

The Jesuit Roman Pope Francis I



by Shaun Willcock, an independent Baptist pastor in South Africa. [His bio.](#)

On 13 March 2013 a Roman Catholic cardinal from Argentina, Jorge Mario Bergoglio, was elected by his fellow-cardinals as the new pope of Rome, the official head of the most powerful religio- political institution on earth.



He took the name of Francis I.

His election was full of deep significance, and almost immediately began to have far-reaching, indeed global, ramifications. There was so much behind the choice of this man. But first and foremost is this fact: Jorge Bergoglio, Francis I, is a *member of the Roman Catholic Jesuit Order*! He is in fact the first openly acknowledged Jesuit to ever become pope of Rome! And nothing, nothing whatsoever, about the choice of this man is more significant than this.

After his election I wrote an article entitled *A Jesuit Becomes the Pope of Rome*.¹ Now, more than a year later, it is time to further analyse the man and the phenomenal success he is having on the global stage as pope of Rome.

I have used that previous article as the basis for writing the present one; but I have added a large amount of new material as well.

Jorge Mario Bergoglio, Francis I: a Brief Background

Let us take a look at this man, the first openly Jesuit pope of Rome, the first pontiff from the Americas, the first from the southern hemisphere, and the first from outside Europe in over 1200 years: He was born in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in 1936. In 1958 he joined the Jesuit Order, the most powerful, sinister, hated and feared of all Roman Catholic religious orders, and was ordained as a Jesuit priest in 1969. This means that he passed through the rigorous, arduous discipline which trainee Jesuits undergo. This training is founded on the Jesuits' manual, the *Spiritual Exercises* of Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuits in the sixteenth century and its first general. These Exercises were created by Loyola with the aim of producing a unique kind of priest, utterly devoted to the Jesuit general. They are carried out over many days, and involve much use of the imagination, meditations, mysticism, etc. The Jesuit is broken down and then re-moulded in the image his superiors desire, a mere instrument in their hands.

Bergoglio spent much time in his early years as a priest studying literature, psychology and philosophy – studies in which the Jesuits have always been prominent. He became a professor of theology and earned a reputation as a Jesuit intellectual. He rose to become in time the leader of Argentina's Jesuits, and the Romish archbishop of Buenos Aires in 1998. He was made a cardinal in 2001, by the Roman pope John Paul II.

According to his official biographer, Sergio Rubin, whose book about Bergoglio is entitled, simply, *The Jesuit*, he is compassionate, simple and humble. Of course, an official biographer does not expose the warts too readily, if at all, but this is the impression his fellow-cardinals want to give the world about him, particularly now that he is pope of Rome. Rubin said in an interview after the election: "It's a very curious thing: when bishops meet, he always wants to sit in the back rows. This sense of humility is very well seen in Rome."² No matter what he was before, no man who accepts the exalted position of Roman pontiff is truly humble; and to say that the cardinals appreciate humility is preposterous, for in truth they revel in their power and their positions as "princes of the Church"; and what the Lord Jesus Christ said of the Pharisees is fulfilled just as much in them: "But all their works they do for to be seen of men: they... love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi" (Matt. 23:5-7).

As an archbishop, Bergoglio chose not to live in an ornate palace in Buenos Aires, but rather in a simple room heated by a small stove, where he apparently cooked his own meals and travelled by bus in the city instead of using a chauffeured limousine. All this of course is held up to the world as evidence of his humility, that he is a man of the people, but again: he was willing to accept the position of pope of Rome, which includes such arrogant papal titles as "Prince of the Apostles", "Vicar of Christ", "Supreme Pontiff", "Holy Father", etc. In accepting the position, he claimed to be the one who takes the place of the Son of God on earth! This is the meaning of the title, "Vicar of Christ". Hardly an act of humility, but rather one of supreme blasphemy and arrogance; the very arrogance of Antichrist (2 Thess.

2:4).

Not surprisingly, a fellow-Jesuit and the director of the Vatican's press office, priest Federico Lombardi, also praised Bergoglio's supposed humility, pointing out that when he came onto the balcony to greet the tens of thousands of well-wishers in St Peter's Square after his election, he bowed to them and asked them to pray for him. Lombardi also said that the Jesuit Order is one "known for serving", and therefore the new pope would be one who "wants to serve".³ Oh yes, much was made of his "humility", and much has continued to be made of it! Even his choice of the name "Francis" was pointed to as a sign of this humility. But it was simply a very clever public relations move, and it paid dividends.

The Roman Catholic "saint", Francis of Assisi (1181-1226), is held up by Roman Catholics as a model of humility, simplicity of lifestyle, poverty, etc., and doubtless Bergoglio wanted to send the signal that he would emulate Francis; indeed, that he had been emulating him already. In addition, however, the original Francis believed that God told him to "repair my Church"; and at a time of massive upheaval, confusion and disillusionment within the Roman Catholic institution worldwide, chiefly (but not only) because of the global priestly sex abuse scandals, this new pope was doubtless wanting to send the world the message that he, like Francis before him, would "repair the Church" again.

But there was still more to this choice of name. Another famous, or rather infamous, Roman Catholic "saint" of that name was the Jesuit "saint", Francis Xavier (1506-1552), a contemporary of the Jesuit founder Ignatius de Loyola and a man who went to India to "evangelise" for Rome. Xavier was the first Jesuit missionary. Bergoglio, as a Jesuit and a man with a great desire for Roman Catholic evangelisation in the world, would have had this Francis in mind, too, when he chose his name.⁴

The Jesuit "White Pope" Serving the Jesuit "Black Pope"



The Jesuit General, Adolfo Nicolás

For centuries, the Jesuits have exercised phenomenal influence over the Roman Catholic institution. They are the real power behind the papal throne. This is a fact so certain that the Jesuit general, the man in charge of the Order worldwide, is known within Papist circles as “the black pope.” Not because he is a black man, for he is not, but because he is the shadow behind the pope of Rome; the real power behind the scenes. At the time of Bergoglio’s appointment as pope, the Jesuit general was Adolfo Nicolás, and I have written about him before.⁵

To quote from my book, *The Jesuits: the Secret Army of the Papacy*: “ever since its founding, the Society [the Society of Jesus, as the Jesuits call their Order] has been totally dedicated, first and foremost, not to the pope, but to the Jesuit General. The Jesuits are a law unto themselves. While outwardly acknowledging the authority of the pope of Rome, their real allegiance is to the Jesuit General. All orders come from the General; even the pope’s instructions are only passed on if the General sees fit. It is not surprising that the Jesuit General came to be known as the ‘black pope’.”⁶

The Jesuits have always operated behind the scenes, secretly, furtively, pulling the strings of power where few could see them. Theirs has always been the world of cloak-and-dagger. This has suited their purposes. That they saw fit, in 2013, to boldly come out and appoint one of their own, openly, as the pope of Rome, indicates that they believed the times called for such an appointment. They believed none but a Jesuit could lead the Roman Catholic institution through the troubled waters ahead. For indeed these are times of great trouble for Rome.

And thus, with the election of Bergoglio as the new pope, the Vatican had two Jesuits in the two highest positions of authority within the Roman Catholic institution! The first was the “black pope”, the Jesuit general, Adolfo Nicolás, the puppet-master who (as the Jesuits have done for centuries) pulls the strings of the entire institution behind the scenes; and the second was Jorge Bergoglio, elected as Francis I, the pope of Rome; on the surface the leader of the world’s 1.2 billion Roman Catholics, and yet a man who swore to obey the Jesuit general – his general, his superior – in everything! Again from my book: “Obedience is absolutely vital to the Jesuit Order. Every Jesuit must be in total obedience to his superior, obeying him without question. In the Constitutions of the Order, it is repeated some 500 times that the Jesuit must see in the General, not a fallible man, but Christ Himself! This was said by a professor of Roman Catholic theology.⁷ In the words of Ignatius [the founder of the Jesuits]: ‘We must see black as white, if the Church says so.’ The Jesuit probationer is required by the Constitutions to be as a corpse, able to be moved in any direction (Part IV, Chapter 1); striving to acquire perfect resignation and denial of his own will and judgment (Part III, Chapter 1).⁸ According to the Constitutions (Part IV, Chapter 5), the Jesuit may even sin, if the superior commands it – for sin will not be sin in such a case!⁹ In the ‘Society of Jesus’, there is a greater authority than the pope, and a greater authority (as far as the Jesuits are concerned) than God Himself – and that is the General. For what God has declared to be sin, the General can declare to be no sin.”¹⁰

Francis I, as a committed, loyal, and hardcore Jesuit intellectual, is a man utterly familiar with the Constitutions of the Order, and with the *Spiritual Exercises* of Loyola. Let us delve into these a bit more deeply. Ex-Roman Catholic priest Richard Bennett explains:

"The goal of Eastern meditation is to unite oneself directly with God. In the 12th and 13th centuries in Europe, there arose a great interest in Eastern Mysticism. The Papacy had never embraced the true Gospel and thus was easily able to assimilate to itself the pagan practices it encountered within the borders of the Holy Roman Empire. Without true spirituality based on the Gospel and the Bible, the Papal Church became the perfect place for an Eastern Alexandrian Egyptian mysticism to flourish.... Then in [the] 16th century Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises* was typical of the mystical movement in Roman Catholicism. However its genius was that it is an attempt, mainly through the imagination, to directly connect the thoughts and actions of an individual with what was called the grace of God. Thus Loyola was a propagator of mysticism by which a person was purportedly to achieve direct personal union with the divine.... The emphasis in the *Spiritual Exercises* is ever on one's imagination. Imagine you can see the particular and gory details of hell; imagine you can smell the sulfur; on and on it goes stoking the heated imagination without mercy, without truth.... Jesuit spirituality and ethics are a very effective combination of mystical techniques and authoritarian propositions. The writing and teaching style of Jesuitism is heavily nuanced with techniques of suggestive dissociation. Disciples are lured ever so subtly into embracing new views of reality and ethical norms apart from critical reflection on either the intellectual or logical integrity of the insinuated dogmatic propositions. The smooth flow of suggestion and casuistic reasoning in Jesuit teaching material hinders mental resistance and diverts learners from appreciating that they are visualizing and emoting rather than thinking. It is a methodical technique of disarmament by dissociation that leads inevitably to surrender of the mind and will."¹¹

This is precisely the state which every Jesuit has to reach: *surrender of the mind and will*. Again from my book:¹² "The *Spiritual Exercises* work on the imagination of the candidate, helped by a 'director'. Various biblical scenes are 'relived' in front of him, beautiful ones alternating with frightening ones. His sighs, inhalings, breathing, and periods of silence are all noted down. After a number of weeks of this, *he is ready for indoctrination*."¹³ His mind and will are brought to the point of surrender to his superior.

