


## The Great Harlot's Daughters



The Church of Rome's daughters: Ritualistic and apostate Churches, and especially to the High Church sections of the Churches of England and Scotland, and to the Greek and Eastern Churches, which all teach and practice many of the Church of Rome's doctrines and abominations.

---

## The Catholic Church And Economics



Opposition of the Catholic church to capitalism has its roots in the Catholic consciousness of the fact that the feudal hegemony of the Catholic church was broken up by the combined power of capitalism and the Protestant Reformation.

---

## Catholic Vs. Protestant Jesus



This is a transcription of a podcast by Christian J. Pinto given on Aug. 1, 2022, on [Noise of Thunder Radio](#). Chris gives many interesting insights, things that I believe deepen our understanding of the spiritual warfare we are all experiencing.

In this transcription, I added titles to identify the contents of the subsection. The titles also automatically generate a menu on the page. I hope you find them useful.

---

Okay, praise the Lord you guys and welcome. I'm Chris Pinto. This is noise of thunder radio today in the show.

We are going to talk about the Catholic Jesus. The Catholic Jesus is the Catholic Jesus, the same Jesus of Protestantism. Is the Catholic Jesus the same Jesus of Protestantism? Well, we're going to allow a very traditional Catholic ministry, a very traditional Catholic organization called Church Militant, one that I've mentioned on this program a number of times. I've made reference to articles that they have. They are very traditional Catholics. They believe that the liberalism and really leftism that's going on, which I'm not sure if they understand is really Jesuitism. I'm not sure that they have that understanding of history. I'm not sure that they understand that the Jesuits are behind social justice and that they're the co-authors of socialism and communism and that the Vatican is really the well-spring of communism.

We're going to talk about that on the program as well. But right now I want to focus on that version of Jesus, the Lord Jesus Christ that is presented by the Roman Catholic Church. Now when we talk about the Catholic Jesus, as opposed to the Protestant Jesus, the Protestant Jesus, if we're talking historic Protestantism is Jesus according to the Bible. As one historian put it, *Protestantism is the Bible*, the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible. So if you're going to talk about the Protestant faith historically, it must be based on the Bible. Otherwise, it's not really Protestantism. It might be some offshoot of Protestantism where people come up with different ideas about things. That's something else entirely.

## Historic Protestantism

Historic Protestantism, however imperfectly a particular church may pursue it or achieve it or accomplish it, the aim is to obey every word of God according to scripture. To live as Jesus said, man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God. That is historic Protestantism. Now we all know that that changed in the late 19th

century into the 20th century. You have so-called Protestant groups that are not really Protestant at all because they're pursuing ideas that would be utterly rejected by the Reformers. The Reformers would have nothing to do with them.

Probably the one that I'm seeing more and more is this partitioning of the gospel into two categories that insist that there are two gospels, one gospel for the Jews and one gospel for the Gentiles. And that, of course, we believe is complete heresy. It's a violation of Galatians chapter 1. The Apostle Paul says, if any man or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel, let him be accursed. So we reject the idea that there are somehow or other two gospels that are contained in the New Testament or really anywhere in the Bible. Jesus is one Lord. He is the way, the truth, the life. No man comes under the Father, but by him. Praise the Lord.

But let's talk about this issue of another Jesus and why this is so important. We have in the New Testament in 2 Corinthians chapter 11, 2 Corinthians chapter 11, the Apostle Paul is writing to the church at Corinth. And he says in verse 2,

*For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy, for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ. But I fear, lest by any means as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your mind should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. Or if you receive another spirit which you have not received, or another gospel which you have not accepted, you might well bear with him.*

### **Another Jesus? Two Gospels?**

So notice the Apostle Paul is confronting this idea of another Jesus. And that's actually his terminology, *another* Jesus. So obviously, when people come and they talk to you about Jesus, we have to be discerning at that point whether or not they're really describing the Jesus of the Bible, or if they're preaching another Jesus.

And in verse 3, Paul is warning the church, he's saying, I fear lest by any means as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, that it'll be through subtle deception and lies obviously, that will contradict the clearly stated words of God. Remember what God said to Adam concerning the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, that in the day that you eat thereof, you will surely die? And what does the serpent do? He shows up and he says, you will not surely die, you shall not surely die. But your eyes shall be opened and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. So the serpent openly contradicts the clearly stated word of God, the clearly stated commandment of God. So that is the immediate context of what we're looking at.

That's one of the reasons why I think those who are preaching the two gospel message, they're claiming that there's one gospel for the Jews, one gospel for the Gentiles. That's obviously wrong, it's obviously condemned by the clear statements that we have throughout the New Testament.

And just as when the serpent beguiled Eve, if Eve had obeyed what God had

commanded Adam, "In the day that you eat thereof, you will surely die." Don't eat of that fruit. Very simple, very straightforward. Then Eve would not have been beguiled or bewitched and she would not have sinned then against God.

And so it is now, you have a clear scripture, if any man or an angel preach any other gospel, let him be accursed. And yet now we have people who are doing exactly that, they're contradicting the clear warnings that we have in scripture.

## **Any other gospel is quite often applied to Rome**

Yet if we were to go and read commentaries prior to the 20th century, the reference to if any man preach any other gospel is quite often applied to Rome. Because the context is you had the circumcision teachers who were saying that except you get circumcised and keep the law you cannot be saved, *they're adding something to the gospel of grace*. And you have earlier commentators who argue that really Rome, when you look at Rome and the sacramental salvation, things like you've got to be in submission to the Pope and you've got to be in submission to the Church of Rome in particular, or you cannot be saved. They have all of these different conditions for salvation that have been added over the centuries. And this is really what brings us to the issue of the Protestant Jesus versus the Roman Catholic Jesus, the papal version of Christ.

So let's define our terminology here. The Protestant Jesus is Jesus based on the Bible, and it can only be that, it cannot be Jesus based on something else, because historic Protestantism embraces only the Bible, which even Catholics who are aware of what historic Protestantism is acknowledge.

