cardinal Burke and Grand Master



Fester intent on reopening the case? Cardinal Burke did not let up; after gathering additional evidence on von Boeselager, he continued to press the issue. Because Boeselager has the support of several high ranking Vatican dignitaries and prominent German Bishops, Burke needed the support of the pope. He apparently succeeded because after meeting with the pope, Francis wrote him a letter in which he specified that:

*“Catholic moral precepts must be followed but that the differences should be resolved through DIALOGUE RATHER THAN EXPULSIONS.”*

**This point is key and the fulcrum on which the whole story turns: Cardinal Burke subsequently exceeded the authority given to him in the pope’s directive. Instead of solving the issue through “dialogue” as instructed, he proceeded to maneuver to have Boeselager removed from office. In true Burkeian style, he accused the Grand Chancellor of being a “liberal”. As such, he should resign; both Burke and Festing insisted. When Boeselager refused, they charged him with disobedience and removed him from office.**

Interesting, as CRUX points out, the only person that was actually disobedient was Cardinal Burke himself, disobedient to the pope’s clear directive. Not only had the pope told him to handle the situation through dialogue, the Vatican Secretary of State, Cardinal Parolin,

*“...wrote twice to the American cardinal to make clear that the pope had approved no such action. He also made clear Boeselager should be reinstated, and any differences between them resolved through dialogue.”*

It was at this point that Pope Francis intervened and asked a commission to investigate, but Grand Master Festing refused to cooperate citing the fact that the Order is a sovereign entity and that the issue was an internal affair they would handle

themselves.

## **What is Going On?**

As a sovereign entity the Order argued that it did not have to submit to a papal inquiry. Further since the Vatican Yearbook lists the Order among “States with embassies accredited to the Holy See” and not among its religious orders, even though they are a lay religious order, it did not have to comply with any requests from the pope. Lawyers for the Order contend that Order’s Constitution clearly specifies that “religious members”...are only subject to their appropriate Superiors in the Order.” Therefore, it is argued that the pope, in order to pierce this legal bubble, would have to abrogate their rights and laws, which he has not done.

Since the pope has apparently disregarded these stipulations, he is being accused by writers such as [Phil Lawler](#) of “unprecedented papal intervention” into the affairs of that venerable body.” Lawler insists that this action of Pope Francis

*“...fits into a pattern that should, at this point, worry all faithful Catholics. Under Pope Francis, the Vatican is systematically silencing, eliminating, and replacing critics of the Pope’s views.”*

For the record, the Order of Malta does have international juridical identity, but

*[“...it is also a lay religious institute whose members profess loyalty to the pope, and as such is subject – as are all recognized Catholic organizations – to the jurisdiction of the Holy See in religious matters.”](#)*

As CRUX further point out, the argument about sovereignty

“beggared belief’. Cardinal Burke had attempted to use the pope’s authority to get Boeselager to resign then turned around and insisted that the pope has no authority in the matter.

*” Given that Burke’s attempt to use the pope to justify Festing’s sacking of Von Boeselager (Burke) had (himself) dragged the papacy into its internal affairs.”*

Festing, apparently urged on by Cardinal Burke continued the fruckus, and Pope Francis continued **investigating through a committee headed by Archbishop Sivano Tomasi**. According to [Catholic World Report](#) (CWR), the “situation is now a full-blown crisis.” Why is it being presented as a crisis? Because some traditionalists are trying to mar the pope.

As of last Tuesday, January 24, the papal committee completed its investigation and Festing was called to the Vatican to meet with Pope Francis. In the Catholic version of “fake news”, The CWR correctly states that after Pope Francis met with Grand Master Festing a second time, he showed him the Papal Commission Report containing documented information about organizational dysfunction relative to his leadership and indicating the need for extensive reform of the Order beginning with its ruling clique consisting of fifty to a hundred knights drawn from Europe’s traditional nobility.