This is the atmosphere in which Francis I has spent his adulthood. He is a Jesuit through and through. He is absolutely familiar with the *Spiritual Exercises*. He believes in them; he follows them. And consequently he is an utterly obedient servant of the Jesuit general, having surrendered his mind and will to him long ago.

Thus Francis I, although pope of Rome, is not the highest authority within the Papal system. He answers to the Jesuit general, the "black pope", and in his hands he has to be as a corpse, having no will of his own!

What an extraordinary situation! A Roman pontiff, supposedly at the pinnacle of power within the Papal institution, and yet, as a Jesuit, actually under

someone else – his general! A Roman pontiff, believed by Papists to be the Vicar of Christ, “Christ Himself under the veil of the flesh”, and believed to be infallible when he pronounces ex cathedra on matters of faith and morals – and yet a Jesuit under his general! A man who sees in his general, not a fallible man, but Christ Himself! Even though all popes for centuries have had to obey the Jesuit general and lived in fear of him, never before has a Jesuit been openly elevated to this position; a man who has taken a vow to obey his general above all others, and at all times!

Be sure that Bergoglio, as a faithful Jesuit under orders, a man sworn to obey his general with absolute blind obedience, only accepted the position of pope after his general gave him permission! Proof is found for this, not only in the open rules of the Jesuit Order, but also in *The Secret Instructions of the Jesuits*, which for centuries has been the top-secret instruction manual for the Order – so secret, in fact, that its very existence is unknown even to many Jesuits themselves, who are deliberately kept in the dark about it, while others are made privy to its diabolical rules and regulations. The following is taken from a translation of *The Secret Instructions* from the original Latin, Chapter 14, paragraph 8: “If any of our Order has certain expectations of a bishopric, or other ecclesiastical preferment, let him, besides the usual vows of the Society, be obliged to make another; namely, That he will always entertain a favourable opinion, and on all occasions speak honourably of us; that he will never confess, but to one of our members, nor determine, in any affair of moment, without first consulting the judgment of the Society” (*italics added*).¹⁴

Jorge Bergoglio most definitely had “certain expectations of” the very highest “ecclesiastical preferment” – that of the Papacy itself. According to the secret Jesuit instruction manual, therefore, he has sworn that before he determines anything in any “affair of moment”, he will first consult the judgment of the “Society of Jesus”, and will only act in accordance with the instruction the Society (via its general) gives him!

Nor is this all. In Chapter 17 of *The Secret Instructions*, paragraph 7, it is stated:

“And lastly let us [i.e. the Jesuits] aspire to abbacies and bishoprics... for it would entirely tend to the benefit of the Church, that all bishoprics, *and even the Apostolical See*, should be hooked into our hands, especially should His Holiness ever become a temporal prince over all” (*italics added*).¹⁵

Centuries ago already, the *Secret Instructions* expressed the Jesuits’ desire to take complete control over the entire Roman Catholic institution, including the “Apostolical See” itself, by seeing to it that a Jesuit would advance to the position of pope of Rome! In times past there have doubtless been other, albeit secret, Jesuits sitting on the papal throne; but Francis I is the first open Jesuit to do so.

Who then runs the Vatican where Francis I is pope? Certainly not Francis, for it is actually not Francis’ Vatican! The black pope runs the Vatican. Francis swore absolute, blind obedience to his general.

The Jesuits have always exercised power over the popes. How much more, over a *Jesuit* pope – one of their own!

Two days before his official inauguration as pope of Rome, the newly-elected Francis I received, in audience, no other than his own master: the superior general of the Jesuit Order, Adolfo Nicolás.¹⁶ The black pope visited the white pope! The man who is the true power behind the papal throne came to see his servant, Jorge Bergoglio, now risen to the position of pope in accordance with the plans of the Jesuit Order and its general! There could be no question about it: Francis I was the faithful slave of Adolfo Nicolás. He had sworn to obey him without question, many years before when he became a Jesuit priest. This oath was just as much in effect now that he had been chosen as pope as it had been all those years before.



The “black pope” and the “white pope”

And after the Jesuit general sent Bergoglio a letter of congratulations upon his election as pope of Rome (well might the general congratulate his servant!), Francis wrote a reply in which he said:

“I received with great joy the kind letter you sent me, in your name and that of the Society of Jesus, on the occasion of my election to the See of Peter, in which you assure me of your prayers for me and my apostolic ministry as well as your full disposition to continue serving – unconditionally – the

Church and the Vicar of Christ according to the teachings of St. Ignatius Loyola.”¹⁷ This was a truly Jesuitical piece of writing! For **it is not the general who will be serving the Roman pope, but the Roman pope who will be serving the general.**

Francis went on: “My heartfelt thanks for this sign of affection and closeness, which I am happy to reciprocate, asking the Lord to illuminate and accompany all Jesuits.... I ask all Jesuits to pray for me and to entrust me to the loving protection of the Virgin Mary... I give you the Apostolic Blessing with special affection, which I also extend to all those who co-operate with the Society of Jesus in her activities...” Oh, the pontiff Bergoglio is a faithful, committed Jesuit indeed. In accordance with the Secret Instructions, he “speaking honourably” of the Order.

An extraordinary situation, pregnant with ominous portents for the future. The Jesuits are now in a position of all-supreme power over the Vatican and the Roman Catholic system. They have taken total control because the crisis within Roman Catholicism demands their ruthless intervention at this level. And if Francis were ever to act in rebellion to the general, no one should be in any doubt as to what would happen to him. They would seek to *murder* him – just as they have murdered other popes before him!

The Jesuits and Papal Murders

Popes were murdered in office on many occasions, and for various reasons – usually by poisoning – prior to the sixteenth century when the Jesuit Order came into being. But once the Jesuits rose to become the dominant power within the Roman Catholic institution, they also became the predominant murderers of popes who stood in their way. As their power and sinister influence over the papal European nations grew, they became so hated and feared by Papists themselves that there were loud calls for their suppression and abolition. And at one time or another they were expelled from virtually every Papist nation in Europe. But they always returned.

Calls for the suppression of the Jesuits came from powerful Papist kings, who even threatened the pope of Rome himself if he did not act. Finally, Clement XIII, pope of Rome from 1758 to 1769, capitulated and agreed to act against them. He made a proclamation announcing the suppression of the entire Jesuit Order. But before the document was made public, Clement was suddenly seized by a mysterious illness as he was going to bed, cried out, “I am dying”, and expired in great agony, experiencing convulsions. Rumours swirled that he had been poisoned; and the document disappeared before it was made public.

He was succeeded as pope by Clement XIV. He actually took the extraordinary step of writing a papal bull abolishing the Jesuit Order in 1773 – and he even had the Jesuit general imprisoned! But he knew that in taking this step he had forfeited his life. “Clement XIV knew very well that, by signing [the Jesuits’] death warrant, he was signing his own as well: ‘This suppression is done at last’, he exclaimed, ‘and I am not sorry about it... but this suppression will kill me.’”¹⁸ As he signed it, he was heard to whisper, “I am lost.” And after issuing it he tried to withdraw it, so greatly did he fear what would happen to him; but the Spanish ambassador had already

dispatched it to Madrid, so it was too late. A few days after it was published, "posters started to appear on the palace's walls which invariably displayed these five letters: I.S.S.S.V., and everyone wondered what it meant. Clement understood immediately and boldly declared: 'It means "In Settembre, Sara Sede Vacante", (In September, the See will be vacant – that the pope will be dead).'"¹⁹ He fell into what was described as "a singular state of agonizing prostration", and died a very painful death. It was believed that he had been poisoned by the Jesuits,²⁰ and there is no reason to doubt this and every reason to believe it. His body decomposed so swiftly that his face could not be shown to the public, and his funeral was hastened and conducted without the usual rites."²¹

"Here is another testimony: 'Pope Ganganelli [Clement XIV] did not survive long after the Jesuits' suppression', said Scipion de Ricci. 'The account of his illness and death, sent to the Court of Madrid by the Minister for Spain in Rome, proved that he had been poisoned; as far as we know, no inquiry was held concerning this event by the cardinals, nor the new pontiff.'"²²

"We can positively affirm that, on the 22nd September 1774, Pope Clement XIV died of poisoning."²³

But let it not be assumed for one moment that such murders are a thing of the past! Let us come to very modern times. There is every reason to believe that Pius XI was murdered in office. And there is solid evidence that John Paul I was murdered in 1978.²⁴ Were the Jesuits involved? They were certainly not the only ones who had reasons to want modern popes dead, but there is every reason to believe they played an important role as well.²⁵

And then there was all the intrigue around, and the attempted murder of, John Paul II (1978-2005). This Polish pope, Karol Wojtyla, was anti-Soviet Marxism, but pro-Roman Catholic Marxism; in other words, he supported a brand of Marxism controlled from the Vatican, not Moscow. He was also a pro-Washington pope. In Latin America the Jesuits were up to their dog-collared necks in promoting the radical Catholic-Communist teaching known as liberation theology. John Paul II was not against liberation theology, but his American backers – namely, the Reagan Administration – wanted him to put the brakes on the Jesuits' violent and bloodthirsty liberation theology activities in Latin America, because their huge support for Marxist revolutions on that continent was a threat to Washington's own interests and plans. So John Paul II told the Jesuits to curtail their revolutionary activities there. This the Jesuits refused to do. Pedro Arrupe, the Jesuit general at the time, met with the pope in early 1981, but no common ground could be reached because Arrupe was supportive of the old alliance between the Vatican and Moscow, whereas John Paul II supported the new alliance between the Vatican and Washington. John Paul II then took the unprecedented step of ordering the Jesuit general to "retire". This was a huge risk to take, and John Paul must have known it. Popes had tried to rein in, and even suppress, the Jesuits before, and had paid with their lives; would John Paul succeed?