And we're going to hear that from a statement made by Michael Voris (who aggressively promotes traditional Catholicism) of Church militant, which I think is very important.

If we were going to talk about the Mormon Jesus, for example, if you're going to talk about the Mormon Jesus, you cannot define the Mormon Jesus without the Book of Mormon. The Mormon Jesus is defined by the Book of Mormon. If you're going to talk about the Islamic Jesus, because yes, in Islam, they also claim to believe in Jesus. But to understand the Islamic Jesus, you have to read the Quran, you have to read the Hadiths, you have to read their writings.

## **Defining the Catholic Jesus**

So how would we define the Catholic Jesus? How would we define the Catholic Jesus? You have to read writings outside of the Bible. Because what is it that makes the Catholic Jesus Catholic? I would propose that you have at least three documents that you have to take into consideration in order to understand the Catholic Jesus.

The Catholic Jesus is defined by the Council of Trent, by Vatican Council I, and by Vatican Council II. Those three documents at the very least, now there may be other documents as well. In fact, Rome has a whole series of documents

and councils and things like that. But the three major documents would be the Council of Trent, Vatican Council I, and then of course they're most up-to-date, extensive declaration, which is Vatican Council II. That is where you define the Catholic Jesus.

And as I've said before, if you believe official Roman Catholic doctrine, if you actually believe the doctrines of Rome as they are set down on paper, you cannot be saved. It is simply not possible because you have to reject the true gospel as it is given in the New Testament. Now what do we mean by that? Let's look at the Council of Trent just very quickly.

The Council of Trent is, I think, the clearest example. You have Canon 9, which says,

"If any one saith, that by faith alone the impious is justified; in such wise as to mean, that nothing else is required to co-operate in order to the obtaining the grace of Justification and that it is not in any way necessary, that he be prepared and disposed by the movement of his own will; let him be anathema."

<https://history.hanover.edu/texts/trent/ct06.html>

Let him be accursed. That's Canon 9 from the Council of Trent. If anyone says that by faith alone, the impious is justified. Okay, and then nothing else is required in order to obtain the grace of justification. Nothing else required. Let him be anathema. That's one.

Canon 12 says,

"If any one shall say that justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in the divine mercy pardoning sins for Christ's sake, or that it is that confidence alone by which we are justified...let him be accursed."

So the Council of Trent pronounces a curse upon you if you believe that you're saved by God's grace through faith in Jesus Christ apart from works. That is the whole problem. I mean, that right there, that just cuts right through everything and gets to the fundamental problem with Rome and Romanism.

## **Michael Voris and his Church Militant organization**

Now, something that I'm typically careful to say whenever these discussions happen is that it's important to remember that the average Catholic, especially here in America, is not aware of the official doctrines of Rome. They're not aware of the details of the Council of Trent. However, when we talk about a group like Church Militant and Michael Voris, you're not talking about ignorant Catholics. You're talking about Catholics who know full well what the official doctrines of Rome are. And so what happened was I was sent an email by one of our listeners that contained a video link to a video that

was made and published by Michael Voris of Church Militant, where he is the one who asks the question, do Catholics and Protestants worship the same Jesus? And he very clearly says, no, we do not worship the same Jesus. I'd never seen this before. I knew that Church Militant was hostile to the Reformation and to people like Martin Luther, etc. But I did not realize that they went this far with it. And I think it's very important that anybody who's stumbling upon the Church Militant website understands what they really believe, which is very important, brothers and sisters, because the ecumenical movement is telling the Protestants, the evangelicals, that really they need to join hands with Rome. They need to see the Pope as a Christian. They need to see Catholics as Christians and this kind of thing. And it is very, very deceptive, very deceptive.

So again, that's why I say you might have a Catholic friend who seems to believe about Jesus what you believe. That could be the case. But when we say the Catholic Jesus, what it comes down to are those documents that are unique to Rome, wherein they define the faith that they believe in, that's the only way you can define the Catholic Jesus.

But here we're going to play some of the audio from Michael Voris on the Church Militant website. And this particular message is called the Vortex "Prodi Jesus." Now Prodi, the word Prodi, just so you know, is sort of a slang or really seems to be kind of an insult for Protestant. So instead of Protestant, they're saying Prodi, the Prodi Jesus. So here is what Michael Voris has to say about the Protestant Jesus versus the Catholic version of Jesus.

(Audio of Michael Voris mocking Protestantism and the biblical Jesus while claiming the Catholic Jesus is superior.)

All right, I have to jump in here very quickly because I can't let that go unanswered, the idea that it's the Protestant form of Jesus who says, "Hey, do whatever you want." Historically, that's not the case at all. That is completely opposite to the Reformed and the Puritan movement. The Puritan movement is the reason why we have moral standards in both church and state that are upheld and defended. Wherever you have Rome and her priesthood in charge, you will have gross immorality normalized and that is throughout history. Nobody pushes LGBT like the Vatican and her agents in America and throughout the world. That's provable beyond any doubt.

But let's listen to the rest of what Michael Voris has to say.

(Voris talks about the worship of Jesus' mother and prayers to Catholic saints.)

Now the reference to the saints is, I believe in the Catholic context, a reference to praying to the saints, patron saints and exalting patron saints over this issue and that issue, etc. Which is really a form of idolatry as we see it as Protestant evangelicals. Certainly when Michael Voris says prodi Jesus has no regard for his mother, if you go and read everything that Church Militant says about the Virgin Mary, they engage in idolatry. What can only be called outright idolatry where the Virgin Mary is concerned. There's no

question about that. But go to their website, look up what Voris says on the Virgin Mary. It's very, very clear. It's nothing that they can defend as venerating the mother of Jesus. They can't claim that because they're looking to Mary in the same way that Christians should be looking to God. They're putting their faith in their trust in Mary to empower them and help them and all this other kind of stuff. Whereas the scripture never tells us anything like that. All of our trust and reliance is to be upon the Lord, upon God Himself and upon the Lord Jesus Christ, not upon Mary or any of these patron saints, so called.

