THE ATHANASIAN

A publication of Traditional Catholics of America † Editor: Fr. Francis E. Fenton, STL † Volume XIV, No. 1 † January 15, 1993

John Paul II: "Pope" Of The New World Order

John Kenneth Weiskittel

Today, as should be no surprise, the Conciliar "Catholic" Church, especially in the person of its false Pope, John Paul II, has become a leading supporter of internationalism. Over the past few years, a major drive to this goal has been the establishment of a regional government in the form of what is called the European Community (EC; it has also been called the Common Market or European Economic Community). The twelve nations that form the EC have all but forged a "union" that would establish a Masonic "United States of Europe." (Of them, only Ireland seems at all deserving of the label "Christian," after two-thirds of the nation's voters rejected the legalization of abortion and rock star Madonna's lewd book was banned throughout the land last fall.) As of January 1, 1993, if the schemers have their way, the countries will have formed a corporate economic entity as a first stage in the process of consolidation. Far from condemning such a confederation, John Paul II has been one of its most fervent supporters.

Last November, the Conciliar magazine *Catholic World Report (CWR)* carried a feature in its "Vatican Watch" department that outlined the faithless Vatican's commitment to the EC. Entitled "Fragile Union," the article focused on John Paul II's response to a unified Europe in light of the signing of the Maastricht Treaty. Jean-Marie Guenois, *CWR's* director and the study's writer, opened it with a brief explanation of the pact's importance:

> This autumn political Europe tripped over the thousand and one pages of the "Maastricht Treaty," signed on February 7, 1992, by the European Heads of State in the Dutch town which gave it its name. This treaty hastened the political and monetary union of the European Economic Community (EEC). Under its terms, the 340 million European "citizens" should one day buy and sell using the "ecu," the "European currency unit,"and speak as one in matters of foreign policy.

Yet there were scattered voices of protest and signs of uncertainty in the budding European superstate. On June 2, Danish voters rejected the treaty (they will vote on it again in 1993), Great Britain has yet to ratify it, and the French (considered the EC's "political motor") passed it with a scant 51.5 percent in a September 20 referendum.

And how was apostate Rome taking this? Tight-lipped to be sure, but with perhaps an air of discreet impatience over the potential stalling of the New World Order, Guenois quotes the Vatican spokesman, Joachim Navarro-Valls, as saying: "The Holy See has always supported the building of Europe, understood as a community of nations. But the Holy See has never commented on the results of an election."

Maybe not, but it has certainly commented often about its desire for a European union. Guenois writes:

> This was the one and only statement issued by the Holy See on Maastricht. The only one — if one sets aside some 300 statements of John Paul II on Europe, a mass of material which constitutes an objective source to understand the Church's [*sic*] point of view on Europe.

When samples of these statements are read in sequence, a pattern of thinking is revealed that leaves no room for doubt about the alleged Pontiff's major role in the geopolitical sphere. Here are a few such pronouncements (all from the *CWR* article):

- Speaking before the presidents of the European parliaments on November 26, 1983, John Paul II said: *"[T]he progress of the European community, its unity and its strength, demands that effective powers be gradually and reasonably transferred or given to the European parliament so that its role of service to all will be fulfilled and the common good of the member countries assured.* [italics added] Such an arrangement requires flexibility and prudence to combine respect for local needs and the wish to achieve greater harmony."

• In an address given in Brussels on May 20, 1985 [well before the "reform" craze in Communist countries, it should be noted — JKW], John Paul II reminded EEC leaders not to omit Eastern Europe from their plans, saying: "The frontiers of treaties cannot draw limits to the opening up to men and peoples. Europeans cannot resign themselves to the division of their continent. The countries which for different reasons do not take part in your institution *cannot be distanced from a fundamental desire for unity*. [italics added] Their specific contribution to the European heritage cannot be ignored."

• On November 19, 1988, in the presence of Italy's Prime Minister Ciriaco De Mita, John Paul II declared: "Beyond technical terms and practical circumstances, *I consider it my duty to express the Holy See's cordial support for the construction of a unified Europe*." [italics added]

• In a message to the Polish Episcopal Conference on August 26, 1989, John Paul II stated: "It is necessary *to construct a system of strength* [italics added] such that no economic or military supremacy can destroy another country and its rights."

