

To a Subversive

Writer's Note 2018: The following letter is a response from this writer sent some years ago to a member of an anti-Biblical group in the East Midlands that sought to impugn the witness of *Christian Watch*, an evangelical movement to which this writer belongs. The response is in this writer's view still wholly relevant even in these post-Brexit days. It is therefore hoped that this work will serve both to edify and to inform the concerned reader who seeks to understand the true nature of the European Union 'Golden Garrotte' that Britain electorally shed via Brexit and to fulfil 1 Peter 2:15 **"For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men."** No reply to this response was ever received. Note that web addresses cited in this work under **References** have been updated though web-based citations are from the original sites. Postal addresses of sources cited in this work were extant at the time of writing. Some annotations to this work have been made in blue or **blue bold** text.

1st February 2003

David Tansley Recipient

Dear Mr Tansley

Mr Crowter of *Christian Watch* has passed your letter of January 4th to me, together with the comments of your group leader. This letter is a response to his comments, which I have placed in bold Italics, with enclosed quotes as necessary. Feel free to forward copies to everyone in your group, including your leader.

1. The organisation is connected to a few Protestant churches...

"It's (sic) championing of the Queen as an Anglican head of state is interesting as it is not a movement with support in that church."

So what? She is still the legitimate reigning Monarch (some Catholics think otherwise, of course), even if she has violated her Coronation Oath by meeting with the Pope (1) p 11-12 and should receive appropriate censure from her loyal subjects, according to Magna Carta (2) p 15-17. (The Oath itself was altered to remove the injunction against the blasphemous fable of the mass (2) p 27 but the alteration was illegal and the injunction therefore still stands.)

"The real agenda is the maintenance of the acts of union and settlement that would prevent any solution of the Northern Irish situation that would lead to a substantial shift of power from Protestants..."

"The real agenda" is therefore to stop traitors from undermining these protective Acts. The writer's turn of phrase reveals that he would at least condone the eventual surrender of part of Great Britain to the Pope of Rome, as set out in the infamous Anglo-Irish Agreement of 1985:

"It is highly significant...that in the Preamble [of the Agreement] "the two major traditions" are defined in terms of their constitutional ambitions for the Province. As a consequence, the British government has committed itself to require of unionists not just that concessions be made to "those who aspire to a sovereign united Ireland" within Northern Ireland, but also to those citizens of the Irish Republic who share this objective" (3) p 7.

In other words, up to one million of Her Majesty's most loyal subjects are to be dragooned into the hegemony of the Irish Republic, which *"is not regarded as a friendly neighbour [and] seen as sharing the same objective as republican terrorism"* *ibid.* p 4. This is essentially the history of the last 18 years in Ulster. In the Second World War, a supporter of such a perfidious strategy would have been called a 'Quisling'.

2. A particular view of history, which is arguably false and particular readings of scripture that are also debatable

It will be shown that the “*view of history*” contradicted in points 3-6 is actually demonstrably true but one wonders to which “*readings of scripture*” is the writer referring? Unfortunately I cannot comment because he fails to cite any.

3. The Roman Catholic Church did not exist as a distinct denomination until...1054

Earle E. Cairns (4) p 160 states “*The Canon of the Mass...emphasised the sacrificial nature of the Communion service. By the end of the sixth century all the seven acts that the Roman Catholic Church regards as sacraments were in use and had an exalted position in worship*”. In other words, the Catholic Church, as such, was in existence at least 500 years before the split in 1054.

“The church that sent Augustine to Britain was the same church that sent the early Christians to Britain from whom the Celtic church sprang...the earliest British Christians came from Rome and Patrick was converted by them”

Early British Christianity was not Roman. It was Apostolic. “*We have the evidence of the historian Eusebius (AD 260-340) who states that “The apostles passed beyond the ocean to the isles called the Britannic Isles” (5) p 29. Elder (6) p 144 states that, among other authorities, Archbishop James Ussher of the 17th Century, in British Ecclesiastical Antiquities, p 4 speaks of St. Paul’s mission to Britain.*

Despite the spiritual darkness that descended upon Britain after the Saxon invasion, apostolic Christianity survived, especially in the west of the British Isles, where Patrick was converted through the witness of Apostolic Christians, not Roman Christians. “*One thing we can be sure of and that is he was born again in Ireland. It was there that the wayward youth repented and sought the God of his fathers and received Christ by simple faith*” (7) p 4. Rev. Foster continues, p 5 “*It is important to understand that though the Roman Catholic Church today claims him as her apostle to Ireland there is nothing more clear than that Patrick’s theology was as far removed from Popery as Heaven is from Hell. It is a simple matter of reading his confession and one will see that Rome’s claim that he came to Ireland as an emissary of the Pope is entirely false*”.

Patrick’s theology establishes that he was not a convert of Rome but of those faithful to **“the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle”** 2 Thessalonians 2:15.

Rome’s claim nevertheless establishes *her* as a distinct church long before 1054 because Patrick lived from 381-461 AD (4) p 128. Rome had no fewer than 7 popes during this time (8) p 36-37, with many predecessors allegedly dating back to Peter. Leo I, who was Pope from 440-461 “*made much use of the title papas from which our word “pope” is derived*” (4) p 159. Yet Patrick “*never mentions Rome or any pope in connection with anything Biblical or Christian*” (9) p 203-204. Inspection of Patrick’s Confession (7) p 10ff will confirm this statement.

Moreover, there is further evidence of two entirely different Christian traditions during this period, because Roman ‘Christians’ did their utmost to stamp out what remained of distinctly Apostolic, Biblical Christianity. Fuller, citing Wilkinson, reveals Rome’s hatred of Bible believers at this time.

“In the silent watches of the night, along the lonely paths of Asia Minor where robbers and wild beasts lurked, might have been seen the noble missionaries carrying manuscripts, and verifying documents from the churches of Judea to encourage their struggling brethren under the iron heel of the Papacy” (10) p 214.

“History does not afford a record of cruelty greater than that manifested by Rome toward the Waldenses. It is impossible to write fully the inspiring history of this persecuted people, whose origin goes back to apostolic days and whose history is ornamented with stories of gripping interest. Rome has obliterated the records. Dr. DeSanctis, many years a Catholic official at Rome, some time official Censor of the Inquisition and later a convert to Protestantism, thus reports the conversation of a Waldensian scholar as he points out to others the ruins of Palatine Hill, Rome. “‘See,’ said the

Waldensian, 'a beautiful monument of ecclesiastical antiquity. These rough materials are the ruin of the two great Palatine libraries, one Greek and the other Latin, where the precious manuscripts of our ancestors were collected, and which Pope Gregory I, called the Great, caused to be burned.'" *The destruction of Waldensian records, beginning about 600 A.D. by Gregory I, was carried through with thoroughness by the secret agents of the Papacy*" *ibid.* p 206.

No wonder Rome wishes to date the origin of their 'church' from 1054 AD!

Rev. Gardner is most explicit about the different Christian traditions (5) p 42-43:

"It was out of Ireland, then – when Patrick's work of establishing churches there had been accomplished – that the light of Christianity began to shine once more like a gleaming beacon upon Britain...from Ireland, the Gospel was carried over to the northern part of Britain by Columba...

