

# Roman Goddess “Libertas” Imported to America

## American Foundations: Intelligence Report #9

THOMAS JEFFERSON swore “eternal hostility” against the Christian clergy and allegiance to “Nature’s God” as presented in [Intelligence Report #8](#). Who exactly is this “God of Nature” on whose altar Jefferson had sworn to fight the Christian clergy in the name of “liberty” and how exactly are the God of Nature and liberty related? Perhaps we can gain some insight into this highly relevant question by examining the “Statue of Liberty”. This historical monument was constructed by the French as a gift to the Americans in respect for their defense of liberty. Significantly the two – French and Americans – were allies in the business of “revolution”. The American phase of Revolution was fought in the New World against some of the same enemies the French were fighting in the old.

The French were engaged in a bloody struggle against the “*Ancien Regime*” of priests and kings under the same banner of “Liberty” that had inspired the Founders to draft a constitution that prohibited “titles of nobility” ([Article 1 Sections 9 and 10 of the United States Constitution](#) – there would be no *Ancien Regime* in America) and that sought to limit the Church and Her clergy by the establishment of a “*Secular Regime*” in which religion was reduced to the private forum and laws were derived from reason without any influence from God or His representatives on earth. They were to be constrained behind a “wall of separation” that kept them out of the courts, out of the senate, out of house, the executive branch, out of public schools, out of post offices and even public parks, in short out of the public affairs of the nation, which is basically just about all the affairs.

Behind one wall was a vast array of public power, economic wherewithal an absolute monopoly over law making and what amounts to a practical monopoly over education; behind the other, a few acres of private property on which to operate, voluntarism, and hopefully some good will. It seems the new government was ascribing full liberty for the exercise of its plans to establish a new word order "*novos ordo seclorum*", while corralling or "chaining the Church" by severely constraining Her area of operation and limiting her support to voluntary donations. Liberty, supported by an abundant and mandatory cash flow, for the state and for the New World secular aristocracy of financiers and captains of capitalism to spread their revolutionary agenda far and wide, prohibition for the Old World landed aristocracy and constraint for the churches who were forced to exist by "good will" on a few acres of property off of which they were not allowed to operate without a license granted by the state. Basically excessive liberty for the state, partial liberty for the churches. It seems that liberty in the New World, was liberty with a bias against old ideas of religion but total freedom for revolutionary ideas, which had all the support of the state, as long as the "people" could be properly influenced. How is the "Statue of Liberty" involved in all of this?

The Statue of Liberty, known formally as "*Liberty Enlightening the World*", is a copper colossus designed by the talented French sculptor, Frederic Auguste Bartholdi. The statue represents the Roman goddess *Libertas*; in her jubilant right hand, stretched toward heaven, she holds forth a perpetual flame and in her left, she holds a tablet on which is inscribed, "July 4, 1776", the monumental day that Thomas Jefferson, assisted by Ben Franklin, John Adams, Robert Livingston, and Roger Sherman presented the [\*Declaration of Independence\*](#) to the Second Continental Congress by which it was solemnly approved and promulgated.



Sundered chains representing Freedom at feet of Liberty

Because *Libertas* represents light and liberty, she symbolizes power over tyrants and every form of tyranny that enslaves the minds of men; her power to liberate is symbolized by a sundered chain that lies prostrate at her feet. She symbolizes the apotheosis of freedom and hostility toward every form of tyranny, esp. that form recognized by Jefferson and Adams, which was the same form of tyranny violently opposed by the French, viz, the supposed tyranny of kings and clergy:

*“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)*

James Madison, the “Father of the Constitution”, also harbored the same hostility for the clergy whom he referred to as “spiritual tyrants” who help kings to “subvert the public liberty”.

*“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”).*



Columbia”

Personification of the  
United States and of  
Liberty or Freedom

*Libertas* was (and still is-even more-so) a popular figure inscribed on many American coins of the time, the Morgan Dollar and later on, the Walking Liberty Half Dollar. She also occupies a prominent place [atop the dome of the Unites States Capitol](#), which houses the United States Congress, the legislative branch delegated power to draft and promulgate laws under her aegis for the “good” of the people whom she has sworn to set free. In her Roman form, *Libertas* is depicted wearing a long flowing dress, sometimes wearing a wreath of laurels or a “liberty cap” or “*pileus*” (a cap donned by slaves when they were manumitted or set free). She is often depicted holding a spear or “liberty poll”. In her modern

rendition, *Libertas* most often appears in some form as “Lady Liberty” as she does in the Statue of Liberty or Columbia, the national personification of the United States .

Ancient Romans, esp. of the Republic, had a unique reverence for various virtues some of which (Justice, Courage, and Piety, to name a few) overtime, they personified and then elevated to the status of a god or goddess. Liberty was a Roman concept, a personified and highly esteemed virtue before she ever became a goddess. Her apotheosis was not achieved until 232 BC. By that time, her cult had grown popular enough to justify her being enshrined in the Roman pantheon. This feat was accomplished by Tiberius Gracchus, a Roman Tribune stepped in democratic virtue and military valor and known to history as a “*hero of the people*”. Gracchus, as champion *pro populo*, favored agrarian land reform and distribution (distributive justice) for which he was eventually assassinated by wealthy patricians. It was this Gracchus, known for his bravery and military valor and eminence in virtue, who constructed the first temple to *Libertas* on Aventine Hill.



Babylonian Goddess Ishtar (Astarte) and Lady Liberty

How does *liberty* a pure virtue personified and then deified as the goddess *Libertas* (*liberty as a concept was also worshiped as the goddess Libera and her male counterpart, the god, Liber [Roman form of the Greek known Bacchus]* who are not considered in this analysis – essentially

all three represent the same concept of freedom), the champion of Roman valor and liberty, become a slave master and connoisseur of debauchery as she is presented in the writings of many ultraconservative Christians who claim that the American Statue of liberty" is a replica of Ishtar, Astarte or the Greek Aphrodite? What we find in their voluminous writings about the Statue of Liberty being a pagan goddess with roots reaching back to the mystery cults of Babylon seems to me unsupported conjecture. For example, Cicero is quoted as saying *Libertas* was the "Mother of Harlots", but as is often the case, specious scholarship fails to provide proper citations by which to verify their statements.[\[1\]](#) Perhaps the seven spiked crown above *Liberty's* head represents the 7 crowns of light in esoteric lore, perhaps she is a rendition of the pagan goddess Astarte, perhaps – it is all conjecture. It is highly improbable, that a righteous champion of the people, like Tiberius Gracchus, would favor a debauched libertine or promote a whoring goddess. However, a debauched libertine and friend of esotericism like Publius Clodius Pulcher (58 BC) might.

Like Tiberius Gracchus, Clodius Pulcher also constructed a famous temple to *Libertas* on the Palatine Hill on the site of the former home of Marcus Tullius Cicero, the eminent philosopher, renowned statesman, and outstanding exemplar of Roman virtue. Clodius was a political enemy of Cicero who, when given the opportunity, had Cicero's palatial home burnt and demolished in order to construct a new and second temple to *Libertas*.

Clodius, unlike Cicero and unlike Tiberius Gracchus, praised liberty as a virtue associated with, and then honored as, the goddess of freedom to satisfy concupiscence (freedom to do anything you want-which is first cousin to enlightened self-interest of American Liberalism); whereas Cicero, his political enemy, understood liberty as a virtue intended for the free pursuit of happiness, an intellectual attainment of

the spiritual soul:

*“Yet the case is simply this, that to me the supreme good seems to be in the soul” (Cicero’s Tusculan Disputations).*

As a libertine, Clodius was complicit in transforming liberty into license under the cover of (sham) philosophy, which provided him with an ability to employ double meaning (liberty as an exoteric philosophical virtue and liberty as an esoteric form of indulgence) that enabled him to mask his vulgarity from the people (at least for a while), even ancient “politicians” had to cultivate the appearance of good . As stated above, *Libertas* was often portrayed wearing or holding a *pileus* or liberty cap associated with manumitted slaves who had prayed to her for their freedom – thus she also became known as “The Goddess of Slaves”. As with *all* things associated with the *Libertas* of Clodius, we must be careful not to fall into the esoteric trap; “Goddess of Slaves” has a double meaning, (1) A false meaning, that is a meaning she used to hide the truth, a meaning intended for public consumption by actual slaves or the downtrodden who had been set free from the bondage of servitude and (2) A true meaning, that is the meaning she kept hidden from the men and women who were becoming slaves by honoring her, especially the cohort of adepts she had introduced into her inner circle; these initiates into the secret societies and mystery cults of Rome were the most blind. Because they worked hard at learning her secrets and passing through her initiations, they cherished membership in a fraternity of men who believed that they were somehow worthy of lording it over other men – not of serving them but of being served by them. They were privy to esoteric secrets, and inflated with power to control the economic and political affairs of the ancient world, but unaware that the *Goddess of Liberty* (there was also a goddess honored as *Libera* with a male counterpart *Liber* who also represent liberty and fertility – I am not making a distinction between *Libertas* and *Libera*) was enslaving them as



well as the rest of humanity who suffered the misfortunes of their leadership. The more they called themselves philosophers, the more foolish they became ([Romans 1:22](#)). Ignorant of what was going on in their own souls, they lustfully sang the praises of “liberty”, the goddess who stealthily bound them while they foolishly proclaimed their freedom.

*“But many there are who follow in the footsteps of Lucifer, and adopt as their own his rebellious cry, “I will not serve”; and consequently substitute for true liberty what is sheer and most foolish license... which, under the guise of liberty, exonerates man from any obedience to the commands of God, and substitutes a boundless license”* ([Pope Leo XIII, Libertas](#)).



*Lady Liberty wearing the pileus along with her good servant General George Washington who led a Revolution to set men and women free in her name).*

---

*Libertas* was thus transformed from a goddess of virtuous



freemen and emancipated slaves, as she was honored during the Roman Republic, into the "Goddess of Slaves" during the Roman Empire. She became the "Goddess of Slaves" because those who sang her praises the loudest, those who daily demanded ever more liberty, were the very ones being enslaved by concupiscence while believing themselves to be free. *Libertas* was not only honored by foolish men and women in the process of being enslaved; she was also honored by obedient Gnostic adepts, men who consciously committed themselves to her, while she feigned love for them by economic favors and positions of power.

*"Then the devil took him (Jesus Christ) up to a very high mountain, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world in their magnificence, and he said to him, "All these I shall give to you, if you will prostrate yourself and worship me. At this, Jesus said to him, "Get away, Satan! It is written: 'The Lord, your God, shall you worship and him alone shall you serve'" [\(Matthew 4: 8-10\)](#).*

*Libertas* has given out many favors and can be imagined laughing with mocking scorn at her enslaved adepts who boast of their esoteric wisdom and at the blind commoners who unceasingly demand freedom while unawares they fastened chains of slavery upon themselves.

*"Whoever commits a sin is the slave of sin" [\(John 8:34\)](#).*

*"Do you not know that if you present yourselves to someone as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness" [\(Romans 6:16\)](#)?*

Cicero, living during the time of transition from virtuous Roman Republic to increasingly decadent Empire, understood the difference between liberty and license. Thus, the political intrigue that ensued between himself and Clodius

helps us understand how the virtue Liberty, of the early Roman Republic, became associated with decadence, immorality, cabal, and esotericism, the *Libertas* of the Roman Empire.

Contrary to Cicero, Clodius is known to have been both an effeminate sensualist and a corrupt politician not above stooping to chicanery to gain a public office. He cajoled his way to becoming one of the most powerful men in Rome and used patronage and inside information to advance his personal monetary interests throughout the empire. Unlike Gracchus, Clodius used his liberty to satisfy his lusts. He became a political enemy of the more virtuous Cicero whom he had exiled from Rome once he procured the chance. Clodius then acquired Cicero's home on the Palatine and had it demolished; in its place, he constructed the second temple to *Libertas*. Because Clodius had made many enemies, and because Cicero was a gracious and affable man, several noblemen conspired for the return of the latter, who, upon returning, pursued litigation to receive his house back. However, by the time his house was returned, a Temple to *Libertas* was already in place and Cicero had to make an appeal for its removal. It is by understanding his argument in favor of getting back his property that we acquire insight that helps us understand how *Libertas* underwent a metamorphosis from goddess of the noble virtue of liberty to become a demon of license veiled in the false garb of a virtue.

## **Who is She that Sets Free by Warring against the Church of God**

?

Cicero is ranked among the eminent men of Classical Antiquity, a lover of wisdom and an advocate of traditional Roman values. It is clear from his arguments against Epicurus[\[2\]](#), a Roman philosopher whom he accused of being a connoisseur of pleasure, that Cicero was a man of high philosophical ideals and refined moral acuity, which allowed him to properly enjoy the pleasures of life while advancing in knowledge and moral strength in the company of classical philosophers of whom

he was speaking when he stated that.

*"We love everything that is true, that is to say, that is faithful, simple, consistent, and we hate what is vain, false and deceitful, such as fraud, perjury, cunning and injustice."* [\[3\]](#)

Thus, Cicero is a trustworthy spokesman for virtue (not the best spokesman, but a trustworthy one). As a lover of wisdom, he sang the traditional praises of *Liberty* (*freedom to pursue truth and goodness unbound by the chains of sensuality which a wise man learns to conquer so that he can freely pursue the higher virtues – wisdom and love – by which he actualizes his human potential*); however, there was poetic irony (not esoteric chicanery) in his words. He understood that "Freedom" could be presented correctly as a noble ideal, but wrongly understood, she could become a decadent licentiate. **Cicero was therefore not fooled by esoteric babel. Because he understood false gods and false displays of piety, he was able to also represent *Libertas* as a prostitute who feigned freedom in order to enslave.**

How did he arrive at this conclusion and how is the Statue of Liberty and her American votaries, "*The Sons of Liberty*" related to his conclusion? As stated above, Clodius was nothing like Gracchus. Clodius was an effeminate and excessive libertine who represented the physical excesses of the Empire while Cicero, like Gracchus, was a lover of virtue represented by allegiance to the Republic. Clodius, a true tyrant, loved freedom for himself but was an enemy of freedom for everyone else. Cicero made his case against Clodius and for the return of his property before the Roman pontifices. When Clodius demolished his home and erected a temple for *Libertas*, Cicero argued, he also evicted Cicero's household gods, the virtuous gods of the Republic, thereby profaning authentic religion and replacing it with a deceptive counterfeit religion headed by a false goddess who, disguised as virtue, is in reality the

“Mother of Slaves” and licentiousness as evidenced by what Clodius, her benefactor did in her name.

Cicero accused Clodius of being a transvestite and of exuding a sexual energy that attracted both men and women. Inflamed with passion he even dared to disguise himself as a woman and intruded upon the sacred rites of the vestal virgins seeking to consummate an adulterous relationship with Pompeia, the wife of Julius Caesar, at whose house the rites were being held.[\[4\]](#) Cicero describes Clodius’ attire on the night that he intruded on the sacred rites of the vestals. Not only is his dress that of an effeminate; his discarding of clothing piece by piece amounts to what Eleanor Winsor Leach described as a verbal striptease:

“Publius Clodius, out from his <a href="#">saffron</a> dress, from his headdress, from his Cinderella slippers and his purple ribbons, from his breast band, from his dereliction, from his lust, is suddenly rendered a democrat.” <a href="#">[5]</a>
---

Cicero accused Clodius of sexual perversion, including the attempt to seduce the wife of Caesar and incestuous relations with his own sisters.

Clodius was a tyrant, Cicero continued, who not only profaned liberty; he also desecrated the sanctuary built to honor her. He did this by introducing a mock statue of *Libertas* intended to take the place of the original. This statue, according to Cicero, represented an act of desecration; **“It is a portrait stolen from the tomb of a prostitute”** pawned off as Liberty and “shipped to Rome” by his brother Appius Clodius[\[6\]](#). Clodius, the tyrant, according to Cicero, had the

*“...effrontery to pass off...nothing but the funerary portrait of a prostitute” as the goddess “Libertas.”*

By this act of ignominy, Clodius had symbolically at first, and then in essence, banished true liberty from the city and introduced licentiousness associated with his tyrannical

political rule in her place.[\[7\]](#) As a tyrant, Clodius had been very successful; he was able to entrap those endowed with great political power and able to reduce Rome's most affluent men to a state of dependency. He had, Cicero said

*"...shut off access to the temple of Castor[\[8\]](#), ordered his attendants to trample a distinguished (but unidentified) ex-consul, had driven Cicero from the city without due process using a "tyrant-like law directed at a single person" (privilegiis tyrannicis inrogatis), shut Pompey up in his house, and beset the forum with armed men. Moreover, Clodius set up his whoring "Libertas" in a house "that was itself a sign of ... bloody despotism and of the wretched slavery of the Roman people"; all in the name of "freedom".[\[9\]](#)*

Thus, because of Clodius' tyranny, debauchery, and ignominy, the goddess Liberty, which was once a cause for celebration and courageous imitation now evoked "lamentations" because, according to Cicero, *the people* who used to "pack" his house to acquire wisdom and engage in philosophical discussions were displaced by Clodius who then filled the sanctuary with free thinking libertines full of lust and its attendant, foolishness. The new *Libertas*, Cicero argued, must be banished so that not only his house, but all of Rome could be returned to its original splendor. According to Latin scholar, Matthew Roller (2010), this was the motive behind Cicero's appeal to the "pontifces": that the sanctuary dedicated to *Libertas* be deconsecrated and the house returned to him so that the household gods, the virtuous icons of traditional Rome, could also return. Clodius had dethroned true religion and enthroned a fraudulent one in its place by placing a prostitute in the sanctuary and calling her Liberty[\[10\]](#).