Arrupe then placed the Jesuits under one of his assistants; but John Paul II imposed his own "personal" papal representative to rule the Jesuit Order!

This in effect meant the entire Jesuit Order worldwide was removed from the control of the “black pope” and placed under the personal control of the “white pope”. This had never happened before and was a huge shock to the Jesuits worldwide. One horrified Jesuit described it as “the most shattering thing that has happened to us since a pope suppressed the Order in the 18th century.”²⁶ And what was the result? Just look at the chronology:

Arrupe, the Jesuit general, first met the pope in January 1981, and again in April, but no compromise was reached. And John Paul II was shot, in an attempted assassination, *the very next month* – May 13, 1981! It is true that the Soviets were heavily implicated in this attempt on his life; but there can be no doubt whatsoever that the Jesuits had a hand in directing it. But it failed; and what happened next? Arrupe himself suffered “a sudden massive heart attack” just a few months later in August, which failed to kill him but left him partially paralysed for the rest of his life.

Beyond all doubt this induced heart attack was meant to have killed him, and was the work of allies of John Paul II. As Vatican historian Avro Manhattan wrote: “It is obvious that all these ‘strokes’ and ‘massive heart attacks’ within a very exclusive influential circle were anything but accidental.”²⁷

A deadly game was afoot between the pope and the Jesuits. The Jesuits (via contacts within the Soviet sphere) tried to murder the pope, and the pope (via his allies, possibly within the CIA) tried to murder the Jesuit general.

So let there be no doubt in anyone’s mind of Francis I’s position. He is a faithful Jesuit under orders to his general. He serves his general with blind obedience. But if at any time he tries to go his own way, he will be severely dealt with in any way his general sees fit. And murder would not be excluded.

But thus far Francis has shown every sign of servile obedience to the Order to which he has devoted his life.

With the election of Bergoglio to the papal office, the Jesuits came into total control of the Vatican, and of the Roman Catholic institution worldwide. These are extraordinary times indeed.

Why This Man was Chosen

The question that cries out for an answer is: Why this man? Why, at this time, was an Argentinian Jesuit cardinal chosen to be the next pope of Rome? It caught many by surprise. His name was not usually mentioned among those considered to be the front-runners for the position, so that in many ways he seemed to come from nowhere. But within the conclave itself he was well known, for in 2005 he reportedly finished second in the election that saw Joseph Ratzinger become Benedict XVI. And from Rome’s perspective there were very good reasons for choosing him. Let us look at six of these:

1. He is a Jesuit!



Francis I is the first openly Jesuit pope. When he was elected his new coat-of-arms, each symbol having a meaning, was revealed to the world. Prominent is a blue shield; and in this shield is the emblem of the "Society of Jesus", most hated and feared of all Roman Catholic religious orders: a radiant, blazing sun containing the letters, IHS, in red, which they tell the world is the monogram of Christ. And thus does the emblem of the Jesuits now sit proudly within the coat-of-arms of the Roman pontiff!

Clearly the Jesuits felt the time was ripe to openly raise one of their own men to the papal throne. And knowing how they operate – knowing that this must have been planned long beforehand – were they, then, behind his predecessor Benedict XVI's sudden resignation? Oh, we can be sure of it! It is beyond question. Benedict's resignation had nothing to do with his supposed shock and sadness about a so-called "gay lobby" within the Vatican, as the media enjoyed reporting. After all, as a man who rose through the ranks, from priest to pope, Benedict was fully aware of the huge numbers of sodomites within the priesthood.²⁸ This would have come as no surprise to him and would never have forced him to resign. Yes, his age and health were part of the reason; and yes, very possibly the false "prophecy" of Malachy was another part of the reason;²⁹ but he had clashed with the Jesuits before,³⁰ and they wanted a Jesuit to replace him. When the "Vatileaks" business erupted, involving Benedict's own butler who stole his documents, beyond question on the orders of others behind the scenes, Benedict told some Germans who visited him that the butler had been giving him his medicine too; and Benedict would have in all likelihood feared for his life.³¹ And known who was behind it all. Whether Benedict was willing to depart on their orders, or whether they forced him out,³² they were involved. Deeply involved.

But why did the Jesuits feel it was so imperative to place a Jesuit on the papal throne at this time? Usually content to operate furtively in the background, why this extraordinary step of placing one of their own, openly, in power?

Above all other reasons, the general state of the Roman Catholic institution, reeling from the global priestly sex abuse scandal and various other high-profile scandals, was the main one. The fact is that, both in the religious

and civil spheres, the Papacy has been losing ground in recent times, and it is the mission of the Jesuits to reverse this state of affairs. Historically, the Jesuit Order was founded at a time when the Papacy was reeling from the damage done to its cause by the Protestant Reformation. To prevent further loss of the Papacy's temporal power, the Jesuits came into being and ruthlessly advanced the Papacy's agenda. And in today's world the Papacy is facing various threats, not this time from Protestantism, which is rushing Romeward at a phenomenal rate, but from an increasingly secular world, with even Roman Catholic Europe constantly going in directions not approved by the Papacy at all. Thus it was time, from the Jesuits' perspective, to put a man in charge who could do something about all these problems faced by Rome. And very evidently Francis is proving to be just the man for the job – *their* job, that is.

"It is a well-established fact that the Jesuits throughout their history have caused many serious disturbances by their nefarious schemes within the civil governments of many countries. Over the centuries, they have justifiably earned their reputation as troublemakers to the extent that they were denied residence in some nations for varying periods of time. Nevertheless, their objective of increasing Papal religious and civil power beyond its previous height remains unchanged. Therefore, in order to move forward the Papacy's drive for power in the current religious and civil arenas, this Jesuit Pope must efface the historic image of the Jesuit Order."³³

There is a global crisis in the Roman Catholic institution. The Jesuits have again come to the fore at this time, in accordance with their ancient mission, to *save the Papacy*.

Despite Bergoglio carefully cultivating an image of being a gentle, kind, unassuming, modest man, beneath this image there is the iron will of the Jesuit. This man is no pushover. He did not rise to be the highest-ranking Jesuit in Argentina in a time of great upheaval and violence in that country by being a softie. He knows that he is there to perform a service to the Order to which he has devoted his life. The very first sentence of his inaugural address showed that he was utterly committed to using his position as pope with firmness and power. He said: "I thank the Lord that I can celebrate this holy mass for the inauguration of my Petrine ministry." As pointed out by ex-Roman Catholic priest Richard Bennett: "Francis knew the claimed power that is embedded in the term, 'Petrine ministry.' As the official Catechism of the Catholic Church states, '...the Roman Pontiff, by reason of his office as Vicar of Christ, namely, and as pastor of the entire Church, has full, supreme and universal power over the whole Church, a power which he can always exercise unhindered.' It is highly significant that Pope Francis began his speech by thanking the Lord that he could celebrate Mass for the inauguration of what he said was 'my Petrine ministry.' His opening sentence shows where his heart is; namely, in himself, in his position, and the power entailed in such a position. It is this particular idea, i.e. that the Pope is the Apostle Peter's successor, which has been the undergirding authority for the Papacy's identity in the world since the time of Pope Gregory VII in the eleventh century. The nature, indeed, the very identity of the Office of the Papacy of the Roman Catholic Church is at stake. Thus, the

Papacy will concede nothing regarding this claim but rather use it to establish itself as the stable institution in the midst of current tumultuous times.”³⁴

2. He is Latin American

Why is this significant? For at least two reasons. The first being that South America is now the continent with the largest number of Roman Catholics in the world – over 40 % of all the earth’s Romanists live there. In Europe, Roman Catholicism is in decline, but in South America the picture is very different. And for a Papal system that wants to control the entire world; that longs to exert total control, for example, over the United States of America, a country into which huge numbers of Latin American Roman Catholics are pouring as legal and illegal immigrants, which is impacting the demographics and the entire voting process in the USA³⁵ – appointing a Latin American man as pope of Rome would give a huge impetus to these things.