"It is important to note at this point that there was a distinction between the form of Christianity which reached England through Columba [and therefore through Patrick] and that form of Christianity which, by then, existed throughout the Christianised countries of Europe...

*"Equally important is the fact that it is historians who tell us (and they have no particular axe to grind) that the form of Christianity which Columba brought, had travelled from its original source in the Middle East, through Northern Ireland, to its new home in Scotland and the north of England **without touching at any moment the centre at Rome.** Emphasis in original.*

"It was not until Pope Gregory the Great sent Augustine as a missionary in 596, that the Roman form of Christianity which had come to dominate Western Europe was introduced to Britain. Thereafter, two streams of Christianity flowed through the land: the one which had been brought by Columba, and the Roman form which had come with Augustine. As time went on, the latter sought to exercise a position of supremacy over the former". Dr. Ruckman (9) p 262 agrees with Rev. Gardner's analysis:

"Gregory the Great [540-604] is called "the great" because he was a crafty politician, a great organiser, and an energetic proselyter for a religious prostitute (Rev. 17:1-6). The modern term is "pimp". His "interest" in England certainly had nothing to do with a burden for lost souls or a desire to obey 2 Corinthians 5:20 or Acts 1:8. Gregory (as all popes) was concerned with bringing every country in Europe into a totalitarian Church State, with himself as head of that church, especially any country at this time that had providentially obtained the correct Bible text and was beginning to oppose Roman traditions on Easter and infant baptism".

Interestingly, Patrick's confession (7) p 18-19 reveals his earnest desire that *"there should be clergy to baptize and exhort a people poor and needy"* and that *"there was one blessed lady of Scottish birth...whom I baptized"*. He makes no reference to infant baptism, showing again how far his theology was divorced from that of Rome.

"The council of Whitby at which the two churches reunited did not debate doctrine, only church structure and calendar"

Doctrine was not debated at Whitby because it was not the central issue. The central issue was final authority. Dr. Peter Trumper (11) p 29 writes

"They gathered at Whitby. Representatives of both the Roman and Celtic Church met in 664 AD to discuss the future of the British people. Were they to remain under the influence of Biblical teaching alone, or were they about to enter a new era?"

The aim of the Romish party was not submission to the scripture but conquest for Rome. Key to their conquest was the conversion of the Northumbrian king, Oswiu, to the 'new' faith. Dr. Trumper continues, *ibid.* p 30-31:

"If Northumbria fell to Roman advances, it would not be long before the remainder of the Britons followed suit...Oswiu was won over to the Roman church, not by the deft handling of Biblical truth but via self-interest and appeals devoid of divine authority. The British were humbled before their

enemies, whose policies and the manner of their execution had been as cunning during those 67 years [since the arrival of Augustine at Canterbury in 597 AD] as they had been unGodly”.

The defeat of the British Church stemmed from their appeal to their founder, Columba, instead of to the scriptures. The Romish party appealed to Peter, who antedated Columba as “*the most blessed Prince of Apostles*” *ibid.*, thus coercing the Celts to bow before papal authority. This melancholy result is a warning to all the Lord’s people that **“It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man”** Psalm 118:8.

Nevertheless, the Romish aims and methods evident at Whitby serve only to highlight further the distinct differences between the two traditions.

4. *The history of the reformation suggested in the documents and the current position of religious freedom in Britain is also misleading.*

“The reason certain countries became Protestant...was purely political. The documents sent out by Christian Watch are quick to point out the political ambitions of the pope but mention nothing of the political ambitions of the Protestant rulers of Britain, Scotland and the Netherlands”

The above statement does not reveal the true stimulus for the Reformation. Manhattan (12) p 100-102 states:

“Whereas the primary motives which inspired the Reformation were theological, forces of no less import gave it the impetus, the strength and the opportunity to be the success it was. These forces were embryonic nationalism [i.e. politics], a veiled racial antagonism and a conflict of diversifying cultures. Underneath and behind them all, however, was perhaps the most important: greed. Had this been absent, it is doubtful whether the Reformation could have been born, let alone have survived...”

“Its success was due not so much to the ripeness of the times or the corruption of the Church or the zeal of the movement’s leaders...but to the fact that behind them rallied powerful lay elements desirous of getting hold of the immense wealth of the Church. Princes, the nobility, burghers, not to mention kings, were motivated mainly by the allure of the distribution of vast estates until then owned by a church which they wanted to dispossess. The theological disputes were to them providential justification for seizing the lands which had been held for centuries. The opportunity had to be grasped, for it might never come again.

“The economic motivation, however, was not confined exclusively to the nobility of Germany, England, and other countries. It existed at all levels of society. It could not have been otherwise since the fiscal exactions of Roman Catholicism as we have seen so often, affected everyone. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries these had become exceedingly burdensome. They had become a kind of perpetual strangulation which, when added to the taxation levied by the king or local princes or town, became unbearable...”

“Henry VIII, for all his coarseness, animal lust, and excuse of wanting an heir to the throne, ultimately became motivated by the grand prize of wealth he could take through the Reformation, the real mother of Anglicanism. The English nobility who rallied behind him were no less greedy than Henry. Their support yielded vast landed domains, estates, and money, all of which came from the Church which they now so conveniently repudiated. The Reformation was for them nothing but a vast business transaction in which they became the major beneficiaries.

“The economic spur thus played a major, if not the major, role in the success of the Reformation as such, not only in England, but also in Germany – it should never be forgotten that Luther’s strength, and therefore success, came through the support of the majority of the German princes who stood by him so as to gain by the “secularisation” of the Church’s property... Had such possession not existed, it is doubtful whether the lay elements which tipped the balance in favour of the Protestant reformers would have supported them solely for theological reasons, since few were genuinely interested in these...”

These examples from History in no way invalidate the *Christian Watch* literature. The scriptures contain several examples in which God uses ungodly men to further His purposes. Consider Joab and Cyrus, to name but two.

“Be of good courage, and let us play the men for our people, and for the cities of our God: and the LORD do that which seemeth him good. And Joab drew nigh, and the people that were with him, unto the battle against the Syrians: and they fled before him” 2 Samuel 10:12, 13.

“Thus saith the LORD to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut” Isaiah 45:1

And neither does the avarice of earthly kings detract from the benefits of the Reformation to ordinary believers, as Bishop Ryle shows (13) p 2-3:

“I do not pretend to endorse the character of all the agents by whom the English Reformation was carried out, or to approve of everything which they did. I do not for a moment maintain that Henry VIII was a godly man. No! Too often he was a brutal tyrant – I do not say that the statesmen who surrounded him were faultless characters. Far from it. Too many of them made a market of the Reformation, and enriched their families by plundering abbey lands. I do not ask you to believe that Cranmer, and the other Reformers, either in the days of Henry VIII, or Edward VI, or Elizabeth, were angels, and made no mistakes... But you must remember that God does a great deal of good work with imperfect tools, such as Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus. All I do maintain is, that the whole result of the Protestant Reformation was an enormous gain to this country. And I confidently assert that England before the Reformation was as unlike England after the Reformation as black and white, darkness and light, night and day. Facts, stubborn facts, exist to prove the correctness of this assertion”.