Cicero was revealing the truth about what had happened to Liberty under Clodius. authentic *Liberty* was not honored by Clodius, but profaned by a false notion of freedom that made a mockery of her, after all, the statue set up by Clodius was in

Cicero's words, a "funerary portrait of a prostitute", who in the name of false freedom led the people of Rome to slavery by licentiousness. *Libertas* did not, and does not, break chains of slavery; by cunning deceit she forges them in the name of false freedom. *Libertas* is a goddess who promises liberty but is in actuality a tyrant who enslaves her votaries by means of *libido dominandi*[\[11\]](#) (the use of sexual liberation to gain dominance).

AN EXCELLENT INTERVIEW WITH E. MICHAEL JONES, AN AUTHORITY ON ZIONISM AND POLITICAL DOMINANCE BY MEANS OF SEXUAL LIBERATION (9:10)

*Libertas* is a goddess who promises liberty but is in actuality a tyrant who enslaves her votaries by means of *libido dominandi*[\[11\]](#) (the use of sexual liberation to gain dominance). Thus, Boller (2010) Concludes:

*"These structures (Cicero's household gods and Clodius' Shrine to Libertas) symbolically replicate the political struggle between them.... The debate... concerns which of the two alternative symbol-systems that have been attached to these structures—the Clodian interpretation or the Ciceronian one—will triumph politically."*[\[12\]](#)

On the surface, it seems as if Cicero should have been the the winner: he was a noble man, he valued both true friendship and authentic freedom for the people, and he honored the virtues. He also saw through esoteric double meaning and claimed that the goddess *Libertas*, set up by Clodius, could be interpreted as her vicious double, as "*Licentia*", who was, in fact, the actual goddess that Clodius honored – liberty as license—apropos for a tyrant seeking political control by means of feigned freedom – *libido dominandi*. In Cicero's eyes, Clodius was one of those *self-professing* "wise" men who try to hide their nefarious intent behind a false veil of goodness, their intent to enslave behind a veil of freedom. In other words, he was Janus faced and two-tongued; his complex designs can be



interpreted as part of a nefarious concealed plan to destroy the Republic that Cicero was trying to preserve.

*“Let your ‘Yes’ mean ‘Yes,’ and your ‘No’ mean ‘No.’ Anything more is from the evil one” (Matt. 5:37).*

Cicero did win the political battle to get his property back; however he lost the more important war for hard-earned virtue and resolute freedom; the manly Roman valor he so admired, was slowly effaced from Roman culture and, over the next few centuries, eradicated. Debauched and effeminate leaders, devotees of *Libertas* such as Nero, Caligula, and Diocletian would so feminize and weaken Rome that, in the end, she had to hire mercenaries to fight her battles.

By that time, the cult of *Libertas* introduced by Clodius had become so prominent in Rome; that during the fourth century St. Augustine was able to refer to *Libertas* as the “Great Mother” of whores who turned men into effeminate votaries.

*Concerning the effeminates consecrated to the same Great Mother, in defiance of all the modesty which belongs to men and women.... These effeminates, no later than yesterday, were going through the streets and places of Carthage with anointed hair, whitened faces, relaxed bodies, and feminine gait, exacting from the people the means of maintaining their ignominious lives....The Great Mother has surpassed all her sons, not in greatness of deity, but of crime. To this monster not even the monstrosity of Janus is to be compared. His deformity was only in his image (two faces); hers was the deformity of cruelty in her sacred rites. He has a redundancy of members in stone images; she inflicts the loss of members (gentiles) on men” [\(Book 7 Chapter 26\)](#).*

Rome had devolved from the virtuous glory days of the Republic admired by Cicero, to become a “savage animal” full of “lust and gluttony”.

*"...man, if he have not virtue, is the most unholy and the most savage of animals, and the most full of lust and gluttony. (Politics, Book I).*

Because she exiled her philosophers, lost her love of authentic virtue, and engaged in a cruel pogrom of Christian saints, the city of Rome was depicted by St. John the Evangelist as the "mother of fornications, and the abominations of the earth", she rode on the back of a scarlet beast, the decadent Empire, which she ruled with a perverted mind, a mind intoxicated with the blood of martyrs.



The Torches of Nero, by Henryk Siemiradzki: Nero an Effeminate Glutton using Christians as Human Torches to Satisfy his Concupiscence

*"I saw a woman seated on a scarlet beast that was covered with blasphemous names, with seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was clothed roundabout with purple and scarlet, and gilt with gold, and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of the abomination and filthiness of her fornication. And on her forehead a name*

*was written: A mystery; Babylon the great, the mother of the fornications, and the abominations of the earth. And I saw the woman drunk with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. And I wondered, when I had seen her, with great admiration" [\(Rev. 17: 3-6\)](#).*

The beast had seven heads (seven hills of Rome and the seven deadly sins) and 10 crowns (the 10 pagan kings or "Foederati" that conquered Rome's enemies and then turned on Rome and devoured her) and was covered with blasphemous names ([Rev 13:1](#)). The mercenary "Foederati" (leaders of pagan tribes) were invited into the Empire to fight her battles; they partook of her food and prepared for the day when God providentially directed them to devour her. In fulfillment of scripture the Foederati made alliance with the beast (the Roman Empire and with the women who controlled the empire (rode on the beast's back)). The beast represents the empire and the woman is the city that controls the empire, Rome. The Foederati gave their power to the empire and later, with her oppressed and dissatisfied subjects throughout the empire, they turned on Rome, its head and capitol, and destroyed her as recorded in John's Revelation on Patmos:

*The ten horns that you saw represent ten kings who have not yet been crowned; they will receive royal authority along with the beast for one hour. They are of one mind and will give their power and authority to the beast. They will fight with the Lamb, but the Lamb will conquer them, for he is Lord of lords and king of kings, and those with him are called, chosen, and faithful.*

*Then he said to me, "The waters that you saw where the harlot lives represent large numbers of peoples, nations, and tongues. The ten horns that you saw and the beast will hate the harlot; they will leave her desolate and naked; they will eat her flesh and consume her with fire. For God has put it into their minds to carry out his purpose and to make them*

*come to an agreement to give their kingdom to the beast until the words of God are accomplished. The woman whom you saw represents the great city that has sovereignty over the kings of the earth" [\(Rev 17:12-18\)](#).*

Cicero, did not have the mystical vision of John, but foreseeing Rome poorly protected and being destroyed by an effeminate ruler like Clodius, he fulminated:

*"If the Republic must be destroyed by someone, let it at least be destroyed by a real man."* [\[13\]](#)

Cicero received his wish, but it was not one "real man"; many real men destroyed Rome. However, they were not Roman men but Celts, Slavs and the Catholic men of Gaul who established Christendom on her ruins.



By Rome's end, *Libertas*, the Great Mother of Harlots" had turned all her votaries into slaves of sin (John 8:34). She then had to go underground as her temples and those all the false gods of the pagan world, which was previously under the rule of demons, [\(1 Corinthians 10:19-20\)](#) were demolished and replaced by Christian shrines, churches, monasteries, basilicas, convents, and cathedrals in a new empire called "Christendom".

*"All the gods of the pagans are demons" [\(Psalm 96:5\)](#)*

The Christian men did not make the mistake the Israelites had made [\(Psalm 106: 34-41\)](#). The Christian men routed sycophants and tyrants, blood thirsty chieftains, druids,



necromancers, witches and wizards who in the name of unbridled freedom polluted Europe and the whole world, with unrestrained concupiscence, pride, sloth, gluttony and anger, jealousy, lust and greed – the signs of the lordship of Lucifer, who up until Christ's death and Resurrection was the "Ruler of this World." ([John 12:31](#) and [14:30](#)). Under his dominion men and women practiced demonology, witchcraft, wizardry, idolatry and human sacrifice, which was abhorrent to Christian men who could stand it no longer.

The Church had exposed these shameful things, which blinded the minds of men

*"We have renounced shameful, hidden things; not acting deceitfully or falsifying the word of God, but by the open declaration of the truth we commend ourselves to everyone's conscience in the sight of God. And even though our gospel is veiled, it is veiled for those who are perishing, in whose case **the god of this age has blinded the minds of the unbelievers**, so that they may not see the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God" ([2 Corinthians 4:4](#)).*

Jesus had established the spiritual kingdom of heaven by His death and resurrection he took out Satan – then he left it to His the leaders of His Church, the priests and bishops as the teacher of nations to bring the kingdom of heaven by the sword of truth and love ([Matthew 26:56-52](#)) and to His other members, in this case, the non-ordained but priestly Christian men and women of Europe, to spread His kingdom by the sword of justice, which they wielded for God as avengers chosen to execute His wrath upon evildoers:

*"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...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. Wherefore be subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake" [\(Romans 13:1-5\)](#).*

*Be subject to every **human institution** for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme or to governors as sent by him for the punishment of evildoers and the approval of those who do good" [\(1 Peter 2: 13-14\)](#).*

*Libertas* and those who did evil in the sight of God and in the sight of men fought with frenzied anger against the warriors of Christendom, but they did not prevail. *Libertas* was then bound for a thousand years [\(Rev. 20:2\)](#), during which time, saintly kings such as King Saint Stephen of Hungary, King Saint Wenseslaus of Bohemia, King Saint Vladimir of Russia, Blessed Emperor Charlemagne of France and Germany, [\[14\]](#) King Pelayo of Spain, King Saint Canute of Denmark, King St. Olaf of Norway, and Alfred the Great of England (to name a few) traversed the globe routing *Libertas*, establishing the temporal domains of *His kingdom* and thereby freeing her slaves, and the slaves of other deceitful demons, from the shackles of spiritual death by which she bound them in the false name of liberty.

When her thousand years were up, counted from the temporal establishment of Christendom by Charles the Great (Charles assumed the throne in 768 and was crowned Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire in 800, although already recognized as *de facto* temporal arm of the church before that time), *Libertas* along with all the other demons, was let loose under the headship of Satan [\(Rev 20:3\)](#). His time being short, she immediately unleashed a barrage of cunning deceit in order to hasten a Revolution in the name of Liberty. Because the "[Great](#)



Mother" is a deceiver, she worked in the shadow of secret societies, wherein she hatched her clandestine plan. Then, in the name of Liberty, she spewed forth a barrage of enticing propaganda intended to bring about a new order of the ages (Novus Ordo Seclorum), an era of slavery initiated in the deep darkness known as the "Enlightenment". She was emblazened with the desire to restore her ancient mystery cults in place of the liturgical mysteries of the Christian faith that were (and still are) regent as she reemerged from the abyss.

By the time she emerged, the Christian men and women of Europe had already spread the faith so far and wide that it would take nefarious skill, innuendo, monetary allurements, false promises of enlightenment, sexual liberation, her old use of double meaning and other surreptitious crafts to bring about a revolution in her name.



Lady Liberty as Depicted by the French

The French were ahead of the Americans in concupiscence, Lady Liberty was portrayed by them as a bare breasted woman leading men blinded by passion to tear down a prison and set prisoners free, when in reality they were spiritually, intellectually, and morally placing themselves behind walls more impregnable than the Bastille. Nothing had changed, *Libertas* was still the Goddess of Slaves – not of slaves being made free but of free men being made slaves.

## THE STORY OF THE STATUE OF LIBERTY

Finished in France, *Lady Liberty* was shipped to, and reassembled in, America after which she was erected, set in place, and solemnly dedicated on Liberty Island in New York Harbor, October 28, 1866. Consistent with Jefferson's and Adam's theme of emancipation from religious tyranny, especially that of the Catholic Church (as demonstrated in Part One), it is not surprising to find (as we will below) that from A-Z, [\[15\]](#) the Statue of Liberty ("Liberty Enlightening the World") was a Masonic project. The Masons had vowed to destroy the Catholic Church, the "Bride of Christ", the Prince of Peace who had come to set men free from false pagan gods and goddesses like *Libertas*.

This was the reason [ST. MAXIMILIAN KOLBE](#) ESTABLISHED A SPIRITUAL ARMY THAT HE NAMED THE ["MILITIA IMMACULATA"](#) (The Militia of the Immaculate Virgin Mary), in honor of the obedient, immaculate, and ever-virgin woman chosen by God to crush the head of the ancient serpent who, in the name of liberty, had come to enslave humanity. Kolbe took the words of Pope Leo XIII to heart: "In the presence of such audacious evils, it is not sufficient merely to be aware of the wiles of this vile sect (Masons): we must also war against it, using those very arms furnished by the divine faith which once prevailed against paganism" ([Inimica Vis, Decmber 8, 1892](#)).

As a seminarian (1917), Kolbe, the future saint, witnessed a massive anti-Catholic demonstration marking the 200th anniversary of the foundation of the Grand Lodge of London, apparently the first Masonic Lodge in the modern world.

*"In Masonic demonstrations celebrating Freemasonry's bicentenary, flags bearing an effigy of Lucifer were carried through the streets by demonstrators shouting: 'The Devil shall rule in the Vatican and the Pope will be his lackey'".* [\[16\]](#)

Kolbe later indicated that it was the Masons who were the lackeys, the lackeys of Zionism:

*“These men [the Freemasons] believe that they are the ones who will rule everything, but let us hear what is written in the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion. Protocol n. 11 states: ‘We will create and put in effect the laws and the governments ... in opportune moments ... by means of national rebellions. ... What we want is that the multitudes, disoriented by the revolt, still in a condition of terror and uncertainty, should understand once and for all that we are so strong, so untouchable, so powerful that in no way will we take into account their opinions and wishes. Instead we are ready and able to crush with irresistible power their manifestations at any moment and in every place. ... Then, in fear and trembling, they will close their eyes to everything and await the consequences.’”*

*“For what purpose have we created this policy and insinuated it into the minds of the Masons, without giving them any possibility of examining its underlying meaning? ... This is what has served as the basis for our secret organization of Masonry, whose existence is not known or even suspected by these cattle, attracted by us into the army of Masonic lodges.”*[\[17\]](#)

If the Masons are under the influence of Zionists, it is not surprising that the poem dedicated to the world’s “huddled masses” inscribed on the statue’s base was composed by Emma Lazarus, an American Jewish advocate of Zionism[\[18\]](#), who imbued the poem with esoteric symbolism; nor is it surprising that the Masonic artist, Frederic Bartholdi, according to Robert Singer Deputy Grand Master Grand Lodge of New York, was inspired by a “a vision of a magnificent goddess, holding aloft a torch (of Illuminism) in one hand and welcoming all visitors to the land of freedom and opportunity”.[\[19\]](#)

Zionists are a small congregation of men, purportedly Jews that reject both Jesus and their own Jewish faith. They call themselves Jews but do not practice or promote their faith. A recent gathering of over 10,00 Jewish rabbis in New York city loudly attests to this reality:

*“Zionism redefines the true essential nature of the People of Israel, and substitutes for it a completely contradictory and opposite character – a materialistic worldly nation”.[\[20\]](#)*

Jesus had harsh words for this type of Jew. He referred to them as the “Synagogue” or “Assembly” “of Satan” ([Rev. 3:9](#) and [Rev. 2:9](#)) The “Synagogue of Satan” is an assembly of individuals who “say they are Jews, and are not.”

*“Behold, I will bring of the synagogue of Satan, who say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie. Behold, I will make them to come and adore before thy feet. And they shall know that I have loved thee” (Rev. 3:9).*

*“I know thy tribulation and thy poverty, but thou art rich: and thou art blasphemed by them that say they are Jews and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.” (Rev. 2:9).*

True Jews, men who live their faith are not a threat, they are not haters of God and thus more likely to become Christians. Crafty false Jews could feign becoming Christians, in which case they would be lying twice – once about being Jewish and twice about accepting Christ. Clearly, there are false Christians and false Jews, what they have in common is rejection of Christ. The synagogue of Satan, however, is composed of false Jews, false Christians belong to “lodges” and “temples”.[\[21\]](#)

In the Gospels, Jesus also referred to false Jews as sons of the devil:

*"Jesus said to them, "If God were your Father, you would love me, for I came from God and am here; I did not come on my own, but he sent me. Why do you not understand what I am saying? Because you cannot bear to hear my word. You belong to your father the devil and you willingly carry out your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning and does not stand in truth, because there is no truth in him. When he tells a lie, he speaks in character, because he is a liar and the father of lies" [\(John 8:42-44\)](#).*

If the devil is their father, we expect them, like the devil, to be thieves and masters of deceit who love power. Like their father, the devil, who wants to raise himself above God and humanity by the *debt of sin*, they want to raise themselves above men and women in order to enslave them by *sinful debt* and other forms of bondage, the most prevalent being usury and sinful sex by which they become sex slaves. It is not odd that men like these worship at the Altars of Liberty, when in fact *Libertas* is a slave master and master of slaves. It is not odd because in addition to being a slave master, *Libertas*, like the devil, is also a liar – the "Great Mother of Lies" – and her seed are like her, as they are like their father: they let their insatiable lust for pleasure and power involve them in deceit; nonetheless, they are easily known – they build all the wrong lodges and temples.