And the second reason why the choice of a Latin American is so significant is because this made Francis I a pope from the Third World! It is in the Third World – Latin America, Africa and Asia – where Roman Catholicism is experiencing its greatest growth, and choosing a non-European pope, a man from one of the ever-volatile, often poverty-plagued Third World countries, will do wonders for the progress of Roman Catholicism in these parts of the world. There had been a loud clamour, from various parts of the Third World, for a pope who understood them, and wanted to uplift them; a pope of liberal/leftist “social justice” policies. Some thought the cardinals would choose Peter Turkson, the cardinal from Ghana; but rather than take such a radical step and elect a black African, they chose instead a man who, although from a Third World country, was still tied very much to Europe. For the next point about Francis I is this:

3. He is of Italian descent

Yes – although he was born in Argentina, his father was an Italian immigrant. And this made him the ideal bridge between the non-European, non-Italian Third World and the predominantly European, predominantly Italian leaders of the “Church”. It certainly made him far more acceptable to the hierarchy as pope, even though he was from a country outside of Europe. He “brings together the first world and the developing world in his own person. He’s a Latin American with Italian roots, who studied in Germany.”³⁶

In the words of South African priest, Chris Townsend, spokesman for the Southern African Catholic Bishops’ Conference, the choice of Bergoglio was a significant acknowledgment that the “Church” of Rome’s “centre of gravity has moved out of Europe.” “It is a huge move from the cardinals,” he said. “We have in this man someone known to be very simple in his lifestyle, but as a Jesuit, he’s no fool.”³⁷

4. He is known as a doctrinal conservative

He is a scholar of Roman Catholic theology who studied in Germany (home of Ratzinger/Benedict XVI). When he gave his first speech after being elected as

pontiff, he said: "Tomorrow I want to go to pray to the Madonna, that she may protect all of Rome."³⁸ He left the world in no doubt of his full commitment to the Romish goddess Mary! His first public act was to pray before an idol of this goddess. On another occasion he once said: "Mary's deep relationship with the Eucharist can guide the faithful and allow people to get closer to God. She is the 'model of the bond between the Lord and his bride, the church, between God and each man.'"³⁹

He has expressed his opposition to abortion, having called it a "death sentence" for the unborn.⁴⁰ He has also expressed opposition to "euthanasia" and to sodomite "marriage". When Argentina adopted sodomite "marriage", Bergoglio, as archbishop, said "everyone loses" and "children need to have the right to be raised and educated by a father and a mother." He labelled the "gay rights" movement as demonic in origin. This opposition put him at odds with Argentina's president, Cristina Fernandez, who compared Bergoglio's tone with "mediaeval times and the Inquisition".⁴¹

5. Yet – he is Marxist in economic and "social justice" matters!

Latin America is known for the number of its priests – particularly Jesuits – who have advocated the radical Catholic-Communist doctrine known as "liberation theology."⁴² And certainly Bergoglio is an advocate of Marxist "social justice" causes. In 2007, while still a cardinal in Argentina, he said that there is an "unjust distribution of goods" in the world – a truly Marxist expression, and one which has been used in recent years in official Vatican documents calling for radical Marxist social policies to be implemented by a world authority.⁴³ These were his words: "We live in the most unequal part of the world, which has grown the most yet reduced misery the least. The unjust distribution of goods persists, creating a situation of social sin that cries out to heaven and limits the possibilities of a fuller life for so many of our brothers."⁴⁴ This is a classic Jesuit "liberation theology" statement! It teaches there is such a thing as "social sin": sin within the structures of society, which needs to be removed and replaced by Communist structures so that wealth can be "re-distributed" from the rich to the poor.

But his official biographer, Sergio Rubin, said of him: "Is Bergoglio a progressive – a liberation theologian even? No. He's no third-world priest. Does he criticise the International Monetary Fund, and neo-liberalism? Yes. Does he spend a great deal of time in the slums? Yes."⁴⁵

If we were to heed his official biographer – never a very wise course to follow – it would appear then that Bergoglio, despite being a Jesuit from Latin America where the Jesuits have been out-and-out Marxists, did not accept Marxism unreservedly, but preferred "social justice" causes without the classic Marxist extremist political activism and violence. But is this, in fact, true? By no means. As a South American Jesuit he certainly accepts Marxist economic and "social justice" concepts, and furthermore, as a Jesuit he would have no qualms about Marxist extremist political activism, if directed to it by the Jesuit general.

Let us delve a bit more deeply into this:

When he was the leading Jesuit in Argentina, that country was ruled by a brutal military regime; but it was an anti-Communist one. And Bergoglio had close ties to the regime, causing many to believe he was anti-Communist himself – which if true would put him at odds with most of Argentina's Jesuits, who were fanatically and even violently supporting the pro-Communist revolution, readily taking up arms alongside the Marxist guerillas.

But all was not as it seemed! Never forget – when the subject is Jesuits, nothing is ever as it seems!

Two quotations, from two Roman Catholic publications: “[The 1970s and early 1980s] were the years of the military junta in Argentina, when many priests, including leading Jesuits, were gravitating towards the progressive liberation theology movement. As the Jesuit provincial, Bergoglio insisted on a more traditional reading of Ignatian spirituality, mandating that Jesuits continue to staff parishes and act as chaplains rather than moving into ‘base communities’ and political activism.”⁴⁶ And: “He is a Jesuit... and during the terrible 1970s, when the dictatorship was raging and some of his confrères were ready to embrace the rifle and apply the lessons of Marx, he energetically opposed the tendency as provincial of the Society of Jesus in Argentina.”⁴⁷

And a Roman Catholic insider said, “He appears to be opposed to liberation theology and doesn't approach ‘social justice’ from the political end.”⁴⁸

These quotations paint a picture of Argentina's top Jesuit being opposed to the direction the Jesuits under him were taking, that of supporting Marxism. This was certainly how things were made to appear. In fact, so politically “right-wing” was he perceived to be that he was accused, in his native Argentina, of failing to publicly stand up to Argentina's anti-Marxist military dictatorship when he was the leader of Argentina's Jesuits; of doing nothing when victims of the State's brutality and their relatives brought first-hand accounts of torture, death and kidnappings to Jesuit priests under him. And to this day many are convinced he was acting contrary to the Marxist Jesuits under him:



Jorge Bergoglio and Gen.
Videla

"There's a wonderful picture that dates back to the 1970s – not a particularly cheerful time in the history of Argentina – of rotund Father Jorge Maria Bergoglio walking alongside lean, dapper, mass murdering General Jorge Rafael Videla. The stroll itself is hardly proof of collusion – it merely confirms that the Catholic Church and the Argentinian military regime were, occasionally, on strolling terms. But when one pairs the image with journalist Horacio Verbitsky's devastating takedown, *El Silencio*, which is proof of collusion, we are able to understand the make of the man who now inhabits the Vatican."⁴⁹ What is *El Silencio*? It is an island in the Plate River, and there Bergoglio had a holiday home. And Bergoglio was accused of assisting the Argentinian navy to hide political prisoners there from the prying eyes of the Inter-American Human Rights Commission. "'The most shaming thing for the church,' wrote Hugh O'Shaughnessy back in January 2011, 'is that in such circumstances Bergoglio's name was allowed to go forward in the ballot to choose the successor of John Paul II. What scandal would have ensued if the first pope ever to be elected from the Jorge Bergoglio and Gen. Videla continent of America has been revealed as an accessory to murder and false imprisonment.'"⁵⁰ Yet in 2013 the cardinals did elect Bergoglio, despite being believed, in liberal and Marxist circles, to be an accessory to murder and false imprisonment. Allowing of course for the undeniable fact that left-wing activists, media, etc., are prone to lying through their teeth to implicate those of the right in any crimes they can, it certainly is beyond dispute that Bergoglio was very intertwined with the military dictatorship.

But was he, in truth, anti-Marxist, even so? No! Please read on:

His supposedly "anti-Marxist" credentials were strengthened when in 2005 a human rights lawyer in Argentina filed a complaint charging Bergoglio with complicity in the 1976 kidnapping of two of his own pro-Marxist Jesuit priests by Argentina's military regime. The two were found alive some five months later, but drugged and semi-naked. Bergoglio, not surprisingly, denied the charge. One of the two Jesuits, priest Orlando Yorio, accused Bergoglio of effectively handing them over to the Argentinian death squads by declining to tell the government that he endorsed their work. The other, Francisco Jalics, refused to discuss it after he went into seclusion in a German monastery. The charge was however rejected by some other human rights lawyers.⁵¹ Many years later, in 2010, Bergoglio told his biographer Rubin that both men were freed when he – Bergoglio – worked behind the scenes to save them. He also told Rubin that he regularly hid people on "Church" property during the dictatorship, and that he once even gave his own identity papers to a man with similar features to his, so that he could escape across the border. Yes, well, maybe, maybe not. We only have his word to go on, don't we? A Jesuit will readily lie if he has to. Rubin said that at the time, failing to challenge the dictatorship was simply pragmatic, and that Bergoglio's reluctance to tell his story was simply because he was so humble.⁵² Again, maybe. Maybe not. This sounds just like the excuses made regarding the Roman pope Pius XII's behaviour towards Jews suffering at the

hands of the Nazis: that it was simply for pragmatic reasons that Pius remained so silent in the face of the atrocities he knew the Nazis were perpetrating against Jews.⁵³ Human rights attorney Myriam Bregman said that Bergoglio's own statements proved that "Church" officials knew from early on that the dictatorship was torturing and killing its citizens, and yet they publicly endorsed it. She said, "The dictatorship could not have operated this way without this key support."⁵⁴ This is certainly true. Even though this was from a leftist herself, it still is all very reminiscent of how Roman Catholic leaders publicly endorsed Hitler and Nazism, but then later said that secretly they were fighting against it all along.