Bishop Ryle describes in detail *ibid.* p 3ff how the Reformation delivered England from “*gross religious ignorance and spiritual darkness, the most grovelling, childish and superstitious practices in religion, degrading tyranny and swindling impostures of the Romish priesthood, the plague of unholiness and immorality among the clergy*”. The latter is now resurfacing through the notorious ‘paedophile priests’ (1) p 58ff, for whose abominable misdeeds, Rome goes to extraordinary lengths to protect, as in the case of the late ‘Father’ Sean Fortune, parish priest of Wexford, Republic of Ireland (14).

Moreover, Bishop Ryle *ibid.* p 11ff describes the great blessings conferred on Britain by the Reformation. These included “*an English Bible, and liberty...to read it, an open road to the throne of grace and the great fountain of peace with God, a true idea of Christian worship, a true notion of the office of a Christian minister, a right standard of Christian holiness*”.

Of the blessing of the English Bible, Kensit (15) p “*Green, the historian rightly enough says: “The Nation became the people of a Book – and that Book, the Bible”. The homes of England literally became Bethels, for the editions of the Scriptures were multiplied and found their way into the establishment of family religion. The very phraseology of the Scriptures became part of the National character*”.

Note that when the Bible becomes established in a nation, it is able to admonish rulers and to correct their avaricious ways:

“The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God” 2 Samuel 23:3.

Ryle nevertheless warned of “*the danger in which the cause of the Reformation is placed at this day, by that mischievous Romanizing movement within the Church of England, which is now called Anglo-Romanism*”.

To judge by the group leader's comments, "*that mischievous Romanizing movement*" is very much at work today. The whole point of the *Christian Watch* literature is to sound warnings against it, in whatever forms it takes and to exhort the nation as Bishop Ryle sought to do, to return to the great blessings that God conferred on this nation through the Reformation.

"Protestants died for their convictions but so did Catholics in this nation and many others. But not one of them were killed because of what they believed, rather because their beliefs meant they were not loyal to the monarch"

The above statement is as neat a piece of sophistry as ever proceeded from the mouth of **"that old serpent"** Revelation 12:9. It is **[only]** a slightly different twist of the serpent's forked tongue from the usual refrain of ecumenical apologists that 'both Protestants and Catholics died for their faith and were put to death by the secular authority, not the church etc.'

Protestants died for disavowing the Mass and other false doctrines of popery. Catholics died for treason. There is a difference.

"Back in 1554...a priest carrying the eucharist (the little Jesus cookie) could stand before a family of Christians in Scotland, tied to posts with dried brush up to their waists. He'd hold that piece of bread before them and ask if what he held in his hand was actually the body, blood and deity of Jesus Christ. When they said, "No, it is only a symbol," the priest's assistant placed his flaming torch into the brush and set those Bible-believers on fire. As the victims screamed in agony, the priest held up his crucifix and said "All this is for the greater glory of God."" (16) p 11.

Forbush reveals (17) p 197ff that Patrick Hamilton was burned at the stake in St. Andrews, Scotland in 1527 because he disapproved of "*pilgrimages, purgatory, prayers to saints, for the dead, etc.*". In 1539, *ibid.* p 199, Jerome Russell and Alexander Kennedy, both youths of eighteen, were incinerated in Edinburgh because the archbishop's examination resulted in "*both of them deemed heretics*", i.e. not traitors.

Likewise, the great preacher George Wishart went to the stake in St. Andrews in 1544 because "*he was too firmly fixed in his religious principles and too much enlightened with the truth of the Gospel, to be in the least moved*" i.e. to recant those principles *ibid.* p 203-204.

Eighty-two year old Walter Mill "*was burnt at Edinburgh in the year 1558...saying that he would 'sooner forfeit ten thousand lives, than relinquish a particle of those heavenly principles he had received from the suffrages of his blessed Redeemer.'* In consequence of this, sentence of condemnation was immediately passed on him..." *ibid.* p 205.

Joan Boucher was burnt on May 2nd, 1550, for denying that Mary was sinless (in accordance with Leviticus 12:6 **[And when the days of her purifying are fulfilled, for a son, or for a daughter, she shall bring a lamb of the first year for a burnt offering, and a young pigeon, or a turtle-dove, for a sin offering, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest]** and Luke 2:22 **[And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord]**). This was evidently a remnant of Romish doctrine that still survived at the time. The power of the bishops was such that even King Edward VI was unable to have her exonerated. A Bishop Scorey preached to her and vilified her as she suffered in the flames. Joan looked him in the eye and said "*You lie like a rogue; go read the Scriptures*" (9) p 403.

Joan's advice is excellent, in the present context.

The first to suffer under the reign of Bloody Mary was John Rogers, Vicar of St. Sepulchre's and Reader of St. Paul's, London, who perished by fire on February 4th 1555. Just before Rogers' execution at Smithfield, "*Mr. Woodroffe, one of the sheriffs...asked him if he would revoke his abominable doctrine, and the evil opinion of the sacrament of the altar. Mr. Rogers answered, "That which I have preached I will seal with my blood."* Then Mr. Woodroffe said, "*Thou art an heretic.*"".

Not one of these executions was for disloyalty. They were all carried out for the ‘heresy’ of denying Romish doctrine. That has been the pattern for the overwhelming majority of Protestant martyrdoms.

Bishop Ryle states (18) p 16-18 *“[Mary] began at once to pull down her brother’s [Edward VI’s] work in every possible way, and to restore Popery in its worst and offensive forms. Step by step she and her councillors marched back to Rome, trampling down one by one every obstacle... The Mass was restored; the English service was taken away; the works of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Tyndale, Bucer, Latimer, Hooper, and Cranmer were proscribed. Cardinal Pole was invited to England. The foreign Protestants resident in England were banished. The leading divines of the Protestant Church of England were deprived of their offices, and, while some escaped to the Continent, many were put in prison. The old statutes against heresy were once more brought forward, primed and loaded. And thus by the beginning of 1555 the stage was cleared, and that bloody tragedy, in which [Catholic] Bishops Bonner and Gardiner played so prominent a part, was ready to begin.*

“For, unhappily for the credit of human nature, Mary’s advisers were not content with depriving and imprisoning the leading English Reformers. It was resolved to make them adjure their principles, or to put them to death. One by one they were called before special Commissions, examined about their religious opinions and called upon to recant, on pain of death if they refused.

“No third course, no alternative was left to them. They were either to give up Protestantism and receive Popery, or else they were to be burned alive. Refusing to recant, they were one by one handed over to the secular power, publicly brought out and chained to stakes, publicly surrounded with faggots, and publicly sent out of the world by that most cruel and painful of deaths – the death by fire.

“It is a broad fact that these 288 sufferers were not put to death for any offence against property or person. They were not rebels against the Queen’s authority, caught red-handed in arms. They were not thieves, or murderers, or drunkards, or unbelievers, or men and women of immoral lives.

“On the contrary, they were, with barely an exception, some of the holiest, purest, and best Christians in England, and several of them the most learned of their day.