*"Let no one deceive you in any way. For unless the apostasy comes first and the lawless one is revealed, the one doomed to perdition, who opposes and exalts himself above every so-called god and object of worship, so as to seat himself in the temple of God" [\(2 Thessalonians 2: 3-4\)](#).*

*"And thou saidst in thy heart: I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God, I will sit in the mountain of the covenant, in the sides of the north." [\(Isaiah 14:13\)](#).*

Thus, not only is it becoming increasingly clear who *Libertas* is, it is very clear why Bartholdi planned to have her “tower over the steeple of Trinity Church, then the tallest building on the New York skyline”, he wanted Lady Liberty, like Lucifer, to ascend above the Holy Trinity.

As stated above, from inception to completion, the Statue of Liberty was a Masonic project that began with the laying of the cornerstone in 1884. The ceremony, as recalled by Robert C. Singer, the Deputy Grand Master of New York’s Grand Lodge, is outlined below:

*“Chairman William M. Evarts of the American Committee contacted the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of New York, and requested a Masonic ceremony “appropriate to the occasion.”*

*“The date set for the ceremony was August 5, 1884.... gaily decorated vessel Bay Ridge, draped with the Tricolor of France and the Stars and Stripes, ferried approximately 100 members of the Grand Lodge of New York and visiting Masonic Grand Officers, along with many civic officials, to Bedloe’s Island.”*

*“Brother Richard M. Hunt, principal architect of the pedestal, presented the Working Tools to M. .W. . William A. Brodie, Grand Master, who in turn distributed them to the Grand Lodge officers.”*

*“By traditional ceremony, the cornerstone was then tested and being found, square, level and plumb, the Deputy Grand Master completed the work by applying the mortar and by having the stone lowered firmly into place. The Grand Master then struck three blows with the gavel and declared the stone duly laid.”*

*“The most Worshipful Grand Master then gave a brief but pointed talk. He posed a question: “Why call upon the Masonic Fraternity to lay the cornerstone of such a structure as is here to be erected?” His answer: “No institution has done*



*more to promote liberty and to free men from the trammels and chains of ignorance and tyranny (sounds like Adams and Jefferson) than has Freemasonry."*

Dedication Day arrived two years late, October 28, 1886, which was declared a holiday in New York City.

*"Charles P. Stone, Grand Marshal, led the 20,000 paraders, including many Masonic Lodges, from 57th Street past President Grover Cleveland's reviewing stand at Madison Square Park and on down to the Battery, where groups were taken by steamer to Bedloe's Island. Brother Henry C. Potter, Episcopal Bishop of New York, gave the Invocation and Comte Ferdinand de Lesseps presented the statue to Chairman Evarts in the name of the French people...."*

*"The main speaker was Chauncey M. Depew, United States Senator, railroad president, one of the most famous orators in American history, and an active member of Kane Lodge 454.*

Given the Masonic connection to the Roman goddess, *Libertas*, it will further help to take a closer look at the acute fondness of many of the Founders with all things Roman, at the esoteric meaning latent in the statue of *Libertas* that was a gift of the French for America, and at the Sons of Liberty, predecessors of the ever waning sect of Masons – From whom, the light of liberty shall shine no more ([Rev. 18:23](#)).

Pope Leo XIII confirms this perspective, or rather his perspective is confirmed by this Intelligence Report: The Freemasons he says are:

*"...prepared to shake the foundations of empires, to harass the rulers of the State, to accuse, and to cast them out, as often as they appear to govern otherwise than they themselves could have wished. In like manner, **they have by flattery deluded the people. Proclaiming with a loud voice liberty and***

*public prosperity, and saying that it was owing to the Church and to sovereigns that the multitude were not drawn out of their unjust servitude and poverty, they have imposed upon the people, and, exciting them by a thirst for novelty, they have urged them to assail both the Church and the civil power."*

*"Nevertheless, the expectation of the benefits (freedom and prosperity) which was hoped for is greater than the reality; indeed, the common people, more oppressed than they were before, are deprived in their misery of that solace which, if things had been arranged in a Christian manner, they would have had with ease and in abundance. But, whoever strive against the order which Divine Providence has constituted pay usually the penalty of their pride, and meet with affliction and misery where they rashly hoped to find all things prosperous and in conformity with their desires" ([Humanum Genus, April 20, 1884](#)).*

---

## ENDNOTES

[1] This kind of specious reporting is all over the internet, the following are random examples (chosen for no reason at all, simply random) of the type that are legion: (1) <http://humansarefree.com/2014/04/the-secret-worship-of-illuminati-statue.html>; (2) [http://yahushua.net/babylon/liberty/pagan\\_statue.htm](http://yahushua.net/babylon/liberty/pagan_statue.htm); (3) <http://humansarefree.com/2014/04/the-secret-worship-of-illuminati-statue.html>

[2] See: Tullius Cicero, Book Two *Treatise "On The Chief Good And Evil"* (*Treatise de Finibus*).

[3] Marcus Tullius Cicero, Book Two *Treatise "On The Chief Good And Evil"* (*Treatise de Finibus*).

[4] Ancient History:  
[http://ancienthistory.about.com/cs/people/a/bingleycicero\\_3.htm](http://ancienthistory.about.com/cs/people/a/bingleycicero_3.htm)

[5] Cicero, the speech *De Haruspicum Responso* 21.44, delivered May 56 BC. Translation and discussion by Leach, "Gendering Clodius," p. 338 (Wikipedia).

[6] *ibid*

[7] *ibid*

[8] Castor, along with his brother Pollux, was accredited with helping to found the Roman Republic, whole virtues Cicero was trying to preserve.

[9] Matthew B. Roller

[10] MATTHEW B. ROLLER (2010), *Demolished Houses, Monumentality, and Memory in Roman Culture*. *Classical Antiquity*. Vol. 29, Issue 1, pp. 117–180. ISSN 0278-6656(p); 1067-8344 (e). Copyright © 2010 by The Regents of the University of California.

<http://krieger.jhu.edu/classics/wp-content/uploads/sites/20/2013/06/Demolished-Houses.pdf>

[11] inbed video )

[12] *ibid*

[13] Wikipedia:  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Publius\\_Clodius\\_Pulcher#cite\\_note-28](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Publius_Clodius_Pulcher#cite_note-28)

[14] "...a local cultus that had developed around the emperor persisted and spread to parts of Germany, Belgium, and France. No subsequent pope protested the cultus, so it endured for several centuries with the tacit permission of Rome. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Pope Benedict XIV confirmed the

cultus, though apparently not as an official papal act. Ultimately, because the cultus continued to exist with the permission of the Church, Charlemagne is considered beatified. Charlemagne, therefore, can be referred to as Blessed Charlemagne; however, he is not Saint Charlemagne.

Quoted from "Reliquarian"  
<http://reliquarian.com/2013/05/02/charlemagne-saint-of-the-holy-roman-empire/>

[15] That is, from conception to finish including, idea, finance, creation, shipping, reassembly, installation and ceremony

[16] *Immaculata Magazine* (May/June, 1996):  
<https://www.ewtn.com/library/ANSWERS/KOLANTI.HTM>

[17] M. Kolbe to the Masons: You are Controlled by the Jews:  
[http://www.traditioninaction.org/History/G\\_010\\_Kobe\\_Jewsl.html](http://www.traditioninaction.org/History/G_010_Kobe_Jewsl.html)

In Polish: *forumdlazycia Tradycji Katolickiej*:  
<https://forumdlazycia.wordpress.com/2012/08/14/sw-maksymilian-maria-kolbe-o-masonerii-i-zydach-pisma-wybrane-wyboru-i-opracowania-dokonal-dr-stanislaw-krajski/>

[18] Virtual Jewish Library:  
<https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/biography/lazarus.html>

[19]  
<http://www.masonicworld.com/education/articles/Masonry-and-the-statue-of-liberty.htm>

[20] Jews United against Zionism  
Website:<http://www.nkusa.org/AboutUs/Zionism/opposition.cfm>

[21] Since the designation Jewish is a religious and not a racial characteristic, anyone can become a "Jew". Accepting the Jewish faith and living it is what makes one Jewish. Thus, the synagogue of Satan is composed of individuals who claim to

be Jewish (this could be men and women of any race) but are not. They might have Abraham's blood in them or they might not; race and blood are not the issues, acceptance of the faith and living it are the issues.

---

# Revolt Against the Kingdom of God

## American Foundations Intelligence Report # 8

**WHO IS THIS "LADY LIBERTY"** pictured above and who were the fabled "Sons of Liberty" who sparked a revolution in her name? These are related questions. To see how they are related requires a thorough scrutiny of the motives behind American Revolution, which was more than a mortal combat fought for independence from Great Britain; the American Revolution was a combat in the name of freedom for the hearts and minds of men. Thus, in the words of John Adams, the "*real revolution*" was,

*"...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."*

[\[1\]](#)

And exactly what sentiments, principles, and opinions was Adams talking about?

*"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."*[\[2\]](#)

More precisely, the Christian ideas of divine sovereignty, divine law, and the moral precepts drawn from the sacred scriptures ([outlined in Intelligence Report #1](#)) that the Pilgrims and other settlers had brought with them to the new world to establish Christian “plantations” (commonwealths) throughout North America; these had to undergo so radical a change that it would require a revolution in the name of “Liberty”.

Adams was *not* alone in this revolutionary cabal. Thomas Jefferson was just as adamant. The revolution was, more than anything else, a campaign to remove the constricting shackles of Christian dogma imposed by ignorant Protestant ministers and plotting Catholic priests because they were both “hostile to liberty”:

*“In every country and in every age, the priest has been hostile to liberty. He is always in alliance with the Despot abetting his abuses in return for protection to his own....They have perverted the purest religion ever preached to man, into mystery & jargon unintelligible to all mankind & therefore the safer engine for their purposes.”*[\[3\]](#)

*“Millions of innocent men, women, and children, since the introduction of Christianity, have been burnt, tortured, fined, imprisoned; yet we have not advanced one inch towards uniformity. What has been the effect of coercion? To make one half the world fools, and the other half hypocrites.”*[\[4\]](#)

The world needed liberation from the tyranny of Christian clergy who had turned men and women throughout the world into “fools” and “hypocrites”, from clerical machinations and subtle “priestcraft” that had sunk the world in a sea of ignorance. Those who were hostile to “liberty” had to be therefore be overcome by those who swore to honor her.



*"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".*[\[5\]](#)

James Madison, the "Father of the Constitution", also harbored hostility for the clergy, "spiritual tyrants" who "subvert the public liberty".

*"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."*[\[6\]](#)

On this topic almost all agreed, however, there was a contest for who was worse, was it the Catholic priests or the Protestant ministers who were the biggest enemies of liberty?

*"The priesthood have, in all ancient nations, nearly monopolized learning. 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."*[\[7\]](#)

Nonetheless, it was clearly the Catholics who were the biggest threat to freedom, in England and France, the "monster" had suffered a wound from which Adams did not believe she would recover; the wound was "mortal":

*“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.”*[\[8\]](#)

Because the monster had not yet expired, it was clear what the revolution was about:

*“The question before the human race is, Whether the **God of nature** 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?”*[\[9\]](#)

Clearly, the god of nature is not the Holy Trinity. Jesus, the Second Person of the Trinity established a church (which the key Framers declared war against) and promulgated a new Law, which He also entrusted to His her to guard as the “pillar and support of truth” ([1 Timothy 3:15](#)) and as the light of the world ([Matt. 5: 14-16](#)). Jesus also referred to Himself as the “Light of the world” ([John 8:12](#)). Since He also referred to the church as His Body ([I Corinthians 1:12-27](#); [Romans 12: 4-5](#); [Colossians 1:24](#) and in at least 19 other places); it is clear that Jesus is the head ([Colossians 1:18](#)) and the Church is His Body; head and body are one mystical person: Together God and His Church are both the light of the world because they are one Body. [The Church is also the “city set on the hilltop”](#) to give light to the world and as the pillar of truth, commissioned to teach all nations ([Matt 28:18-20](#)).

Apparently, the “Founding Fathers” were free thinking revolutionaries (as well be shown in the following two Intelligence Reports) who had a problem with the Church’s

authority AS LIGHT OF THE WORLD, TEACHER OF NATIONS AND GUARDIAN OF THE LAWS OF GOD. Likewise, SOME Protestants have no problem saying that the Catholic Church is heretical because Catholics call priests “father” when scripture clearly says to “call no one on earth your father” ([Matt 23:9](#)). Yet, most of them have no problem calling men like Jefferson, Madison and Franklin their “Founding Fathers” and they also seem to neglect the scriptural fact that the Apostle [Paul referred to himself as “father” \(1 Corinthians 4:15\)](#). and that God commands us to honor our “mother” and “father”.

Men such as these unite themselves to the Founding Fathers who set themselves in opposition to the Church as the city on a hilltop and as the light of the world. They received plenty of support for these radical ideas by deferring to the people who were roused by the British tyranny, by severe mercantile trade restrictions and by political oppression (what the Christian people *en banc* failed to see clearly was that the church was thrown into the mix but disguised by the veneer of “nature’s God”). Thus, what we are about to learn below is not surprising: **The “Founding Fathers” were in the process of founding or establishing a “new order of the ages” in which the Church would be prohibited from public affairs** (not allowed in the court rooms, not allowed in the congress, not allowed in the senate, not allowed in the schools, not allowed in the post office not on public property, not allowed in the centers of political power and law making... not allowed, not allowed, not allowed), **from law making, and any type of political discourse while the Framers set themselves up as the lawgivers**; thereby making themselves and the people, *not God and His Church*, the final source of light and arbiter of truth. Jefferson concurred with Adams’ thoughts; and then furthered them by insisting that the teachings of Jesus, the **“purest system of morals ever preached to mankind”, had been perverted by men like St. Paul the “great Coryphaeus, and first corrupter of the doctrines of Jesus”**[\[10\]](#). Afterward, the popes and bishops mutilated and adulterated the scriptures

thereby turning them into “impious heresies”:

*” [A] short time elapsed after the death of the great reformer of the Jewish religion (Jesus Christ) before his principles were departed from by those who professed to be his special servants (the apostles), and perverted into an engine for enslaving mankind (the church perverted Jesus’ teachings to enslave mankind), and aggrandizing their (mankind’s) oppressors in Church and State (priests and kings); that the purest system of morals ever before preached to man, has been adulterated and sophisticated by artificial constructions, into a mere contrivance to filch wealth and power to themselves (priests and kings); that rational men (like Jefferson and other founders) not being able to swallow their impious heresies (the clergy’s) , in order to force them down their throats, they (the clergy) raise the hue and cry of infidelity, while themselves are the greatest obstacles to the advancement of the real doctrines of Jesus, and do in fact constitute the real Anti-Christ.”*[\[11\]](#)

Jefferson and Adams *et al* would be the final arbiters of truth not the apostles, not their successors, nor the Catholic and Protestant clergy, but the writers of the constitution ratified by the people were setting themselves up as the arbiters of truth in order to set men free from the tyranny of the Christian Church and Her clergy. Adams had drawn up the battle lines between the “God of nature” and the God who had established the Catholic Church, and by inference, her separated brothers, and sisters in the Protestant Churches to teach the nations, to be the pillar of truth and the light to the world. By defending the liberal doctrine that authority originates with the people (it is “*not brought down from heaven by the power of the Holy Ghost*”), Adams fell on the side of nature and popular sovereignty heretically enshrined in the Constitution. Adams and Jefferson denied Jesus’ own teaching that all authority comes down from above ([John 19:11](#)) and then they denied the explicit teaching of the Old

Testament and of St. Paul, whom they dismissed as the “great Coryphaeus”, that all authority comes from the God, not the god of nature but the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, from the Holy Trinity whom scripture acknowledges as the source of all power and authority—nowhere does scripture say that power or authority comes from the people.