What is beyond dispute is that there is very damning documentation which certainly indicates that Bergoglio did betray those fellow-Jesuit priests to the military dictatorship.⁵⁵ His own testimony in his defence is worthless, given the Jesuit tactic of lying if it will further their own ends. So no denial out of his own mouth can be trusted. He is a faithful Jesuit, under orders. Equally worthless is the Vatican's own press office denial of the allegations against Bergoglio, issued on March 15, 2013.⁵⁶ Of course the Vatican would deny any allegations made against its new Jesuit pope!

But when one understands how the Jesuits operate, it makes perfect sense. And none of the above means that he was anti-Marxist. What we must never lose sight of here is that Bergoglio is a Jesuit! And with the Jesuits, nothing is ever as it seems. Nothing. Remember the words of their founder, Ignatius de Loyola: "We must see black as white, if the Church says so." And in their writings the Jesuits have repeatedly justified the telling of lies if to do so would be advantageous to the Society.⁵⁷ Bergoglio is a Jesuit, and he is a Latin American Jesuit, who rose through the ranks of the Order in the volatile period when Latin American Jesuits were under orders from the Jesuit general to actively support the Marxist revolutionaries in Latin America. But the fact is that Jesuits are always deliberately positioned on both sides of any conflict, so that no matter who wins, they win. They were definitely in favour of Marxist revolutionaries coming to power in the 1970s and early 1980s; but just in case things did not work out as they planned, they also had Jesuits on the other side of the conflict – the side of the anti-Marxist governments against whom the Marxists were fighting!

Bergoglio would have been ordered, as a faithful Jesuit under orders from his general in Rome, a man with no will of his own, a man as a corpse in his general's hands, to support the military dictatorship of Argentina, while other Jesuits (under his command, for he was their leader) supported the Marxist revolutionaries. Jesuits will call one another names, accuse one another of crimes, etc. – and yet all the time be working in unison, although from opposite sides!

Thus the truth about Jorge Bergoglio as a Jesuit in Argentina is hidden behind a dense fog of the Jesuits' own making.

According to the National Catholic Reporter, when he was almost elected back in 2005, "He appealed to conservatives in the College of Cardinals as a man who had held the line against liberalizing currents among the Jesuits, and to moderates as a symbol of the church's commitment to the developing world."⁵⁸

He was therefore seen as the ideal compromise between two extremes: pleasing both conservatives and liberals, yet pleasing neither group completely.

And there is yet another reason why this man was chosen to be pope of Rome at this time in history:

6. He is perceived as being a Pro-Washington Pope.

This may come as a surprise, and would be vociferously denied by many; and therefore it needs to be carefully explained, so that the reader grasps in what sense Francis is pro-Washington, considering that by "Washington" is meant the Washington of Barack Obama. And to provide necessary background information, it is valuable and very instructive to look at recent history and the involvement of the world powers in the elections of popes.

The man in the street understands very little, in fact in most cases nothing at all, about the political intrigues behind the scenes at the election of every new pope of Rome. What is claimed to be a secret ballot, carried out by cardinals behind closed doors and beyond the reach of the outside world, is a fallacy. The fact is that the election of a new pope attracts the attention of very powerful governments. The reason? They well know that the man who is elected can literally sway the balance of power in their own countries. For no man on earth has such power as the pope of Rome (of course, as directed by the "black pope"). No man on earth controls the destinies of so many hundreds of millions of people, and entire nations.

In every papal election of modern times, various governments have had their operatives at work behind the scenes, seeking to influence the voting; and in particular, the United States and the old Soviet Union, and today Russia.

After World War Two, during which an alliance had existed between the pope, Pius XII, and Nazi Germany, a new pope – John XXIII – was elected in 1958. This man was a pro-Moscow pope. After him came Paul VI, another pro-Moscow pope. This was unacceptable to certain cardinals of the "Church", as well as being unacceptable to Washington; it had to change. "Cardinals in Rome and elsewhere, having formulated a policy of opposition to Paul VI, jointly with high prelates in key positions in Europe and the Americas, had formed a kind of secretive but effective alliance with the most influential intelligence agencies of the U.S. Amongst these were the Directorate of the CIA, the Central Security Agency, the special strategic wing of the Pentagon, and other policy formulators of the American Administration. The Curia-CIA Coalition had come into existence with the precise objective of neutralising the pro-communist policies of Paul VI commonly known as the Vatican- Moscow alliance." And so the Curia-CIA coalition began working "for the election of a pope who was willing to destroy the Vatican-Moscow alliance."⁵⁹ In order to accomplish this, the Vatican-CIA alliance began to promote a version of Communism not controlled from Moscow, but from the Vatican itself: a type of American-backed Catholic-Communism, particularly (at least initially) in the Third World countries of Latin America and Africa.

And so it was that when the cardinals gathered in 1978 to elect a new pope after Paul VI's death, the CIA hoped it would be a pro-American man. However,

they were outsmarted by the pro-Russian cardinals in the conclave, who worked with the KGB to get a “non-political” pope elected: John Paul I. The Curia-CIA coalition then decided upon the deliberate “accelerated demise” of the pope, and to so manipulate the election of his successor that there would be no mistakes this time, and a pro-American pope would be elected. Accordingly, within 33 days the new pope was found dead. And the evidence that he was murdered is overwhelming.⁶⁰

“After John Paul I’s death, the Conclave reconvened to elect a new pope, the second within two months. This time, however, unlike before, the name of the papal candidate was already on the lips of some of the leading members of the Curia-CIA Coalition: Karol Wojtyla of Krakow, Poland”. The rigged election obtained the Papacy for him, and he took the name of John Paul II. “The CIA... had at last succeeded in electing their very own pope.”⁶¹ He was a Communist, but not a pro-Moscow Communist. He favoured the Vatican’s own brand of Catholic-Communism, and America supported it fully. So did various Latin American Communists, who despite their Marxism looked to Washington, not Moscow, for financial support.

Jumping ahead now, to a different time and a very different global geopolitical stage, we see the same forces playing a deadly game in the election of Jorge Bergoglio as Francis I. The world has massively changed since 1978. It is not divided so neatly between the “free world” West headed by Washington, and the Communist East headed by Moscow of the old Soviet Union. Communism has not died, but it has metamorphosed. Today, the United States of America, under Barack Obama, has a Marxist government;⁶² and as for Russia, it may not be the old USSR anymore but it is still Communist and still very powerful (deliberately deceptive media reports notwithstanding). Obama’s Washington wants a Marxist-based New World Order, a world dominated by itself, but with its own version of Marxism. To achieve this, it needs a pro-New World Order pope in the Vatican who is pro-Marxist, but who is in alliance with Washington. And in Jorge Bergoglio it has its man. But again, it must be understood in what sense Bergoglio is Washington’s man.

The Washington of Barack Obama is a very different place from the Washington of Ronald Reagan. The Obama Administration is pro-Marxist, pro-Muslim, and in some ways anti-Roman Catholic while in other ways (notably on Marxist economic matters) pro-Roman Catholic.⁶³ And we must see what Obama’s Washington stood to gain from the election of Jorge Bergoglio to the Papacy in 2013. Yes, he is a doctrinal conservative, anti-abortion, etc. This was a decided negative to the Obama Administration. But what outweighed Bergoglio’s doctrinal conservatism was his political activism, his pro-Marxist policies. He is what is called a political “progressive”, i.e. a Marxist in economic and “social justice” matters. And – because of his previous 1970s support for the pro-Washington military regime in Argentina, he is perceived as being pro-Washington today! And this is a huge positive for Washington, because although it is pro-Marxist, at this time various South American governments, although also pro-Marxist, are Moscow-leaning rather than Washington-leaning. There is a massive build-up of anti-Washington sentiment in one Latin American country after another. Washington’s influence in the entire continent is under threat. Having the support of a pope from South America,

then, is of immense significance to Washington.

When the time for the papal election came about, Washington saw in Bergoglio the best man they could back for the position. Not an ideal man, be it noted! But the best man at the time. Politics is the art of the possible. Doubtless Washington would have wished for a better man (from Washington's point of view) than Bergoglio. But in the absence of anyone better, Washington backed Bergoglio, working on the principle that a doctrinally conservative pope who was pro-Marxist yet hopefully pro- Washington was better than a doctrinally conservative pope who was also politically conservative. At least Bergoglio, as pope, would support Washington's pro-Marxist stance, even if he was not in agreement on moral issues such as abortion. This was better than nothing.

As noted previously (but it bears repeating here, with added detail), in the 1970s Argentina was ruled by a brutal military dictatorship, backed by Washington. The CIA supported the coup that brought the military to power there in 1976, as did the Illuminati branch known as the Council on Foreign Relations, or CFR, also often called America's secret government; and it was supported by the Roman Catholic "Church".⁶⁴ The objective in supporting the military coup was to curtail Soviet influence in South America. Large numbers of Jesuits were supporting the Marxist revolutions on that continent, but at the very same time other Jesuits – notably Bergoglio, the highest-ranking Jesuit in Argentina – were backing the government, as shown above. So then, when the papal election rolled around and Washington was looking for a cardinal it could support to become pope, it is not surprising that Bergoglio became the candidate:

"The election of Pope Francis I has broad geopolitical implications for the entire Latin American region. In the 1970s, Jorge Mario Bergoglio was supportive of a US sponsored military dictatorship. The Catholic hierarchy in Argentina supported the military government.... The Catholic Church in Latin America is politically influential. It also has a grip on public opinion. This is known and understood by the architects of US foreign policy. In Latin America, where a number of governments are now challenging US hegemony, one would expect – given Bergoglio's track record – that the new Pontiff Francis I as leader of the Catholic Church, will play de facto, a discrete 'undercover' political role on behalf of Washington. With Jorge Bergoglio, Pope Francis I in the Vatican (who faithfully served US interests in the heyday of General Jorge Videla) the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in Latin America can once again be effectively manipulated to undermine 'progressive' (Leftist) governments, not only in Argentina (in relation to the government of Cristina Kirschner) but throughout the entire region, including Venezuela, Ecuador and Bolivia."⁶⁵

Imagine the power of a pro-Marxist America backed by a pro-Marxist pope of Rome!