Michael Voris of the Catholic media organization called Church Militant is very, very conservative traditional Catholic. They resist liberalism and leftism in the Catholic church today. However, they also are very, very hostile toward historic Protestantism and make it very clear that they completely denounce the Protestant Reformation.

## **Catholic means of salvation vs. the Bible**

Michael Voris says the Protestant version of Jesus is basically denying people the means of "salvation." And this is what it comes down to, brothers and sisters, the understanding of salvation. Rome teaches a sacramental form of salvation, works-oriented salvation. And they believe that you have to take the Eucharist, the Eucharist, meaning the wafer, which has been called for several hundred years, the true God of Rome, the God of Rome is the wafer. When the Catholic priest holds up the wafer, the Eucharist, the host and says, *hoc est corpus meum*, (Latin for this is my body) the Protestant corruption of which is Hocus Pocus, supposedly the Eucharist then becomes the literal physical body, blood, bones and sinew of the Lord Jesus Christ. That is what they believe. That's the doctrine of trans-substantiation.

It's important to understand that the doctrine of trans-substantiation is said to have begun with Pope Innocent III, the same pope who initiated the great Inquisition. And through the dark age period, what happened was you'd have Catholic priests that would hold up the wafer and they expected people to come and bow down and worship the wafer or the Eucharist as God, as Christ, manifest in the flesh, in the hands of a Roman priest. And if you did not come and bow down, there are multiple cases, many, many cases of people who were taken and punished and put to death for refusing to bow before this Eucharist, the Eucharistic Adoration.

Now, if you want to read a book on this to really understand the extreme nature of it and the absurdity of it, look for the book by 19th century Catholic priest who eventually became a Protestant, Charles Chiniquy, who was the personal friend of Abraham Lincoln. He wrote a book called [The God of Rome, eaten by a rat.](#) And he talks about ministering at a church in Quebec in Canada, and that there was an older priest there who was blind, and that one day the priest was hunting about on the altar in a Catholic church, looking for the wafer, and the wafer had disappeared. And the priest is saying to him, he tells the story, let me see if I can get the dialogue.

(Please read the entire account, [The God of Rome, eaten by a rat.](#))

Chiniquy is revealing to us that this old Catholic priest in Canada openly referred to the wafer, the Eucharist, as God. They believed the wafer was and is God. That is the God of Rome. And if you don't believe on this wafer God, you cannot be saved according to Michael Voris.

The God of Roman Catholicism, the Jesus of Roman Catholicism, the Catholic Jesus is another Jesus, if in fact, Catholics believe in that version of Jesus that is contained in the official writings and doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. If that's the Jesus you believe in, you believe in another Jesus and your Christ is really an anti-Christ, another Christ. It is not the Christ of the Bible.

Now to read another quote from the book, here's a quote. It says,

If there is a thing which is as evident as two and two make four, it is that Romanism is the old idolatry of Babylon, Egypt and Rome under a Christian mask. But this new form of idolatry is so boldly denied by some of the great dignitaries of Rome and so skillfully concealed by others under the spotless robe of Jesus that not only the two unsuspecting nominal Protestants, but even the very elect are in danger of being entrapped and deceived.

Okay, that's just one of the quotes from the book. And so you have people who are saying, well, let's just focus on Jesus and we all believe in Jesus, right? And so we just focus on Jesus and we'll forget about everything else. But here we're learning from a very traditional Catholic organization, Church Militant, that the Jesus of Roman Catholicism is not the Jesus of Protestantism, meaning it's not the Jesus of the Bible. It can't be.

Now we know that the liberal Jesus, the LGBT Jesus is obviously not the Jesus of the Bible. That's the other Jesus that's also being preached by Rome and by the Jesuits in particular. They are promoting the rainbow Jesus and we say rainbow in the sense of LGBT activism. It is a different Jesus. So whether it's the traditional Catholic Jesus that Church militant is describing based on historic Catholicism, or it is the LGBT Jesus that is now being promoted by the Jesuit order and to some extent by Pope Francis, whatever the case may be, it is another Jesus entirely. And Catholics themselves admit it. That's what we have to recognize. They admit that they bow to a different Christ.

Now there was a time when Protestants understood this. There was a time when they understood it and they believed it was a critical understanding because if you allow Catholics to be in charge in matters of government, what happens is your government is essentially going to be controlled by the Vatican because the Catholic version of Christianity, so-called Christianity, is to do whatever the pope tells you to do. That's Roman Catholicism. And so if Catholics are in charge, that means the pope is in charge. That means the Jesuits are in charge. The Holy See in Rome is in charge of your country. That's the problem.



## The No Religious Test Clause

And if you examine early American laws where the states are concerned, it was required that you had to be a Protestant in order to hold political office anywhere in early America.

This is from the <https://constitutioncenter.org/>. And an article they have called [The No Religious Test Clause](#). This is one of the most misunderstood things happening politically in our country, one of the most misunderstood parts of the Constitution. And I could probably talk about this for an hour, but we're not going to have time, but where it says the No Religious Test Clause, no religious test shall be required, etc.

The thing that we've gotten away from is that the whole concept of a religious test was the swearing of an oath. It was not seen as the same thing as a religious requirement. Religious requirements are entirely constitutional. You just can't have somebody swear an oath concerning it.

So let me read part of this article. It says,

In England, religious tests were used to "establish" the Church of England as an official national church. The Test Acts, in force from the 1660s until the 1820s, required all government officials to take an oath disclaiming the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and affirming the Church of England's teachings about receiving the sacrament. These laws effectively excluded Catholics and members of dissenting Protestant sects from exercising political power. Religious tests were needed, William Blackstone explained, to protect the established church and the government "against perils from non-conformists of all denominations, infidels, turks, jews, heretics, papists, and sectaries."