*“LORD, God of our ancestors, are you not God in heaven, and do you not rule over all the kingdoms of the nations? In your hand is power and might, and no one can withstand you” [\(2 Chronicles 20:6\)](#).*

*“Let every person be subordinate to the higher authorities, for there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been established by God. Therefore, whoever resists authority opposes what God has appointed, and those who oppose it will bring judgment upon themselves” [\(Romans 13:1-2\)](#).*

All power belongs to God as does the right to make laws for the governance of the universe – they all belong to God and come from Him:

*The eleven disciples went to Galilee, to the mountain to which Jesus had ordered them. When they saw him, they worshiped, but they doubted. Then Jesus approached and said to them, **“All power in heaven and on earth has been given to me”** (Matt 28: 16-18).*

After the resurrection, there is no legitimate power except from Jesus. Power from on high can be justly transferred to rulers *through* the people, in which case, the case of an authentic democracy or republic, the people can rightly legitimize the person or persons on whom power is conferred, *but they have no right or authority* to alter the laws of God by contrary laws that exclude both the Holy

Trinity and Divine Precepts from public affairs and institute secular law in their place. By referring to the Christian Church, the Bride of Christ, as “Antichrist”, they were also dismissing Her Divine Spouse who established Her, not America or any other nation, as “light of the nations”. According to Adams and Jefferson, Jesus is not a Divine Person—He is not God (see Intelligence Reports [3–5–6](#)). Thus, it is not surprising that they thought it their sacred duty, the duty of the revolution, to undertake the initial final steps to finish off the wounded “monster”, His Bride, who “must finally die” and whose God-given authority must be ridiculed, publicly stripped, and then, contrary to God’s own decree, transferred to the new secular state that they were establishing—the new state that has, for example, appropriated to itself power over education, marriage, birth, the Sabbath to name a few – these are not things that belong to Caesar ([Matt 12:17](#)):

*“And Jesus answering, said to them: Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.”*

Some vital “things of God” (marriage and its mystical meaning, Sabbath recognition, dignity of life teachings, education) have been stripped from the Church, just as Christ has been rejected as the cornerstone. Interestingly, these two scripture passages about rejection of the cornerstone and giving to God what belongs to God, occur together in Mark’s Gospel (Chapter 12) and in the Gospel of Matthew (Chapter 22) in which we find rejection of the Messiah and failure to make a proper distinction between the “things of God” and “things of Caesar” presented together in one passage – rejecting Jesus and rejecting His Church and her authority are connected, as they are in these gospels. No one can be united to Christ unless they are part of his body, the Church. If the distinction between Caesar and his state and God and His Church is not maintained, the state will soon enough reject the proposition that sacred things such as marriage belong to



the Church and therefore can be abrogated and reassigned to secular authorities. Below is Mark's version, if you check Matthews, the theme is repeated, *albeit* in different words:

*'Have you not read this scripture passage: The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone; by the Lord has this been done, and it is wonderful in our eyes' [\(Mark 12:10\)](#)?... They sent some Pharisees and Herodians to him to ensnare him in his speech... Is it lawful to pay the census tax to Caesar or not? Should we pay or should we not pay?" Knowing their hypocrisy he said to them, "Why are you testing me? Bring me a denarius to look at." They brought one to him and he said to them, "Whose image and inscription is this?" They replied to him, "Caesar's." So Jesus said to them, "Repay to Caesar what belongs to Caesar and to God what belongs to God" [\(Mark 12:17\)](#).*

Jesus being rejected as the cornerstone of the New Israel, His Church and Mystical Body, is synonymous with her spiritual legitimacy or authority being rejected and then pilfered by the state – things such as marriage, dignity of life teachings leading to abortion legislation, education, abrogation of God's law, power and authority (sovereignty) – these things do not belong to Caesar! They belong to God and they belong to His Church, which the founders were in the process of rejecting along with Her Cornerstone, Jesus Himself. It is not possible to have one without the other, that is, it is not possible to have Jesus without His Church. They are one person; the Church is the body and Christ is the head of the body [\(Colossians 1:18\)](#) [\(Ephesians 5:29-30\)](#).

Christ is the groom and the Church is His bride [\(2 Corinthians 11:23\)](#) [\(Ephesians 5:27-32\)](#) [\(Rev 19:7\)](#) – in marriage they are made one. To speak of one is to speak of the other. Thus, whatever is done to one is done to the other!

*"Whoever listens to you listens to me. Whoever rejects you rejects me. And whoever rejects me rejects the one who sent*

me" ([Luke 10:16](#)).

*"Whoever receives you receives me, and whoever receives me receives the one who sent me" ([Matt 10:40](#)).*

*'Amen, I say to you, whatever you did for one of these least brothers of mine, you did for me" ([Matt 25:40](#)).*

But in the minds of men like Franklin, Adams and Jefferson, et al, the Church, the mystical Body of Christ, was "Cabalistic" and therefore clearly the "Antichrist who could, and should, therefore be "rejected" just as they had rejected the divinity of Christ and reduced Him to a "great teacher of morality". It seems that in calling the Church "Antichrist, they were unaware that they were fulfilling scripture ([Matt 10:25](#)). Whatever happens to Christ happens to His Church and whatever happens to the Church happens to Christ; they are simply inseparable as man and wife are inseparable ([Matt 19:5](#)) ([Mark 10:8](#)). Men such as the Founders who rejected Christ's Church cannot have Christ as they claimed. No, in rejecting the Church they rejected Christ too. The bottom line is: Men such as these did not know God!

*"Remember the word I spoke to you,\* 'No slave is greater than his master.' If they persecuted me, they will also persecute you. If they kept my word, they will also keep yours. And they will do all these things to you on account of my name, because they do not know the one who sent me" (John 15: 20-21).*

Given what we have learned in this series of Intelligence Reports, it is becoming quite clear where the cabal lies and who the "Antichrist" is likely to be.

## GO TO NEXT PART TWO: LADY LIBERTY

---

### ENDNOTES

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

[2] *ibid.*

[3] Thomas Jefferson (March 17, 1814) Letter to Horatio G. Spafford,

[4] Thomas Jefferson, Notes on the State of Virginia:  
<https://www.monticello.org/site/jefferson/christian-god-three-headed-monsterquotation>

[5] Letter to Dr. Benjamin Rush, September 23, 1800

[6] James Madison (1785) "*A Memorial and Remonstrance*".

[7] John Adams, Letter to John Taylo

[8] John Adams, (*July 16, 1814*) *Letter to Thomas Jefferson.*

[9] John Adams, (*June 20, 1815*) *Letter to Thomas Jefferson*

[10] Thomas Jefferson (*April 13, 1820*) *Letter to William Short*

[11] Thomas Jefferson (1810) *Letter to Samuel Kercheval*

---

## WHAT ARE THE GREATEST BOOKS?

**KOLBE'S GREATEST BOOKS** are an Accumulated Treasury of Human Wisdom. As such, they are indispensable components of liberal education because liberal education—unlike training and schooling—culminates in wisdom.

They are called “Greatest” because of the formative impact they have had as a tour de force of Christian civilization, because they masterfully deal with the greatest questions the human mind is capable of examining, and because they help readers acquire truth, which is the one attainment of the human mind that sets a person free (John 8:32) or “liberates”. This is why the Greatest Books are key components of “liberal” arts education; liberal education is education intended for free men and women or for those who desire to be free to develop all their human potential.

Because human beings are endowed with an intellect and will made to the image and likeness of God, they possess the potential to become increasingly Godlike. This is a trinitarian mystery manifest in man’s highest intellectual faculties: intellectual apprehension, understanding (also known as reason), and the ability to love (which is an intellectual appetite that involves the body but originates in, and proceeds from, the mind).

When human beings properly exercise and develop these faculties the result is ongoing growth in knowledge, understanding, and wisdom leading to ongoing sanctification in a spirit of unitive love. This is a uniquely human process referred to by Western mystics as “divinization” (in the East it is referred to as “theosis”) resulting in spiritual growth and phenomenal creative expression in the arts, sciences, and humanities. The Greatest Books are an indispensable collection of many such authors (some further developed than others) whose wisdom graces the various arts and sciences in the Judeo-Christian and classical natural law tradition.

Here in 101 color coded volumes are the writings of eminent statesmen, philosophers, poets, saints, and scientists, the greatest thinkers and exemplars of humankind; men and women dedicated to the development, penetration, and diffusion of noble literature, artistic beauty, and demonstrated ideas that have shaped the legal, ethical, moral, and spiritual codes, which are the bedrock of Christian civilization.

**BROWN – MATH & SCIENCE**

**GREEN – LITERATURE**

BLUE – POLITICS, HISTORY, LAW

BLACK – PHILOSOPHY

PURPLE – THEOLOGY

RED – SPIRITUAL CLASSICS

These masterful writings have enlightened popes and kings, savants and generals, along with countless others everywhere. They form the intellectual record of our Judeao-Christian patrimony and the story of its development.

*Kolbe's Greatest Books* are an integral part of authentic liberal education, education devoted to the acquisition of intellectual skills leading students to knowledge of truth and acquisition of wisdom, which help set them free to live a good life in pursuit of happiness. In every age men and women seek clarity and understanding of ultimate questions asked about the nature of things, about God and man, heaven and hell, wisdom, justice and charity, virtue and vice, about human suffering, the best form of government, the use and abuse of power and authority, the meaning of life and death, and other fundamental questions, which perplex the human soul.

In Dickens and Dostoevsky human nature combats pride, ambition, greed, and envy; in John of the Cross and Teresa of Avila human nature seeks highest perfection; in King Alfred the Great's Law Books the Old Law revealed to Moses is united to the New Law revealed by Jesus; in La Maitre and Einstein man struggles to understand the cosmos; in Augustine and Shakespeare man endeavors to understand himself, while Aquinas and Dante explore virtue, sin, grace, redemption, and final judgment.

When most current novels and best sellers are no longer remembered, the *Greatest Books* (which have stood, and continue to stand, the test of time) will still be cherished and read by millions as they have been for over two thousand years.



---

# THE GREATEST BOOKS ARE NOT THE GREAT BOOKS


[KOLBE'S GREATEST BOOKS](#) are often confused with BRITANNICA'S GREAT BOOKS. The two are alike in that they are compilations of outstanding written contributions to the advancement of civilization. The only question is: What civilization are they advancing? Kolbe's Greatest Books are all part of the Judaeo-Christian, Greco-Roman natural law tradition. Britannica's *Great Books of the Western World*, edited by Robert Hutchins and Mortimer J. Adler, are often antithetical to this tradition.

Greatest Books: [Politics – Law – Social Theory](#)

Greatest Books: [Theology](#)



Britannica's Great Books include thinkers such as Karl Marx, Friedrich Hegel, Sigmund Freud, Charles Darwin, Niccolo Machiavelli, and Jean Jacques Rousseau; these men are atheists, deists, agnostics, anti-Christians, and revolutionaries. The *Great Books* collection also includes an additional series of 102 "*Recommended Readings*" that embrace thinkers antithetical to Christian civilization such as Ivan Pavlov, the father of classical conditioning, Sir James Frazier who endeavored to reduce Christianity to a human construct and the Son of God to a myth.



They also include Herbert Spencer, a social evolutionist and cultural determinist, the agnostic Thomas Huxley, and others such as the François-Marie Arouet (Voltaire) and the deist Thomas Paine who waged ceaseless war against Christianity. According to Paine, the Christian system of faith is "derogatory" and "repugnant".



"Of all the systems of religion that ever were invented, there is no more derogatory to the Almighty, more unedifying to man, more repugnant to reason, and more contradictory to itself than this thing called Christianity. "

Voltaire signed his letters *Écrasez l'infâme!* – "crush the wretch" by whom he meant the Catholic Church. He made her destruction the center of all his efforts. According to Voltaire, enlightened statesmen and philosophers should focus all their efforts on destroying the church's "infamous missionaries"; they should be willing to "risk all things,

even to be burned in order to destroy it. Let us crush the wretch! Crush the wretch! *Écrasez l'infâme!*"

In short, the "*Great Books of Western Civilization*" are not the "*Greatest Books of Christian Civilization*"— the Great Books are often arrayed against Christian Civilization. Is it a good thing to introduce young underdeveloped minds to advanced thinkers such as Hegel and Freud before they have developed critical intellectual skills as well as knowledge and understanding of their own intellectual-cultural tradition? We can do to better than this.

Nonetheless, for the very reason that the Great Books are often antithetical to ideas expressed in the Greatest Books, they help students develop dialectical thinking skills, analytical judgment, and substantive evaluation, which are essential to intellectual formation.



Consequently, The Great Books form a part of Kolbe's series **to be respectfully approached *after* students have had a solid formation in their own tradition** including studies of history, theology, social science, philosophy, and literature from a perspective of faith and reason, *fides et ratio*.

Parents and professors need not cower to those who claim that education in the Christian tradition, including faith and reason, is tantamount to indoctrination rather than the freedom and emancipation that accompany wisdom toward which liberal education aims:

**Faith is not indoctrination; faith is enlightenment**

**that helps keep one from being indoctrinated.**

Intellectual formation that includes faith and reason is the highest guarantor of freedom. When faith and reason are coupled with higher dialectical studies, including many of the authors of the *Great Books*, the mind is sharpened, fine tuned, and intellectually challenged thereby leading to the work of further expansion. As a result of dialectical studies, the mind is continually exercised leading to increased insight, to new discoveries and the joy of finding creative solutions to antithetical challenges coming from many different directions. These challenges tend to sharpen the intellect, enhance focus and increase mental acuity thereby preparing students for life in the “real world”, a world wherein the wisdom contained in the *Greatest Books* necessarily dialogues with contrary and often inimical ideas.”

In authentic education, *reason* is regent (in a spirit of charity). Aquinas defines law as a dictate of reason; law cannot validly be a force of the will as some ideologues would have it; nor does faulty or undemonstrated reason have the force of law. Law is a rule of reason it is not an undemonstrated dictate of the will (minority or majority). If an idea is to be accepted, it must have the force of right reason (*rex ratio*) behind it: Human beings have minds that must be developed and respected. Demagoguery is an affront to human dignity.

Britannica’s *Great Books of the Western World*, although graced with sagacity and wisdom, are unfortunately laced with deceit and chicanery. Such books are properly introduced to students *after* they have explored, become conversant with, and demonstrated sufficient mastery, of their own broader Christian tradition, which includes Judaism, the pagan natural law tradition that begins in classical antiquity, and the writings of Christian savants, scholars, scientists and statesmen that are available in Kolbe’s *Greatest Books of Christian Civilization*.

Without *The Greatest Books*, *The Great Books* often become a stumbling block rather than a blessing.



---

# Self Interest and the Oracle of Reason – Part 2

## Intelligence Report

### American Foundations #5

**ALTHOUGH PAGAN PHILOSOPHERS OF ANCIENT ROME** such as Epicurus made the mistake of either deemphasizing or dismissing metaphysics from their philosophy, they were unable to dismiss the Christian faith because it had not yet been revealed to them or to anyone. The American Founders such as Thomas Jefferson (an Epicurean by his own admission) and Benjamin Franklin ( a professed deist) do not have the same excuse. Like other leading lights among the Framers, they rejected both Aristotelian metaphysics and the Christian faith while living in a Protestant society among a deeply Christian people – they knew about Christ and about philosophy; yet in place of Christianity and metaphysics, they set up a deficient “Oracle of Reason” by which they derived a false understanding of human nature and therefore of self-interest and the pursuit of happiness as discussed in the previous Intelligence Report #4.

Thus, when Thomas Jefferson campaigned for president, various Protestant ministers joined hands to campaign against him. William Linn, a Dutch Reformed pastor and John Mitchell Mason, a Presbyterian minister began the Anti-Jefferson onslaught. Linn was sure that "the election of any man avowing the principles of Mr. Jefferson" would *"destroy religion, introduce immorality, and loosen all the bonds of society."*[\[1\]](#)

Linn also "accused Jefferson of the heinous crimes of *not* believing in divine revelation and of a design to destroy religion and "introduce immorality'" and likened him to a "true infidel". According to Pastor Linn,

*"An infidel like Jefferson could not, should not, be elected."*[\[2\]](#)

Rev. Mason voiced similar concerns:

*"By giving your support to Mr. Jefferson, you are about to strip infidelity of its ignominy" and to engage in a "crime never to be forgiven."*

Jefferson, he reasoned, was an "open enemy to their religion, their Redeemer, and their hope." He was a secularist who desired "to see a government administered without any religious principle among either rulers or ruled." Consequently, Mason argued that voting for Jefferson "would be mischief to themselves and sin against God."[\[3\]](#)

Unlike Jefferson and Franklin, Classical and Christian philosophers of human nature exercised great care and undertook extensive effort to demonstrate the spiritual dimensions of the human soul. They opened the door to the transcendental dimensions of human existence and the acceptance of revealed truths that lead to increased understanding, wisdom, and love, which are necessary for the authentic "pursuit of happiness." Aristotle rightly understood

*happiness* to be a contemplative attainment of the spiritual soul that was dependent on growth in wisdom shared among a community of friends united in virtue and love. Christian philosophers, enlightened by the mysteries of faith, further built upon the metaphysics of Aristotle and thereafter understood that happiness exceeded the *spiritual* and *intellectual contemplation* of God to include ultimate integral *union with* God and with all of His children as members of the mystical Body of Christ, the ultimate mystery of human existence.

Love, the crown of wisdom, is the adamant bond that makes authentic community possible—human happiness is the result of shared friendship, that spiritual bond of *wisdom* and love that makes men one. *Aristotle and Cicero sang the praises of friendship*, the bond of unity among men that brought rejoicing and pleasure because such friends united in wisdom and *filial* love *truly* cared for each other and were achieving penultimate human union, the glory of a Greek city state. Christian friendship is also a cause of rejoicing, an even greater cause and magnificent achievement, the Divine bond between God and men also the supernatural bond of wisdom and of divine love (a love that far exceeds filial love), that unites men and women in friendship known as the “Communion of Saints”, the mystical Body of Christ – the ultimate union and glory of man, not Athens, but the New Jerusalem, the City of God.

Both pagan philosophers such as Aristotle and Cicero and Christian philosophers such as Augustine and Aquinas understood that the pursuit of happiness requires wisdom and love and a community of friends necessary to actualize and consummate our ontological spiritual potentials and the supreme requirements of our individual and communal human nature, *albeit* the later to an infinitely greater extent as consummate supernatural unity perfected as the mystical Body of Christ filled with the glory of God.