• To parliamentarians of the European People's Party, he spoke these words on December 7, 1990 [*in tandem* with the fledgling Eastern Europe "reform" movement]: "In a world which *is always more interdependent* [italics added], those in charge of the nations of the old continent must establish a space in which the peoples of the center and the east will have solid development [through financial and technological giveaways to "ex" Iron Curtain countries? — JKW] ...*Now, 33 years after the signing of the Treaty of Rome, you are entering into an accelerating phase of the process of integration envisaged and desired by the founding fathers.*" [italics added]

While it is very disturbing to hear a leader of worldwide stature give such glowing praise and vigorous support for an international subversive movement, *it should be positively infuriating to every Catholic worthy of the name to know that praise and support should be coming from the Chair of Peter, and by a leader almost universally — though wrongly — recognized to be the lawful occupant of the Holy See.*

"The United States of Europe"

For John Paul II, the above quotations represent more than a passing flirtation with internationalism. Further evidence of his commitment to the New World Order are his remarks to the European Movement, when it met in Rome on March 28, 1987, for the thirtieth anniversary of the Treaty of Rome. He told the assembled dignitaries:

> After the economic realm... European perspectives are reaching out to the political level. Your movement is planning a European federation whose form will be *the United States of Europe* [italics added] with a stable government, responsible to parliament, well beyond the present Council of Ministers and the Commission... The movement seems irreversible and perhaps beneficial... This common good is certainly a condition of progress and of strength and, in a certain way, of survival. Progress must be a completely human development from every point of view. This demands wisdom, prudence, maturity, but also tenacity and a spirit of openness. (Cited from *CWR* article.)

As is his custom, John Paul II seasons his remarks with appeals to "safeguard" national cultures and "guarantee" personal rights (elsewhere he invokes the "Christian faith"), but the overall message, as always, is: *full speed ahead for the EC*. What agenda has so captured the imagination of the "Pope" that he feels compelled to return to it habitually? What "ideal" could elicit such dogged support from him? And just what *is* this "United States of Europe" to which he is so steadfastly committed?

As the merger of the EC countries has moved closer to its completion, the term "United States of Europe" has been getting more exposure. Whether, at some future date, it will become the offical name of the new Europe — once full economic and political union is achieved — remains to be seen. But what *is* known about the expression is its use by international Freemasonry, from early in this century,

to describe a step along the path leading to a Masonic global "democracy" (read *dictatorship*). Such a design will come as no surprise for those at all familiar with Masonry. In fact, it is quite in keeping with a group whose very nature is internationalist, and that teaches initiates of its higher degrees that they are to be rulers and "priests" over the whole world after the final battle is won. (Hence, any Mason truly committed to these Lodge principles can *never* be a genuine patriot, outward appearances notwithstanding.)

During World War I, at a special conference of Lodge leaders from the Allied nations (U.S., England, France, Italy, etc.), the groundwork was laid for the first manifestation of this plot — the League of Nations. At this meeting, held in Paris on January 14-15, 1917, it was decided that another session (or Congress of Freemasons) the following June would be needed to allow Masons from the neutral countries to take part in the planning. Father Edward Cahill, S.J., in *Freemasonry & the Anti-Christian Movement*, quotes from an official document of the meeting, which spells out as among the future Congress' aims: "To prepare the way for *the United States of Europe* [italics added]; to set up a supranational authority, whose purpose will be to settle the disputes between nations. Freemasonry will be the agent of propaganda in favour of this conception of universal peace and happiness [*sic*], namely, the League of Nations."