That's them quoting William Blackstone. Then it goes on in the same article. It says,

At the time the United States Constitution was adopted, religious qualifications for holding office also were pervasive throughout the states. Delaware's constitution, for example, required government officials to "profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ His only Son, and in the Holy Ghost." North Carolina barred anyone "who shall deny the being of God or the truth of the Protestant religion" from serving in the government. Unlike the rule in England, however, American religious tests did not limit office-holding to members of a particular established church. Every state allowed Protestants of all varieties to serve in government. Still, religious tests were designed to exclude certain people—often Catholics or non-Christians—from holding office based on their faith.

Now bear this in mind, brothers and sisters, that principle, you see the no religious test shall be required, had to do with not requiring people to swear an oath and they limited religious liberty to Protestant belief systems. Why? Because Catholics were devoted to a foreign power, a foreign leader. And atheists and Turks, etc. did not acknowledge the Bible as the Word of God. And the Bible is what is intended in the Constitution rather in the Declaration of Independence, where it mentions the laws of nature and of nature's God. That's a very direct reference to the Bible. Furthermore, the subscription clause of the Constitution, which says in the year of our Lord, is a direct reference to the Lord Jesus Christ.

So Catholics believing transubstantiation, they believe the Eucharist is Christ. And that's a problem when you've got Catholics involved in government, because they bend and twist everything towards Rome, typically. Maybe not every single Catholic, not every single one, but collectively, ultimately they're going to bend things in the direction of the Pope. And all of the teachings of Rome that basically say the Pope has the authority to control all the countries, especially professing Christian countries, the Pope has the authority to control all of them.

Now this used to be well known, and was the reason why there were laws against having Catholics in position to political power. And that continued all the way until when, until 1961. And this article at [ConstitutionCenter.org](http://ConstitutionCenter.org) acknowledges that.

It says;

But in *Torcaso v. Watkins* (1961), the Supreme Court unanimously held that religious tests for state office-holding violate the religion clauses of the First Amendment.

And what they did really is they reinterpreted Article 6 so that now a religious test was equal to having a requirement. You see, before, the religious test was only the swearing of an oath. It just like getting you to testify is one thing. Getting you to testify under oath is a different level of accountability. If you say something when you're being questioned kind of unofficially and you make certain statements, that's one thing. If you're under oath and you go into a court of law, you go before the FBI or you go before the US Congress and you testify under oath and you lie and you give out false information, you're committing a crime. You can be arrested and prosecuting go to jail. It's a different level of accountability. And that's what they were trying to remove from articles of religion. They wanted to remove that the oath and the punishment of somehow or other being in violation of a religious oath.

That's what Article 6 originally represented. There's even a whole article on this on the Harvard University website for those who want to investigate it further. I learned it from reading this article on the Harvard website.

Because our forefathers understood the political influence of the Vatican

over all the countries in Europe, how that had created so many of the wars and so many of the problems even wrote about it.

Read what Sam Adams says in his [Rights of the Colonists 1772](#). He talks about the manipulations of Rome in a country, and that they established secret groups in a country, and they develop a hidden order within the established order.

And now, of course, people are trying to figure out why is communism taking over our country? Why is that happening? We're going to be talking about this in this new film on the Jesuits on American Jesuits. We're going to go over in part the history of the Jesuits and the development of communism in the 19th century.

## **The doctrine of Transubstantiation is political**

That the word communism is traced to the word communion. Communion. That's not typically what we're told, but it is traced to the word communion. And in the communion, the Catholic communion, when the priest holds up the wafer and he says the words, *hoc est corpus*, and the wafer now becomes God, becomes Christ in the flesh, so much so that you have to go and bow down and worship this wafer. And if you don't, then you're in rebellion to God. Well, who's holding the wafer? The Catholic priest. And only an ordained Roman Catholic priest has the power and the authority to call down Christ from heaven. So if a Roman Catholic priest has the power to call down God himself from heaven, if God is going to obey the priesthood of Rome, well, then how much more should everybody else obey the priesthood of Rome?

You see where this is headed. This is where transubstantiation was a very politicized issue. It wasn't just about somebody's theology. It became very political and it became about the priesthood of Rome controlling all areas of society. And that's what transubstantiation empowered the priesthood of Rome to do.

## **Catholic Communion linked to Communism!**

And so what they did is they took that concept of communion and they turned into communism. So now instead of the wafer, instead of all power being channeled into the wafer as God, now all power is channeled into the state. And the state effectively becomes God. That, I believe, is what the Jesuits engineered in the 19th century with Karl Marx as one of their co-conspirators, if you will.

This is from a work by J.A. Wiley called [The Seventh Vile or The Past and Present of Papal Europe](#). And this was published by J.A. Wiley in 1868. 1868. Mark the date. 1868. Before communism ever really took over any country anywhere, but this is before the communists take over of China or Russia or any other part of the world. You had Wiley warning people that communism emanates from Rome. All right, so here is the quote. I'm going to read at least part of it. He says:

"Despotism had long withheld from society its rights. Communism has now come affirming that society has no rights.

And then he goes on to say,

"If ever Heaven in his wrath sent an incarnation of malignity from the place of all evil to chastise the guilty race of man, it is communism. But the hell from which it has come is Rome. Communism has drawn its birth from the fetid womb of Popery, whose superstition has passed into atheism."

Wow, isn't that powerful? Wiley goes on. Of course, he saw he saw prophetic fulfillment happening with the development of communism. So he goes on, I'll skip down a bit. He said,

"Should the communists prevail? There remains on earth no further power of staying the revolution. And it must roll on avalanche like to the awful born. Providence may have assigned it, crushing and bearing in its progress, thrones, altars, laws, rights, the fences of order and the bulwarks of despotism, the happiness of families and the prosperity of kingdoms. But above the crash of thrones and the agonies of expiring nations, we may hear the voice of the angel of the waters saying, Thou art righteous, O Lord, because Thou has judged thus, for they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and Thou has given them blood to drink, for they are worthy.

