

CHAPTER V

FREEWAY TO THE TYRANNY OF ANTI-CHRIST

After the 16th century Protestors' Revolt, Phillip, we will follow the progressive development of the evil through the 17th to the 19th century to the point where atheism is conceived as a religion in itself.

As I see it, Phillip, Protestantism was an attack upon the whole Faith under the pretense of objections to some articles of Faith or some sins and ecclesiastical abuses among its adherents. But with the coming of the spirit of antichrist in the 20th Century, the mask of religious quibbling is thrown off and the naked spirit of hatred for God Himself emerges.

Hillaire Belloc described the modern attack of antichrist forces.

"We approach the greatest moment of all.

The Faith is now in the presence not of a particular heresy as in the past -- the Arian, the Manichean, the Albigensian, the Mohammedan -- nor is it in the presence of a sort of generalized heresy as it was when it had to meet the Protestant revolution from three to four hundred years ago. The enemy which the Faith now has to meet, and which may be called "The Modern Attack," is a wholesale assault upon the fundamentals of the Faith -- upon the Very existence of the Faith. And the enemy now advancing against us is increasingly conscious of the fact that there can be no question of neutrality. The forces now opposed to the Faith design to *destroy*. The battle is hence-forward engaged upon a definite line of cleavage, involving the survival or destruction of the Catholic Church. And *all* -- not a portion -- of its philosophy.

We know, of course, that the Catholic Church cannot be destroyed. But what we do not know is the extent of the area over which it will survive; its power of revival or the power of the enemy to push it further and further back on to its last defenses until it may seem as though Anti-Christ had come and the final issue was about to be decided. Of such moment is the struggle immediately before the world.

To many who had no sympathy with Catholicism, who inherit the old Protestant animosity to the Church (although doctrinal Protestantism is now dead) and who think that any attack on the Church must somehow or other be a good thing, the struggle already appears as a coming or present attack on what they call "Christianity."

You will find people saying on every side that the Bolshevik movement (for instance) is "definitely anti-Christian" -- "opposed to every form of Christianity" and must be "resisted by all Christians irrespective of the particular Church to which each may belong," and so on.

Speech and writing of this kind are futile because they mean nothing definite. There is no such thing as a religion called "Christianity" -- there never has been such a religion.

There is and always has been the Church, and various heresies proceeding from a rejection of some of the Church's doctrines by men who still desire to retain the rest of her teaching and morals. But there never has been and never can be or will be a general Christian religion professed by men who all accept some central important doctrines, while agreeing to differ about others. ...

There is no essential doctrine such that if we can agree upon it we can agree to differ about the rest: as for instance, to accept immortality but deny the Trinity. A man will call himself a Christian though he denies the

unity of the Christian Church; he will call himself a Christian though he denies the presence of Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament; he will cheerfully call himself a Christian though he denies the Incarnation.

... The modern attack will not tolerate us. It will attempt to destroy us. Nor can *we* tolerate *it*. We must attempt to destroy it as being the fully equipped and ardent enemy of the Truth by which men live. The duel is to the death.

Men sometimes call the modern attack "a return to Paganism." That definition is true if we mean by Paganism a denial of Catholic truth: if we mean by Paganism a denial of the Incarnation, of human immortality, of the unity and personality of God, of man's direct responsibility to God, and all that body of thought, feeling, doctrine and culture which is summed up in the word "Catholic," then, and in that sense, the modern attack *is* a return to Paganism."

Godliness builds an intelligent moral order in society. Satan desires to tear down this order and its authoritative governing structures because they support godliness in disciplining fallible human nature by setting up as standards of conduct the guides of right reason, thus opposing the chaos of rule by the standards of passion, expediency, popular opinion, etc. In order to tempt godly society to tear down its own righteous order, Satan's agents, who were incapable of doing so great a feat themselves, brewed a popular philosophy of revolution that would justify and even impel men to tear down their own house. This evil philosophy's slogans challenged the basic principles supporting the rational and godly order of society, which God had helped Christian people establish through much sacrifice and labor.

The revolutionary philosophy of hell designed to appeal to the rebellious nature of man's pride in himself and aversion to God's rule revolved around words like "liberty" and "equality." It asserted that everyone is "destined," by the god-hunger in them to be "free from the rule of others" and "equal to all others", therefore, there can be no ruling government, other than the temporary "government" of Anarchy, which destroys "the rule of others" with the rule of others, the elite revolutionary zealots who are licensed by ideology to destroy in the name of "Freedom." These unqualified "democratic" principles of liberty and equality lead to chaos, moral and civil disintegration, even the disintegration of the mind. But this end result, total destruction (Hell), is never put forward by the enemy, only utopian promises of a better world, advanced civilization, the solution of age-old problems, nirvana, peace, etc. They propose a transfer of power from the few to the many. They propose what will accomplish the destruction of the existing order, whether that be a monarchy, oligarchy, dictatorship, republic, or democracy. When that order is destroyed, they are soon proposing the destruction of that order which took its place, until the principle of chaos or disorder is enshrined in the death of all order, the negation of all evidence of intelligent life, that is, the reign of Satan, which is death and Hell.

"Let me see if I understand what you are saying, Father. The design of those who executed the Protestant Revolution was to destroy society and ..."

That was Satan's design. And he was the spirit who guided them. But he who is guided by a spirit knows not where the spirit will go. Even the agents of Satan are deceived by him,

Phillip. He must use their errors concerning apparent goods and the weaknesses of their human nature to motivate them: their vanity, greed, lust for pleasure, power and honors. The closer Satan's agents are to being fully possessed by him, the

more naked he can present to them his real plan for the world, which is eternal death. But he must always style their goals as apparently good in some guise.

And since Satan's ongoing, step by step Revolution must be gradual, in order to refrain from unduly arousing either the strong opposition of sane and courageous men or the common sense and survival instincts of the average man, the enemy would have to engineer, by innuendo, propaganda, armed rebellion, etc., the collapse of one power structure at a time.