Three years after this was written, the League of Nations came into being. Then, in 1922, the Lodge gave a clearer picture of what it sought for its infant group. In that year, the Congress of the French Grand Lodge, writes Father Cahill, "[passed] resolutions in favour of enlarging the powers of the League so as to make it into a supranational government with an International Bank [today known as the World Bank — JKW] and an international currency..." [the "ecu" — JKW] In defining its vision of the League, the Congress detailed so much that matches what has come to pass in the past seventy years (or is still being sought) that it is well worth citing at length:

> The principal tasks before the League of Nations consist in the organization of peace, the abolition of secret diplomacy [*sic* — JKW] ... the extension of a pacifist education, resting especially on an international language [Esperanto], the creation of a European spirit and a patriotism of the League of Nations, in a word, the formation of *the United States of Europe* or rather the Federation of the World... This Federation of the nations implies the institution of a superstate which will be supranational, invested with executive, legislative and judiciary powers... The international authority ought to have the sanction of an army and a police... The League of Nations will have a moral and real force and influence on peoples in proportion to the extent to which it can rely for support upon the Masonic Governments of the entire world.

Some years later, a group of European Catholics — priests and laymen — formed an Anti-Masonic League [which should be revived in 1993!]. At a Congress it held in Trent, the League included in its propositions about the Lodge the following, which parallels remarks made earlier by Pope Benedict XV:

> That the object of Freemasonry, in sowing revolution in all parts of the world, is the establishment of a universal republic, based on the rebellion against divine sovereignty, the destruction of local liberty and freedoms, the abolition of frontiers and the perversion of the patriotic sentiments which, next to God, have inspired in mankind its most beautiful deeds, its noblest sacrifices, its most heroic abnegation. (Cited, Cardinal Caro y Rodriguez, *The Mystery of Freemasonry Unveiled*. The year of the Congress is not given but it had to be after 1930 — the year of the first such gathering in Vienna, and likely was no later than 1937, since the Cardinal makes no reference to Pope Pius XI's *Divini Redemptoris* when he writes on Masonry's connection to Communism.)

The League of Nations failed in the intended mission of its designers, largely due to rock-solid resistance from patriots in the United States (and, it may be hoped, from efforts of the Anti-Masonic League). For one of the few times in the century, American Masons were unable to set national policy. By 1946, they reluctantly came to the

conclusion that, since participation by the U.S. was vital in advancing their dreams of global conquest, the League would have to be sacrificed or, at least, be ostensibly dissolved in favor of a new group with no reputation to live down. And so the United Nations was formed (with some major features of its predecessor being retained). This time, unfortunately, the U.S. — weary of war after its second costly engagement in a twentieth-century world conflict — eagerly jumped aboard the internationalist bandwagon.

Gorbachev: "My Partner, The Pope"

John Paul II's aid and participation in building this New World Order dreamt of by the enemies of God and man is significant: his visit to and lavish praise of the United Nations; his many friendly meetings with and warm encouragement to key groups in the movement; and his almost obsessive commitment to the vision of a unified Europe — a United States of Europe. All of this is sufficient to reject him as worthy of the title *Pope*. And yet there is another even more invaluable contribution made by him to this impious cause that is arguably more important to it than all the rest put together, and, for that reason, *it is all the more damning*.

"Ladies and gentlemen, we all agree that ours is a vulnerable, fragile, yet interdependent world, where we must coexist, whether we want this or not. For all that separates us, we have one planet and Europe is our common home, not a [military — JKW] theatre of operations." Many readers, no doubt, will conclude that this is but the umpteenth pro-world government quotation from John Paul II in this article, and that the only puzzle is to figure out where he made the statement and to whom. Although not the correct answer, it might well be, for the rhetoric — "one planet," "interdependent world," "Europe is our common home" — is so similar to that of the "Pope." But this orator who speaks much the same language as John Paul II is someone who, in theory anyway, ought to be as different in his message as is conceivable, for it turns out to be none other than Soviet Communist Mikhail Gorbachev in a speech he made to the British Parliament in 1984, one year before he became ruler of the U.S.S.R.

Gorbachev, however, was no average Bolshevik, but a camera-hungry jetsetter who dresses more like a filthy rich capitalist than a champion of the working class. Given that the Communists have always used deceit as one of their most powerful weapons, such peculiar behavior — unbecoming any Marxist-Leninist who wished to remain in good standing with the Party — should have been a tip-off about him. Instead, Gorbachev became the much-touted hero of Western journalists, who used their considerable prestige and power of persuasion to create the portrait of a secret admirer of private property and representative government. Somehow, if they were to be believed, he was a Communist *in name only*. President Ronald Reagan and other leaders of the Free World embraced Gorbachev, stating that he had pushed the "self-destruct" button on Soviet ambitions: presiding over the death of Communism, the end of the Cold War, and the collapse of the Evil Empire. John Paul II, as will be shown presently, has actually gone them all one better by suggesting that, in reality, *Gorbachev is a closet Christian*.