Of course, this perception that Francis is pro-Washington needs to be put within the proper perspective. As a Jesuit whose mind and will is surrendered to the Jesuit general, he carries out the general's orders. The Jesuits, unlike other priests or religious orders, are not men who act according to their own principles and political persuasions. Whereas a priest from another

religious order might be personally pro-Washington or pro-something else, a Jesuit priest is whatever his superior tells him to be, and ultimately whatever the general tells him to be. The Jesuits have long favoured Marxism because it advances their purposes. And whereas Paul VI was pro-Moscow and John Paul II was pro- Washington, a Jesuit pope will be pro- whatever the Jesuit general orders him to be.



This explains, also, Barack Obama's visit to Francis I in the Vatican. Considering Obama's track record, taking a decidedly anti-Roman Catholic stance in the US on various matters and even demanding that America's powerful Roman Catholic hierarchy bow to his will on Obamacare and various other matters, it might be natural to assume that the Obama Administration and the Roman Catholic institution are poles apart. But what one must always understand is that Rome may oppose a particular government on certain matters, and support it to the hilt on other ones, if those other ones are deemed to be of greater importance at the time. And this is how to understand the relationship between the Obama White House and Francis' Vatican. On pro-Marxist economic policies, on Roman Catholic immigration from South America into the USA, on pro-Marxist global one-world policies, Obama and Francis are far, far closer than many would imagine.

When he was a young activist in Chicago, Barack Obama worked extremely closely with the Roman Catholic institution in its Socialist "social justice" activities amongst the poor working classes. He operated from a desk in a parish in Chicago's south side. He did not become a Papist, but he was surrounded by radical Socialist/Marxist Papists during this formative period. He "fit seamlessly into a 1980s Catholic cityscape forged by the spirit of Vatican II, the influence of liberation theology and the progressivism of Cardinal Joseph L. Bernardin, the archbishop of Chicago".⁶⁶ One of his mentors at the time was Gregory Galluzzo, a former Jesuit priest and a disciple of the Marxist Saul Alinsky. Of course, with the Jesuits one can never be 100% certain that a "former" Jesuit really is a "former" Jesuit. Often he is still a Jesuit in good standing, playing a deceptive game.

In this Roman Catholic atmosphere the young Obama thrived and worked, although religiously he gravitated to the black American version of liberation theology preached by Jeremiah Wright (who became his pastor). But liberation theology, both the "Protestant" and the Jesuit versions, helped to shape Obama into who he became.

Obama won the Roman Catholic vote in 2008 – the "Church" of Rome massively supporting him.⁶⁷ But during his first term of office he alienated many Roman

Catholics with his pro-abortion stance, and fewer Roman Catholics voted for him in 2012. Relations were strained.

When the meeting between Obama and Francis was being planned, a senior Vatican official warned that the meeting would not be like the 1982 meeting between Reagan and John Paul II, which was a clear sign of the Vatican-Washington alliance against pro-Moscow Communism in Eastern Europe. "We're not in the old days of the great alliance," the official said.⁶⁸ That may be so – but both sides knew there was much to the advantage of both in the meeting. Thus, while the Vatican-Washington alliance of Francis/Obama may not be anywhere near the strength of the Vatican-Washington alliance of John Paul/Reagan, it is still an alliance. Shakier, definitely, but an alliance notwithstanding – at least for now.



Indeed, Obama profiled Francis for Time magazine's list of the 100 Most Influential People, saying: "His Holiness has moved us with his message of inclusion, especially for the poor, the marginalized and the outcast... His message of love and inclusion...distills the essence of Jesus' teachings and is a tonic for a cynical age. May we heed his humble example."⁶⁹ Oh, sure, this is just what the world needs: the pro-Marxist Obama telling us what the essence of Jesus' teaching is. But Obama loves it when Francis preaches liberation theology. This is the only "gospel" Obama understands. It is a false "gospel", a lie from the pit of hell.

Religious News Service analyst David Gibson wrote: "Political conservatives [in the US] are especially worried that Francis' frequent blasts at income inequality are playing into the hands of President Obama and the Democrats".⁷⁰ Indeed they are, and this is all immensely pleasing to Obama and to all leftists and Reds everywhere in the western world.

And, it must be noted, Bergoglio has deliberately gone out of his way to suppress too much talk, in high Papist circles, of the doctrinal issues – such as Rome's official stance against abortion and homosexuality – which so anger liberal, leftist Americans and other westerners. Although he has stated he is anti-abortion and anti-sodomite "marriage", he has deliberately sought to play these issues down when addressing those who would likely be pro-abortion. Reason? So as not to make things more difficult for his Washington buddies, with whom he is one on "social justice" if not on things like abortion. Again, he is a Jesuit, and he knows how to say the things his audience wants to hear.

Thus, "In his interviews with those in the left-wing media he seeks to impress, Francis has said that the Church needs to stop being 'obsessed' with abortion and gay marriage, and instead of seeking to convert people, 'we need to get to know each other, listen to each other and improve our knowledge of the world around us'.... he [has] insulted and severely damaged the work of [Roman Catholic] pro-life and pro-marriage groups with his comments..."⁷¹ Now why would a pope speak like this? Why would he risk alienating the doctrinally conservative Romanists with whom he apparently agrees in fact? Only one reason: he believes that it is more important to cosy up to the liberal/left on social and political issues than to support conservative Roman Catholics on such things as their opposition to abortion and sodomite "marriage". Any why is this more important? For the simple reason that placing himself at the centre of the international political arena at this time in history is far more important (for the Vatican) than supporting doctrinal causes among conservatives. He was trying not to offend his western, liberal/leftist friends. Like Barack Obama, he is a chameleon. significantly, he is a chameleon like all top Jesuits are chameleons.

Seen in the light of all the above, one can also then understand the meaning behind the meeting between Francis and Russian President Vladimir Putin in the Vatican. As we have seen above, the Jesuits always play both sides. This has been their tactic from their very beginning. This way they always win – no matter which side wins in any conflict or any stand-off. Putin, no less than Obama, wants the Roman pope's support. Hence his trip to the Vatican, where he behaved like a religious believer, making the sign of the cross, giving Francis an icon of the Virgin Mary, and even kissing it. Putin knows what he would gain from receiving the papal blessing. As for Francis, there is an international power play unfolding, a geopolitical chess game, and the pro-New World Order pope will do what he can to influence Russia.

The Roman Catholic "Church" and the KGB-controlled Russian Orthodox "Church" are seeking closer collaboration on the world stage. This is because they see the advantages of doing so to combat an increasingly secular world. It has also always remained Rome's goal to finally conquer Russia for Roman Catholicism. Any moves in that direction – such as closer collaboration between Romanism and Russian Orthodoxy, and a Russian president professing to be a "Christian" sympathetic to the Vatican – will be encouraged by the Vatican for its own conquest objectives. Francis, therefore, met with Putin because Rome desires world domination, and Russia is a major world player.



Still another reason for the meeting – and an explanation of Putin’s religious actions at the meeting – was that Putin in recent years has been deliberately positioning himself as an upholder of conservative values, shown in his public opposition to sodomy, and as a kind of protector of “Christian” minorities in the Middle East. The Vatican, therefore, sees the value of encouraging contact with such a man, because he can be useful to the Papacy in these fields. He is viewed as a very possible ally in the Vatican’s war against an increasingly secular and immoral West. Plus there is the matter of Roman Catholics in Ukraine, which Russia is warring against; and Rome-aligned “Catholics” in the Middle East, where Russia has influence. Truly, faithful and cunning Jesuit that he is, Francis keeps the door open to Russia, even while cosying up to America.

Francis I’s Pro-Marxist, One-World, “Social Justice” Position



The pro-Marxist position of the brand-new Roman pope was shown on his first official day as pope of Rome, when he met President Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe, shook his hand – and even bowed his head to him in greeting!⁷² Mugabe had been permitted to travel to the Vatican for the inauguration of Francis, defying an EU travel ban on the Marxist monster who has destroyed his country. The Vatican placed Mugabe in the VIP section at the inaugural mass. Just a slip? Not likely, when one knows that Robert Mugabe was educated by the Jesuits in Zimbabwe, and still considers himself to be a Roman Catholic! It was then surely the greeting of a Jesuit to a man who, despite all his abominable crimes, has nevertheless carried out certain Jesuit objectives in Zimbabwe.

Once he became pope, Bergoglio began to raise his voice in support of

economic and “social justice” Marxism. The evidence mounted up rapidly. Within weeks of his inauguration he criticised Capitalism and called for global financial changes along Communist lines! ⁷³ He said, “Unbridled Capitalism has taught the logic of profit at any cost, of giving in order to receive, of exploitation without looking at the person.” The results of such attitudes “we see in the crisis we are now living through.” This of course is false: the present crisis in the world is not the fault of free market policies, but of the Marxist policies so dear to so much of the world in recent decades. Addressing diplomats, Francis called for global financial reform that assists the poor, promotes the “common good”, and allows states to regulate markets. All typical Marxist phrases. His words were that economic inequality is caused by “ideologies which uphold the absolute autonomy of markets and financial speculation, and thus deny the right of control to states, which are themselves charged with providing for the common good.” Actually, this is not the duty of states at all, and any form of State regulation is deadly to the true creation of wealth, which only happens when individuals are free from State interference. “The common good” – how Communists love to prattle on about this!