The French Revolution celebrated the destruction of monarchy, in order to replace it with an oligarchy of powerful men who were replaced by a popular dictator, who was ruled by their secret government. Many years later, after having acquired near complete control of the medias of information and education, constitutional republics or so-called "democracies" could be controlled by the enemy effectively. Successively, rule *appears* to go into the hands of common, uneducated or miseducated men, but the reality is that they must actually depend on someone to tell them what their choices are, and these are the real, yet hidden, rulers. These uneducated or, better yet, poorly educated masses are more or less easily led by the manipulators of popular opinion. And who would dare revolt against the apparent *majority* of their fellow men. The most absolute dictatorship is the dictatorship of the proletariat, the common working man. Speak for him or pretend to speak for all such men, and you will have an insurmountable mandate.

When universal education became mandatory by law in the 20th century and fell, of course, into the hands of the State, the full education of men in the ungodly and anti-traditional principles could begin. Then Christian society could be thoroughly denigrated and misshapen with all manner of error, until the very idea of God's rule over man could be erased from the minds of a whole generation.

But I am getting ahead of my immediate objective, which is to bring us into the 19th century atheism that spawned Communism.

"Father, why doesn't God rule man directly as He did through Moses and the Judges?"

Just as God did not *ordain* that Israel elect a king of their own in place of the Judges by which God ruled them more directly, Phillip, so too God did not ordain but *permitted* this progressive leveling of the political and social hierarchy of the world from the 16th to the 19th century. And He did it for a reason. Monarchy is potentially a more efficient form of government, but a republic throws more responsibility upon the common man to control his civic destiny. Only the power of the mass of common men could stop tyranny – simply by overcoming their own susceptibility to ignorance and human respect.

The power of the common man had to be developed in order to overpower the enemy of civil order. Man would be forced to take more responsibility for the affairs of state and to educate himself, in order to resist the tyranny of those who would secretly rule the ignorant, the intemperate, the misled, and an increasingly sinful majority. In other words, society would have to grow up and fully accept the responsibility of its destiny as the battle for its soul more clearly appeared as the issue of conflict in the world.

To survive men would have to more personally, intellectually and emotionally weld themselves into the unity of Christ and His Church, His Mystical Body. Yes, in order for the elect to gain this grace, God would allow mankind to freely choose the rules

it lived by, and he would allow it to bear as well the good or evil consequences of those choices; so that, inasmuch as they would not confide in God and His Church as their teacher, guide and saviour, creating a society based on that, they would learn the same lessons by way of bitter experience.

Divine Providence is always in control, Phillip, but he uses the means that are necessary considering the character and plight of His subjects at a given time in history. He regards their very errors and foolishness in forming His plan to save them. God, thus, uses the evils He permits to bring about good. Without this perspective of the last 500 years it is difficult to see God's providence among men, since so many evils have come upon the society of men.

"Why must the war between good and evil go on, Father, if good is destined for victory?"

Suffering the effects of evil in this battle is absolutely necessary for the discipline of weakened human nature, Son, which, if not scourged, will sink into sloth and be ruled by the lower world and die in the eternal misery of sin's alienation from God.

Now let us look at a history of modern philosophy to see how the most basic thinking of mankind, which is the subject of philosophy, was slowly but radically disrupted and rendered absurd. The evil control achieved over mankind could not have taken place without the perversion of basic ideas upon which our whole viewpoint depends. In the perversion of the philosophical sciences of ontology (the study of being) and epistemology (the study of knowledge) we see the "inspiration" of Satan.

The corruption of Philosophy, "Queen of Sciences", by the enemy began with the *nominalism* of certain medieval philosophers, like William of Occam, arguing against the moderate realism taught by the Church, especially through St. Thomas Aquinas, who built upon the metaphysics of Aristotle.

The dictionary tells us that "*Realism is a doctrine that universals exist outside the mind and that an abstract term names an independent and unitary reality.*" What could be more natural? But nominalism is "*a theory that there are no universal essences in reality and that*

the mind can frame no single concept or image corresponding to any universal or general term."

If our mind cannot truly grasp the essential nature of real things, namely universals, we cannot truly know anything real. The Church teaches that we can truly know reality, and, by that fact, we are made to be responsible for our actions in *correspondence with the truth*, which is defined as *that which is (reality) in the understanding*."

"Let me see if I can repeat, Father. You say the true philosophy of being and knowledge is that the terms of our knowledge, called universals, actually correspond to reality. That's pretty obviously true, Father."

You would think so.

"Let me catch up to you, Father. Nominalism claims that our knowledge is just made up of arbitrary terms chosen to represent what we think, and those terms don't represent a real understanding of reality?"

That's right. The Scholastics, like St. Thomas, compared the mind's conception of reality to the molding of hot wax to the signature of a ring pressed into it. The ring is reality, the wax our understanding of it. There is a true and perfect representation of reality in our mind, a mind which God made *conformable to reality*.

"But our mind is not the reality it apprehends, just as the wax is not the ring whose image it conforms to."

Right, Phillip.

"So what does nominalism say the relationship of knowledge and reality is, Father?"

It does not answer that problem, Phillip. You will see as we go on – you saw it perhaps with the theory of Evolution – error never gives answers, it just destroys the truth, leaving the mind free to get lost. Now listen.

Much later Kant picked up the inference of nominalism and fashioned the theory of idealism, which supposes ... *"that "the essential nature of reality lies in our consciousness, in the mind or reason,"* not in the real world outside the mind! Now it's not only that we cannot know reality, but that it isn't even out there; "it" is just subjective ideas in our mind. Consider the implications here: If man's mind is now empowered with the creation of the only reality "knowable," man is one step closer to appearing as God-like. He is not only liberated from God by this notion but also from the reality God made, and principally, the reality of his own created nature as man. This leads to complete amorality and immorality. And, Kant has led us to agnosticism, because we can't know God, only our own arbitrary mental constructs. But this describes the insane mind.

Kant built his idealism on the back of Descarte's much earlier Rationalism, which is defined as *"the reliance on reason as the basis for establishment of religious truth."* Although it is true, Phillip, that reason *apprehends* God's creation and affirms His law and His

Revelation as reasonable, neither creation or Revelation *depend on* human reason for their existence. Therefore, human reason does not *establish* religious truth. Such an error makes Reason the source of divine realities. In such an absurdity God depends on man's reason instead of Reason being wholly dependent on God. Man suddenly becomes Godlike again, an infallible judge and determiner of reality, even *supernatural reality*. No longer is man God's student at the desk of creation and divine Revelation.