This false promotion is by no means coincidental — nor can it be. Gorbachev's record was there for everyone to inspect. Anyone even reasonably well-versed with this record would *know* that the man is a career Communist, that he could scarcely rise in such ranks without a *ruthless* character, and that later, as head of the Soviet Union, he presided over the *savage and immoral* invasion of Afghanistan. What does it say about such leaders that they would turn a blind eye to this? Either they are too hopelessly naive and uninformed to hold such vital positions or, worse, that they are even less fit to hold them because they knew the record and deliberately suppressed it, giving him "the benefit of the doubt." More relevant to the subject at hand is the question of how the rise of Gorbachev and his subsequent ties with John Paul II fits into the master plan of world government.

The architects of the New World Order knew for some time that the major roadblock to the full realization of their goals was *the radical division between East and West, between Communist and non-Communist nations*. Consequently, a new strategy needed to be constructed to allay suspicions. In 1984, ex-KGB [Soviet secret police] official Anatoly Golitsyn exposed the plan in a book

entitled *New Lies for Old*. It would consist, he wrote, of false "liberalization," and "democratization" in the Soviet Union, and "spurious independence" in its satellite countries. These deceptions were to include a Polish coalition government featuring the Solidarity labor union and the Conciliar Church, the unification of Germany (highlighted by the razing of the Berlin Wall), and even the "reform" of the KGB itself. No doubt readers were skeptical, but all came to pass — down to the smallest details — within the next few years, just as Golitsyn had forecast.

Only a year after the publication of *New Lies for Old*, a new leader assumed power in the Soviet Union — Mikhail Gorbachev. Through his policies of "glasnost" and "perestroika," Gorbachev led the way for all of the pseudo-reforms that would soon sweep the Eastern Bloc nations. In the very same year, author Larry Abraham was among the few who saw through the ruse. In his book *Call It Conspiracy* (an update of the 1971 bestseller, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, which he cowrote with Gary Allen), Abraham noted [as indicated above] that the liberal media in America, upon news that Gorbachev had been named the new Soviet leader, immediately began touting him as "the Russian version of John F. Kennedy." The New World Order had at last found the charismatic personality it needed to sprint to the finish line, and this in no way changed when he lost his job with the "self-abolition" of the Soviet Union.

Far from tarnishing his reputation, Gorbachev became, with Moscow's cosmetic changing of the guard, an "elder statesman" among world leaders, who was revered for the "insights" he brought to discussions on geopolitics. This became clear (if it was not already) when a secular Italian newspaper based in Turin, *La Stampa*, began publishing columns from him that were syndicated around the world.

About a year ago, the paper carried a fascinating and most revealing exchange between Gorbachev and John Paul II. Gorbachev devoted one of his columns entirely to his friendship with the "Pope." (It appeared in the March 9, 1992 issue of the *New York Times* as "My Partner, the Pope.") This, in turn, was followed by an article that included several quotations from John Paul II in response to the column. The resulting exchange resembled nothing so much as the lyrics of a popular song from generations ago: "We belong to a mutual admiration society!"

For his part, Gorbachev acknowledges that he has carried on an "intensive correspondence with John Paul II since we met at the Vatican in December 1989," and that he expects this to be "an ongoing dialogue." Not only did these meetings affirm a "mutual affection and understanding" but also the Russian's newfound conviction that "the Pope [*sic*] had played a key role in what we came to call the new political thinking." Besides their "closeness of spirit" and the way "[John Paul II's] speeches were in harmony with ours," Gorbachev notes that the quality he has always held in "high esteem about the Pope's thinking and ideas is their spiritual content, *their striving to foster the development of a new world civilization*." [italics added] He also expresses his belief that John Paul is "a great man," [italics added] and the hope that he can "continue working with the Pope... I am certain that this desire is mutual and will prove lasting."