Aristotle understood the bond of friendship to be something greater than the bond of justice, something more akin to the bond of love. He makes this issue the high point of his *"Ethics"* as does Cicero – even Epicurus speaks eloquently about friendship. The difference is that Aristotle makes happiness a spiritual pleasure of the soul dependent on the acquisition of wisdom necessary for the contemplation of God undertaken within a community of friends united by intellectual and moral virtue; whereas Epicurus makes happiness a physical pleasure of the lower sentient soul and physical body (he denies the existence of a spiritual soul) shared by a community of friends pursuing pleasure heightened by the absence of pain. Epicurus thus remained a materialist, while Aristotle and Cicero soared towards heaven on the wings of metaphysics. According to Cicero, Epicurus, and those who follow him,

*"...did not perceive that as a horse is born for galloping, and an ox for ploughing, and a dog for hunting, so man is also born for two objects, As Aristotle says, namely, for understanding, and for acting as if he were a kind of mortal god."* [\[4\]](#)


After a chapter on justice, Aristotle devotes two chapters to friendship, which he claims is the authentic bond among human beings. True friends, that is friends united by wisdom and love, as Cicero understood, seek the good of each other expecting nothing in return.

*"And what is loving, from which the verb (amo) the very name of friendship (amicitia) is derived, but wishing a certain person to enjoy the greatest possible good fortune, even if none of it accrues to oneself?"* [\[5\]](#)

Such friends, according to Aristotle, do not need justice; friends already treat each other with kindness and respect. But justice, as something lesser, needs friends. Even

strangers can treat each other with justice, but justice does not make strangers friends, although it helps. Once they become friends, justice is no longer required by force of law; it is reciprocal among those who love each other:


*“Friendship seems too to hold states together, and lawgivers to care more for it than for justice; for unanimity seems to be something like friendship, and this they aim at most of all, and expel faction as their worst enemy; and when men are friends they have no need of justice, while when they are just they need friendship as well, and the truest form of justice is thought to be a friendly quality” (Aristotle, The Ethics, Chapter Eight).*

In short, a transcendental conceptualization of the self and the pursuit of happiness (as Aristotle proposed) necessarily includes the good of others. It includes the good of others because happiness is rooted in human nature, a nature whose  actualization requires growth in wisdom and love, which, ontologically speaking, require the existence of others. Love cannot be consummated in solitary acts. Solitary love of self (or of others for the good of oneself – the first cousin to self-interest), results in utilitarian relationships whereby human beings become objects necessary for one’s own benefit. Authentic love is rooted in the intellectual and *communal dimensions* of human nature, a nature consummated and perfected in love of God, of self and of neighbor. (The book “Trinitarian Humanism” provides a full and detailed understanding of the ontological roots of love in human nature made to the Trinitarian image of God). Solipsistic self love is unnatural; it is a form a narcissism – a psychological form of neurosis dressed up in the language of philosophy as “enlightened self-interest”, which is an integral dimension of the culture of death, a culture of narcissistic self-love and therefore of no love at all.

Those who love only themselves end up (in the long run) hating

everyone else, even to the extreme extent of unrestricted cannibalism fueled by psychopathic self-love. According to famed German psychoanalyst Karl Abraham whom Freud called his “best pupil”:

*“Melancholia qualified as narcissistic psychoneurosis par excellence: a state where a ‘pure culture of the death instinct’ supports a superego at war with the ego. ‘Complete and unrestricted cannibalism’ is fueled by ‘unrestricted narcissism’” (1924 quoted by Vincent, 2011, p. 488).*



In short, “Liberalism is a Sin”. This helps us to understand why liberal philosophers such as Thomas Hobbes and other “contract theorists” of the “Age of Reason” envisioned social life as a jungle ruled by finely dressed beasts. Liberal self-interest knows nothing of love because the patriarchs and generals of liberalism, men such as Hobbes, Jefferson and Franklin *et al* knew nothing of the spiritual dimensions of the human soul; either by recourse to Christian philosophy, to speculative reason, or to the mysteries of revelation, which were despised by the chic clique of classical liberals.[\[6\]](#) Lacking a proper concept of human nature and thus of the bond of love, liberalism promotes self-interest and the pursuit of happiness, which, they reduce to worldly success, refined sentient pleasures and peace of mind; not the peace that flows from wisdom and virtue, but the kind of ersatz peace that flows from cunningly committing a crime and getting away with it.

Those who espouse liberalism must therefore learn to protect themselves from the self-seeking pleasures of others, even enlightened others. The best self-interested liberals can hope for is a “common” or broad grasp of justice, that is, justice broadly valued by many. Even if such an unlikely scenario were to become a broad social reality, it would nonetheless

be insufficient for unity. Justice is a necessary moral and political good; however, it is insufficient for establishing social bonds of friendship. Both Cicero and Aristotle ranked justice below authentic friendship, well below wisdom that is crowned with love that unite men and women into a *community of friends*. Cicero articulated the activity of this community of philosophers (the lovers of wisdom), by using the pronoun, “we”:

*“Since... nature has implanted in man a desire of ascertaining the truth, which is most easily visible when, being free from all cares, we wish to know what is taking place, even in the heavens; led on from these beginnings we love everything that is true, that is to say, that is faithful, simple, consistent, and we hate what is vain, false and deceitful, such as fraud, perjury, cunning and injustice.”*[\[7\]](#)

On the other hand, a community of self-seeking individuals intent on pursuing happiness, understood as pleasure and sentient peace of mind, can harm each other. The more reasonable and brilliant they are, the more they can convince themselves of their own righteousness, and the more they can devise plans to satisfy their pursuits. For, as stated previously,

*“...man, when perfected, is the best of animals...and he is equipped at birth with arms, meant to be used by intelligence and virtue, which he may use for the worst ends. Wherefore, if he have not virtue, he is the most unholy and the most savage of animals, and the most full of lust and gluttony. (Politics, Book I).*

Friendship based on virtue, the type admired by Aristotle, Cicero, and Christ, was also admired by America’s founders, but the latter misconceived virtue and thought that such a form of friendship was too lofty and difficult a goal for general attainment. Virtue as conceived by Madison et al was

akin to virtue as conceived by Epicurus; it was not the brand espoused by Aristotle, Cicero, Aquinas or Augustine. Cicero, speaking about Epicurus and the liberal political thinkers who followed in his train, had this to say:

*There is nothing shameful such men would not do for the sake of pleasure, "if only they could pass undetected."* [\[8\]](#)

Their virtue therefore becomes an ersatz show, a show good for business and necessary to acquire and hold on to political office.

Because authentic virtue was in short supply among the economic and political aristocracy, whom Jefferson referred to as the "pseudo-aristocracy" (Letter to John Adams, Oct. 28, 1813<sup>0</sup>), it is not surprising that men like James Madison, the Father of the Constitution, held a liberal anthropology (definition of human nature) of depravity whereby he believed that all human beings, men, women, and children were too depraved to be the object of a social-political project of general reformation. The Framers, thinking it too difficult to undertake the laborious and perhaps impossible task of making that mass of the populace virtuous, opted for something much less – they designed a Constitution with a built in system of checks and balances. Then they punted on the questions dealing with intellectual and moral virtue, thereby hoping to control political immorality by the legal and structural impediments they had built into the Constitution, discussed further below. Because corrupt men are too eager to get more than their fair share of advantages and fall short of performing difficult tasks for the common good, they cannot live in peace and concord. Such men must constantly keep an eye on each other in order to protect themselves.

*"But bad men cannot be unanimous except to a small extent, any more than they can be friends, since they aim at getting more than their share of advantages, while in labour and*

*public service they fall short of their share; and each man wishing for advantage to himself criticizes his neighbour and stands in his way; for if people do not watch it carefully the common weal is soon destroyed. The result is that they are in a state of faction, putting compulsion on each other but unwilling themselves to do what is just (unless compelled)."* [\[9\]](#)

Thus, in a liberal society that makes self-interest understood as pursuit pleasure and peace of mind the norm, political power becomes very important, as does growth in sophistication employed by those who wield the most power. Underdeveloped people cannot control their passions and act like animals. Sophisticated and "enlightened" people learn to control their passions in order to get much more out of life – this is the crux of enlightened self-interest.

Because common sense and self-interest are not vigorous enough to guarantee virtuous action, liberal societies are continually threatened by outbreaks of irresponsible egoism and in constant need of regulations and safeguards. Yet, liberals strangely seek to reduce regulations and safeguards and demand an ever-increasing arena in which to exercise their economic, political, and moral liberty. They advocate *limited* government, *unlimited* use and acquisition of private property, *unregulated* markets and *unprotected* workers. Then they act surprised when the combination of self-interest and deregulation result in human abuse such as that engendered by the modern captains of organized crime or by the captains of the 18th and 19th century Industrial Revolution. To rectify abuse, once it has become unbearable, liberals have historically promoted either (1) a leviathan state (Reform Liberalism of the Franklin D. Roosevelt "New Deal" type), or (2) increased deregulation and argued for more limited government (Neoliberalism of the libertarian type). Neither one of these solutions is good enough to meet the exigencies of the situation. One of the chief reasons we find ourselves



in our current economic, political, and moral imbroglio is the insufficiency of the system of checks and balances implemented by the Framers to mitigate the problems caused by self interest.

By seeking to curb moral problems by the implementation of a constitutional system of checks and balances (and by subsequent implementation of an educational philosophy rooted in a deficient understanding of human nature, followed by the establishing of a public school system on the recommendations of philosophers, such as John Dewey *et al*, men who disdained both Classical Philosophy and the Christian faith), the Founders failed to include the one ingredient most essential for building a virtuous republic, *viz.*, they failed to undertake public educational initiatives in cooperation with the Christian churches. That is, with churches that hold the transcendental dimensions of human development in high regard and therefore provide intellectual, moral, and spiritual education rooted in an understanding of the human soul. This type of education is necessary for growth in authentic virtue and the maximization of intellectual and moral goodness of the type advocated by Ancient and Medieval political philosophers such as Cicero, Aristotle, and Aquinas *et al*.

According to James Q. Wilson, author of the best selling political science textbook *"American Government"*, these men (Socrates, Aristotle, Aquinas *et al*) "believed that the first task of any government was to cultivate virtue among the governed."

*"But to James Madison, and the other architects of the Constitution, the deliberate cultivation of virtue would require a government too strong and thus too dangerous to liberty...Self-interest, freely pursued within reasonable limits, was a more practical and durable solution to the problem of government than any effort to improve the virtue of the citizenry. He wanted, he said, to make republican government possible 'even in the absence of political*

virtue.’”

The learned Wilson informs us that,

*“Madison argued that the very self-interest that leads people toward factionalism and tyranny, might, if properly harnessed by appropriate constitutional arrangements, provide a source of unity and guarantee of liberty. This harnessing was to be accomplished by dividing the offices of the new government among many people and giving to the holder of each office the ‘necessary means and personal motives to resist encroachment of the others.’ In this way, ‘ambition must be made to counteract ambition’ so that the private interests of every individual may be sentinel over the public rights.”*

*“‘If men were angels’, all this would be unnecessary. But Madison and the other delegates pragmatically insisted in taking human nature pretty much as it was, and therefore adopted ‘this policy of supplying, by opposite and rival interests, the defect of better motives.’ The separation of powers would work not in spite of the imperfections of human nature, but because of them” (Chapter Two, p. 32, 2012).*

*In other words, rather than establishing a government, and an accompanying educational system to promote intellectual virtue and human moral betterment, the “Architects of the Constitution” accepted self-love as a given that could work in everyone’s favor “if properly harnessed by appropriate constitutional arrangements”.*

They decided that self-interest could be turned to everyone’s advantage by the separation of powers and by endowing each branch of government with a roughly equivalent portion of power necessary to check the ambitions of the others. Thus,

the Framers endeavored to establish a political system in which liberal self-interest, rather than *proper* education and moral formation, would serve as a “*source of unity and guarantee of liberty*”.

Because the Framers misunderstood human nature and the relationship of intellectual-moral virtue to the spiritual operations and powers of the human soul (and because they had privatized religion, and generally disdained metaphysics), they misunderstood the cultivation of virtue necessary for ongoing human development necessary to achieve happiness. Consequently, they talked much about virtue without knowing what it is. For example, Benjamin Franklin hailed virtue as if it were some type of utilitarian good beneficial for procuring social benefits and sentient pleasures . To his credit, Franklin nobly conducted a daily examination of conscience to foster personal growth in virtue. Unfortunately, because he forsook Christianity (by his own testimony became a “deist”)[\[10\]](#) and misunderstood metaphysics, he mistook the ethical maxim “*In medio stat virtus*” (*virtue is in the mean or all things in moderation*) as a green light for satisfying his passions, *albeit* with sophistication and moderation according to (practical) “reason” as predicated of Epicurus by Cicero. Franklin thought he was being virtuous when he wrote:

*“Rarely use venery (sexual desire) but for health or offspring; Never to dullness, weakness, or the injury of your own or another’s peace or reputation” (Article 11 in Ben Franklin’s Autobiography[\[11\]](#))*

Human nature was so poorly understood by this school of liberals that leaders among them, such as Baron de Montesquieu, made “patriotism” the font and root of all virtues. Thus, he argued in his *Spirit of the Laws* (IV, chapter 5), that...

*“Virtue may be defined as the love of the laws of our*

*country. As such love (love of a nation's laws) requires a constant preference of public to private interest; it (love of a nation's laws or patriotism) is the source of all private virtue."*

Jefferson imbibed this idea penned by Montesquieu and wrote it into his personal memoirs:

*"Now a government is like everything else: to preserve it we must love it... Everything, therefore, depends on establishing this love in a republic; and to inspire it ought to be the principal business of (secular public) education".*

There is a considerable difference between

- (1) Conceiving virtue as excellency in the development and use of human intellectual and moral powers necessary for the actualization of human potential (intellectual, moral, and spiritual) inherent in human nature and affirmed by the Christian religion and
- (2) Conceiving virtue as self-interest in service of patriotism and the imbibing of liberal national values through the agency of a secularized school system alienated from the full truth about man and further alienated from Christian religion (or any religion) by a constitutional wall of separation, which, due to a lack of Christian religion in the public forum, helped transform patriotism into a type of civic religion[\[12\]](#).

The Framers misunderstood human nature and therefore misunderstood the nature of virtue necessary for the actualization of human potential. They despised metaphysics and therefore neglected the study of philosophical psychology necessary to grasp the spiritual nature and powers of the human soul – metaphysics was as detested by many of the Framers as it had been by Martin Luther.[\[13\]](#) [\(For detail see](#)

[p. 6 of Intellectual Report #3, "Liberalism and the Challenge of Faith and Reason"](#)).

*"The metaphysical insanities of Athanasius, of Loyola, and of Calvin (Protestants and Catholics), are, to my understanding, mere relapses into polytheism, differing from paganism only by being more unintelligible." (Thomas Jefferson, letter to Rev. Jared Sparks, November 4, 1820)*

Moreover, and most poignantly, the Framers privatized religion, thereby leaving virtue to be formed in the public schools from the futile seeds of patriotism, utility, and pragmatism increasingly devoid of any metaphysical or Christian meaning. Because the framers privatized Christianity and despised epistemology and metaphysics, which provide an objective basis for morality rooted in human nature (body and soul), they set the nation afloat on a sea of relativity leading to eventual intellectual and moral errors worse than the ones that emanated from the pen of Benjamin Franklin.

To correct those errors, the Framers led by James Madison, the "Father of the United States Constitution", built the idea of self-interest into the Constitution – **the system of checks and balances was crafted to take advantage of self-interest in the political arena much as the imperceptible and arguably non-existing "invisible hand" was to take care of moral problems in the economic arena.** Moral economic, social, and political problems in America were thus to be solved by a nonexistent invisible hand, by a very real wall of separation that kept Christianity out of the public forum, by a specious constitutional system of checks and balances, and by a secularized school system that attempts to solve every problem from a shallow practical perspective by throwing money at it.

Social, political and moral challenges were *not* to be corrected by reasonable devices derived from an ontological understanding of the moral, spiritual and intellectual

potentials inherent in human nature (and a subsequent political, social, economic and educational program built upon this understanding), and certainly not by divine grace operating in the public arena, but by a limited understanding of the human person based upon practical common sense and the pursuit of happiness understood as pleasure attained by enlightened self-interest. The latter was to be curtailed by a structural impediment of checks and balances and a secular civic religion facilitated by secularized public schools that are supposed to be the bulwark against debauchery, which they quite possibly do more to promote than to contain. Madison deemed ontological education for Classical and Christian “moral virtue” (*vis a vis* patriotic “civic virtue”) to be a difficult ancient and scholastic metaphysical exercise doomed to failure or one better left to the [increasingly liberalized churches](#). This solution is a little nonsensical – everyone must go to school but going to church is voluntary.