"I think I see the twisting of the truth, Father. Instead of the wax of reason conforming to the ring of religious reality, religious reality is determined by the wax."

Yes. Wax by nature is conformable to other things because of its softness. With reason this might translate into humility or reasonableness. And do you see the same inverted order of mind and reality in Kants' idealism, where he supposes that "the essential nature of reality exists in and of the consciousness, instead of our being conscious of reality?"

"Easily, I see this."

The progression of error from nominalism through rationalism to idealism prepares the stage for atheistic Humanism, Phillip. For if reality is either a figment of the human mind or only something relevant to that mind, then the individual Mind *is* what we had formerly called God, and if man is God, there is no God, because the fact is, man *is not* God. He doesn't have the attributes or powers that the commonly accepted definition of God contains. So the concept of God is dead, is without meaning, since there is no real reference for it.

"It sounds like they wanted to dispense with the very notion of God as it had always been defined, Father."

Right. If God is a part of reality and reality is merely a subject of the human mind, "God" is just a more or less useful term in that mind.

For the atheist, Phillip, "reality" becomes either an illusion of the mind or a physical material, something in complete potentiality to temporal mechanical forces, such as time, place, weight, speed, energy. The latter is atheistic materialism, the former is what I would call atheistic idealism. In eastern atheism, which advertises itself as religion, metaphysical reality is the transcendental, universal Mind and physical reality is only an illusion. But in western materialism, it is the reverse. Matter is real and mind is arbitrarily abstract.

I suspect the original, *non-corrupted* ancient philosophies or teachings of Eastern peoples were based on common practical wisdom collected from oral tradition of Patriarchs of the Semetic race. However, certain pagan rituals and other errors become attached to these collections of traditional wisdom. For example, Hinduism is the belief, according to the dictionary, that "*an individual's duty is fulfilled by custom or law,*" based on the cosmic and individual principles of nature. Buddhism adds to this that '*suffering is due to the craving of selfish individuality producing the torments of greedy desire.*' Here is a description of Buddhism:

Until a man has overcome every sort of personal craving his life is trouble and his end sorrow. There are three principal forms the craving of life takes, and all are evil. The first is the desire to gratify the senses, sensuousness. The second is the desire for personal immortality. The third is the desire for prosperity, worldliness. All these must be overcome – that is to say, a man must no longer be living for himself – before life can become serene. But when they are indeed overcome and no longer rule a man's life, when the first-personal pronoun has vanished from his private thoughts, then he has reached the higher wisdom, Nirvana, serenity of soul. For Nirvana does not mean, as many people wrongly believe, extinction, but the extinction of the futile personal aims that necessarily make life base or pitiful or dreadful." (Outlines of History by H. G. Wells, p. 395)

Confucius taught the traditional decorum and restraint of a devoted public man, based on the moral philosophy of former generations.

In cultures that have not fully received the teaching of Divine Revelation, various deities spring up from the corrupted versions of the oral tradition that Adam began. This is largely due to ignorance, but the atheistic movement of the 19th and 20th centuries used the corruptions of eastern religions as *carriers* of their doctrine of human deification. This developed into the New Age Movement. This was done to achieve their aim of a one-world religion based on the basic similarities found in all religions. Reincarnation, for example, might well be an error added to the original oriental religions by the agents of Satan.

"It sounds like every civilization since Adam has been at war with Satan's liars to preserve the integrity of thought, custom, law and religion that they were left with by oral tradition from Adam."

Yes, Phillip, and some of these peoples are only now, in our time, being thoroughly evangelized by the Church of Christ. How much truth they retained from Adam depended on the purity of mind and soul their ancestors maintained.

The 18th Century Enlightenment *popularized* the arguments that would lead to dispensing with God, Phillip. The mass distribution of works by cynical utopians like Voltaire and Rousseau helped accomplish this. The French Revolution was the political

result of the Enlightenment – two deliberately coordinated events. And the next step of the World Revolutionary Movement would be the Russian Revolution, and its philosophical accompaniment would be various atheists.

Voltaire specialized in defining the non-churched believer in God who has graduated from organized religion by rejecting the sects of all religions.

"That seems to be a logical result of Protestantism, Father."

Yes. And how often I heard this miserable lie from Fundamentalists, Phillip, who would have cringed at the deism of Voltaire. Voltaire is a mouthpiece for the same enemy, the

sons of Satan, that earlier instigated the apparent shattering of Christianity into sects during the Protestant Revolt, which suggested that Christianity was confused, divided and ripe for replacement by more democratic, liberated churches representing the diversity of opinions that Rationalism demanded. So, the *next* reasonable step is Voltaire's advice to altogether abandon organized religion since its endless division by squabbling opinion renders organization meaningless.

The enemy had created one evil in order to "solve it" with a even greater one. This is Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for the enemy, Phillip.

"But, Father, I do not like to hear the phrase "shattered Christianity". If we agree with Hillaire Belloc that there is no religion called Christianity, then the *one* Catholic Christian Church can't be shattered."

You are absolutely right, Son. Well done. I think you may be a chip off the old block all right.

"What?"

Never mind. Note, as we read Voltaire that his "Deist" is a prototype for the ideal member of a collective One-World Religion which is superior to any one religion in representing man's opinions about the mere concept of "God" and the various folklore and tradition surrounding that comforting myth.

When the Spirit of God is taken out of human thinking, that thinking disintegrates progressively like any material substance abandoned by the principle of life, the soul. The philosophical trend we are illustrating, Phillip, is nothing more or less than a description of the decay of rationality itself.

"That means the decay of the essence of man's nature, Father. Spiritual death!"

Yes, let me read from Voltaire's Philosophical Dictionary:

"The (Deist) is a man firmly persuaded of the existence of a Supreme Being, as good as He is powerful, who has formed all beings with extension, vegetating, sentient and reflecting, who perpetuates their species, who punishes crime without cruelty, and rewards virtuous actions with kindness ...

(The Deist) submits to this Providence, even though he perceives but a few effects and a few signs of this Providence, and, judging the things he does not see by the things which he does see, he considered that this Providence reaches all places and all centuries.