So Wiley saw communism as a righteous judgment from God, God's judgment upon man and his sin and rebellion against God in the gospel of Christ. He goes on, he says,

"Had the Reformation succeeded, the world would have been spared all these dreadful calamities. The Reformation was the Elijah before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord. It was the voice crying in the papal wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord. It addressed the apostate churches of Europe, as John did, the Jewish church. The axe is laid unto the root of the trees, therefore every tree which bringeth not forth fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.

Now I think what Wiley is communicating in his teaching here is his belief that events are unfolding, that the same pattern of warnings and followed by judgment that we have seen in the past, as recorded in the scripture, that those same patterns of warning and judgment we find throughout history. And Wiley saw that beginning to come to pass in his day in the 19th century. I don't think J.A. Wiley could have foreseen how devastating communism would be. But maybe I'm wrong. Maybe he did, because you know the wording, the

words that he's choosing and the description, talking about destroying everything in its path, that is very much the impact that communism has had in many parts of the world. It has had a very destructive ruinous, calamitous, bloody impact on mankind.

And now what we're watching here in the United States of America, now that agents of Rome have captured the government of the United States of America, we are sitting on the brink of a full-blown communist revolution and takeover of our country. In fact, some people are already arguing that the United States government is operating as a communist government. There are people who are saying that we're already there, and they're pointing to things like what's going on with the January 6 trials. People just rounded up, and it's obviously a show trial where the due process is not really being followed. The rule of law is not really being obeyed. The rule of law, and this is the great danger. It's what all of our ancestors warned us about.

Once we the people allow those who are in charge of government to remove the laws of God, you allow God's law to be taken out of the way, you have to ask yourself the question, what are they going to replace it with? And typically what happens is they replace it with arbitrary decision-making. In other words, whoever's in charge just says, okay, here's what we're going to do. Do this, do that, whatever. And the rule of law is cast aside. And that's what we're seeing happen. The rule of law is cast aside.

Now we have people in government making these arbitrary decisions about gender confusion. I mean, there's a video clip of Kamala Harris sitting down and talking about her pronouns, and she identifies as a female, and her pronouns are this and that. And all this other, there's been no formal decision made by our Congress. The American people haven't voted for people to get involved in Congress and start passing laws to support these things. No, they're just arbitrarily making them up and imposing them on our schools, colleges, universities, and on the government.

What they're doing, of course, by denying the authority of our Creator and the boundaries given to us by God Himself is engaging in a form of sedition and ultimately treason. Because the very foundation of our law begins with the authority of God with the laws of nature and of nature's God and the authority of God as our Creator. And that's what they're denying fundamentally. But nevertheless, these things have happened before throughout history.

Brothers and sisters, I mean, we're told, for example, in the Old Testament where it says in Psalm 119, verse 126, it says, It's time for the Lord to work for they have made void thy law. God's law has been made void because of how these corruptors and usurpers are handling the rule of law. They've cast aside the whole idea that government is supposed to operate as the minister of God. They've cast aside what King David says in the Old Testament. The word of the Lord came unto me saying, He that ruleth over men must be just reigning in the fear of God. That's what they have put aside.

## **Our only hope as a nation**

And we believe, as we've said before, if there's any hope for America for us as a nation, it is to repent of the ungodliness that's being normalized before our very eyes, to repent of that and turn this country back toward God and to restore the authority of God and His Word in the Bible, which, yes, I believe we have the right to do. Why? Because that's what our country was founded on. That's the whole point of my film, the true Christian history of America. There is a true Christian history.

Yes, there are tares among the wheat, but the wheat don't stand down because of the tares. In other words, God's authority is not overthrown because there's tares in the wheat field. So there's nothing in the Scripture that says any such thing. In fact, God's people are called to stand up and to confront the wicked and ultimately to overcome them by faith, and by the power of God above all, praise the Lord.

Listen to the entire talk!

---


## **The CIA – Vatican Connection**



The Vatican / Jesuit connection to the CIA. The American government has been under the control of the Catholic church for a long time, over 100 years.

---

## **The 45 Goals of Communism**



I just saw a 2010 documentary film entitled, "*Agenda: Grinding America Down*" about the leftist socialist takeover of America. It talks about a book written in 1958 by a former FBI Agent, Cleon Skousen, called "*The Naked Communist*". On Jan. 10, 1963, Congressman Albert S. Herlong Jr. of Florida read this list of 45 Communist goals into the Congressional Record. How many of these 45 goals do you think have been implemented? You can write your answer in the comments section below.

Some of the goals are dated due to the collapse of the Soviet Union and the unification of East and West Germany, but from my observation, the goals have been fulfilled or close to fulfillment by the liberal leftist socialists – most of the current American Democratic party members. I enhanced in **bold font** the ones I especially find disturbing.

1. U.S. should accept coexistence as the only alternative to atomic war.
2. U.S. should be willing to capitulate in preference to engaging in atomic war. [Note: These encapsulate the Kennan Doctrine, which advocated for the "containment" of communism. Establishment figures supporting the amoral containment policy at least implicitly worked with the communists in scaring the wits out of the American people concerning atomic war. President Ronald Reagan undid the doctrine when he took an aggressive stand against the Evil Empire by backing freedom fighters from around the world that were struggling against the left-wing communist jackboot. As a result, the Soviet Union and its satellites imploded, a considerable and unexpected setback to the international communist edifice.]
3. Develop the illusion that total disarmament by the U.S. would be a demonstration of "moral strength." [Note: The nuclear freeze advocates supported a freeze on American nuclear development only. Rarely were Soviet nukes or those of other nations mentioned in their self-righteous tirades. The same advocates now call for reducing American military might, claiming that there is something immoral about America preserving its military pre-eminence in the world.]