“I must ask my readers never to forget that for the burning of our Reformers the Church of Rome is wholly and entirely responsible. The attempt to transfer the responsibility from the Church to the secular power is a miserable and dishonest subterfuge. The men of Judah did not slay Samson; but they delivered him bound into the hand of the Philistines! The Church of Rome did not slay the Reformers; but she condemned them, and the secular power executed the condemnation!”

Once again, it should be noted that the condemnation was for heresy, not disloyalty.

By contrast, Catholics were executed because they were traitors intent on assassinating the Queen of England. They were not merely ‘disloyal’.

Albert Close (19) p 76ff describes a challenge from Mr. A.W. Martin to Father McNabb of St. Dominic’s Priory in September 1934. The challenge is worded thus:

“The Old State papers, recently recovered from the Vatican Archives, etc., clearly prove that many of whom the Roman Church now designates as “Martyrs for their Religion” were clearly involved in Jesuit plots to murder the Queen and bring about the invasion of our country by foreign armies”.

Father McNabb eventually accepted the challenge and the issue was debated on March 20th 1935 at Caxton Hall before a packed audience. 40 of the incriminating documents that substantiated the challenge were produced. The Roman Catholics present were Father McNabb and Mr. Richard O’Sullivan K.C. They did not dispute a single one of the documents, thereby acknowledging that they were genuine, a conclusion that has never been disputed since then. Mr. Close’s book continues with a detailed description of the contents of the documents. See also Wylie (20) p 410ff and Shepherd (21) for details of the papal plots against the throne of England in Elizabeth’s time.

Significantly, the British press did not report a word of the debate or its result.

Edmund Paris (22) p 43-44 summarises how Catholic sedition was rife in England from Elizabeth's time up to and beyond the time of Charles II. He shows unequivocally how the Jesuits in particular merited the supreme penalty.

"The Company...was training English priests at Valladolid, Seville, Madrid and Lisbon, while her secret propaganda continued in England under the direction of Father Garnett. After the Gunpowder Plot against James I, successor of Elizabeth, this Father Garnett was condemned for complicity and hanged, like Father Campion. Under Charles I, then in Cromwell's Commonwealth, other Jesuits paid for their intrigues with their lives. The order thought it would triumph under Charles II, who together with Louis XIV, had concluded a secret treaty at Dover, pledging to restore Catholicism in the land".

Not only were Protestants and Catholics put to death for entirely different reasons but also the numbers of executions that may be attributed to each are vastly different. Henry Halley (23) p 793 states *"All told a few hundred martyrs may be charged against Protestants, at most not over a few thousand; but to Rome, untold millions"*.

However slowly and imperfectly the Protestant Reformation may have come into effect, Rome has never reformed. In the words of Bishop Ryle (17) p 18:

"The burning of the Marian martyrs is an act that the Church of Rome has never repudiated, apologized for, or repented of, down to the present day..."

"Never has she repented of her treatment of the Vaudois and the Albigenses; - never has she repented of the wholesale murders of the Spanish Inquisition; - never has she repented of the massacre of St. Bartholomew; never has she repented of the burning of the English Reformers. We should make a note of that fact and let it sink down into our minds. Rome never changes".

The unchangeable nature of Rome will become apparent once more when the group leader's comments on the EU and *"the Nazi attempt to conquer Europe"* are considered. I turn now to his statement on religious liberty:

"To suggest that Protestantism has enabled religious liberty is simply false. Rather Anglicanism was promoted in this country and all other faiths legislated against from the time of Elisabeth to the period between the two world wars. These forbade any but Anglicans to teach in university, stand for parliament or hold any position of authority, and this applied to all other Protestants as much as Catholics. This can hardly be viewed as tolerance!"

The obvious flaw in this statement is that the examples given are drawn from the educational and political spheres. ***"Religious liberty"*** is the freedom to hold the beliefs that the Reformers were burned for. Halley notes (23) p 793 that *"while the Reformation was a grand struggle for Religious Freedom, the Reformers were slow in granting to others what they sought for themselves"*. Ryle (24) p 3 provides a very realistic explanation.

"We must not forget that for at least a hundred years England had been incessantly exposed to the untiring machinations of the Jesuits. Ever since the accession of Elizabeth, those mischievous agents of Popery had been compassing sea and land to undo the work of the Reformation, and to bring back our country to the thralldom of the Church of Rome. Disguised in very possible way, and professing anything by the Pope's permission and dispensation, in order to accomplish their end, these Jesuits throughout the days of the Stuarts were incessantly at work. To set Churchmen against Dissenters, Calvinists against Arminians, sect against sect, party against party, and so to weaken the Protestant cause, was their one constant employment. How much of the bitter divisions between Churchmen and Nonconformists, how much of the religious strife which defiled the early part of the seventeenth century, is owing to the Jesuits, I believe the last day alone will declare."

Cushing Biggs Hassell (25) Chapter XVII states *“The Church of England for a long time imitated the tyrannical and persecuting spirit of her old mother, Rome. It was particularly during the infamous reigns of Charles II and James II (1660-1688) that the Baptists were persecuted in England... They were plundered and imprisoned without remorse. It has been computed that, from 1660 to 1689, in England, seventy thousand persons suffered on account of religion, eight thousand persons perished, and two million pounds sterling (tens of millions of dollars in today’s value) were paid in fines. ‘The Baptists,’ says Sir James McIntosh, ‘suffered more than any others under Charles II, because they had publicly professed the principles of religious liberty.’”* These figures do not amount to *“untold millions”* though they are rather more than Halley’s estimates but all three authors reveal a very unpalatable truth, namely that the persecuting spirit died hard. It is therefore not surprising that Bunyan (26) has no hesitation in referring to the established church as *“the Monster...like unto no one Beast upon the Earth”* p 278. Interestingly, he writes *“it was governed by a Woman”*. The notes to the passage, p 326, identify *“the Monster”* as the Church of England, according to Revelation 17:3 but fail to identify the Woman, verses 1-4, whom Bunyan no doubt clearly saw as Rome. Very likely, Bunyan would have agreed with Ryle’s and Hassell’s analyses.

Yet the progress of religious liberty in England could not be stopped. Hassell notes that *“But all this severe persecution did not succeed in putting an end to the religious meetings of the Dissenters in England. They met for worship in private houses, in the lanes, in the fields, in the woods, at all hours of the day and of the night, wherever and whenever they could best escape the vigilance of the authorities. The word of the Lord was very precious in those days. There was a very lively spirit of faith and prayer among the people of God; their numbers increased; it was a spiritual spring-time with them, though a period of great outward gloom; they felt and declared that the time of the singing of birds was come, and that the voice of the turtle was heard in the land. They blessedly realized the holy rejoicing of the prophecy of Habakkuk, not in worldly prosperity, but in the God of their salvation (Hab. iii. 17-19)”*.

One reason for the growth of religious liberty in England was that God worked not through a system but through a man, as He has often done in history and as He did repeatedly in the scriptures. Oliver Cromwell was God’s man for the true championing of religious liberty. He himself observed that restrictive attitudes were not confined to Anglicanism. According to Cromwell, *“Every sect saith, ‘Oh give me liberty,’ but give it him and to his power he will not yield it to anybody else”*. As Lord Protector, he saw his role as a constable to keep opposing factions from *“knocking their heads one against another”* Firth (27) p 336, 361.