Reconciled with the rest of the universe by this principle, he does not embrace any of the sects, all of which contradict one another. His religion is really the oldest and most widespread, for the simple worship of God has come before all the systems of the world. He speaks a language that all peoples understand, while they do not understand one another. He has his brothers from Peking to Cayenne, and he numbers all wise men among his brethren."

Here is the basis for a one-world religion which at this point in history is simply a

logical extension of Protestantism. Atheism would take another 150 years to develop in the popular mind, but Voltaire sets the stage. Perhaps his concealed skepticism peeks through these apparently religious words: "If God did not exist, it would be necessary *to invent him*."

Let us now read from another social engineer glorified in the history books. In The Social Contract Rousseau invented the slavery of the individual man to the State, which he called the "common will." He termed this slavery to the collective will, divorced from God's Will, as absolute personal freedom! In fact, it was absolute personal slavery and more, since a collective will, no longer guided by God, will drift along the currents of popular error and ignorance until it no longer understands the nature of the man that God created. Such a ruler slowly becomes *inhuman*. It is a naked, terrifying, satanic *tyranny*.

"The problem is to find a form of association that will defend and protect with the whole common force the person and property of each associate, and in which each, while still uniting himself with all, may still obey himself alone, and still remain as free as before." This is the basic problem for which the Social Contract gives the solution.

When properly understood these clauses may be reduced to one: the total alienation of each associate, in common with all his rights, to the whole community. This is because in the first place, since each gives himself absolutely, the conditions are the same for all. This being so, no one has any interest making them burdensome to others.

... whoever refuses to obey the general will shall be compelled to do so by the whole body. This means nothing less than that he will be forced to be free, for this is the condition which, in giving each citizen to the country, secures him against all personal dependence. In this lies the key to the working of the political machine..."

"That sounds like communism, Father."

See if the following from his Discourse on Inequality sounds like the abolition of private property.

"The first person, who having enclosed a piece of ground, be-thought himself of saying, "This is mine," and found people simple enough to believe him, was the real founder of civil society. From how many crimes, battles and murders, from how many horrors and misfortunes would not that man have saved mankind, who should have pulled up the stakes, or filled up the ditch, crying out to his fellows, "Beware of listening to this imposter; you are undone if you once forget that the fruits of the earth belong to us all, and that the earth itself belongs to nobody ..."

Such was, or may well have been, the origin of society and law, which bound new fetters on the poor, and gave new powers to the rich; which irretrievably destroyed natural liberty, eternally fixed the law of property and inequality, converted clever usurpation into unalterable right, and, for the advantage of a few ambitious individuals, subjected all mankind to perpetual labour, slavery and wretchedness ...

That men are actually wicked, a sad and continual experience of them proves beyond doubt; but, all the same, I think I have shown that man is naturally good. What then can have depraved him to such an extent, except that changes that have happened in his constitution, the advances he has made, and the knowledge he has acquired? We admire human society as much as we please; it will be none the less true

that it necessarily leads men to hate each other in proportion as their interests clash, and to do one another apparent services, while they are really doing every imaginable mischief."

Can you see in this, Phillip, that we have been told to abolish the present society and its laws based on the ancient false presumption of private property in favor of a commune where no one owns anything? Where is the lie in this?

"It seems true that mankind owns the earth, father."

What is the root word of "property," Phillip?

"I suppose "propriety."

Right, and he who holds proprietary rights over something holds the first rights to its good use. This is different from absolute ownership. That rests with God, Who gives stewardship to men in their respective localities. Now proprietary use of something allows a man to invest his time, labor and wealth into it with the assurance that he will not be robbed of the fruits of his labor, which he needs to survive. Now these criminal thinkers like Rousseau come along and license the mob of ignorant sheep to rob anyone of everything they own. That was the rationale for the French Revolution, the robbery of Church lands being the greatest prize of all, just as in England 150 years before.

We also see in this passage the absolute leveling of all authority. The common bond of all persons is that they have all committed themselves to be the slave of the whole. In that decision their "independence" and "freedom" lies. One forsakes all private property, all personal dignity and becomes a perfectly happy, mythical non-person. They are all equally slaves. A more docile herd of goats the devil could never wish for. Here is the prescribed justification for the destruction of all organized civilization. And who moved into the power vacuum this surrender of human rights created but the *instigators* of this insane fantasy – those who laughed heartily at anyone foolish enough to believe it! Mockery is the laughter of Satan.

The next quotation I will read from *The Social Contract* shows Rousseau's justification for the total destruction of previous organized religions and a definition of "civil religion," in other words, a religion of man's invention, a state Religion or better, the Religion *of* the State.

"The dogmas of civil religion ought to be few, simple, and exactly worded, without explanation or commentary. The existence of a mighty, intelligent and beneficent Divinity, possessed of foresight and providence, the life to come, the happiness of the just, the punishment of the wicked, the sanctity of the social contract and its laws. These are its positive dogmas. Its negative dogmas I confine to one, intolerance, which is part of the cults we have rejected."

In other words, leave God up in the sky for now, but make a civil religion that sanctifies the social contract and its laws. This denies Divine Providence, who wills to rule society by *His* chosen ministers, the just men in every age. Rousseau clamors for the intolerance of just men by demanding tolerance for the common herd containing both the just and the evil. He

says that proud man will rule himself, without the help of any "contrivance" of God, such as the Divine Institution of the Church or governments subservient to this Church, and therefore to *Him!*

This awful Deism shouted: "Take God back up in the sky! Get him out of here, Man! Rule yourself by the light of your own Reason and your own originally innocent

nature! You don't need a saving or ministering God! You are gods!" Such is the "noble savage" of Rousseau, a pure anarchist at heart.

Communism, Phillip, was the answer to the call of the French Revolution. It shouted to the whole world, "All you have-nots, rise up and destroy the 'haves' "! Of course few believed such insanity, but it was shouted as a pretext for the revolutions that every person would be dragged into.

"To obey that slogan would be to destroy society itself, Father. If the haves are destroyed who would have anything?"