4. Permit free trade between all nations regardless of Communist affiliation and regardless of whether or not items could be used for war. [Note: Today, there are calls to end the embargo on the slave island of Cuba, there were complaints about the embargo against Iraq, and the U.S., not Saddam Hussein, was blamed for the suffering of the Iraqi people. Would they have advocated for free trade with Hitler and his National Socialist regime?]

5. Extend long-term loans to Russia and Soviet satellites.

6. Provide American aid to all nations regardless of Communist domination. [Note: Such aid and trade over decades contributed greatly to the left-wing communist liquidation of over 100 million people worldwide, according to the well-documented "Black Book of Communism." This aid and trade marks a shameful chapter in American history. Without the aid and trade, the left-wing international communist behemoth would have imploded on its own rot a lot sooner and umpteen millions would have been saved from poverty, misery, starvation and death.]

7. Grant recognition of Red China and admission of Red China to the U.N. [Note: Not only did President Nixon fulfill this goal but he also betrayed America's allies in Nicaragua, El Salvador, Iran, Afghanistan, Angola and elsewhere.]

8. Set up East and West Germany as separate states in spite of Khrushchev's promise in 1955 to settle the Germany question by free elections under supervision of the U.N.

9. Prolong the conferences to ban atomic tests because the U.S. has agreed to suspend tests as long as negotiations are in progress.

10. Allow all Soviet satellites individual representation in the U.N.

11. **Promote the U.N. as the only hope for mankind.** If its charter is rewritten, demand that it be set up as a one-world government with its own independent armed forces. [Note: There are still American intellectuals, and elected members of Congress, who dream of an eventual one world government and who view the U.N., founded by communists such as Alger Hiss, the first secretary-general, as the instrument to bring this about. World government was also the dream of Adolf Hitler and J.V. Stalin. World government was the dream of Osama bin Laden and the 9/11 hijackers.]

12. Resist any attempt to outlaw the Communist Party. [Note: While the idea of banning any political party runs contrary to notions of American freedom and liberty, notions that are the exact opposite of those held by the left-wing communists themselves, nevertheless these goals sought to undermine the constitutional obligation of Congress to investigate subversion. The weakening of our government's ability to conduct such investigations led to the attack of 9/11.]

13. Do away with loyalty oaths. [Note: It is entirely proper and appropriate for our government to expect employees, paid by the American taxpayer, to take an oath of loyalty.]



14. Continue giving Russia access to the U.S. Patent Office.

15. **Capture one or both of the political parties in the U.S.** [Note: In his book, "Reagan's War," Peter Schweizer demonstrates the astonishing degree to which communists and communist sympathizers have penetrated the Democratic Party. In his book, Schweizer writes about the presidential election of 1979.]

16. **Use technical decisions of the courts to weaken basic American institutions, by claiming their activities violate civil rights.** [Note: This strategy goes back to the founding of the American Civil Liberties Union by Fabian Socialists Roger Baldwin and John Dewey and Communists William Z. Foster and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn among others.]

17. **Get control of the schools.** Use them as transmission belts for Socialism and current Communist propaganda. Soften the curriculum. Get control of teachers associations. Put the party line in textbooks.

18. **Gain control of all student newspapers.**

19. Use student riots to foment public protests against programs or organizations that are under Communist attack. [Note: The success of these goals, from a communist perspective, is obvious. Is there any doubt this is so?]

20. **Infiltrate the press.** Get control of book review assignments, editorial writing, policy-making positions.

21. **Gain control of key positions in radio, TV & motion pictures.**

22. Continue discrediting American culture by degrading all form of artistic expression. An American Communist cell was told to "eliminate all good sculpture from parks and buildings," substituting shapeless, awkward and meaningless forms.

23. **Control art critics and directors of art museums.** "Our plan is to promote ugliness, repulsive, meaningless art."

24. **Eliminate all laws governing obscenity by calling them "censorship" and a violation of free speech and free press.**

25. **Break down cultural standards of morality by promoting pornography and obscenity in books, magazines, motion pictures, radio and TV.** [Note: This is the Gramscian agenda of the "long march through the institutions" spelled out explicitly: gradual takeover of the "means of communication" and then using those vehicles to debauch the culture and weaken the will of the individual to resist.]

26. **Present homosexuality, degeneracy and promiscuity as "normal, natural and healthy."** [Note: Today those few who still have the courage to advocate public morality are denounced and viciously attacked. Most Americans are entirely unwitting regarding the motives behind this agenda.]

27. **Infiltrate the churches** and replace revealed religion with "social" religion. **Discredit the Bible** and emphasize the need for intellectual maturity, which does not need a "religious crutch." [Note: This has been largely accomplished through the communist infiltration of the National Council of Churches, Conservative and Reform Judaism, and the Catholic seminaries.]
28. **Eliminate prayer or any phase of religious expression in the schools** on the grounds that it violates the principle of "separation of church and state"
29. **Discredit the American Constitution** by calling it inadequate, old fashioned, out of step with modern needs, a hindrance to cooperation between nations on a worldwide basis.
30. **Discredit the American founding fathers.** Present them as selfish aristocrats who had no concern for the "common man."
31. **Belittle all forms of American culture** and discourage the teaching of American history on the ground that it was only a minor part of "the big picture." Give more emphasis to Russian history since the Communists took over. [Note: Obliterating the American past, with its antecedents in principles of freedom, liberty and private ownership is a major goal of the communists then and now.]
32. **Support any socialist movement to give centralized control** over any part of the culture – education, social agencies, welfare programs, mental health clinics, etc.
33. Eliminate all laws or procedures which interfere with the operation of the Communist apparatus.
34. Eliminate the House Committee on Un-American Activities.
35. Discredit and eventually dismantle the FBI.
36. Infiltrate and gain control of more unions.
37. **Infiltrate and gain control of big business.** (Read corporate monopolies)
38. Transfer some of the powers of arrest from the police to social agencies. Treat all behavioral problems as psychiatric disorders which no one but psychiatrists can understand or treat. [Note: The Soviets used to send "social misfits" and those deemed politically incorrect to massive mental institutions called gulags. The Red Chinese call them lao gai. Hitler called them concentration camps.]
39. Dominate the psychiatric profession and use mental health laws as a means of gaining coercive control over those who oppose communist goals. [Note: Psychiatry remains a bulwark of the communist agenda of fostering self-criticism and docility.]
40. **Discredit the family as an institution.** Encourage promiscuity and easy

divorce. [Note: Done! The sovereign family is the single most powerful obstacle to authoritarian control.]