Yet Firth states *ibid.* p 362 that *“no man exerted more influence on the religious development of England. Thanks to [Cromwell], Nonconformity had time to take root and to grow so strong in England that the storm which followed the Restoration had no power to root it up”*.

From the roots of Nonconformity grew the great revival preaching and subsequent missionary movement of the 18th and 19th centuries. Significantly, this did *not* happen in lands under *“the iron heel of the papacy”*, never has and never will. Therefore insistence that Protestantism failed to provide a basis for religious liberty overlooks the vital factors described above and betrays a very shallow view of the relevant history.

On the particular matter on teaching in universities, Masters (28) p 14ff reveals that Michael Faraday, who pioneered the study of electricity during the 19th century, worshipped in a small nonconformist chapel. However, he received a doctorate from Oxford University and lectured at the Royal Institution. Another distinguished scientist of the 19th century, Lord Kelvin, openly criticised the Anglican Church for *“much perversion allowed to go unchecked...with only too feeble remonstrance on the part of the bishops”*. Yet this protest did not prevent Kelvin from receiving a knighthood from another Bible believer, Queen Victoria *ibid.* p 110-113. These examples suggest that however slowly and despite setbacks and hindrances, educational liberty was following religious liberty. The entrance of the scripture, thanks to the Reformation, was giving light to the whole nation, light that was denied to papal lands.

“The entrance of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding unto the simple” Psalm 119:130.

“One only has to look at Catholic Spain to realise religious freedom would not today be compromised by a catholic monarch. Why? Because monarchs do not rule nations as they did at the time of the reformation...[and] to suggest a Catholic monarch would become a base for Rome to overtake Britain and persecute Protestants is highly fanciful”

In the late 1970's, evangelicals were 0.2% of the population of Spain, with Protestants as a whole estimated to be 0.3% or about 55,000 in a population of 36,000,000 (29) p 64-65. 99% of the population were Roman Catholics and the Roman Catholic Church was still the State Church in spite of “rapid liberalisation since 1975” (29) p 64-66. Persecution of Protestants lasted until 1968, when discriminatory laws were repealed and the movement for liberalisation was doubtless encouraged by the death of Franco in 1976.

A report published by the U.S. State Department in 2002 (30) confirms that “generally free practice of religion” continues in Spain to the present day. 94% of the present day population of 41,000,000 are Roman Catholic citizens, 2% are followers of other religions and the remainder consists of unbelievers, agnostics and atheists. There is much nominalism so that many of the latter group may be counted amongst those who are officially Roman Catholics. There is now evidently no state religion but “the Catholic Church enjoys some privileges unavailable to other faiths”.

In other words, despite the new liberality, Rome is still in control, with Spanish Protestants numbering only 350,000 or less than 1% of the population. Whilst this is a marked and commendable growth in a little over two decades, it hardly constitutes either Reformation or revival and would be of far less concern to the Vatican than the Spanish republic of 1930's (31) p 227. When “the Spanish republic began to restrict the overbearing influence of the Church over all aspects of Spanish life...in 1936 Franco invaded Spain from Morocco with a largely Muslim army, but with the full backing of the leadership of the Church of Rome”. The Vatican knows how to punish her wayward children. Right now, she simply lacks the wherewithal. This will change with the establishment of the EU army, the formation of which is already underway (32) p 77ff, chapter 6, *Ein Reich, Ein Volk, Ein Wehrmacht*.

One should never forget that “Rome, when in minority, is as gentle as a lamb, when in equality is as clever as a fox, when in majority is as fierce as a tiger, willing to kill and maim to extend her reach” (33) p 3. In Spain, Rome will simply bide her time until she has the armed force with which to exert her authority. That is the lesson of history – and Rome does not need a complaisant monarch to repeat that lesson. Franco was a dictator, not a king.

Moreover, Spain may simply be the exception that proves the rule. Protestant Christians are not readily tolerated in much of the European Union, especially evangelical Protestants. Persecution of Protestant Christians in Austria, France, Germany, Greece and even Great Britain illustrates this point (2) p 44, (31) p 269, (34), (35), and (36) p 119ff.

These examples simply emphasise that Rome does not need a monarch to persecute Protestant Christians. Any supportive government will do. However, Ashley Mote (37) p 126-128 has this dire warning for Britain in particular.

“The Vatican...has consistently backed the aggressive players on the world stage who offered to spread Catholicism...So the proposal to lift the ban on Catholics on or next to the throne of England has more to it than meets the eye. It is yet another step on the constitutional slippery slope. It is yet another step towards losing our sovereignty. It is yet another step towards losing our identity and becoming submerged in the Catholic Europe of the EU. British – and Protestant- rights and freedoms are as much at risk from this source as from others.

“It is hardly surprising that until the coronation of King Edward VII the coronation oath contained a clause to keep this land free from “Catholic superstition”.

“The reason for not having a Catholic monarch is clearly spelled out in the Declaration of Rights and also in the Bill of Rights. It is inconsistent with the safety and well-being of this Protestant kingdom.

“This proposition was entrenched in the Act of Settlement, 1701, and in Article 11 of the Treaty of Union, 1707, which embodied the substance of the Act of Settlement. And since this treaty was not incorporated into statute law it cannot be repealed by an Act of Parliament...”

The group leader therefore displays further ignorance of history in stating that **“the act of settlement is the last piece of legislation surviving from those times”**. As Mr Mote also shows (37) p 247, even *Magna Carta* from 1215 is still in force as are all the acts of the Williamite era designed to protect the integrity of the Protestant British throne. Constitutionally, the 17th century Coronation Oath still applies, with its abjuring of the *“blasphemous fable”* of the Catholic mass and the altered version, used at the Queen’s coronation in 1953, is illegal (2) p 27. Mr Mote continues.

“Though the Church of England is part of the state, it does not involve itself much in political issues. But many religions take a very different view. They demand a say and want the state to be run according to their principles. When they are in a minority, as in Britain, they keep quiet. But when they are in a majority, as in Italy, they make their weight felt continually. They even have their own political parties, which argue for Roman Catholic doctrine to be made the law of the land”.*

*This would mean that preaching the simple Gospel of salvation by grace through faith in the shed blood of the Lord Jesus Christ plus nothing, Ephesians 1:7 **[In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace]** would be illegal.

“In a united Europe they will be in a permanent majority capable of forming a euro-government, as they have done already in Spain, Germany, and Italy. By becoming part of a federal superstate, the British would also be drawn back into long-term domination by Roman Catholics and papal dogma...”

Mr Mote also clearly shows that Rome perceives Britain differently from Spain.

“The Roman Catholic Church dominates Europe. For it, the UK is unfinished business stretching back 500 years”.

Although largely kept out of the media, this conclusion has been accepted for many years by prominent public figures in Britain.

“We will be joined to a Europe in which the Catholic religion will be the dominant faith, and in which the application of the Catholic Social Doctrine will be a major factor in everyday political and economic life”.

- Baroness Shirley Williams, in 1975 (36) p 84

To assess the implications of *“Catholic Social Doctrine”* for Protestants, one should consider the experience of the Citadel Church in France (35).