Good point, Son. But what if the enemy made their rich Capitalists worthy of destruction by their depredations upon society. Because the Enemy could control the creation and destruction and value-fluctuation of money by 1848, and because they were in control of many of the great capitalistic ventures of the world, they could make the conditions, fortunes and future of the common working man very miserable. And they did, *so that* the Communist Manifesto could invite this disposed worker "class" to revolt. They jump-started their own revolution of the proletariat, even providing the union organizers that led the working men to challenge their intentionally monstrous "Capitalists." It's what I used to call one of their "hand-in-glove" operations, the trademark of *all* their works.

"They both create the problem and provide their chosen solution, as you have said, Father."

Yes, and *the only change intended* in the Protestant, French and Russian Revolutions was to pass the reins of power into the hands of the Revolutionary Party. Destroy the old order and keep it destroyed. Take over capital and the means of production, and retain it. But use as your excuse this sob story about the poor proletariat rising up to take what is theirs by the supposed *right* of all to have Equality. Sheer subterfuge! Manipulate the masses to destroy the good order they had; then enslave them in a totalitarian State, which, like Rousseau's "common will," has the right to control all men in the name of their (dictated) "common good." Naked power Play! Thinly disguised by pure hype. The common man never believed this bologna, but he was *told* the common man believed it, and those who took over his government pretended to do it on the basis of this mandate. *All* "classes" and *all* individuals suffered the consequences of Communist takeovers in the 20th Century, but the same hype about the people claiming their rights was maintained for public relations purposes.

"I can see where this propaganda would tend to stifle all protest, Father, even if no one

believed it."

Remember the old saying, Phillip, "Fear is *the* tool of the Devil."

Let us continue our little history of philosophy. Although not an atheist like his student Feuerbach, the "intellectual forerunner of Communism, atheism and religious modernism is a German professor named Hegel, a Rationalist. In noting that human reason *apprehends* universal absolutes and the attributes of god, he raised Reason to *being* these absolutes and attributes. What does this make man to be but a god himself. Let me read from the *Gods of Atheism* by Fr. Miceli.

"Now Hegel, the progenitor of a famous brood that split into two factions at war with each other, was far from being an atheist himself. Nevertheless, he set the stage for the assault upon god. It was generally agreed that God was the object of both philosophy and theology; of the former by the light of reason, of the latter by the light of revelation. But

102

Hegel questioned whether the philosophers or the theologians had succeeded in attaining the real God. He protested that the God of Christian experience was an inadequate, a premature, not-yet-developed God. Hegel set himself the task of completing the good news of the Gospels; he would go beyond Christianity by demonstrating that the only valid God was dialectically evolving Thought or Spirit Which gradually, inevitably attains and reveals Itself in conceptual clarity and complete self-consciousness through the entire scope of cosmic and human history. Hegel set himself the mission of rescuing the God of Christianity from the vagueness of imagery, the symbolism of myths, the simplistic charm of parables.

Moreover, Hegel had a bill of particulars against the Christian God. The trouble with the Christian God is that He is only experienced and remembered when the human conscience is sick or in trouble. But this Jewish-Christian god, Who is unapproachable and inscrutable in His aloof transcendence and unattainable by the imagination, mind or heart of men, arouses in man resentment against the only choice he is offered by this mysterious God – obedience or revolt. Frustrated by the demoralizing experience of failing futilely to satisfy his hunger for communion with the transcendent god, humbled by the degrading knowledge of his abject powerlessness, man resents the situation that equates God's glorification with his own depreciation. The transcendent God of the Old and New Testament thus succeeds in enslaving and alienating His worshippers. He sets before them the face-to-face eternal embrace of Himself as a goal that is actually beyond man's personal achievement. Yet He continually tortures man's metaphysical hunger as if this human aspiration for complete communion were actually attainable.

... All modern atheism will thus be seen to be rooted in Hegel's rejection of the God of the master-slave relationship, the God who begets an "unhappy conscience" in man, the God who reduces man from being a hero to being a "beautiful soul."

Feuerbach saw the inevitable outcome of Hegel's reduction of God from the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Jesus to the God of the philosophers and

scientists. He saw that the God of the fifth Gospel – the gospel of reason according to Hegel – was merely a man-made God, sprung full-blown from the Hegelian head. Taking his inspiration, however, from Hegel's work as a beginning which was going in the right direction, Feuerbach set himself to account psychologically for the illusion of all religion. He realized that Hegel had already demolished God without even suspecting his own great accomplishment. Feuerbach successfully drew the logical conclusions of Hegel's work in his book *The Essence of Christianity*. In an heroic manner he continued the process of all theology to anthropology.

... In his *Essence of Religion*, Feuerbach reached a similar conclusion in his field of endeavor, proclaiming that God is merely a myth which embodies the highest aspirations of the human consciousness. "Those who have no desires," he wrote, "have no Gods ... Gods are men's wishes in corporeal form."

... Feuerbach was acclaimed for having swept the heavens clean of the phantom of God, exorcised this sacred sorcerer from the consciousness of his age, broken forever this theological tyrant's fatalistic, master-slave domination of men, restored divinity to its rightful owner – liberated Humanity – and rendered the thousands of years' discussions about God henceforth pointless."

103

Thus atheistic humanism was born. Man was offered a new heart and mind, a new hope in *Himself*. Satan could obviously work great evils with men who accepted such conceits. He could more completely possess them. And so it has happened, the inhuman face of Satan has become more and more visible in the actions of men given into his service. Now we do not just have pretended reformers of the Christian Church and its society, we have those who totally discount Christianity and religion in order to achieve man's "New Consciousness," which is that "God" is a mere notion, that is, "God" is dead.

"Why did God allow the scourge of Communism, Father?"

When something or someone is attacked, it must defend itself, raising itself up from apathy or indolence to full strength. Communism attacked Christianity and mankind.

"So God allowed this evil so we would all wake up and fight, Father?"

I think it can be seen in that way. Let's read more of Fr. Miceli.