41. **Emphasize the need to raise children away from the negative influence of parents.** Attribute prejudices, mental blocks and retarding of children to suppressive influence of parents. [Note: Outcome-based education, values clarification or whatever they're calling it this year.]

42. Create the impression that violence and insurrection are legitimate aspects of the American tradition; that students and special interest groups should rise up and make a "united force" to solve economic, political or social problems. [Note: This describes the dialectical fostering of group consciousness and conflict, which furthers the interests of authoritarianism.]

43. Overthrow all colonial governments before native populations are ready for self-government.


44. Internationalize the Panama Canal.

45. Repeal the Connally Reservation so the U.S. cannot prevent the World Court from seizing jurisdiction over domestic problems. Give the World Court jurisdiction over domestic problems. Give the World Court jurisdiction over nations and individuals alike.

**Agenda: Grinding America Down**

---

## [The Communist Takeover of America – By G. Edward Griffin](#)



G. Edward Griffin (born November 7, 1931) is an American author, filmmaker,

and conspiracy researcher. He is the author of *The Creature from Jekyll Island* (1994), which exposes the Federal Reserve System as a private banking cartel designed to undermine the economy of America.

I took the time to transcribe the text of the YouTube because I consider it quite insightful and important for the American public to know. I retain knowledge better when I read rather than just listening to a speaker.

The first part of the talk was given in 1969. I think any reasoning person ought to be able to see clearly just from the daily news how the communists have implemented their plans through the years.

At the time of this post, G. Edward Griffin is alive and 89 years old.

Another speaker is Hollywood producer Aaron Russo who gave a famous interview about his friendship with one of the Rockefellers who confided with him the Rockefeller plan for one-world government. Russo died within the year of giving that interview!

## **G. Edward Griffin Communist Take Over – A 1969 Lecture**

(G. Edward Griffin) As early as 1928, the Communists declare that the racial differences among our people, constituted the weakest and most vulnerable point in our social fabric. By constantly probing and straining at this one spot, they calculated that eventually the cloth could be torn apart, and that Americans could be divided, weakened, and perhaps even set against each other in open combat.

We mustn't kid ourselves into thinking that the communists have placed their agitators only into the black communities. They're working both sides of the street. They want hatred, violence and bloodshed between the races, and they don't care how they get it or whom they use, even children if necessary. That the communist blueprint calls also for white retaliation and violence in the black communities. It's a very important objective for the Communist Party.

So far, they've only been able to involve a small percentage of our Negro people in this war of national liberation, the great majority want no part of it in any form. But the one sure way to change that is to have white vigilante groups striking into the Negro sections, supposedly, to seek revenge.

Ladies and gentlemen, the plans and preparations for a communist revolution of force and violence are far advanced. The organization behind these preparations has almost unlimited financial resources, and it provides both training and leadership based upon years of experience in many other countries. Our enemies are deadly serious about their task. And it's nothing short of national suicide, for us to continue to ignore their plans and their progress.

The strategy of the proletarian revolution calls for the quiet conversion of our government into a communist regime, but **under the banner of socialism**.

## **What is Socialism?**

Well, what is socialism? Alright, let's define it. According to the dictionary, socialism is a political concept based upon the principle of government ownership and control of property, the means of production, and the avenues of commerce. Under socialism, those who run the government – and the communists are confident that in America, they eventually will be the ones who do so – those who run the government will know who is to get something, and who has to wait, and **that represents control over human beings**.

What is all this to do with the communist revolution in America? Well, ladies and gentlemen, it has everything to do with it, because **the building of socialism is the communist revolution in America**. It represents the process, whereby **our country can be moved gradually toward communism, without the people even being aware of it**. No matter what grievance we may have real or imagined, no matter what national problems we may face, the communists seize upon these as excuses to build socialism. They have one and only one solution for all problems, more government, more government, and then more and more, until its total government. And forgive me for saying it one more time. **Total government is communism**.

## **How Communists Respond When They Lose An Argument**

In 1943, the following directive was issued from party headquarters to all communists in the United States. It read,

*"When certain obstructionists become too irritating, label them after suitable buildups as fascist or Nazi or anti semitic, and use the prestige of anti fascist intolerance organizations to discredit them. **In the public mind, constantly associate those who oppose us with those names, which already have a bad smell. The association will after enough repetition, become fact in the public mind.**"*

## **Truth is a Far Superior Weapon Than Deceit**

But because they are lying, it's possible to expose them. And this is their Achilles heel. By comparison, we have nothing to hide, therefore, we have no reason to lie. And we wouldn't want to even if we could, truth is a far superior weapon than deceit. It's a weapon which is denied to them. And in the end, it will be the decisive weapon that destroys them completely.

## **A World Government Based on Collectivism**

(Hillary Clinton:) We get a lot of advice from the Council (on Foreign Relations, CFR). So this will mean I won't have this far to go to be told what we should be doing and how we should think about the future.

(G. Edward Griffin:) People like Hillary Clinton, know. Even at that elevated

position Hillary Clinton is say one of the big movers and shakers. Compared to the Council on Foreign Relations, she's not. She's a small fish. And she knows that she's got to get the approval of the CFR.