As Britain draws closer to Rome, she inclines more and more to the vileness that characterises the true Rome – not the high moral tone Rome adopts in this country, to support the pro-life movement. The group leader seems to be unaware of the arrests of street preachers in this country and the tragic case of the late Mr Harry Hammond, victimised by the authorities on behalf of a pack of sodomites (38) p 33. *Christian Watch* literature has included some of these references. Evidently the group leader was too lazy to check them out, or too prejudiced, or both.

Further, even without a Catholic monarch, the *Crown Prosecution Service* is even now taking steps effectively to outlaw preaching against the sin of sodomy (39):

“Homophobic crime is based on prejudice, discrimination and hate and has no place in an open and democratic society, the Crown Prosecution Service says today...”

“The Attorney General, Lord Goldsmith, QC, said: “Homophobic crimes strike at people's right to feel safe and secure, and to abuse or attack someone because of their sexual orientation and gender identity is a hate crime which cannot be tolerated.”

“The CPS definition of a homophobic or a transphobic incident is:

“Any incident which is perceived to be homophobic or transphobic by the victim or by any other person.”” Emphasis in original [site].

In other words, any sex pervert wishing to attack any Christian who rightly declares sodomy to be gross sin, Genesis 13:13, now has every facility to do so – legally, according to the Crown Prosecution Service. The CPS may become the *Christian Persecution Service*, because there is no reason why it should limit its abuse of power to the defence of sodomy.

Such developments would be in complete harmony with Nazi and therefore Catholic politics (40). (For the Catholic connection to the Nazis, see below.)

Further, if the group leader had read the *Christian Watch* literature carefully, he would have seen that nothing is needed now to overtake Britain. Britain has already been overtaken (34), inside panel.

5. *What ever one thinks of the EU to compare it to the Nazi attempt to conquer Europe is not only ludicrous it is highly offensive!*

“Indeed much of the stuff about the EU is based on a notion that it’s a Catholic conspiracy to destroy the Protestant church. No evidence is supplied”

Displays of wilful ignorance of this kind are themselves highly offensive, even though Paul enjoins a certain toleration 1 Corinthians 14:38 **[But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant]**. Once again, the group leader displays his refusal to check references (34) and then follows the line of least resistance by lapsing into denial mode – which of course does *not* constitute refutation. In addition, he supplies no evidence himself to back up any of his assertions.

For answer to his point 5, see citations above and this further statement from Lindsay Jenkins (32) p 268-269, for which there was insufficient space in the *Christian Watch* leaflet (34).

“The Vatican can see advantages in backing the EU. To promote a Europe in which Catholicism might dominate, the Vatican has pursued EU integration from at least the early 1940s and mainly in secret. The first six members of the EEC were largely Catholic countries. According to John Cornwall’s seminal book, Hitler’s Pope, the Secret History of Pius XII, the Catholic Church today is returning to the ideology of total papal power introduced in the first Vatican Council of 1870. It was this policy which politically disarmed Germany’s Catholic community, the most powerful in the world, enabling Hitler to rise to power virtually unopposed. The alliance between the EU and the Papacy could further endanger democracy and accelerate dictatorship...the Vatican is already taking a more public stance. The Rome Synod of October 1999 declared it was necessary to, ‘pursue with courage and urgency, the process of European integration, widening the circle of member countries of the Union...’ In December 1999 the Vatican began the canonisation process for the so-called ‘Founding Fathers of Europe’: Konrad Adenauer, Alcide de Gasperi and Robert Schuman”.

Hilton (36) p 19ff has this comment:

“Even into the 21st century, Europe’s leaders and the Roman Catholic Church are still working together towards the common goal of unity. Many of Europe’s political leaders, including Commissioners and MEPs, see a crucial role for the Roman Catholic Church in their efforts, providing a powerfully cohesive common religion to hold Europe together politically. The Pope’s calls for spiritual unity are echoed by leading politicians all over Europe, especially those allied to the Vatican’s political wing, the so-called Christian Democratic parties. The Christian Democratic leaders from Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands have all backed far-reaching plans for the transfer of national sovereignty and the establishment of a federal government, with sole control over monetary, foreign and defence policy. Among European leaders who have been

influential in furthering this social agenda are former Dutch prime minister, Ruud Lubbers, and the former president of the European Commission, Jacques Delors-both Jesuit educated. Chancellor Kohl of Germany and former Spanish prime minister, Felipe Gonzales, are also devout Roman Catholics. For them, there is no nobler task than the unifying of the European continent. A German colleague of Jacques Delors described the idea of a united Europe as 'essentially a Catholic concept', of which an inevitable result would be the subjugation of Britain's Protestant ethos to Roman Catholic social, political and religious teachings".

One should also consider the following disclosures, (41) p 96, (42) and then decide whose comments are **"ludicrous"**.

"After Chancellor Hitler's statement [on January 30th 1933, the day he became Chancellor], Mgr. Kaas, Chief of the Catholic Party, Ritter von Lex (Bavarian Catholic Party), Messrs. Maier (State Party) and Smiptendoerfer (Christian Socialists) announced that their representative groups would vote for the law of full powers to Hitler. After a speech by President Goering, this law was voted... It constituted the sole basis of Hitler's dictatorship... The fact that all parties except the socialists voted for full powers had a far more decisive effect than the Nazi victory in the elections..."

"THE OMINOUS PARALLELS: NAZISM AND THE EU

"It's often claimed - not least by our opponents - that Nazis and Fascists are nothing more than extreme xenophobic nationalists, totally opposed to 'good' international bodies like the EU. In the words of the song, "It Ain't Necessarily So".

"The EU War Baby

"Back in 1942, a book called The European Community was published. Its principal author, a Doctor of Economics, had argued in 1940 for a "Central European Union" and "European Economic Area" and for fixed exchange rates - EMU in all but name. In this book, he wrote that "No nation in Europe can achieve on its own the highest level of economic freedom which is compatible with all social requirements...The formation of very large economic areas follows a natural law of development...interstate agreements in Europe will control [economic forces generally]...There must be a readiness to subordinate one's own interests in certain cases to those of [the EC]."

"One of his co-authors wrote that the "classic national economy..is dead...community of fate which is the European economy...fate and extent of European co-operation depends on a new unity economic plan". Another observed that "We have a real European Community task before us...I am convinced that this Community effort will last beyond the end of the war."

"The last three words explain things. The principal author was Nazi Economics Minister and war criminal Walther Funk. The other two were respectively Nazi academic Heinrich Hunke and official Gustav Koenig. Nor were they just eccentrics. Goering's orders in 1940 were followed by a project for the "large-scale economic unification of Europe". Goebbels, in the same year, compared Germany's road to unification in the nineteenth century with Europe's in the twentieth, believing that "in fifty years' time [people] no longer think in terms of countries."

"The Same Old "New Europe"?"

"Ribbentrop, in 1943, endorsed plans for a European confederation. Seyss-Inquart, Gauleiter of Holland, spoke of "The new Europe of solidarity and co-operation among all its people... will find...rapidly increasing prosperity once national economic boundaries are removed."