Far from disavowing a word of this, John Paul II seconded Gorbachev, whom he refers to as "*a man of integrity*." [italics added] If anything, he is even *more* gushing in praise of his counterpart: "[Gorbachev] is a man *committed to principles and very rich in spiritual terms*," [italics added] and one who has spoken "with human warmth." If the "Pontiff" is to be believed, Gorbachev may even be a secret Christian: "He does not profess to be a believer, but with me he spoke of the great importance of prayer and of the inner side of man's life." Then John Paul II gets away with a statement that weds the terminologies of contradictory systems in such a manner as only he could pull off:

But we must not forget something very important: there was not simply a crisis of communism, but there was also perestroika. And perestroika means, among other things, "conversion." This means that in the crisis and breakdown, in the upheaval which took place and is in progress, there is a spiritual element — an inner change. Moreover, that is as it must be, and it could be no other way.

In a few short lines, the pseudo-Pope of Rome has managed to tangle his readers into a web of errors — so many, in fact, that, given his considerable intellect, they seem hardly accidental. Among them, he claims that the "reforms" must have a *spiritual* side. This, as he surely knows, is absurd, for "perestroika" focused on restructuring the Soviet *political* system. In October, 1989, Gorbachev himself declared: "The concept, the main idea, lies in the fact that *we want to give a new lease on life to socialism* through perestroika and to reveal the potential of the socialist system." While John Paul II talks of an "inner change" to the system that would radically transform — or "convert" — it, Gorbachev clearly is talking about *outer* change. Indeed, in his definitive book, *Perestroika*, he writes: "We are not going to change Soviet power, of course, or abandon its fundamental principles, but we acknowledge *the need for changes that will strengthen socialism*." *So, according to the very architect* of perestroika, there was to be *no* deviation from "fundamental principles" of Soviet power -- and, hence, *no* "inner change." In the current political parlance, the "Pontiff" is putting a favorable "spin" on a subject that does not warrant it.

John Paul II's philosophical approach is equally erroneous, professing as it does an *inevitable* direction of events — "it could be no other way" (much the same as Roskens' "inexorable spread of freedom"). This amounts to *determinism*: the notion that events are *unavoidable*, rather than *freely chosen* by the human will. While determinism has been condemned by the Church, it has *always* been embraced by the Communists as *a basic element* of their thinking.

Despite clear and compelling evidence to the contrary, through a confusing mixture of Communist and non-Communist senses of the same word ("perestroika"), John Paul II attempts to convince Catholics of the "conversion" of Russia. How enticing such soothing words must sound to many traditionally-oriented Conciliar "Catholics" (and, perhaps in a few cases, to poorly-informed traditional Catholics as well), who exclaim: "See, now we have confirmation of Our Lady of Fatima's promise!"

The *Unholy* Roman Empire?

More on Gorbachev, John Paul II, and their shared goal of a "common European home" surfaced in the May 18 issue of *U.S. News & World Report*. In its "Washington Whispers" column appeared the following item:

> ■ **Papal promoter.** Pope John Paul II is promoting Mikhail Gorbachev, whom he considers a "crypto [secret — JKW] Christian," to head a new institution designed to speed the integration of all Europe. According to Malachi Martin, a Roman Catholic theologian and Vatican insider, the Pope dislikes the existing institutions of European unity such as the Common Market because they are dominated by the materialism of the British and the Germans. The Polish-born Pontiff, Martin says, feels that only in an international organization that includes Eastern and Central as well as Western Europe can the influence of "Slavic spirituality" assert itself, and that Gorbachev, a fellow Slav and one of his most frequent pen pals, would be the ideal presiding officer.