Jefferson agreed with Madison: the constitutional system of checks and balances was a brilliant idea he thought, but a brilliant idea that needed to be supplemented by the institution of a public school system, which was to be the vehicle providing the education necessary to enable them to participate in government by wisely exercising the right to vote and by transmitting the spirit of patriotism founded on a liberal understanding of man. Although, to his credit, Jefferson *did* envision the input of the various Christian denominations in his plan for the University of Virginia, he left it up to the churches to support their ministers employed at the university. Moreover, it was not a plan that “caught on”, nor could the courts bring themselves to viewing it as anything else than an “establishment of religion” in violation of the first amendment.

*Given such a constitutional scheme of things, secular civic virtue slowly replaced Classical and Christian moral virtue*



*as the guiding light shining on the practical path that Americans were to trod.*

When Framers, such as Jefferson, did promote virtue education, it was extracted from the moral teachings of Jesus Christ, whom Jefferson greatly admired. But, due to poor philosophy and a non-existent faith, Jefferson separated the moral teachings of Christ agreeable to practical reason from the mysteries of the faith, the incarnation, virgin birth, resurrection and other “insane writings” not attainable by reason, he attributed to the “unlearned apostles” and therefore estimated their worth as little more than a “pile of dung” ([See Intelligence Report #3 “Liberalism and the Challenge of Faith and Reason”](#)). In so doing, Jefferson severed morality and civic virtue from classical philosophy, metaphysics, the spiritual dimensions of human existence and most importantly from sacramental grace, which he despised. Jefferson referred to the Holy Trinity as a “three headed monster” a magical phantasm that had to be eliminated from the minds of men.

Jefferson, in a letter to James Smith (1822) stated that the Holy Trinity (Father and Son) are a:

*“Hocus-pocus phantasm of a God like another Cerberus, with one body and three heads.”*

He further stated that

*“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”.*

Instead of supporting morality on the firm bedrock Christ and His Church and the adamant pillars of divine grace, agape love and supernatural wisdom, Jefferson propped up morality on the sands of liberalism and the insufficient pillars of practical reason, civic religion and mandatory public education. So situated, Christian virtue soon morphed into a desacralized civic code rooted in the national ethos whereby [civic religion and Christianity intersect and slowly become indistinguishable](#). When this happens healthy patriotism becomes intransigent nationalism; church and state are increasingly indistinguishable. Democracy, free markets, liberty, private property and other national values, ideas, sentiments and beliefs inherit a sacred quality and are thought to originate from heaven and thus worth dying for.

Unlike the unchanging Mosaic Code, the national ethos severed from its Christian heritage, is an ever-changing and constantly *devolving* cultural accouterment subject to the caprice of nine politically appointed justices and ever-changing statutory law supported by an educational mission to transmit to every man, woman, and child whatever secular liberal values America's Founders and their successors would have them believe: Popular sovereignty; *laissez-faire* economics, and *laissez-faire* morality; privatization of religion, liberty to pursue illicit as well as licit “private” pleasures (as long as no one is hurt), nearly uninhibited free speech, press and assembly resulting in civic-virtues such as excessive tolerance that binds the majority while the national Christian ethos is devoured by an intolerant minority.

These secular civic values, and others, were all introduced into the American curriculum and slowly worked, by the courts, into a civic ethos that increasingly brings into doubt the idea that the American Constitution was the work of Christian

men or that America was established as a nation of God's chosen people: Roosevelt's "Arsenal for Democracy", Jefferson's "Empire of Liberty", Reagan "Shining City upon a Hill" and Winthrop's "Light of the World". These latter two are highly irreverent statements. Most people are aware that these were declarations pronounced by Jesus Christ (Matthew 5:14) in reference to his Church whose sacred teaching and foundation are quite distinct (historically, philosophically, and theologically) from the liberal foundation crafted by the inner circle of our nation's Framers.

## A NOTE ON EDUCATION

The celebrated American Constructional shibboleth that demands the separation of church and state might have worked better if education, which became a public affair, had remained a private affair entrusted to the church and family, as it was from the beginning. This was not the case. At about the same time that America was undergoing the nationalization of its private school system, Napoleon Bonaparte was spreading the new world order across Europe. He understood well the importance of education for molding the national character:

*"Of all our institutions public education is the most important. Everything depends on it, the present and the future....Above all we must secure unity: we must be able to cast a whole generation in the same mould."* [\[14\]](#)

Like Bonaparte, Thomas Jefferson firmly believed that education was the ultimate ingredient and structural necessity for forming and transforming an entire nation in the quintessential mold of liberalism. Thus, the move for public education gained increasing momentum after the 1788 ratification of the Constitution so that **by 1821, the first public school was open in Boston and by 1870, every state had tax supported public schools.** Although the full secularization

inherent in the Constitution would not take hold of the nation's public schools until after 1900, it was inevitable.

Because the "Founders" established a secular educational system fostered by an artificial barrier constructed between church and state, Christian values, though initially profuse and everywhere evident in the new public schools (due to the Christian nature of the culture in which the new system of government was placed), became less and less a concern of public education. The cultivation of "moral virtue" was replaced with an appealing but limited notion of "civic virtue" (patriotism, and a sense of duty to democracy and an increasingly unfamiliar set of American ideals and values) whose diffusion was entrusted to the public schools. Funded by public dollars and under the influence of state owned teacher training colleges, public schools became the new champions of democracy and of the democratic ethos advanced by the Founders. A short time thereafter, renowned American educational leaders, such as John Dewey, a man who understood the connection between democracy and education took over the helm:

*"Democracy has to be born anew every generation, and education is its midwife", [\[15\]](#) .*

Dewey was as passionate about education as the Founders were, but because of the door they had opened to a new order of humanity by means of disdain for metaphysics, the privatization of religion, distorted notions of self-interest and the reduction of morality to "civic virtue", Dewey was able, over time, to further distance the curriculum from its classical moorings in the "*liberal arts*" to something more modern and "progressive". As the Father of "Progressive Education", Dewey birthed "hands on" student centered education that promoted democratic citizenship skills and successfully promoted a shift away from intellectual skill development (the liberal arts) toward practical and

utilitarian skill development and “general education”. In short, public education became less and less a liberal intellectual vehicle for living a good life by growth in knowledge, understanding, wisdom and moral goodness to become more and more a utilitarian vehicle for furthering democratic reform, social utility, and practicality. Although the idea of “virtue” was maintained in name, it was transformed in substance, according to the form articulated by the Framers such as the Epicurean Tom Jefferson and the Deist, Ben Franklin. Dewey just took it a step further.

Due to the increased secularization of American education, virtue was increasingly understood as utilitarian excellence and the ability to achieve practical results strengthened by a democratic character marked by increased tolerance, nihilism, skepticism, and an ever increasing acceptance of moral relativity as evidenced by Dewey’s disdain for philosophy and Christian religion.

*“There is 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”.[\[16\]](#)*

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

The “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:

1. Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.
2. Man is a part of nature and that has emerged as the result of a continuous process.
3. The traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected.[\[17\]](#)
4. The nature of the universe depicted by modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values.
5. 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.

Thus, in summary, according to Dewey,

*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.”*

*The social sciences have provided a “radically different version of the historic events and personages upon which Christian religions have built.” and*

*Biology has “revolutionized conceptions of soul and mind which once occupied a central place in religious beliefs and ideas.” [\[18\]](#)*

Documenting progress on all these fronts, Dewey affirmed the success of the American experiment initiated by the Framers. Consequently, as early as 1908, Dewey concluded that the 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."* [\[19\]](#)

Like Abraham Lincoln before him, John Dewey was prepared to swear by the blood of the revolution, the revolution that ushered in a "New Order of the Ages" (novus ordo seclorum), an order that brought with it the birth of a new civic or "political religion". Not only was Dewey willing to swear upon its blood, he was also willing to sacrifice upon its altars rather than bow in humble worship at the Altar of Christ.

*"Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well wisher to his posterity, swear by the blood of the Revolution,...so to the support of the Constitution and Laws, let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor;—let every man remember that to violate the law, is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the character of his own, and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws, be breathed by every American mother, to the lisping babe, that prattles on her lap—let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in Primers, spelling books, and in Almanacs;—let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues, and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars".* [\[20\]](#)

That a Christian nation (that is a nation initially comprised of Protestant and Catholic citizens), can remove any mention



of an omnipotent and omnipresent God from its governing documents and favor irreligious liberal principles over divinely revealed ones and not devolve into a secular regime is a preposterous supposition held only by those still duped by an increasingly non-convincing performance.

---

## ENDNOTES

[1] William Linn, (1800) *Serious Considerations on the Election of a President* pg. 24.

[2] Samuel K. Padover, (1952) *Jefferson* (pgs. 116-117).

[3] John M. Mason, (1800) *The Voice of Warning to Christians*, pg. 35.

[4] Marcus Tullius Cicero, Book Two *Treatise "On The Chief Good And Evil"* (*Treatise de Finibus*).

[5] *ibid*

[6] It might speak of friendship, but at the very best such friendships are rooted in the pleasures of the body and seek a peace of mind intent on practical matters and scientific subjects, which though good and worthy pursuits are nonetheless something significantly less than Aristotle's idea of friendship rooted in spiritual intellectual and moral virtue culminating in love of God and joy shared *among friends committed to spiritual growth*, something unknown too liberalism. Liberal friendship, moreover, tends to quickly devolve into lesser forms of self-satisfaction, pleasure and utility, which can hardly be avoided by "philosophers" that make a god out of practical reason and pleasure. Pleasure, even accompanied by calculated control (a false type of temperance), is a physical pursuit that becomes increasingly difficult to satisfy.

[7] Marcus Tullius Cicero, Book Two *Treatise "On The Chief*

*Good And Evil” (Treatise de Finibus).*

[8] Marcus Tullius Cicero, Book Two *Treatise “On The Chief Good And Evil” (Treatise de Finibus).*

[9] Aristotle, *Nichomachean Ethics*, Book IX, Chapter 6.

[10] To be a Christian, a person must first accept Jesus Christ as true God and true man. This was something that Franklin could not quite bring himself to do. Franklin wrote in his autobiography: “Some books against Deism fell into my hands...It happened that they wrought an effect on me quite contrary to what was intended by them; for the arguments of the Deists, which were quoted to be refuted, appeared to me much stronger than the refutations; in short, *I soon became a thorough Deist.*”

Moreover, Franklin, like Thomas Jefferson, made himself the final arbiter of moral truths written in the bible; in short, he set himself over the church and decided which of the Christian morals and religious beliefs he would accept and which he would reject: “As to Jesus of Nazareth, my opinion of whom you particularly desire,

- I think his system of morals and his religion, as he left them to us, the best the world ever saw or is likely to see; *but I apprehend it has received various corrupting changes,*
- and *I have...some doubts as to his divinity...* I see no harm, however, in its being believed, if that belief has the good consequences, as probably it has, of making his doctrines more respected and more observed.”

([Letter to Ezra Stiles](#), 9 March 1790, found in John Bigelow, *The Works of Benjamin Franklin*, pages 185-86 (New York: Putnam's, 1904)

[11]

<http://www.archive.org/stream/theautobiography00148gut/bfaut11>

.txt

[12] The tendency to identify and uphold the time honored traditions, hallowed beliefs, values, and ideas of one's homeland as sacred beacons of light emanating from heaven for the good of humanity enshrined internally on heart and externally on family hearth to be recalled and honored at every national holiday and moment of social intensification and cultural renewal to the point where identity and reverence for country becomes roughly equivalent to or synchronized with reverence and love for God.

[13] According to Luther, "**Reason is the Devil's greatest whore**; by nature and manner of being she is a noxious whore; she is a prostitute, the Devil's appointed whore; whore eaten by scab and leprosy who ought to be trodden under foot and destroyed, she and her wisdom ... Throw dung in her face to make her ugly. She is and she ought to be drowned in baptism... She would deserve, the wretch, to be banished to the filthiest place in the house, to the closets." (Martin Luther, Erlangen v. 16, pgs. 142-148)

[14] Molé, Mathieu Louis, Count, The Life and Memoirs of Count Molé. Edited by Marquis de Noailles. Vol 2 London, 1923, 61.

[15] *The Need of an Industrial Education in an Industrial Democracy* (1916)

[16] The Spiritual Perils of Modern Secular Education, Program VC1464, a video tape from Living his Life Abundantly.

[17] Because they misunderstand Christian philosophy, men such as these are still penning mistakes about the body and soul – there is no "dualism, man is an integral composite being consisting of body and soul. Nonetheless, their meaning is clear: the spiritual dimension of the human soul must somehow be forged into a unity with the physical body (an accomplishment already attained by Catholic philosophers) such that something more like the Epicurean idea of physical body

occupied by less physical soul must be imagined.

[18] John Dewey, *A Common Faith*, Yale University Press, 1934, pg 84.

[19] John Dewey (1908) *The Hibbert Journal*, Dennis L. Cuddy, Ph.D. *Chronology of Education*, pg. 11.

[20] Abraham Lincoln, July 27, (1838) *The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions: Address Before the Young Men's Lyceum of Springfield, Illinois*.  
<http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/speeches/lyceum.htm>

---

# Self Interest and the Oracle of Reason- Part 1

Intelligence Report  
American Foundations #4

*"The way to see by faith is to shut the eye of reason."*  
Benjamin Franklin

THOMAS JEFFERSON and BENJAMIN FRANKLIN *et al* graced the *Declaration of Independence* with an elegant and perennial philosophical truth that all men are endowed by their Creator with an "unalienable right" to "pursue happiness". Unfortunately, Jefferson and Franklin imbibed their philosophy, and thus their ideas about "happiness", from the streams of Roman Epicureanism[1] and classical Liberalism that flooded the waters of the Potomac, rather than from the current of Thomism that graced the waters of the Seine as it

cascaded along the Sorbonne[\[2\]](#). That is, they drew their ideas about human nature and happiness from pagan rather than Christian sources.

The otherwise rich waters of Virginia's 18th century Potomac River were contaminated by noxious liberal elements such as Deism, Epicureanism, anti-Trinitarianism, secularism, materialism, and *enlightened* self-interest. Most Americans have been taught the benign and positive attributes of the latter. On the surface, enlightened self-interest certainly sounds plausible, especially when its adherents are convinced that they must regularly deal with *unenlightened*, unformed, and underdeveloped men and women who seek pleasure from a motive of solipsistic self-interest ("what's in it for me" in disregard of "you"). Consequently, in the tradition of Jefferson and Franklin, *enlightened* self-interest has become an American hallmark. The following words could be attached as a goal placquered to a "Mission Statement" and hung in the front lobby of American schools: "In accordance with our civic mission to promote liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and the common good, faculty, staff, administrators and students will be taught to value the existence of others and to act with *apparent* justice, charity and benevolence towards all." Not authentic justice, charity and benevolence, but the "apparent" brand, which enlightened men and women realize is the quintessential ingredient that must be added to the mix if they are to successfully advance their own interests. Anyone who fails to calculate the good of others while calculating his own, must resign himself to the likelihood that his own desire for future pleasure will likely be frustrated if everyone that deals with him ends up a loser. Thus, the more sophisticated a person becomes, the more benign their selfishness becomes, at least that is the way it is presented.

Even though enlightened self-interest is lauded for calculating the "good" of others, self-interest (as vaunted in the liberal tradition) remains, in the last analysis, a

philosophical toxin. It remains a toxin because the rewards shared with others are usually less than the rewards a man feigning virtue assigns to himself, and the burdens assigned to others more. It is not a toxin simply because people tend to assign more good things to themselves and more burdens to others; it is a toxin precisely because *it fails to apprehend both what the "self" is and what the "good" is, and because it further fails to comprehend how the "good" is rooted in human nature (body and soul)*. As indicated in Intelligence Report #3, "*Liberalism and the Challenge of Faith and Reason*", representatives of 18th century liberalism, such as Jefferson and Franklin, despised metaphysics and speculative thinking from which knowledge of the human soul is derived:

*"The metaphysical insanities of Athanasius, of Loyola, and of Calvin, are, to my understanding, mere relapses into polytheism, differing from paganism only by being more unintelligible".* [\[3\]](#)

*"To talk of immaterial existences, is to talk of nothings. To say that the human soul, angels, God are immaterial is to say, they are nothings, or that there is no God, no angels, no soul. I cannot reason otherwise: ... I believe I am supported in my creed of materialism by Locke."* [\[4\]](#)

Thus, to men like Jefferson and Epicurus, his philosophical master, who profess "materialism" there might be a soul, *but it is not spiritual*. Because liberalism fails to study and account for the existence of a spiritual soul, it does not, and cannot, know what the authentic *human* good is; it does not even know what a human being is. As a result, even though liberals like Thomas Jefferson *et al* mentioned happiness in the Declaration of Independence, they are unable to correctly diagnose what *human* happiness is or how it is to be obtained. When the *spiritual potentials* of the human soul are left

unconsidered (either by faith or reason) and thus unactualized, the human good is robbed of its transcendental dimension and therefore misunderstood. With metaphysics and the spiritual soul excluded, the pursuit of happiness is necessarily limited to that of the human body guided by the “practical intellect” enlightened by mere “common sense”. Common sense is a necessary guide for many things, but it is an *insufficient* guide for *authentic* integral human development and a *deficient* intellectual tool for understanding the spiritual nature of the human soul and for attaining wisdom and corollary moral virtues of the soul requisite to the “pursuit of (*human*) happiness”.