"It has been wisely perceived that communist humanism, as a commitment to godlessness, could only have taken root and flourished in the enfeebled body of a mankind that had once been vigorous but became venal in the profession and practice of Christianity. Indeed the record shows that Marx, with intense bitterness and total dedication, took up his world-shattering mission in resentful hatred of the heartless Christians around him whose pagan lives and policies he rejected. He started from the false premise that wicked Christians are the fruit of wicked Christianity. His conclusion that Christianity had been tried for eighteen hundred years and had failed only compounded his original error. Nevertheless, the decadent Christian nations, whose national and international lives were truly scandalous, gave Marx in 1847 the weapon he

needed to attach Christianity and organize a movement of his own to replace it. It seems quite accurate to state that communist humanism has deliberately formed itself into an anti-Christian humanism, that is to say, into an anti-religion religion, an anti-Church Church, an anti-Catholic catholicity, an anti-Messiah messianism. And communist humanism rightly sees in the Catholic Church – whose dogma, zeal and unity it imitates in transposed, secularized forms – the ultimate enemy it must destroy, if its ideology and Eden are to prevail in the end.

On her part, the Catholic Church, especially in her leadership, the Popes, has certainly recognized clearly the nature and aims of this militant humanism, even if many of her intellectuals have not. For more than one hundred years Popes have been analyzing and rejecting communism from the viewpoint of philosophy and Faith, warning not merely their own faithful but the whole world of the falsity of doctrine and the incredibly inhuman practices of this pseudo-humanist. As far back as December 28, 1878, while Marx was still alive, Leo XIII stigmatized communism as "a deadly pestilence which attacks the essentials of society and would annihilate it."

This atheism of Feuerbach's became the basis for the messianic Communism of Marx. But it was also the basis of a heresy that resembles a religious communism called Modernism, religious humanism or liberation theology. The basis of this new religion is the notion that man does not exist as man except in community and that this fully realized Community is God. Fr. Miceli uncovers the seeds of this in Feuerbach's philosophy.

"Now two theses control the development of Feuerbach's atheistic humanism. The first, a negative thesis, develops Hegel's idea of alienation.

104

However, Feuerbach does not apply this concept as Hegel had done, to dialectically evolving Mind, but to man – that flesh and blood creature who exists only in community, whose being is found only in the unity of man with man – the unity of I and thou. Now this man with man – the unity of I and Thou – this being of man in community – this is God.

... In his desire to stabilize the noble qualities he finds in his nature, man hypostasizes, idolizes, absolutizes them outside his own changeable being into an Absolute Other who is unchangeable. This Other is endowed with wisdom, will, justice, love, all the noble feelings and virtues which man himself experiences from time to time, both in himself and in his fellowmen. Thus the absolutized attributes appear to man as if they were the exclusive ornaments of another, an infinitely more perfect being than himself. Spontaneously, religiously, man projects and objectifies his own goodness and greatness in the fantastic being he calls God. God is thus the product of pure human imagination.

... In this way man simultaneously dispossesses himself and enriches his God; in affirming God he denies himself; the poorer he becomes, the richer his God becomes; nothing really exists in God except what belongs and actually really still is in man's heart."

"And Rousseau said men had to give up all their rights to the Community, which was "sacred". So the State and God are one, Man in Community. For some reason all that really scares me, Father."

It should, Son. The political Communist and the ecclesiastical communist believed that traditional religion, as epitomized in the Catholic Church, is positively debilitating to mankind, thwarting his progress, and they believed that man himself is God. Feuerbach wrote:

"It is the essence of man that is the supreme being ... If the divinity of nature is the basis of all religions, including Christianity, the divinity of man is its final aim ... The turning point in history will be the moment when man becomes aware that the only god of man is man himself." (pgs. 31-33)

Phillip, Christianity, according to these community-crazed deifiers of humanity, must be dismantled and replaced with a compulsive, universal "religion" of man, so that man can reach his full potential, that is, so he can develop his ego to the point of thinking himself a god, with the prerogatives and attributes of God, including decisions over the life and death of himself and his fellowman and over the very course of mankind's future. Those elite men who "understood" this great mission would naturally have to take control of the destiny of the world by infiltrating the governments of the Church and the State, and slowly turn the rudder 180 degrees without alarming the passengers. With preternatural skill, energy, fortune, and speed these possessed Masonic "Masters" came to the brink of accomplishing this by the year 2000 AD. Much of mankind by then had come to doubt the objective reality of God. Whether they gave God "lip service" or not, their active allegiance was to Mankind.

Feuerbach put it this way: "...let it be remembered that atheism ... is the secret of religion itself; that religion itself, not indeed on the surface, but fundamentally, not in intention or according to its own supposition, but in its heart, in its essence, believes in nothing else than the truth and divinity of human nature."

In perfecting atheism, one is perfected in diabolical possession, just as in perfecting the worship of God, one becomes more perfectly possessed of His Holy Spirit.

The conspiratorial Frauds of the Centuries found a bridge between Christianity and Antichristianity in people like Feuerbach, Nietzsche, Marx, Comte, Camus, Sartre, Heidegger, Bonhoeffer, Bullmann, Tillich, Cox, and others. Though the last four of these held positions as Christian ministers, they so changed the nature of God, His Revelation and His Sacraments so as to create a non-god. Yes, these modernists, these reinterpreters were atheists, cutting into the hearts of believing Christians with the scalpel of humanistic pride.

"So how did the atheists implement their ideas in society, Father?"

The Communist Revolution in 1917 and the subsequent buildup of Russia as an atheistic slave-state importing revolution to every corner of the globe was the work of the

conspirators' secret governments in the USA, Britain, Germany and elsewhere. All was financed by Zionist bankers milking U.S. taxpayers, through unconstitutional legislation and traitorous agents in our government. Yes, we financed Communist Russia and all its revolutions throughout the world from the very beginning.

"That is incredible, Father!"

Never before had one nation been so possessed by the agents of Satan as Russia.

"How and why did it happen in Russia, Father? Russia was almost wholly Catholic!"

And this made it a prime target of the Revolutionists. But also, the last five Czars were assassinated by them because they had thwarted the work of the Internationalist conspirators in various parts of the world and needed to be stopped. Russia was also ready, after many years of negotiations, to reconcile the Russian Orthodox Church with the Roman Catholic Church. This truly alarmed the Satanists at the head and heart of the Internationalist Communist Conspiracy. Czar Nicholas II had the final document in hand when they struck. The timing was not coincidental. They brutally murdered the Czar and his beautiful, courageous Catholic family, as they took possession of the government.