Whatever interest can be found in Malachi Martin's books (and his skill as a writer *is* considerable), the reciting of his interpretations of events is usually avoided in *The Athanasian* for at least four reasons: 1) he is a laicized "coat-and-tie" variety priest who — presumably at his own request — is never identified as "Father" or "Reverend" (or even as a *priest* at all, only as a "former Jesuit" on the covers of his books); 2) the works are suspect, as they are published by a secular establishment house [Simon & Schuster] never known for its commitment to Catholicism and highly touted by the liberal media; 3) lack of documentation; and 4) the interpretations themselves, though attractive to readers, say, of *The Wanderer*, are too seriously flawed or misleading to recommend them to truly traditional Catholics. Nevertheless, there is nothing in the *U.S. News & World Report* piece that has not been confirmed in the material already cited in the present article. In fact, it rather faithfully reproduces the sort of thinking John Paul II has manifested on many occasions. And the only really speculative point, that the "Pope" is promoting his partner to head a new group, while unsubstantiated by any hard news articles, is itself consistent with all the rest, and so it is quite conceivable, given the harmony of thinking exhibited between the two.

sent copy Re.
M.M. dtd 3/23/93

Keeping the above qualifications in mind, passing reference should be made to Malachi Martin's 1990 bestseller, *The Keys of this Blood*, since it is devoted to an examination of (states its subtitle): *The Struggle for World Dominion between Pope John Paul II, Mikhail Gorbachev & the Capitalist West. According to the book's thesis, the "Catholic Church" is battling with the Communist and Capitalists to determine whose version* of the New World Order will be ascendant. Martin establishes John Paul II's globalist views and regards them as impractical, but sees nothing un-Catholic about them. These views are seen to be in opposition to Western internationalists, but no mention whatsoever is made, for example, of his warm reception of the Trilateral Commission in 1983.

Likewise, the link with Gorbachev is downplayed; in fact, John Paul II is said to eye him with suspicion (since the book was published two years before their amazing exchange in *La Stampa*, certain allowances can be made). Martin quotes a few of Gorbachev's allusions to God in some of his speeches, and then draws the conclusion that these references, most unusual for an atheistic Communist, may be attributed to one of three realities: 1) Gorbachev is using such expressions, devoid of any religious significance, through mere linguistic custom; 2) he is a "crypto-Christian," who somehow managed to avoid detection and rise to the highest echelons of Soviet power; 3) he is a totally dedicated Communist who is giving "convincing Christian lip service... to secure the deep and extensive integration with the West that is needed by the Soviet Union."

Despite shortcomings in Martin's thesis that have already been mentioned, and the obvious problems inherent in parts of the following, a passage from *The Keys of this Blood* regarding the third characterization of Gorbachev's actions is worth citation (both for the present point and a later one):

> If this third scenario is the true one, then it would have deadly significance for Pope John Paul II and for the West. If true, it would mean that in the Soviet inventory of enemies to be penetrated, deceived, leavened and taken over, Gorbachev has put religion and formal religous organizations at the top of his list — just as Antonio Gramsci [an Italian Communist who sought the internal subversion of Christianity — JKW] advised. If this is the true scenario, it would mean that Pope John Paul's Roman Catholic [*sic*] organization is the prime target. If true, it would mean that Gorbachev is the most dangerous Soviet leader the Church has faced, the author of the ultimate seduction, practitioner par excellence of KGB intelligence deception, the coldest "cold eye" Leninism has yet produced. [No mention is made by Martin of the revelations contained in *New Lies for Old*, which would have strengthened the case against Gorbachev.]

The Keys of this Blood fails because it attempts to portray John Paul II as a potential (if reluctant) savior of Christian Civilization. *His* world order (as opposed to the others), it claims, revolves around a sort of revival of the Holy Roman Empire when, in fact, what it encompasses is quite *the opposite*. An essential flaw in Malachi Martin's theory is that it does not explain why, given current political realities, *John Paul II would even want there to be European unity*. The EC nations (along with "ex"-Communist Eastern ones), which this "Pope" has for a decade sought to bind as one, have demonstrated themselves (with the possible exception of Ireland — one in twelve) to be firmly committed, not to Christian but, like America, to *neo-pagan* social policies. Hence, any such merger could only lead to a further *strengthening of these policies* (such as abortion) to the point where they would be incredibly more difficult — in fact, *virtually impossible* — to undo.

Expose The Fraud In Rome!