This realization was first iterated by Aristotle:

*“By human virtue we mean not that of the body but that of the soul; and happiness also we call an activity of soul. But if this is so, clearly the student of politics must know somehow the facts about the soul” (Ethics, Book I, Chapter XIII).*

But, it is precisely the “facts about the soul” that are lacking in liberal political philosophy. **Because liberalism fails to adequately account for the human soul, its conception of “enlightened self-interest” is rooted in a misconception about human nature.** It is also rooted in aberrant *self-love*, which is, as John Adams, among the first rank of America’s founders, tells us the “spring” or cause “of *self-deceit*”, deceit such as convincing oneself that taking the interests of another into account in order to satisfy one’s own pursuit of pleasure, is somehow a virtuous (rather than a utilitarian) act that leads to happiness – it might lead to physical “*pleasure*” as Jefferson and the Epicurus understood it, but human “*happiness*” is another matter; happiness involves the spiritual soul.

John Adams provides perhaps the most accurate account of self-deceit, which he rooted in self-love, the source of the



“greatest vices and calamities” effecting mankind.

*“There is nothing in the science of human nature, more curious, or that deserves a critical attention from every order of men, so much, as that principle, which moral writers have distinguished by the name of self-deceit. This principle is the spurious (illegitimate) offspring of self-love; and is perhaps the source of far the greatest, and worst part of the vices and calamities among mankind”.[\[5\]](#)*

Self-love is not only a “calamity” and “vice”, improperly understood, it is also a cause for “lamentation”. It is a cause of lamentation because human beings are endowed with *innate potential* to acquire the intellectual virtue of wisdom and to act with the moral (and theological) virtue of love for the good of themselves and that of others without expectation of a “payback”. This potential, however, must be nurtured by proper intellectual education and moral formation; it is not instinctual or the result of simple *common sense*. Wisdom and love are difficult to attain. With these virtues, human beings are properly equipped to pursue happiness and the authentic actualization of their spiritual potentials. Without them, human beings are reduced to little more than brute animals in pursuit of sentient pleasures, which they mistake for happiness. Because liberals misunderstood happiness, their pursuit of it results in misery – their own ontological misery as well as the ontological, social, or economic misery of most everyone else who suffers the misfortune of living in a society governed by such a principle, a principle that negates solidarity and improperly understands human nature and cannot therefore act to perfect it.

*“For man, when perfected, is the best of animals... he is equipped at birth with arms, meant to be used by intelligence and virtue, which he may use for the worst ends. Wherefore, if he have not virtue, he is the most unholy and the most savage of animals, and the most full of lust and gluttony.*

(*Politics, Book I*).

Political philosophy, properly understood, revolves around the ontological idea of the human person (body and soul) and the corollary idea of virtue necessary to pursue human happiness. Many politicians, and men and women in general, talk about virtue; unfortunately, many do not have it because through the fault of a faulty educational system, they do not know what it is or how to obtain it. Consequently, they have not yet risen victorious in their struggle with concupiscence and the “pride of life” and therefore are reduced to the unenviable specter of feigning wisdom and love; in such a world, it is more about appearances than reality. Politicians are not taught to be actually be virtuous; rather they are taught that they must avoid “the *appearance* of impropriety” or run the risk of not getting elected. Unfortunately, even a nation of Christians (such as 18th century colonial America) living in a liberal regime that talks about “God” can be seduced by excellent political performances veiled in theological and philosophical rhetoric that “sounds good” but is deceptive.

Surprisingly, liberalism promotes freedom to pursue human happiness, yet does *nothing* to advance *intellectual understanding* of the spiritual dimensions of human nature necessary to *correctly* pursue *human* happiness, and it does *next to nothing* to prepare people morally for responsible use of freedom, which is its beacon. Liberalism promotes liberty guided by “common sense”[\[6\]](#) aided by the lower sentient powers of memory, imagination, associative practical thinking, and by the physical passions associated with the body, which, Epicurus assures us, are involved in every act undertaken to pursue pleasure. Love, however, is not a physical passion of the body; it is an intellectual appetite of the rational soul “spirated” from the human will, which is activated by *understanding*. Knowledge and understanding *precede* loving – a person must be known before he or she can be more fully and properly loved. There is no love in the sentient passions, but

there is pleasure, which untamed and undirected turns into lust. Lust does not require understanding; it is activated by mere sensation. Happiness requires wisdom and love, which are intellectual and spiritual virtues of the human soul. Consequently, the pleasures of the body (and even of the lower sentient mind) are not synonymous with happiness and its attendant pleasures. Happiness is experienced in the soul. But, because human beings are composite body-soul beings, the happiness experienced in the soul overflows as pleasure into the body. Although there is an integral back and forth relationship between the two, the connection between spiritual happiness of the soul and physical pleasure of the body does not work in converse; happiness requires wisdom and love, sentient pleasure does not. Wisdom and love have their attendant physical pleasures. Physical pleasure however does not result in wisdom and love, which reside in the soul.

*“But a person does not always grasp or feel this love, because it does not reside with tenderness in the senses, but resides in the soul with properties of strength and of greater courage and daring than before, though at times it overflows into the senses, imparting a gentle, tender feeling” (Saint John of the Cross).*[\[7\]](#)

Thus, Epicureans, like Jefferson, who spend a lifetime pursuing *pleasures of the body and practical intellect*, miss out on the *happiness of a soul crowned with wisdom and love*. They misunderstand human nature and cultivate the practical intellect (common sense), which can make a man “crafty” (I do not say prudent – authentic prudence requires speculative wisdom) but cannot make a man “wise”. Wisdom is dependent upon apprehension of the spiritual soul and by faith in the Word of God, which were rejected by men like Jefferson and Franklin. Thus, their “wisdom” is turned to naught.

*“One does not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes forth from the mouth of God” (Matthew 4:4).*

Nonetheless, enlightened self-interest is far better than mere (unenlightened) self-interest. What enlightened self-interest has going in its favor is the *true claim* that it does not *blindly* pursue the passions like an animal does. Because it is guided by common sense of the practical intellect, **it is able to consider the consequences before it acts to attain pleasure or decides to boldly abstain from it.** Many men, men such as Epicurus, Jefferson, Franklin, *et al* often boldly abstain from pleasure because commonsense counsels otherwise. Practical reason thus has its paragons of virtue. Blessed Cardinal John Henry Newman chose Julian the Apostate to paint the elegant and even noble caricature of classical philosophical virtue so in vogue with America's Framers. Julian was...

*"...all but the pattern-man of philosophical virtue... His simplicity of manners, his frugality, his austerity of life, his singular disdain of sensual pleasure, his military heroism, his application to business, his literary diligence, his modesty, his clemency, his accomplishments, as I view them, go to make him one of the most eminent specimens of pagan virtue which the world has ever seen.*

Newman, appreciated the liberal and generous character of Classical Roman philosophy and pagan virtue, but in the end evaluated it negatively as a "gentleman's religion" rooted in limited knowledge and understanding that produced *apparent* but not real virtue. Such men have the *appearance* of virtue; it is a merely apparent display because it falls short of authentic wisdom graced by love and therefore ends in pride, which earned such men the scorn of Newman's eloquent pen:

*"Rather a philosopher's, a gentleman's religion, is of a liberal and generous character; it is based upon honour; vice is evil, because it is unworthy, despicable, and odious. This was the quarrel of the ancient heathen with Christianity, that, (Christianity) instead of simply fixing the mind on the fair and the pleasant, it intermingled other ideas with them*

*of a sad and painful nature; that it spoke of tears before joy, a cross before a crown; that it laid the foundation of heroism in penance; that it made the soul tremble with the news of Purgatory and Hell; that it insisted on views and a worship of the Deity, which to their minds was nothing else than mean, servile, and cowardly. The notion of an All-perfect, Ever-present God, in whose sight we are less than atoms, and who, while He deigns to visit us, can punish as well as bless, was abhorrent to them; they made their own minds their sanctuary, their own ideas their oracle."*[\[8\]](#)

Newman was quite sure that this display of self-confidence and flawless etiquette, although becoming, was nothing more than the "shadow of the future Anti-Christ", a false show of "philosophical virtue".

*He, in whom every Catholic sees the shadow of the future Anti-Christ, was all but the pattern-man of philosophical virtue. Weak points in his character he had, it is true, even in a merely poetical standard; but, take him all in all, and I cannot but recognize in him a specious beauty and nobleness of moral deportment, which combines in it the rude greatness of Fabricius or Regulus with the accomplishments of Pliny or Antoninus*[\[9\]](#)

Saint Peter displayed some of this false human wisdom before he was sharply rebuked by the Wisdom of God;

*"Get behind me, Satan! You are an obstacle to me. You are thinking not as God does, but as human beings do."* (Matthew 16:23).

As if to say, you have mistakenly made mere emotion and human reason your oracle. Thus, we are able to understand why philosophers more skilled than Jefferson, philosophers such as Marcus Tullius Cicero, rejected Epicurus as a false

teacher and as a “hedonist” in spite of eloquent arguments paraded in his defense by Epicurus’ followers. Although Epicurus at first sight appears to be a proponent of doctrines that end in hedonism, his followers were, and are, quick to point out that those who believe such silly things about him are unschooled and little understand the *true* meaning of Epicurus’ profound teachings. Such devoted disciples, either in ignorance themselves, or with a subtlety equal to that of their master, set about assuring those in darkness that their master’s doctrines are vehicles of light. Then they proceed to deceptively make them sound attractive and consummately virtuous[\[10\]](#).

Cicero, however, was not a novice—he demonstrated his excellent understanding of Epicurus’ doctrines, adroitly saw through them all, and then proceeded to take them apart, gently exposing them for what they were.[\[11\]](#) Because he had recourse to the metaphysics of Aristotle and understood that happiness was an attainment of the *spiritual soul* requiring virtue (intellectual and moral), he exposed Epicurus as a novice, as one who had failed to master metaphysics and other Aristotelian insights that require extensive labor. This is the philosophical bottom-line underlined by Cicero:

*“Yet the case is simply this, that to me the supreme good seems to be in the soul, to him in the body; to me in virtue; to him in the body; to me in virtue, to him in pleasure” (Tusculan Disputations).*

Thus, Epicurus lacking any philosophical understanding of human nature, beyond that of the physical body and lower sentient intellect and sentient soul, had little reason to stay his passions when they erupted, causing Cicero to refer to him as a “voluptuary”:

*“I do not ask of you that you should define pain by the same terms by which Epicurus, a voluptuary, as you know,*

*designates pleasure" (Tusculan Disputations).*

Epicurus, to be sure, wrote about moderating the passions; he even wrote well about the cardinal virtues, but he mistakenly had them all serve the end of pleasure rather than of happiness. Thus, gluttony was moderated by the virtue of temperance; however, temperance for Epicurus was not a virtue in service of wisdom, and of other persons, flowing from a motive of filial love (friendship) as Cicero and Aristotle understood it. Rather, temperance was intended to preserve the pleasure of satiety and to avoid the discomfiture of psychological distress or imagined medical maladies attributed to being overweight, which cause pain and thus are antithetical to pleasure. An Epicurean therefore learned to be moderate in eating or to use the vomitorium. I, with Cicero, suspect the latter was more prominent:

*"For I should be sorry to picture to myself, as you are in the habit of doing (said Cicero to Torquatus, a disciple of Epicurus), men so debauched as to vomit over the table and be carried away from banquets, and then the next day, while still suffering from indigestion, gorge themselves again".* [\[12\]](#)

Temperance is a virtue associated with "moderation". Unfortunately, moderation is oftentimes misapplied by philosophers who misunderstand human nature and the ethical pursuit of happiness. For example, the classical philosophical maxim *"In medio stat virtus"* [\[13\]](#) counseling moderation, is intended for *morally licit* actions, not for illicit ones such as adultery and covetousness. It is not a virtue to "screw" and "steal" with moderation. Thus, "philosophers" like Epicurus, and Benjamin Franklin after him, who argued for, or who permitted screwing and intoxication in "moderation" as if moderation were a moral panacea are, in Cicero's words, hard to "endure".



*“It is as much as I can do to endure, a philosopher speaking of the necessity of setting bounds to the desires (inordinate passions). Is it possible to set bounds to the desires? I say that they must be banished, eradicated by the roots. For what man is there in whom appetites dwell, who can deny that he may with propriety be called appetitive? If so, he will be avaricious, though to a limited extent; and an adulterer, but only in moderation; and he will be luxurious in the same manner. Now what sort of a philosophy is that which does not bring with it the destruction of depravity, but is content with a moderate degree of vice” (Cicero speaking of Epicureanism)? [\[14\]](#)*

Moderating inordinate passions is not enough, inordinate passions need to be mastered. Because political philosophers like Thomas Jefferson (who followed in the footsteps of Epicurus) and his companion, Benjamin Franklin, because such eminent American statesmen rejected (1) Classical Aristotelian and Christian Thomistic metaphysics and more poignantly, (2) the rescuing grace inherent in the divinity of Christ, they misunderstood human nature, the powers and potentials of the spiritual soul, and the role of contemplation and selfless charity necessary for the proper pursuit of happiness, they made a deficient and false religion out of practical reason. They failed to master the inordinate passions and therefore did not disapprove of morally illicit actions if they were “moderated” by practical considerations accompanied by the quasi ersatz moral virtue of temperance. Although they sang the praises of reason and of virtues such as temperance, unfortunately, at their hands, both reason and moral virtue were disfigured and disgraced.

*“...as you have one dress to wear at home, and another in which you appear in court, are you to disguise your opinions in a similar manner, so as to make a parade with your countenance, while you are keeping the truth hidden within? [\[15\]](#)*

Such, dear reader "... is the final exhibition of the Religion of Reason: in the insensibility of conscience, in the ignorance of the very idea of sin, in the contemplation of (their) own moral consistency, in the simple absence of fear, in the cloudless self-confidence, in the serene self-possession, in the cold self-satisfaction, we recognize the mere (pagan) Philosopher" (Newman, *The Idea of a University*). What are men who, like Franklin and Jefferson *et al*, reject Christ, but pagans?

## **Conclusion**

Because liberal political philosophers and politicians associate happiness with physical pleasure, sentient knowledge, and peace of mind, and because the spiritual soul as understood by both Classical and Christian philosophy and as revealed in sacred scripture remains unaccounted for liberal philosophers, the liberalism of the nation's Framers was, and is, an insufficient political philosophy for the purpose of founding a Christian nation or for the purpose of building or rebuilding one.

Liberal self interest, moreover, is tainted with self love and self-deceit because those who consider themselves wise apart from speculative wisdom of the human soul and/or apart from the revealed truth about God, the revealed truth that human beings are made in the image and likeness of the Holy Trinity, such people remain in darkness while professing themselves to be in the light.

The pagan philosophers of Rome made the mistake of dismissing metaphysics; they could not also make the additional mistake of dismissing the Christian faith because it had not yet been revealed. The American Founders cannot say the same; they rejected both metaphysics and the faith, and in their place set up the deficient "Oracle of Reason".

---

## ENDNOTES

[1] "As you say of yourself, I too am an Epicurean. I consider the genuine (not the imputed) doctrines of Epicurus as containing everything rational in moral philosophy which Greece and Rome have left us."

(Thomas Jefferson, letter to William Short):  
<http://www.godlessgeeks.com/LINKS/Quotes.htm#jefferson>

[2] The *University of Paris*, where Aquinas taught.

[3] Letter of Thomas Jefferson to Jared Sparks, Nov. 4th 1820.

[4] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to John Adams, August 15, 1820:  
<http://www.godlessgeeks.com/LINKS/Quotes.htm#jefferson>

[5] Boston Gazette, August 29, 1763.  
<https://www.masshist.org/publications/apde2/view?id=ADMS-06-01-02-0045-0007>

[6] The term is being used in the vernacular, not the Thomistic sense.

[7] Saint John of the Cross, *"The Ascent of Mt. Carmel"*, Chapter 24.

[8] Blessed Cardinal John Henry Newman, *"The Idea of a University"*, (*Discourse Eight*).

[9] *Ibid*

[10] See Book One of Cicero's *Treatise "On The Chief Good And Evil"* (*Treatise de Finibus*).

[11] See Book Two of Cicero's *Treatise "On The Chief Good And Evil"* (*Treatise de Finibus*).

[12] Book One of Cicero's *Treatise "On The Chief Good And Evil"* (*Treatise de Finibus*).

[13] Virtue is in the middle of the road

[\[14\]](#) Marcus Tullius Cicero: *Second Book "Of The Treatise On The Chief Good And Evil" (Treatise de Finibus)*.

[\[15\]](#) *ibid*

---

# **Poles Historic March for Catholic Faith in Homeland – Arousing Global Rejection of Liberalism**

**POLAND, LONG KNOWN AS THE "BULWARK" of Christian Europe, has once again become the epicenter of opposition to those whom would destroy the Christian culture of Europe. Saint John Paul II devoted his papacy to the mission of Divine Mercy helping to bring about the words that Jesus spoke to Saint Faustina: Out of Poland would come the "spark" that would prepare the world for His final coming.**

The Devotion to Divine Mercy has gained the highest approbation of the Catholic Church. The Feast of Divine mercy that Jesus presented to Saint Faustina has now been placed on the universal liturgical calendar of the catholic 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."