(Aaron Russo: I had a friend, Nick Rockefeller, okay, who is one of the Rockefeller family. The ultimate goal that these people have in mind is to create a one world government. And this is given me straight from Rockefeller himself as what they want to accomplish.

(G. Edward Griffin:) Not just any world government, but a world government based on the model of collectivism. In other words, **big powerful centralized world government**. If it were a world government based on the principles of freedom, and freedom of choice, freedom of culture, low intervention, if no intervention in the lives of normal human beings, it might be a wonderful thing, but that's not the kind of world government, the left and the right have in mind. They're talking about total world government with all major decisions being made at the top and people at the bottom being peasants basically in a high tech feudalism.

---

## The True Authors of Communism & Socialism: The Jesuits



This is without a doubt the clearest explanation I have ever come across about the historical origin of Communism and Socialism, and who formulated its ideology.

To understand the Hegalian character of Jesuitical deception, (Hegalian dialectic, a very old Jesuit principle explained in the picture below) we must consider that **the doctrines of Communism were designed by the Jesuits** through what were known as their **Reductions in Paraguay in the 17th and 18th centuries**, which were a series of communes in which Jesuit priest exercised authority over the natives there. In that environment, the Jesuit Order maintained control over a group of South American Guarani Indians, who they educated and trained to work on their behalf, generating goods that were later sold in the markets of Europe. From a 1933 book titled, "The

Revolutionary Movement” by J. Findlater, we read the following:

*“...the Jesuits had established twenty strong Mission centres, called Reductions, with many thousands of the Guaranis enrolled as their members....The Jesuits aimed to set up there a completely communistic system, in the sense that no individual rights were recognized and there was no private property. Everything belonged to the State, and was supposed to be shared in common. But in reality much the greater part of the proceeds of goods sold was always remitted to the Camarilla (Jesuit superiors) in Europe; and the Guaranis got only the bare necessities of life in return for their toil and sweat.”*

The Jesuit leaders provided the necessary food, clothing, and health care the Indians needed, while using them as “worker bees” to generate income for the order. Just as the Soviet Union would do in the 20th century, the Jesuits maintained strict control over the activities of their subjects:

*“...neither would they allow any Guarani to learn Spanish, nor would they tolerate and intercourse between the Guaranis and the peoples of the surrounding Spanish Colonies—a prohibition maintained at the sword’s point.”*

They perfected their system of totalitarian control, all the while telling the world that their oppression over other people was, in fact, “Utopia,” a deluded fantasy maintained by some Catholic historians to this day. Perhaps worst of all is that the Jesuit did not present any form of the Gospel or what might be called the Christian faith to these poor Indians.

*“There is no evidence that any effort was ever made by the Jesuits to impart the truths, properly so called, of the Christian religion....When the Jesuits were expelled, the Guaranis, having had no moral or religious training to fit them to continue in the Christian Faith, in a few years....became as if no religious teachers had ever lived and worked among them....”*

The ideas the Jesuits developed in Paraguay over a period of 158 years, **were then communicated to Karl Marx in the nineteenth century:**

*“For five years Karl Marx went to the Jesuit school in Trier, which during the Prussian period was known as the Friederich-Wilhem Gymnasium.”*

Along with Karl Marx, other leading Communists like Joseph Stalin and Fidel Castro were also trained by the Jesuits. In fact, the former Jesuit General, Pedro Arrupe (1965-1983) once boasted:

*“And what makes you think we are not proud of Fidel Castro?”*

While it is true that the Popes are known for condemning Communism, this on their part seems to be more political manipulation than anything else, since Rome has repeatedly supported the principles of Communist thought. “The Communist Manifesto” was first published in 1848, and within less than fifty years we find the **Vatican publishing declarations in agreement with it**. In his book, “Ecclesiastical Megalomania,” author John W. Robbins notes the following:

*"One of the Roman Church-State's most influential statements on economic matters is the 1891 encyclical Rerum Novarum, On the the Condition of the working Classes. In this encyclical the Roman Church-State allied herself with the proletariat, which in Marxism is the great and final enemy of the capitalist order. The encyclical's Marxism is so blatant that one Roman Catholic writer declared that 'much of encyclical (Rerum Novarum) appeared only to repeat in more orthodox language what Marx had said ten years before'....Indeed, there are paragraphs, if not pages, in **The Communist Manifesto that might have been written by the pope...**"*

Then, incredibly, after about a hundred years of various Papal diatribes against Communism in all its forms, the Sunday Times of London reported that:

*"Karl Marx, who famously described religion as 'the opium of the people', has joined Galileo, Charles Darwin and Oscar Wilde on growing list of historical figures to have undergone an unlikely reappraisal by the Roman Catholic Church."*

The article goes on to quote Georg Sans, a professor at the Vatican's Gregorian University, who, with the utmost subtlety, speaks about Marxism in a way that seems carefully designed to **undermine capitalism and promote the communist principles that Rome has always aligned herself with**. Any study of the Papal influence in world governments—will prove that Capitalism, which is the promotion of free enterprise, is the very antithesis of official Roman Catholic dogma.

Because of these things, we cannot help but consider the possibility that the real purpose of the McCarthy era was to manipulate the American mentality with **Hegelian tactics**, intended to take the anti-Communist fury to such an extreme that it would become offensive to the American people. McCarthy's methods were so unreasonable that **the idea of condemning someone for being a Communist was collectively shunned**. If we consider the growing influence of Communism today, we can only wonder if McCarthyism had been part of the Jesuits' greater plan all along: condition the people to despise anti-Communist "witch-hunting," then use their desire for toleration as an open door to usher in a more moderate version of it (i.e. Socialism) later on. Such tactics would be impossible to believe, except for the fact that **we find Rome on both sides of the issue**.

(End of article)

This article is an excerpt from my friend Walt Stickel's website: [The Root of Communism "The Jesuits"](#) Please read the rest of it.