When a pope of Rome is praised highly by the secretary general of the United Nations – that diabolical one-world, pro-Marxist organisation – then we can be sure of Francis’ Marxist leanings! This is precisely what happened on April 9, 2013, when UN secretary general Ban Ki-moon met the new pope in the Vatican and said afterwards that Francis was “a man of peace and purpose” whose choice of the name “Francis” (after Francis of Assisi) was a “powerful image for the many goals and purposes shared by the United Nations.”⁷⁴ Oh, this pope of Rome is a one-worlder all right.

Ban went on to say that Francis “speaks loudly of his commitment to the poor”, and that the two men “discussed the need to advance social justice and accelerate work to meet with the Millennium Development Goals. This is vital if we are to meet the Millennium promise to the world’s poorest.” Any doubts left, dear reader?

Lastly, Ban called Francis “a voice for the voiceless” and invited him to the UN.

Francis continued to return to Marxist economic themes, slamming the free market but speaking highly of Marxist doctrine. In July 2013, for example, he completed a papal encyclical begun by his predecessor, Benedict XVI, and in this Francis called for an overhaul of the financial system and warned that unequal distribution of wealth leads to violence – a very typical Marxist analysis of violence. Then, in November 2013 he again returned to such themes, attacking Capitalism and speaking in favour of Marxist policies. In a lengthy document known as an “apostolic exhortation”, he attacked unfettered Capitalism, calling it “a new tyranny”, and called on world leaders to fight poverty and growing inequality. The words he used were that they needed to “attack the structural causes of inequality” and strive to provide work, health care and education to all citizens. ⁷⁵ When Papists, particularly Jesuits, speak of “structural causes of inequality”, they are speaking according to the doctrine of liberation theology, which teaches that “sin” is

to be found within the structures of society. This is nothing but religious Communism! Nor is it the duty of governments to provide the citizens of the countries they govern with work, health care or education – this kind of Big Brother control, this overbearing State regulation of all aspects of life, is pure Communism. But the Lord never gave such tasks to governments. According to Romans 13 and elsewhere in Scripture, governments are there to maintain law and order. This is the limitation, biblically, on government authority. Providing jobs, health care and education is *not* their duty.

As one Roman Catholic has written: “About communism, a destructive ideology that slaughtered millions of Catholics, [Francis] said: ‘Learning about it through a courageous and honest person was helpful. I realized... an aspect of the social, which I then found in the social doctrine of the Church.’ Not such kind words for the free market, however. In his recent apostolic exhortation he slammed unfettered capitalism, calling it ‘a new tyranny.’ Apart from the fact that there is no major nation practicing unfettered capitalism (like Obama, Francis loves attacking straw men) there is more real tyranny in socialist cesspools like Francis’ home of Argentina than in places where capitalism is predominant. In the document he rejects the free market and calls for governments to overhaul financial systems so they attack inequality... failing to see that free markets have consistently lifted the poor out of poverty, while socialism merely entrenches them in it, or kills them outright.”⁷⁶ But Francis went even further, harping on about the “social justice” Marxism he so loves. He called on rich people to share their wealth. The “redistribution of wealth” (read theft from the rich to support the poor) is at the very heart of Communism, and always has been.

Note how Francis, in true Jesuitical style, keeps mum about the Vatican’s own vast global wealth, greater than that of any Muslim sheikh sitting on some desert oil well.⁷⁷ Quick to call on the wealthy to redistribute their wealth, he does not declare that the Romish religion, the richest institution on the face of the earth, will be “redistributing” its wealth to the poor anytime soon. Do not be fooled by this pope’s pretence at humility and personal poverty, living in an apartment and cooking his own supper. It is all a Jesuit act. He is a hypocrite of the first order.

Beyond all question, Francis I, the Jesuit pope, has pushed the diabolical doctrine of liberation theology, religious Marxism, the doctrine so violently and fanatically promoted throughout Latin America and Africa by the Jesuits since the 1970s, to the very forefront of his devilish “ministry”. Even the secular press has noted this fact. In the London Telegraph, for example, in early 2014, an article appeared entitled “Liberation Theology is back as Pope Francis holds capitalism to account.” Its subtitle was: “Amid accusations of Marxism, Pope Francis has turned the Vatican into the spearhead of radical economic thinking.”⁷⁸ Excerpts from the article:

“Unfettered global capitalism has met its match at last. Ever since Bishop Bergoglio picked St Francis of Assisi to be his guiding inspiration and lead a ‘church for the poor’, all his actions have been in the same direction. Liberation Theology is taking over the Vatican... The ‘preferential option for the poor’ is back. The doctrine that so inflamed controversy in the 1970s and

1980s, famously wedded to Nicaragua's Sandinista cause, now has a Papal imprimatur. It is close to becoming official doctrine for the world's 1.2bn Roman Catholics under 'Evangelii Gaudium', the Pope's first apostolic exhortation. This will have consequences...

"The conservative power of the Papal Curia is being broken. All of a sudden the Vatican is the spearhead of radical economic thinking. The best-known of the Pope's newly-minted Council of Cardinals is none other than Archbishop Reinhard Marx, the firebrand 'Rote Kardinal' of Munich and author of *Das Kapital: A Plea for Man...*

"Professor Harvey Cox from Harvard University writes in the *Nation* that one of the Pope's first gestures after his acclamation was to invite Peru's Gustavo Gutiérrez to Rome. This is highly significant. He is the priest who wrote the original 'Magna Carta' for Liberation Theology in 1968, the symbol of the movement. They celebrated Mass together, then had breakfast."

What, then, happens to this idea that Bergoglio in Argentina was opposed to Jesuit liberation theology? It evaporates. In Argentina he was playing a role, as a faithful Jesuit under orders. He was not against what the radical Marxist Jesuit liberation theologians were doing while he himself was hobnobbing with anti-Marxists – he was simply following orders!

In December 2013 Francis continued his praise and support of liberation theology. He wrote a letter to Brazil's "Base Ecclesial Communities" in which he expressed the hope that "the light of the Holy Spirit help you live with renewed enthusiasm the commitments of the Gospel of Jesus within Brazilian society."⁷⁹ All innocent-sounding – until one understands what these "Base Ecclesial Communities" were, and are. The following is from my book, "Holy War" Against South Africa:⁸⁰

"The 'Catholic Base Communities', as they were called [in Latin America], numbered over 53000 in Brazil alone by 1982. They were the equivalent of the classic Marxist cell groups which were extremely successful in pre-Soviet Russia, and they were usually led by priests, most often Jesuits. The indoctrination was 'meant to develop a political approach to economic and social problems via active disruption or even violent militancy. The 'comunidades de base' are, therefore, powerful revolutionary tools in the hands of a militant Catholic Church preparing them for use during the forthcoming commotions.'"⁸¹

Thus, time and again, this pope voices his support for radical religious Marxism. He did it again on April 28, 2014, when he used Twitter to send out the following short tweet:

"Inequality is the root of social evil."

Apart from it being a direct contradiction of the Word of God, which declares: "For the love of money is the root of all evil" (1 Tim. 6:10), it was a statement of pure Marxism.

Then he did it again some weeks later, when he again condemned the world's

financial markets, at a conference entitled, "Investing in the Poor: How Impact Investing Can Serve the Common Good in Light of Evangelii Gaudium [the pope's recent document]".⁸²

Of course, so as not to alarm anti-Communist Roman Catholics too much, every so often Francis issues a statement which seems to indicate his opposition to Marxism. But in doing so he is again simply acting as a good Jesuit does. For example, he has said, "The Marxist ideology is wrong. But I have met many Marxists in my life who are good people".⁸³ In saying Marxist ideology is wrong, he means atheistic Marxism; but religious Marxism, specifically Roman Catholic Marxism, is absolutely acceptable to him, for it was the Jesuits who came up with the doctrine.

In an interview he said: "The Communists stole our cause. Rallying for the poor is Christian", and it was so for 2000 years before Karl Marx picked up on it.⁸⁴ Another example of how he turns criticism of his Marxist stance into something that makes him look good.

In March 2014 Fortune magazine named Francis I "the world's greatest leader". This was high praise indeed. The magazine said that since his election, "Francis has electrified the Church and attracted legions of non-Catholic admirers by energetically setting a new direction". It stated that "signs of a 'Francis effect' abound".⁸⁵

The significance of this recognition from Fortune is that it is a global business magazine published by Time, Inc. It is therefore part of the one-world stable of leftist publications. Indeed, Time magazine itself named Francis as "Person of the Year" for 2013. Truly, this man is charming the liberal/leftist world!

Francis I is the Current Antichrist of God's Word

In all these momentous events, let us not lose sight of the divinely inspired prophecies of the Bible. When Jorge Bergoglio was asked if he accepted the position of pope of Rome and he said yes, at that point he became the next one in the dynasty of men through the centuries who are called, in God's Word, the Man of Sin and Son of Perdition; the Antichrist! (2 Thess. 2:3; 1 Jn. 2:18,22). At that point, he became the next one in the long line of men through the centuries who are described in God's Word thus: "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God" (2 Thess. 2:4). And thus, at that point, he set himself up in opposition to God the Father as the so-called "Holy Father"; in opposition to God the Son as supposedly "Christ on earth", "Christ in office, Christ in jurisdiction and power", "the Lamb of the Vatican"; and in opposition to God the Holy Spirit as the so-called "Vicar of Christ", the vice-Christ, the substitute for Christ on earth. But to claim to be the one who takes the place of Christ on earth is to be nothing less than the Antichrist! For this is the very meaning of the Greek word.