"Their collaborators felt the same way. Quisling himself stated that there was no opposition between European economic co-operation and National Socialism, Vichy French Minister Jacques Benoist-Mechin that France had to "abandon nationalism...[to] take [its] place in European Community with honour."

“In the words of Rodney Atkinson, “The European Community was therefore intended by the Nazis... as a common cause against British...economic systems of trade and free exchange.” Mr. Atkinson goes on (in his book Europe’s Full Circle) to kindly provide us (pages 92-93) with a list of parallels between “Hitler’s Europe” and “Today’s Europe.”

- *Europäische Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft
European Economic Community*
- *European Currency System
European Exchange Rate Mechanism*
- *Europabank (Berlin)
European Central Bank (Frankfurt)*
- *European Regional Principle
Committee of the Regions*
- *Common Labour Policy
Social Chapter*
- *Economic and Trading Agreements
Single Market*

“A few further quotes may be of interest –

“The Germans alone can really organise Europe...”

“The future will belong to the Germans when we build the House of Europe...”

“The Anglo-Saxon economic system, the classic national economy, is dead...”

“It is important to establish a European Single Currency core in order to stand firm against Anglo-Saxon values.”

“I just quoted, respectively, Goebbels, Kohl, Hunke, and (in 1996) Belgian Finance Minister Philippe Maystadt. No, I’m not just indulging in cheap jibes or insinuating that all Europhiles are closet Nazis. Obviously they don’t share Hitler’s racial paranoia. No doubt they see themselves as good liberal-minded democrats. However, all totalitarian regimes stand for concentrating power in central hands. They’re all prone to meddle in people’s private lives and pursuits and to issue directives without properly consulting a free Parliament first. In short - the Eurocrats may not be totalitarians but they are totalitarian-minded in their behaviour.

*“A final thought: The Nazis used referenda to seduce power out of the hands of the people’s representatives and concentrate it in the hands of a few. With the prospect of a UK referendum on the single currency and the dangers of concentrating economic powers in the hands of a virtually unaccountable European Central Bank - remember: **NEVER AGAIN!**”*

“The EU is once more linked to the beast in the book of Revelation. On what basis? The number of heads no longer fits the number of nations...why not decide that the Act of union which creates one nation out of many is a sign that the Protestant monarchs of Britain are the beast? Or why not NATO? A good case has to be made before such comments on fulfilment of scripture should be offered, currently such linkages of the EU to the whore of Babylon or the beast run the risk of debasing rather than promoting belief in Scripture”

The group leader’s ignorance of history is matched by his apparent ignorance of scripture. The set of heads refers initially to **“seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth”** Revelation 17:9, *not nations*. The mountains and the woman are in turn associated with **“seven kings”** verse 10, *not nations*. Thus the kings are associated with the woman **“arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, decked with gold and precious stones, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication”** Revelation 17:4.

The woman is **“drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus...and in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth”** Revelation 17:6, 18:24.

And this woman **“is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth”** Revelation 17:18.

There is only one city that fits this description. It follows from the scripture that she must hold sway over all the rulers of the earth, including those of the member states of the EU.

These scriptures cannot possibly be interpreted as Protestant monarchs and the Act of Union. The Act of Union dates from 1707 but Halley (23) p 793 states that in (European) Protestant countries, persecution had ceased by the year 1700. By contrast, it has never ceased in Catholic countries, where Rome could get away with it, whether against Protestants or non Catholics of any description e.g. Croatia in WW2 (15) p 25ff. See also de Semlyen (43) p 64ff, who states with respect to Spain *“religious discrimination, often severe, still operates...it was only barely two years ago that Protestants were given access to the ‘holy ground’ of public cemeteries, usually owned or controlled by the Roman Catholic Church”*.

These scriptures cannot refer to NATO. NATO is the North Atlantic Treaty *Organisation*. By definition, it is an *organisation* but the beast of Revelation is **“a man”** verse 18 and the beast of Revelation 17:3 is clearly *Satan* [or full of the devil]. Compare with Revelation 12:3, 9.

One should note in this context that *Christian Watch* does *not* link the EU to the whore of Babylon but to the whore of *Mystery* Babylon. Her religion based on works originated with *Cain*, the first human murderer Genesis 4:3, 8 and with Satan **“a murderer from the beginning”** John 8:44. The Babylonian religion, now represented by papal Rome, has been a murderer ever since (31).

Yet it is ironic that the group leader should suggest that NATO may be the beast while denying the possibility of the EU in this respect, allegedly because **“the number of heads no longer fits the number of nations”**. NATO currently has 19 [29 in 2016] members and this figure does not correspond to either the number of heads on the beast, the number of his horns or any combination of these numbers (44).

Note also that where the number ten appears associated with the two beasts of Revelation 13:1, 17:3, 12 – and has historically been associated with the member states when these numbered only ten - it is primarily a reference to **“ten horns”** and **“ten kings”**, *not nations*. Further, the ten kings represented by the ten horns have yet to receive their kingdoms, Revelation 17:12 but NATO’s areas of responsibility already exist.

In fact, the number of member states in the EU is irrelevant to the horns and heads of the beasts of Revelation 13, 17. According to the scripture, the size and nature of a king’s realm is variable. It is not restricted to a single nation. He may be **“ruler over many things”** Matthew 25:21, 23 or over different numbers of cities Luke 19:17, 19 or even over all nations Revelation 11:15 or, as shown, over all kings Revelation 17:18. Queen Elizabeth II is technically the Queen of all the countries of the British Commonwealth.

This is important to an understanding of the EU in prophecy because the ultimate fate of the member states of the European Union is actually dismemberment. The existing 15 member states [nominally 27 post-Brexit en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Member_state_of_the_European_Union] are to be split into 111 *regions*, of which Britain will constitute 12, (32) p 274 (34). The number of regions would most likely exceed 150 if, as is intended, more member states were admitted from Eastern Europe.

There is no scriptural reason why the 10 satanic rulers of Revelation 17:12 could not each be allocated 11 to 15 regions each as their respective kingdoms. Their rule could extend even further, given that they eventually subsume the realm of **“that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth”**. See Revelation 18:16.

Interestingly, the group leader did not suggest that the godless United Nations might be the beast. Perhaps he approves of the satanic new world order that it embodies.

Concerning the seven heads of the dragon Revelation 12:3 and the two beasts of Revelation 13:1, 17:3, a detailed study is beyond the scope of this response. However, the most realistic interpretation is that they are successive world empires, found also in Daniel 2:31-33 and 7:3-7 and dating from the old Babylonian empire under Nimrod (45) p 303, 369, 470-471. In other words they clearly do not represent either NATO or Protestant monarchs at the time of the Act of Union.