The investigation must have been thorough and convincing: **At the end of the meeting Festing tendered his resignation in writing**. Then Francis took further steps: He declared all actions taken by the Order since the dismissing of von Boeselager (December 6, 2016) as “null and void” including his elected replacement. Festing acquiesced unlike Burke, who has refused to stop fighting:

*“Even after Festing had agreed to the pope’s request to resign, Burke tried to persuade him to retract, in effect telling him to keep fighting Francis, [according to sources in](#)*

[both the Vatican and the order.](#)

## **So How did the Order Respond?**

The stage was set for a battle between the Vatican and the Knights of Malta; however when the information reached Malta and was digested by its Sovereign Council; they, like Festing, also acquiesced to Francis' requests. They accepted Festing's resignation and reinstated von Boeselager as Grand Chancellor.

On January 25, Vatican Secretary of State Cardinal Pietro Parolin wrote on Pope Francis' behalf to members of the Order's Governing Board. He stated that, the Grand Commander, **Ludwig Hoffmann von Rumerstein, is now in charge of the Order** and that

*"...in the renewal process which is seen as necessary," Pope Francis would "appoint his personal Delegate with powers that he will define in the act of appointing him."*

Cardinal Burke, it appears, will find himself further demoted; that is, his use of "soft-power" as papal liaison is being eroded. First he was removed from the Apostolic Penitentiary to become the Vatican's liaison with the Order of Malta, which responsibility is now being redefined and down-graded to a mere "titular role". Francis' legate, not Cardinal Burke, is now the pope's "official spokesman during his mandate" pertaining to formal relations between the Order and the Holy See.

Be that as it may, the main thrust of these moves, as noted by CRUX "is not to silence Cardinal Burke, but to reform the Order's constitution and governance so that it better serves the purpose (mission) for which it exists, something that Burke failed to do: seeing that the knights better serve their ancient charism to **defend the faith and assist the poor.** The

latter was a mission area stressed by Boeselager, while the camp supported by Festing and Cardinal Burke favored a more traditional agenda to bolster their financial portfolio and

*"...build up the elite quasi-monastic arm of the knights (stressing the military aspects, trappings of nobility, and social-cultural-theological traditionalism, rather than placing the main thrust of their efforts on pastoral and charitable works consistent with the pastoral spirit of Vatican II and the modern papacy). Although those stressing the former number "only around 50 of the 14,000 members of the order, they are the ones who hold the leadership positions of the world-wide knights, and elect its leader."*

A small clique that many members have grown weary of. Consequently according to [Catholic World Report](#):

*"Boeselager and his allies in the Vatican "have triumphed.*

However, the Catholic World Report could not help displaying its loyalties by asserting that

*"These allies have carried out a sordid campaign of leaked letters from Cardinal Parolin's department, which served the sad and obvious end of framing a public narrative in which Fra' Festing supposedly 'defied' the explicit wishes of the Pope."*

But, according to [CRUX](#)

*"The reaction from traditionalists and critics of the pope has been apopleptic, seeking to portray Francis as an autocrat imposing his vision of the Church on a hapless conservative order. In reality, he is doing no more than what popes have always done with Catholic organizations that suffer from abusive or dysfunctional leadership which undermines their witness."*

*“Francis has done the same with other religious orders or societies, such as the Peru-based Sodality. Benedict XVI did the same with the Legion of Christ, among others.”*

*“Why should Francis’s critics believe this one is any different? Sadly, some have become so invested in Burke’s campaign against Francis over Amoris Laetitia that they have failed to spot what this is about.”*

Clearly, there are two conflicting interpretations of events, one favoring Cardinal Burke and a small camp of traditionalists, the other favoring von Boeselager and those who want to engage in pastoral and charitable works per the instructions of Pope Francis. Since there is division in the Order exacerbated by confusion in the press, it appears that some other agent having an agenda contrary to the Holy Spirit’s unifying charity are at work.

### **Is Anything Else Going On?**

Changes being experienced around the world relative to the growing global rising against liberalism are being echoed in **the Church as it has finally begun to take decisive steps to deal with the infiltration of Masonry and Masonic influences into its various dicasteries, departments, orders etc.** Like the nations of the world reacting to the rising tide of liberalism, the Vatican is reacting to the rising tide of Masonry, which like liberalism has become an unbearable cause of dysfunction, division, and confusion that needs to be thrown off.