It is instructive to reflect on what John Paul II (then-"Cardinal" Karol Wojtyla) was doing during the days leading up to his election as "Pope." So that no one may claim bias, the following is quoted from a very *pro*-John Paul II book, Paul Johnson's *John Paul II & the Catholic Restoration* (St. Martin's Press, 1981):

> John Paul II is well instructed in the theory of Marxism-Leninism. He brought with him to the October conclave [the one at which he was elected in

> 1978 — JKW], and was observed reading it there, the latest issue of a quarterly review of Marxist theory. Unlike most Catholic priests he has taken the trouble to master the Marxist theory of religion. [Critics will counter that he has mastered *much more* — JKW] (Indeed, he often uses expressions familiar to Marxist-type thinkers, such as "contradictions," "distortions," "negative forces" and so forth.)

The incident was also mentioned in *Time* magazine (October 30, 1978):

> During the first day of voting last Sunday, Wojtyla nonchalantly read a quarterly review of Marxist theory as the time-consuming balloting dragged on. "Don't you think it's sacrilegious to bring Marxist literature into the Sistine Chapel?" joked a Cardinal. Wojtyla smiled, "My conscience is clear."

While others were reading their Breviaries and other devotional writings, the future "Pontiff" was reading Marx! So, Gorbachev uses the language of Christians and John Paul II uses that of Communists. Is it possible that they are doing so to arrive at a *common center*? Considering the record, it is *very* possible. One of the most revealing bits of evidence regarding the mystery of the "Pope" came in an anthology, *Christian Married Love* (Ignatius Press, 1981), where "Father" Joseph A. DeLestapis, S.J., very much a supporter of John Paul II, declared: "Karol Wojtyla was once a Marxist." Perhaps an ending should be affixed to his sentence — *...and remains one to this day*!

What can traditional Catholics do? Frankly, very little, except to bring the truth to others, hoping that eventually enough Catholics will see the full picture so that the restoration of the Church may begin in earnest. Certainly prayers are in order — and *many* of them. God will bring an end to current sufferings of the Church in His good time, but *not*, as *The Wanderer*, *The Remnant*, *The Fatima Crusader* and their kindred argue, by, for example, flooding the Holy See with petitions (one would have better luck serenading a deaf man with songs). What can be more ludicrous than to seek help in overcoming the plot against the Church from someone who has never wavered in his commitment to "reforms" that would have destroyed the Church, were it not for the promised heavenly safeguards — "...the gates of hell shall not prevail aginst it." (Matt. 16:18), and in his commitment to this neo-pagan world government?

Far from someone worthy of veneration, John Paul II is, in spiritual terms, *the most dangerous man alive*. And this is not only because he leads so many but also, as noted above regarding Gorbachev, because the enemy to be feared the most is always the one who seems to be a friend. God alone knows his degree of culpability but it defies reason to suppose a man with his great intellect is so totally ignorant that he is innocently carrying out policies that are aiding the enemies of Christ. Millions of Catholics' spiritual lives have been ruined because of Vatican II, and their Faith stolen from them, but John Paul II is oblivious to their plight. It is a sign of the falseness of his rule that he is content to allow these souls to be ground under by the wheels of the revolutionary juggernaut he guides.

When the evidence in this article is carefully analyzed, one question immediately arises above all others: *How can the man who allegedly heads the Roman Catholic Church so wholeheartedly align himself with an utterly un-Catholic New World Order that was devised by, and continues today to be the supreme objective of, the enemies of the very Church he purports to govern?* All that has occurred since Vatican II is nothing but the fulfillment of a master plan drawn up long ago in the Synagogue of Satan by its dark masters and, wittingly or not, John Paul II has advanced this plot. In 1766, almost two centuries before the Council, Pope Clement XIII warned the faithful in his anti-Masonic encyclical, *Christianae Republicae Salus*, about the infiltration of the Lodge into the Church, and the potential consequences of this aggression: "The enemy of all Good has sown the evil seed in the field of the Lord and the evil has grown rapidly, to such an extent that it threatens to destroy the harvest. It is time to cut it down." Today, more than a generation after this evil seed has grown to its full fruition, traditional Catholics must now, more than ever, give their wholehearted backing to Clement's solemn admonition: *It is time to cut it down!* †