He, like Judas, is the Son of Perdition (Jn. 17:12), and will for his unpardonable blasphemy and wickedness "go to his own place" (Acts 1:25), even

hell itself. But how true believers should pray for, and preach the true Gospel of Christ to, the poor, deceived, benighted followers of Antichrist, that the sovereign Lord would in mercy save many of them, plucking them out of the fire!

August 2014

Shaun Willcock is a minister of the Gospel. He runs Bible Based Ministries. For other articles (which may be downloaded and printed), as well as details about his books, audio messages, pamphlets, etc., please visit the Bible Based Ministries website; or write to the address below. If you would like to be on Bible Based Ministries' email list, to receive all future articles, please send your details.

ENDNOTES:

1. A Jesuit Becomes the Pope of Rome, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2013. www.biblebasedministries.co.uk.
- 2.. The Washington Post, March 13, 2013. www.washingtonpost.com.
- 3.. Zenit.org, March 13, 2013.
- 4.. The Moynihan Letters, March 13, 2013. MoynihanReport@gmail.com.
- 5.. The Jesuits Elect a New General, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2008. www.biblebasedministries.co.uk.
- 6.. The Jesuits: the Secret Army of the Papacy, by Shaun Willcock, pg.10. Bible Based Ministries, 2012. www.biblebasedministries.co.uk.
7. Les Jesuites, by J. Huber, pgs. 71,73. Sandoz et Fischbacher, Paris, 1875. Quoted in The Secret History of the Jesuits, by Edmond Paris, pg. 26. Chick Publications, Chino, California, USA.
8. Footprints of the Jesuits, by R.W. Thompson, pg. 51. Published in 1894.
9. Footprints of the Jesuits, pgs. 57-59.
- 10.. The Jesuits: the Secret Army of the Papacy, pg.12.
11. The Key to Pope Francis' Identity: Master of the Jesuit Spiritual Exercises, by Richard Bennett. April 14, 2014. Berean Beacon. www.bereanbeacon.org.
12. The Jesuits: the Secret Army of the Papacy, pg.12.
13. The Secret History of the Jesuits, by Edmond Paris, pgs. 21,22. Chick Publications, Chino, California, USA.
14. Secret Instructions of the Jesuits, faithfully translated from the Latin of an old London copy, published by Charles K. Moore, New York, 1841.
15. Secret Instructions of the Jesuits.
16. The Moynihan Letters, March 18, 2013. MoynihanReport@gmail.com.
17. Zenit.org, March 22, 2013.
18. Caraccioli: "Vie du Pape Clement XIV" (Desant, Paris 1776, p.313); quoted in The Secret History of the Jesuits, pg. 70.
19. Baron de Ponnat, "Histoire des variations et des contradictions de l'Eglise romaine", p. 223; quoted in The Secret History of the Jesuits, pgs. 70-1.
20. Brewster's Encyclopaedia, Vol. XI, p. 171, as quoted in a historical

- sketch of the Jesuits by W.C. Brownlee, given in a republication of Secret Instructions of the Jesuits, New York, 1841.
21. Murder in the Vatican, by Avro Manhattan, pgs. 73-75. Ozark Books, Springfield, Missouri, USA, 1985.
22. Potter: "Vie de Scipion de Ricci" (Brussels 1825), I, p.18; quoted in The Secret History of the Jesuits, pg. 71.
23. Baron de Ponnat: "Histoire des variations et contradictions de l'Eglise romaine" (Charpentier, Paris 1882, II, p.224); quoted in The Secret History of the Jesuits, pg. 71.
24. See In God's Name, by David Yallop. Jonathan Cape Ltd., Great Britain, 1984.
25. See Murder in the Vatican.
26. The Vatican Moscow Washington Alliance, by Avro Manhattan, pg. 49. Chick Publications, Chino, California, USA, 1982.
27. The Vatican Moscow Washington Alliance, pg. 50.
28. Is the Pope of Rome Guilty? by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, April 2010. See also Child Sexual Abuse by Priests: Revelations of Shocking Crimes and Sinful Cover-Ups; Homosexuality in the Roman Catholic Priesthood; both by Shaun Willcock, as well as other articles, all available from Bible Based Ministries: www.biblebasedministries.co.uk.
29. See The Rat(zinger) Abandons His Ship: the Astonishing Resignation of the Roman Pope Benedict XVI, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2013. www.biblebasedministries.co.uk.
- 30.. The Jesuits Elect a New General.
- 31.. The Moynihan Letters, March 11, 2013. MoynihanReport@gmail.com. 32.. See The Jesuits Elect a New General.
33. Pope Francis Shows His True Colours, by Richard Bennett. Berean Beacon, www.bereanbeacon.org.
34. Pope Francis Shows His True Colours.
- 35.. See America's Alien Invasion: the United States is Becoming Roman Catholic, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2006. www.biblebasedministries.co.uk.
- 36.. National Catholic Reporter, March 14, 2013. <http://ncronline.org>.
- 37.. Daily Maverick, 14 March 2013. www.dailymaverick.co.za.
- 38.. The Moynihan Letters, March 13, 2013.
- 39.. The Moynihan Letters, March 13, 2013.
- 40.. The Blaze, May 13, 2013. www.theblaze.com.
- 41.. The Washington Post, March 13, 2013.
- 42.. See The Vatican Moscow Washington Alliance.
- 43.. See The Pope of Rome Calls for a World Government, by Shaun Willcock, Bible Based Ministries 2009, and The Vatican and the "Occupy Wall Street" Movement, by Shaun Willcock, Bible Based Ministries 2011. www.biblebasedministries.co.uk.
- 44.. The Blaze, May 13, 2013.
- 45.. The Washington Post, March 13, 2013.
- 46.. National Catholic Reporter, March 14, 2013.
- 47.. The Moynihan Letters, March 13, 2013.
- 48.. NewsWithViews.com, March 15, 2013.
- 49.. Daily Maverick, 15 March 2013. www.dailymaverick.co.za.
- 50.. Daily Maverick, 15 March 2013.
- 51.. New York Daily News, March 14, 2013. www.nydailynews.com.

- 52.. The Province, March 13, 2013. www.theprovince.com.
- 53.. See, for example, The Vatican Against Europe, by Edmond Paris. The Wickliffe Press, London, reprinted 1988.
- 54.. The Province, March 13, 2013.
55. Daily Mail, 16 March 2013. www.dailymail.co.uk. Art. "Special report: The damning documents that show new Pope DID betray tortured priests to the Junta." Also Global Research, March 19, 2013. www.globalresearch.ca. Art. "'Change of Skin', From Argentina's 'Dirty War' to the Vatican: Pope Francis 'Dissociates Himself' from Father Bergoglio."
56. Zenit.org, March 15, 2013.
57. Fourteen Years a Jesuit, by Count Paul von Hoensbroech, Vol.II, pgs.301-319. Cassell and Company Ltd., 1911.
58. The Blaze, May 13, 2013.
59. The Vatican Moscow Washington Alliance, pgs.23-25.
60. As, for example, by David Yallop in his unanswered and unanswerable book, In God's Name.
61. The Vatican Moscow Washington Alliance, pgs. 31-5.
62. See Comrade Barack Obama: President of the United Socialist States of America, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2008. Also America: Communism Triumphant, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2012. www.biblebasedministries.co.uk.
63. See The Vatican/Obama Alliance, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2010. www.biblebasedministries.co.uk.
64. Global Research E-Newsletter, 14 March 2013. newsletter@globalresearch.ca. Art. "'Washington's Pope'? Who is Pope Francis I?"
65. Global Research E-Newsletter, 14 March 2013.
66. The New York Times, March 22, 2014. www.nytimes.com. Art. "The Catholic Roots of Obama's Activism."
67. The Vatican/Obama Alliance.
68. The New York Times, March 22, 2014.
69. TruthRevolt.org, April 28, 2014. www.truthrevolt.org.
70. MoynihanReport@gmail.com, 30 April 2014.
71. Fox News, December 4, 2013. www.foxnews.com.
72. Daily Mail, 19 March 2013. www.dailymail.co.uk.
73. The Southern Cross, May 29 to June 4, 2013.
74. Zenit.org, April 10, 2013.
75. Reuters, 26 November 2013.
76. Fox News, December 4, 2013. www.foxnews.com.
77. See The Vatican Billions, by Avro Manhattan. Chick Publications, Chino, California, USA, 1983.
78. The Telegraph, 8 January 2014. www.telegraph.co.uk. Art. "Liberation Theology is Back as Pope Francis Holds Capitalism to Account."
79. Zenit.org, January 8, 2014.
80. "Holy War" Against South Africa, by Shaun Willcock, pgs. 185-6. Bible Based Ministries, Third Edition 2011. www.biblebasedministries.co.uk.
81. The Vatican Moscow Washington Alliance, pgs. 322,323.
82. The Southern Cross, June 25 to July 1, 2014.
83. The Telegraph, 8 January 2014. www.telegraph.co.uk. Art. "Liberation Theology is Back as Pope Francis Holds Capitalism to Account."
84. The Southern Cross, July 9 to 15, 2014.

85. Zenit.org, March 20, 2014. Bible Based Ministries
info@biblebasedministries.co.uk www.biblebasedministries.co.uk

This article may be copied for free distribution if it is copied in full
WORLDWIDE CONTACT FOR BIBLE BASED MINISTRIES:

Contending for the Faith Ministries
42055 Crestland Drive
Lancaster, CA 93536
United States of America
BBMOrders@aol.com