Thus, according to the CWR:

*“There is much more” going on. Edward Pentin of the National Catholic Register [reported on January 7th](#) that Cardinal Burke had been asked by Pope Francis to expose problems within the Order: “Hopes that the contraceptive scandal would be addressed came on Nov. 10, when Cardinal Burke was received in private audience by Pope Francis. During that meeting, the Register has learned, the Pope was ‘deeply disturbed’ by what the cardinal told him about the contraceptive distribution. **The Pope also made it clear to Cardinal Burke that he wanted Freemasonry ‘cleaned out’ from the order, and he demanded appropriate action.**”*

According to Robert Monihan writing for [Inside the Vatican](#):

*“During the past several months, quietly and privately on most occasions, but sometimes publicly, a word has been whispered and spoken aloud in Rome in a way unlike any other time in the 33 years that I have been writing about Vatican affairs. That word is freemasonry.”*

Apparently, Pope Francis equated the condom scandal and other reports of activities in the Knights of Malta along with division within its ranks and dysfunction as indicators of Masonic infiltration, which he wants out of the order and out of the Church.

Monihan echoed what was reported by the CWR:

*“Published reports have stated something that few have noted, but which must be studied and explained: that Pope Francis, in a meeting in November with Cardinal Raymond Burke, gave Burke a very unusual instruction. The Pope, it is reported, during their November 10 meeting, asked Burke, the American cardinal who is the ecclesial Patron of the Knights of Malta, to carry out an important and delicate task: to ferret out and remove from the Knights of Malta all members who are... freemasons.”*

The pope followed-up was with a letter to Cardinal Burke, in which he “underlined the cardinal’s constitutional duty to promote the spiritual interests of the order and **remove any affiliation with groups or practices that run contrary to the moral law**. Here, repeated, is the critical phrase”:

*“The Pope also made it clear to Cardinal Burke that he wanted Freemasonry ‘cleaned out’ from the order...”*

Monihan correctly identifies Cardinal Burke as “one of the leaders of the ‘traditional’ faction in the Church and in the College of Cardinals because of his raising questions about the “progressive” teaching of Pope Francis, especially in *Amoris Laetitia*. Although the issue of condoms and leadership are being or have been rectified, the vetting of Masonry and Masonic influence in the order will be an ongoing saga as Pope Francis attempts to do in the Church what leaders around the world are doing in the State: ridding their countries of liberalism and the disorganizing influence of Masonry.

Masonry is a fraternity of Satan, the Father of Liars. As such, it has long been characterized by Gnosticism, Esotericism, and double meaning; **it advances error by crafting antithetical ideologies which it sets in apparent opposition** in order to ravish the truth and lull unsuspecting victims into its deceptive web. Its symptoms include, confusion, dysfunction, and division. In dealing with this diabolical sect, Pope Leo XIII invoked the Blessed Virgin Mary:

*“Let us take our helper and intercessor the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, so that she, who from the moment of her conception overcame Satan may show her power over these evil sects, in which is revived the contumacious spirit of the demon, together with his unsubdued perfidy and deceit”*  
*([Humanum Genus](#))*.



Pope Pius IX was equally clear:

*“WE strongly exhort them to beware of the perfidious discourses of sectarians who, under a disguise of honesty, are inflamed by an ardent hatred of the Religion of Christ and of all legitimate authority: they have but one thought with the sole aim of exterminating, all Divine and human rights. Let them all be fully conscious of the fact that the affiliates of such sects are as the wolves who, as Our Lord predicted, **come disguised with sheeps hide to devour the whole flock.**” ([Multiplices inter](#)).*

Those who advance error can be easily detected. They cover themselves by pointing their fingers at deviating others at the opposite end of the spectrum. Realizing that most traditionalists are true sons of the Church appalled with abuse and desirous of high sanctity, we hope that the conflict between traditionalists and liberals within the hallowed Order of Malta is *not* a manifestation of a Masonic dialectic and that traditionalists controlling the inner circle at Malta and pointing the finger at supposed liberals are not part of the cabal that Pope Francis is vetting and wants “cleaned out” of the Order. How traditionalists members of the Order fare in this process will be interesting to see. Those who cry loudest against an abuse are often the perpetrators of abuse themselves.