The power of this Revolution came from the so-called Jews, the ancient Kazars who traced their ancestry back to Gog and Magog, whose ancestral land had been southern Russia. And this is where many of these people had been sent after being evicted from all Europe because of their usury and unpatriotic, anti-national character and covert dealings. A nation within nations, they were considered a blight; so, back to their ancestral homeland they were sent. There they were confined by the Czars until Catherine the Great released them. She was an agent of the Zionists, who corresponded with Voltaire and ruled by advanced western ideals. Catherine, a Prussian princess and at least secretly a Protestant, was sent in to marry and murder the Czar. She was another Ann Boleyn. She orchestrated the ruin of Russia, while giving the moral example of a great harlot. The Jews soon became educated and took control of all the professional classes of society. After they murdered five Czars, Russia was theirs to rule, although they always sought to hide their evil influence by secrecy, using "gentile" puppets, like Lenin and Stalin.

Well publicized contributions in philanthropy, science or art hid the deeds of the elitist Zionist Yids of Europe. These were efficiently organized and led by an invisible, yet powerful hierarchy, both secular and ecclesiastical, for there is and always has been, Phillip, a church of Satan, with pope and bishops, celebrating black masses, where ritual murder or other hideous desecrations take place. In the 20th century these Zionists clamored for an "ancestral homeland" among the nations in Palestine.

"What is amazing to me, Father, is how far from the truth this claim was, and yet it succeeded. They weren't even Semetic people. And they knew that. So how could their ancestral homeland be Palestine, the home of the Israelites who were Semetic?"

By controlling the political machine, the policy-making positions of governments and by controlling the press they pulled off this gigantic farce. Government is supposed to have a mandate from the people to do what it does. If the press reports something without question as fact, does it not *appear* to have found consent with the people even when their suspicions or disagreement had never been fully heard and fairly represented.

"So the Zionists played the role of liberals or capitalists, while their brother Communists played the role of militant socialists trying to save the world from the greedy depredations of capitalists."

Very well put, Phillip. Together they practiced extortion on the Commonwealth of Nations. The conspirators, as you noted, provided for both sides of the conflict. This "dialectic" creates and fuels two opposing forces. In mopping up their own mess, a new synthesis comes about which *apparently* resolves the conflict, but which actually proposes a compromise more evil than the other two combined.

The two opposing forces in the 19th century were called "liberalism" or "capitalism" and "socialism" or communism. Both were materialistic, immoral, and anti-religious.

"Some choice."

If one can control the definition of the issues, Phillip, he also controls the course and outcome of the argument and its resolution. By proposing that the world was characterized by the division of all people into socialists or capitalists, the real divisions of good and evil, Christian and anti-Christian, were made irrelevant and unimportant. The reality was that the enemy of mankind had created rapacious capitalism to oppress the working class in order to give excuse for the solutions of communism, tyranny or democratic socialism as a cure for the proletariat's plight. But the educated working man wanted neither evil system.

In The Papal Critique of Capitalism and Socialism by John J. Mulloy we read:

"In speaking of the Papal critique of capitalism, we must remember that the 19th century growth of capitalism was closely linked with the philosophy of Liberalism, which provided the rationale for the capitalist enterprise. Consequently, when people speak of the Catholic Church in the 19th century as not being concerned with the evils of capitalism, and praise Karl Marx for his concern for the proletariat, they ignore a most important element which Marx shared with capitalism. That is the rejection of the supernatural element in human life and in society. It is because of this rejection that the disciples of Marx have created the slave states and the evil empires which Marxist fellow travelers do so much to gloss over and to pretend that it is but the growing pains in the creation of an ideal society.

The reason it is important to see that the philosophy of Liberalism was linked with capitalism is that it brings into focus the fact that the Catholic Church, from the time of the French Revolution onwards, was locked in a struggle against the materialist and man-centered elements in Liberalism. It is true that there were certain elements in the Liberal philosophy which favored human rights and thus had an appeal to the Christian conscience. But those elements were detached from the Christian beliefs and values in which they had been rooted. Moreover, they often set up against the common good the idea that State authority had no responsibility to protect that good against powerful individuals in the community. Liberalism taught that, by

allowing each individual to pursue his own self-interest without concern for society, the result would be for the benefit of all. There was an Invisible Hand which brought about this happy result. To a considerable degree, our libertarian conservatives today hold to this conception of society and thus resist all attempts at social regulation of the activities of the entrepreneur.

What the Catholic has to do today is to recognize the need for society and government to exercise authority for the common good and against exploitation, while not being caught in the trap of Marxist analysis of social ills and the remedies which Marxism offers. It should now be apparent to all that Marxist remedies are worse than the disease. But this cannot be recognized by those who believe this present world to be the ultimate goal and end of human life.

... Speaking of the Socialist system and its invasion of the family and removal of private property, Pope Leo XIII says: *"If incentives to ingenuity and skill in individual persons were to be abolished, the very foundations of wealth would necessarily dry up; and the equality conjured by the Socialist imagination would, in reality, be nothing but uniform wretchedness and meanness for one and all."*

Resisting the jaws of the godless capitalists and socialists, stood the Church, Phillip.

Leo XIII criticized the capitalism of this time: *"... It gradually came about that the present age handed over the workers, each alone and defenseless, to the inhumanity of employers and the unbridled greed of competitors. A devouring usury, although often condemned by the Church, but practiced nevertheless under another form by avaricious and grasping men, has increased the evil; and, in addition, the whole process of production as well as trade in every kind of goods has been brought almost entirely under the power of a few, so that a very few rich and exceedingly rich men have laid a yoke almost of slavery on the unnumbered masses of non-owning workers. ... The rich and employers should remember that no laws, either human or divine, permit them for their own profit to oppress the needy and the wretched or to seek gain from another's want. To defraud anyone of the wage due him is a great crime that calls down avenging wrath from heaven. .. It is incontestable that the wealth of nations originates from no other source than the labor of workers."* (Christian Culture and World Civilization)

Pius XI also saw that the Capitalists came to virtually possess the all-powerful State, which Brother Socialism then demanded from them in order to supposedly stamp out the evils of capitalism. What happened, Phillip, was that the western capitalists readily turned over the state to socialism, but in an inch by inch manner, protesting all the way to make it look like they were putting up a good fight for us consumers.