The fire that began in Poland with the pontificate of Saint John Paul II is spreading around the globe. The world press is

only now beginning to take notice of it. 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. A general global uprising of Euro-skeptic Christian political parties and social movements are rapidly gaining momentum throughout Europe, Asia and Africa; increasing numbers are rising to challenge secular liberalism and reasserting their Christian or native patrimonies.

---

## The Christian Renewal of Russia

**We are living at a pivotal moment** of human history in which the backward relationship between the secular and sacred, discussed in a previous article is being slowly reversed. That is, the spirit of nationalism (that reifies secular values, imbues them with a sacred identity, and thereby diminishes the voice of the Spirit) is being corrected by an authentic outpouring of the Spirit. In the process, the temporal public square, rather than being increasingly secularized, is being increasingly sacralized. It is being increasingly sacralized not by a religion that has become secularized, nor by a form of secular humanism that has become sacralized, but by authentic Trinitarian Christian renewal.[\[1\]](#) Although imperceptible in the West, this trend is increasingly evident in the East and is becoming more evident in Europe and throughout the globe.

According to Russian President, Vladimir Putin,

*"We can see how many of the Euro-Atlantic countries are actually rejecting their roots, including the Christian values that constitute the basis of Western civilization. They are denying moral principles and all traditional identities: national, cultural, religious and even sexual. They are implementing policies that equate large families with same-sex partnerships, belief in God with the belief in Satan. The excesses of political correctness have reached the point where people are seriously talking about registering political parties whose aim is to promote pedophilia... I am convinced that this opens a direct path to degradation and primitivism, resulting in a profound demographic and moral crisis."*[\[2\]](#)

Therefore, Vladimir Putin has vowed that it will be one of the tasks of Russia's foreign policy to defend Christianity and Christians persecuted for their faith.

After Metropolitan Hilarion (Metropolitan of Volokolamsk, and Chairman of the Department of External Church Relations for the Russian Orthodox Church) informed Putin about the destruction of churches in Afghanistan, acts of terror committed against Christians in Syria and the bombing of churches in Iraq, he also expressed hope that the Russian government would defend persecuted Christians around the globe to which Putin replied,

*"You needn't have any doubt that that's the way it will be."*[\[3\]](#)

Likewise, Hungarian Foreign Minister Peter Szijjarto believes Russia should join with other nations to defend Christianity. In a meeting with Nikolay Fyodorov, Deputy Speaker of the Russian Federation Council, Szijjarto said

*"Christian values should be protected, both in Europe and in the East. And I believe that Russia should play a key role*

here.”[\[4\]](#)

Subsequently, over 50,000 Syrian Christians petitioned Russia for dual citizenship. In a letter to the Russian Foreign Ministry, the petitioners stated that,

*“Russian citizenship would be an honor for any Syrian Christian who wished to acquire it.”*

The petitioners also stated that,

*“Our appeal does not mean that we have any mistrust in the Syrian army or government. However, we are scared of the conspiracy of the West and hateful fanatics who are waging a brutal war against our country.”*

*“It is for the first time since the Nativity of Christ that we Christians of Qalamoun living in the villages of Saidnaya, Maara Saidnaya, Maaloula and Maaroun are under threat of banishment from our land.”*

*“We see the Russian Federation as a powerful factor of global peace and stability. Russia pursues a firm line in the defense of Syria, its people and its territorial integrity.”[\[5\]](#)*

Metropolitan Hilarion also believes that Orthodox and Catholic Christians should act together to defend the Christian faith.

*“I would like to use this opportunity to call on my brethren from the Catholic Church to create a united front to defend Christian faith in all countries where it is persecuted and oppressed”.*



*"We see that supporters of militant secularism and atheism in Europe and America are trying to cause Christian faith to leave the life of society, banish Christian symbols, destroy the traditional Christian understanding of family and marriage as a union between a man and a woman, and question the very value of human life, from its birth to its natural end."*

*"In Iraq, where up to 1.5 million Christians lived several years ago, only 150,000 Christians are left, and the others have been killed or driven away. There is intensive persecution of Christians going on in Egypt, Libya, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nigeria, India, Indonesia, and other countries, both in the Middle East and in other regions."*

*"The Christian communities of Syria and other countries of the Middle East are crying for help, while the Western media are ignoring these cries for help. As for politicians, they are turning a blind eye to this unprecedented persecution."* [\[6\]](#)

On March 13, 2015, Archbishop Silvano Tomasi, the Vatican's top diplomat at the United Nations in Geneva, presented a joint statement to the UN Human Rights Council entitled *"Supporting the Human Rights of Christians and Other Communities, particularly in the Middle East,"* along with a call for an international force to stop the Islamic State from further assaults on Christians in Iraq and Syria. Surprisingly, this is the first time ever that the plight of Christians has been addressed by the Human Rights Council. [\[7\]](#)

Equally surprising, the statement was initiated by Moscow in cooperation with the Vatican and Lebanon. According to Rev.

Stefan Igumnov, Secretary of the Synodal Department for External Church Relations for the Russian Orthodox Church,

*"We can expect that cooperation in this sphere between Russia and the Holy See will continue developing. Russia and the Vatican are very influential members of the UN and their joint actions aimed at protecting Christians, especially if they are joined by other countries, can be fruitful."* [\[8\]](#)

Beginning with the collapse of communism in the 20th century as foretold by the Mother of God at Fatima, the modern era is increasingly typified by signs of a Christian renewal in Russia and further dissolution of the West in the ongoing 21st century collapse of liberalism foreshadowing the beginnings of formative change leading to a New Era. Pope Francis voiced this social-cultural verity in Cathedral Santa Maria del Fiore during his November 2015 visit to Florence:

*"... It is not useful to search (any longer) for solutions in conservatism or fundamentalism,"...We are not living an era of change, but a change of era."*

Thus, if what the pope is saying is true (and we have much reason to believe that it is), religious analysis can no longer be limited to the increasingly antiquated sociological perspective of secular political conserver (conserver of cultural, political, or economic liberalism). At moments such as these, to continue viewing religion through a political or sociological lens [\[9\]](#) inhibits a fuller and more comprehensive understanding of what in fact is really going on.

If the intent of a news and intelligence service is a fuller more objective analysis approximating truth (and not a slip into ideology, rigid nationalism, or a limited sociological understanding of religion and social institutions), religion should no longer be simply explained as a social construct, as a secular or social-cultural phenomenon reduced to the role of

political legitimization. Rather, the Church should be increasingly viewed as a free and spontaneous actor and shaper of social policy, cultural identity, and historic destiny.

The world is on the cusp of a change in Era precipitated by divine providence, what the Mother of God identified at Fatima as an “Era of Peace”.

Because of the Message of Fatima, Saint John Paul II consecrated the entire world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary and then Pope Francis did the same. Without understanding Fatima and the role of Divine Providence in modern affairs, the current changes underway (changes that are making American foreign policy and global politics increasingly difficult to grasp) cannot be properly understood. The modern world is moving away from its 18th-20th century moorings in secular liberalism toward a Christian spiritual renewal spearheaded by the Mother of God, the Queen of Peace.

At Fatima, the world was promised an “Era of Peace” beginning with the “conversion of Russia”. The purveyors of liberalism are working hard to keep us at war and from knowledge of the ongoing Christian evangelization initiated by the Mercy of God beginning in Poland and the return of Russia to its Christian patrimony with all of its ramifications for global politics and spiritual renewal.

---

## ENDNOTES

[\[1\]](#) For example, according to Patriarch Kirill Primate of Moscow and All Russia:

“It is very important that all healthy forces of the society today unite for the true revival of Russia. The Church, science, art, culture, education, sport – all these things should work for strengthening spiritual foundations of our person.”

“The things which define the true revival are connected with the person’s spiritual life.”

Likewise, according to the President Putin, “First and foremost we should be governed by common sense. But common sense should be based on moral principles first. And it is not possible today to have morality separated from religious values.”

([http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/personoftheyear/article/0,28804,1690753\\_1690757\\_1695787-3,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/personoftheyear/article/0,28804,1690753_1690757_1695787-3,00.html))

“We stand against legalization and legal justification of homosexual ‘marriages’ and other outrages in the sphere of ethics” (Interfax, Dec. 9).

[2] <http://archive.larouchepac.com/node/28244>

[3] <http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=9050>

[4] <http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=12425>

[5] <http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=10818>

[6] <http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=10016>

[7]

<http://www.cruxnow.com/church/2015/03/13/vatican-backs-military-force-to-stop-isis-genocide/>

[8] <http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=12072>

[9] Whereby authentic, not secular, religion is, in effect, removed from the public square and from political analysis.

---

# THE CHRISTIAN RENEWAL OF RUSSIA

[New Era World News](#)

WE ARE LIVING AT A PIVOTAL MOMENT of human history in which the backward relationship between the secular and sacred, discussed in a previous article is being slowly reversed. That is, the spirit of nationalism (that reifies secular values, imbues them with a sacred identity, and thereby diminishes the voice of the Spirit) is being corrected by an authentic outpouring of the Spirit. In the process, the temporal public square, rather than being increasingly secularized, is being increasingly sacralized. It is being increasingly sacralized not by a religion that has become secularized, nor by a form of secular humanism that has become sacralized, but by authentic Trinitarian Christian renewal.<sup>[1]</sup> Although imperceptible in the West, this trend is increasingly evident in the East and is becoming more evident in Europe and throughout the globe.

According to Russian President, Vladimir Putin,

*"We can see how many of the Euro-Atlantic countries are actually rejecting their roots, including the Christian values that constitute the basis of Western civilization. They are denying moral principles and all traditional identities: national, cultural, religious and even sexual. They are implementing policies that equate large families with same-sex partnerships, belief in God with the belief in Satan. The excesses of political correctness have reached the point where people are seriously talking about registering political parties whose aim is to promote pedophilia... I am convinced that this opens a direct path to degradation and primitivism, resulting in a profound demographic and moral crisis."*<sup>[2]</sup>

Therefore, Vladimir Putin has vowed that it will be one of the tasks of Russia's foreign policy to defend Christianity and Christians persecuted for their faith.

After Metropolitan Hilarion (Metropolitan of Volokolamsk, and Chairman of the Department of External Church Relations for the Russian Orthodox Church) informed Putin about the destruction of churches in Afghanistan, acts of terror committed against Christians in Syria and the bombing of churches in Iraq, he also expressed hope that the Russian government would defend persecuted Christians around the globe to which Putin replied,

*"You needn't have any doubt that that's the way it will be."* [\[3\]](#)

Likewise, Hungarian Foreign Minister Peter Szijjarto believes Russia should join with other nations to defend Christianity. In a meeting with Nikolay Fyodorov, Deputy Speaker of the Russian Federation Council, Szijjarto said

*"Christian values should be protected, both in Europe and in the East. And I believe that Russia should play a key role here."* [\[4\]](#)

Subsequently, over 50,000 Syrian Christians petitioned Russia for dual citizenship. In a letter to the Russian Foreign Ministry, the petitioners stated that,

*"Russian citizenship would be an honor for any Syrian Christian who wished to acquire it."*

The petitioners also stated that,

*"Our appeal does not mean that we have any mistrust in the Syrian army or government. However, we are scared of the conspiracy of the West and hateful fanatics who are waging a brutal war against our country."*

*"It is for the first time since the Nativity of Christ that*

*we Christians of Qalamoun living in the villages of Saidnaya, Maara Saidnaya, Maaloula and Maaroun are under threat of banishment from our land."*

*"We see the Russian Federation as a powerful factor of global peace and stability. Russia pursues a firm line in the defense of Syria, its people and its territorial integrity."* [\[5\]](#)

Metropolitan Hilarion also believes that Orthodox and Catholic Christians should act together to defend the Christian faith.

*"I would like to use this opportunity to call on my brethren from the Catholic Church to create a united front to defend Christian faith in all countries where it is persecuted and oppressed".*

*"We see that supporters of militant secularism and atheism in Europe and America are trying to cause Christian faith to leave the life of society, banish Christian symbols, destroy the traditional Christian understanding of family and marriage as a union between a man and a woman, and question the very value of human life, from its birth to its natural end."*

*"In Iraq, where up to 1.5 million Christians lived several years ago, only 150,000 Christians are left, and the others have been killed or driven away. There is intensive persecution of Christians going on in Egypt, Libya, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nigeria, India, Indonesia, and other countries, both in the Middle East and in other regions."*



*“The Christian communities of Syria and other countries of the Middle East are crying for help, while the Western media are ignoring these cries for help. As for politicians, they are turning a blind eye to this unprecedented persecution.”*

[\[6\]](#)

On March 13, 2015, Archbishop Silvano Tomasi, the Vatican's top diplomat at the United Nations in Geneva, presented a joint statement to the UN Human Rights Council entitled *“Supporting the Human Rights of Christians and Other Communities, particularly in the Middle East,”* along with a call for an international force to stop the Islamic State from further assaults on Christians in Iraq and Syria. Surprisingly, this is the first time ever that the plight of Christians has been addressed by the Human Rights Council.[\[7\]](#)

Equally surprising, the statement was initiated by Moscow in cooperation with the Vatican and Lebanon. According to Rev. Stefan Igumnov, Secretary of the Synodal Department for External Church Relations for the Russian Orthodox Church,

*“We can expect that cooperation in this sphere between Russia and the Holy See will continue developing. Russia and the Vatican are very influential members of the UN and their joint actions aimed at protecting Christians, especially if they are joined by other countries, can be fruitful.”* [\[8\]](#)

Beginning with the collapse of communism in the 20th century as foretold by the Mother of God at Fatima, the modern era is increasingly typified by signs of a Christian renewal in Russia and further dissolution of the West in the ongoing 21st century collapse of liberalism foreshadowing the beginnings of formative change leading to a New Era. Pope Francis voiced this social-cultural verity in Cathedral Santa Maria del Fiore during his November 2015 visit to Florence:

*“... It is not useful to search (any longer) for solutions in*

*conservatism or fundamentalism,"...We are not living an era of change, but a change of era."*

Thus, if what the pope is saying is true (and we have much reason to believe that it is), religious analysis can no longer be limited to the increasingly antiquated sociological perspective of secular political conserver (conserver of cultural, political, or economic liberalism). At moments such as these, to continue viewing religion through a political or sociological lens[\[9\]](#) inhibits a fuller and more comprehensive understanding of what in fact is really going on.

If the intent of a news and intelligence service is a fuller more objective analysis approximating truth (and not a slip into ideology, rigid nationalism, or a limited sociological understanding of religion and social institutions), religion should no longer be simply explained as a social construct, as a secular or social-cultural phenomenon reduced to the role of political legitimization. Rather, the Church should be increasingly viewed as a free and spontaneous actor and shaper of social policy, cultural identity, and historic destiny.

The world is on the cusp of a change in Era precipitated by divine providence, what the Mother of God identified at Fatima as an "Era of Peace".

Because of the Message of Fatima, Saint John Paul II consecrated the entire world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary and then Pope Francis did the same. Without understanding Fatima and the role of Divine Providence in modern affairs, the current changes underway (changes that are making American foreign policy and global politics increasingly difficult to grasp) cannot be properly understood. The modern world is moving away from its 18th-20th century moorings in secular liberalism toward a Christian spiritual renewal spearheaded by the Mother of God, the Queen of Peace.

At Fatima, the world was promised an "Era of Peace" beginning

with the “conversion of Russia”. The purveyors of liberalism are working hard to keep us at war and from knowledge of the ongoing Christian evangelization initiated by the Mercy of God beginning in Poland and the return of Russia to its Christian patrimony with all of its ramifications for global politics and spiritual renewal.

---

#### ENDNOTES

[1] For example, according to Patriarch Kirill Primate of Moscow and All Russia:

“It is very important that all healthy forces of the society today unite for the true revival of Russia. The Church, science, art, culture, education, sport – all these things should work for strengthening spiritual foundations of our person.”

“The things which define the true revival are connected with the person’s spiritual life.”

Likewise, according to the President Putin, “First and foremost we should be governed by common sense. But common sense should be based on moral principles first. And it is not possible today to have morality separated from religious values.”

([http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/personoftheyear/article/0,28804,1690753\\_1690757\\_1695787-3,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/personoftheyear/article/0,28804,1690753_1690757_1695787-3,00.html))

“We stand against legalization and legal justification of homosexual ‘marriages’ and other outrages in the sphere of ethics” (Interfax, Dec. 9).

[2] <http://archive.larouchepac.com/node/28244>

[3] <http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=9050>

[4] <http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=12425>

[5] <http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=10818>

[6] <http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=10016>

[7]

<http://www.cruxnow.com/church/2015/03/13/vatican-backs-military-force-to-stop-isis-genocide/>

[\[8\]](http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=12072) <http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=12072>

[\[9\]](#) Whereby authentic, not secular, religion is, in effect, removed from the public square and from political analysis.

---

# Discussion Forum: America's Foundations A Masquerade of Light

[RETURN TO INTELLIGENCE REPORT](#) — [NEW ERA HOME PAGE](#) —  
[KOLBE FOUNDATION HOME PAGE](#)