Pius XI said: "It is patent that in our own days not wealth alone is accumulated, but immense power and despotic economic domination are concentrated in the hands of a few, who for the most part are not the owners, but only the trustees and directors of invested funds, which they administer at their own good pleasure.

This domination is most powerfully exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, also govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life blood to the entire economic body,

and grasping in their hands, as it were, the very soul of production, so that no one can breathe against their will.

This accumulation of power, the characteristic note of the modern

economic order, is a natural result of limitless free competition, which permits the survival of those only who are the strongest, and this often means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience."

Paul VI summarizes the case against both Marxism and Liberalism in these terms: "He (i.e., the Christian) cannot adhere to The Marxist ideology, to its atheistic materialism, to its dialectic of violence and to the way it absorbs individual freedom in the collectivity, at the same time denying all transcendence to man and his personal and and collective history; nor can he adhere to the liberal ideology which believes it exalts individual freedom by withdrawing it from every limitation, by stimulating it through exclusive seeking of interest and power..." The appeal to a Utopia is often a convenient excuse for those who wish to escape from concrete tasks in order to take refuge in an imaginary world. To live in a hypothetical future is a facile alibi for rejecting immediate responsibilities.

After ruining the economies of their host nations with economic liberalism and money manipulations, the enemy proposed social reconstruction through the beneficent (Socialist) State, which they would control. The reality was put in perspective by Christopher Dawson, Religion and the Modern State, 1935:

"All those ideals which we regard as typically Western – the supremacy of law, the recognition of the moral rights of the individual and the duty of society toward the poor and the oppressed – are not the invention of modern democracy. They are ultimately products of the Christian tradition and find their only true justification in Christian principles ... (Such) principles were clearly laid down fifty years ago in the great social encyclicals of Leo XIII. They are not the private opinions of a modern political theorist. They are the opinions which St. Thomas drew from the ancient wisdom of the **philosophia perennis**. Indeed, they are as old as human civilization itself. The greatest minds of the human race have always recognized that the social order does not exist merely to serve man's needs and desires. It is a **sacred** order by which human action is conformed to the divine and eternal law."

"It is in the rejection of that conception of social life that the errors of both Communism and Liberalism are rooted." (John Mollow)

"So, how would we define in summary the basic elements of the antichristian spirit, Father?"

Let me read Belloc again in answer to you, Son.

"These things being so, let us examine the Modern Attack -- the anti-Christian advance -- and distinguish its special nature.

We find, to begin with, that it is at once materialist and superstitious. There is here a contradiction in reason, but the modern phase, the

anti-Christian advance, has abandoned reason. It is concerned with the destruction of the Catholic Church and the civilization proceeding therefrom. It is not troubled by apparent contradictions within its own body so long as the general alliance is one for the ending of all that by which we have hitherto lived. The modern attack is materialist because in its philosophy it considers only material causes. It is superstitious only as a byproduct of this state of mind. It nourishes on its surface the silly vagaries of spiritualism, the vulgar nonsense of "Christian Science,"

109

and Heaven knows how many other fantasies. But these follies are bred, not from a hunger for religion, but from the same root as that which has made the world materialist -- from an inability to understand the prime truth that *faith is at the root of knowledge*; from thinking that no truth is appreciable save through direct experience.

Thus the spiritualist boasts of his demonstrable manifestations, and his various rivals of their direct clear proofs; but all are agreed that Revelation is to be denied. ...

...But that great Modern Attack (which is more than a heresy) is indifferent to self-contradiction. It merely affirms. It advances like an animal, counting on strength alone. Indeed, it may be remarked in passing that this may well be the cause of its final defeat; for hitherto reason has always overcome its opponents; and man is the master of the beast through reason.

Anyhow, there you have the Modern Attack in its main character, materialist, and atheist; and, being atheist, it is necessarily indifferent to truth. For God is Truth."

"So, Father, it is irrational, materialistic and atheistic."

Yes, and when the natural ability of reason to know God is denied, then material things are worshipped in God's place as the only source of reality and value.

"Do you think the modern world so magnificent and proficient in material accomplishments because the focus and faith of mankind has been taken away from God and has nothing else to focus upon but material things?"

Yes, I do. The human soul has a great capacity for creative reasoning and when the natural end and goal of that power, God, is cast aside, this energy and genius will be expended on worldly projects.

Before we retire I will say the task of every age, Phillip, is "getting the story straight", that is, the historical analysis that unravels the tapestry of deceit by which the enemy hides the truth and their basic work, namely, the eternal and temporal destruction of mankind. It is a depressing, miserable business, Son, to wade through this muck, but a fitting punishment and necessary alert for sinful mankind. For this life must be a continual warfare. Our peace, our utopia is in Heaven. All promises to the contrary are signed by "Lucifer". When the enemy pretended to crush Religion by explaining away God, they put forth a promise of material bliss as a consolation prize for the loss of Heaven. This lie is the "cheese" in their mousetrap. Tomorrow we will summarize the last century before the end came.

"You look so very tired, Father ... and very old too. I will prepare some food for us and draw the water. Rest, Father."

Hand me the Bible, Son. I will lay my head upon it for a pillow; for it is a physical consolation to me.

[{TABLE OF CONTENTS}](#)

[{PREFACE}](#)

[{CHAPTER I}](#) [{CHAPTER II}](#) [{CHAPTER III}](#) [{CHAPTER IV}](#) [{CHAPTER V}](#) [{CHAPTER VI}](#)

[{CHAPTER VII}](#) [{CHAPTER VIII}](#) [{CHAPTER IX}](#) [{CHAPTER X}](#) [{CHAPTER XI}](#)

[{Bibliography}](#)

[{Bookstore}](#) [{Order Form}](#) [{Instructions}](#) [{Notice of Permissions}](#) [{Download}](#)

[{Links}](#)

[{FRAMES VERSION}](#)

(Requires a frames-enabled browser)

Website contents © 1999 - 2000 [Web Designs by Doc](#). Literary content ©1999 - 2000, Dave Pedry. All rights reserved.