Concerning the identity of **“that great city”** and demonstrating the futility of any ecumenical movement such as that lauded by the group leader in his point 6 – see below – Dr. Ruckman has this comment (45) p 392-392 on Revelation 18:24:

“And in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth”

“The saints were “chosen in him before the foundation of the world” (Eph. 1:4). So whatever city crucified the Lord and Savior is indirectly responsible for the death of every Christian that ever died. There is only one city that meets this requirement; there is only one city in hell, heaven, or on earth that put nails through His hands, a crown of thorns on His head, a spear in His side, and then professes to believe in Him; there is only one city that had Christians eaten in the arena, and burned at the stake, and went on professing to be the “Holy Mother Church” of all Christians; there is only one city whose colors are purple and scarlet, whose symbol is a golden cup, whose political she-nanigans involve the “kings of the earth,” while professing to be a church. And if you don’t know where that city is, all I can say is that Christians are commanded to “comfort the feeble-minded” (1 Thes 5). If you don’t know who this woman is, there is one of three things wrong with you; (1) you are either as blind as a bat, and can’t read Braille, or (2) you are lazy and insincere, and don’t want the truth because it’s going to cut you up, or (3) you are so full of the Devil that your hatred for the word of God can only be paralleled by that of Satan himself”.

6. A proper distinction should be made between searches for Christian unity and multi-faith unity

“Historically there was only one church, this split into west and east in 1054”

A lie. See comments under the group leader’s point 3.

“Ecumenism is about returning to the one church Jesus founded...the over all goal is not a Roman take over, as Rome would also return to the east”

Another lie.

Rev Foster states (46) p 3-6 *“The Roman Catholic Church, at the time of the Second Vatican Council, issued a Decree on Ecumenism. It sets forth the official view of Rome on all matters pertaining to ecumenical affairs. Whatever sentiments may be expressed by priests and bishops, following various ecumenical meetings and events, they must be interpreted in the light of this Decree. Rome does not tolerate ecclesiastical entrepreneurs! The official line is the only one that will be sanctioned...Rome’s Decree on Ecumenism makes it very clear what it is she wishes to achieve through the ecumenical meetings and gatherings in which she becomes involved...”*

“The Decree on Ecumenism [says that] Our separated brethren, whether considered as individuals or as Communities and Churches, are not blessed with that unity which Jesus Christ wished to bestow on all those whom He has given new birth into one body, and whom He has quickened to newness of life – that unity which the Holy Scriptures and the ancient Tradition of the Church proclaim. For it is through Christ’s Catholic Church alone, which is the all-embracing means of salvation, that the fullness of the means of salvation can be obtained. It was to the apostolic college alone, of which Peter is the head, that we believe that our Lord entrusted all the blessings of the New Covenant, in order to establish on earth the one Body of Christ into which all those should be fully incorporated who belong in any way to the people of God, chapter 1, paragraph 3. This is clearly saying that in Rome alone may the fullness of salvation be obtained and, furthermore, to her alone have been entrusted

the blessings of the New Covenant by which unity is Christ may be established. (Emphasis in original).

“Chapter 1, paragraph 4...continues: ...little by little, as the obstacles to perfect, ecclesiastical communion are overcome, all Christians will be gathered, in a common celebration of the Eucharist, into the unity of the one and only Church, which Christ bestowed on His Church from the beginning. This unity, we believe, subsists in the Catholic Church as something she can never lose, and we hope that it will continue to increase until the end of time.

*“Unity, for the Roman Catholic, already exists as something which his church can never lose and, therefore, for other Christians to enjoy it they must simply return to the one and only Church, the Roman Catholic Church! Under ecumenism, the Romanist is to work for the little by little return of the Protestant separated brethren. While Protestant ecumenists (excuse the contradiction, please) urge their people to be ready for the death of their church, Rome urges her people to look for and strive toward the return of the separated brethren to the true fold. This is the reason why Protestants are prepared to accept compromise after compromise, sellout after sellout within the unity movement. They have been taught that such a course is the will of God. A document from the fifth assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1975 urged [that] **The churches must be so permeated by prayer for unity that surrender and rediscovery of this true identity becomes part of the rhythm of their life** (emphasis ours). At every level there has been a retreating from the views and ideals and standards that sprang from the rediscovery of God’s Word at the Reformation”.*

In other words Rome is not about to ‘return’ anywhere. According to Rome, it is everyone else who must ‘return’ to her.

“It is however true that at present Rome does believe Protestants should become Catholic. Not surprisingly this is a barrier to unity! But most of the issues are organisational not doctrinal between Anglicans and Catholics (the position of the Pope is the key problem, most Anglicans cannot accept Papal infallibility...but equally neither can a lot of Catholics, it must be remembered that this doctrine only came into force in 1870!)”

Two more lies in a row, together with a contradiction with respect to the earlier statement. The overall goal is a **“Roman take over”** after all.

The issues are doctrinal and so-called papal infallibility is not **“the key problem”** –and regardless of either when it came into force or what **“a lot of Catholics”** think about it, the Vatican has never rescinded it. (It is not lay Catholic opinion that matters but the position of the papal hierarchy, as Rev Foster has shown with respect to Rome’s *Decree on Ecumenism*.)

Rev Foster *ibid.* p 7-8 states *“The route towards restored communion that is being followed is the one mapped out by the Second Vatican Council. I will refer to only one of the agreements worked out by these talks, the one dealing with that most central of all doctrines, the death of Christ, and how a sinner avails himself of its blessings. Rome teaches that it is through participation in the Eucharist. The person eating the bread and drinking the wine, after the priest has pronounced the words of consecration, is actually eating Christ’s flesh and drinking His blood. Thus he partakes of eternal life. This teaching was utterly rejected by the Reformers as a blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit (Articles 28 and 31 of the Church of England and the Church of Ireland). Anglican theologians have changed their views according to the agreement they entered into through the **Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission**. They now agree that: Through the prayer of thanksgiving, a word of faith addressed to the Father, the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ by the action of the Holy Spirit, so that in communion we eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood, *The Final Report*, page 16. Thus, that which was once repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, Article 28, becomes an agreed doctrine. That which was once a blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit, Article 31, has become the Truth of God in the new ecumenical church”.*

And by which ecumenical ‘truth’, souls that could have been saved by believing the Biblical doctrine of salvation, are now damned to hell. That is why ‘papal infallibility’ is *not* central to ecumenical ‘dialogue’. Personal salvation *is*. Rev Foster continues.

“Here is the little by little process that Rome speaks of! It is a dying of the candle of truth in the United Kingdom and it is a return, little by little, to the slavery and degradation of black popery from which God, in mercy, delivered our forefathers. Here in Ulster, we have seen death at work. The Gospel light has almost died out in the Methodist Church. It has likewise almost died out in the Presbyterian Church. In the Church of Ireland, you would find it very difficult to uncover a dozen ministers who really know the Lord. There is spiritual death in the land”.

The same could be said of England or anywhere in the British Isles.

Rev. M.J. Roberts, editor of *The Banner of Truth Magazine* and minister of Greyfriars Free Church in Inverness (47) said this in 1994.

“The Bible is a lost book in Britain today. It has little influence on national life any more...We have to admit that we are not seeing souls converted in great numbers. It does not matter where you go. Go to Wales, to Scotland, or to England here. Few are being converted in these days. Where are the days when the Bible was being blessed to the conversion of thousands and ten thousands?...The problem is here. This book is not being read so as to bring light to bear upon men’s lives. Therefore the tragedy is that men are not being converted to Christ. Could any curse in this life be greater? Could any judgment be more awful than this?”

No.

Rev Foster continues. See also Bishop Ryle’s comments, (13). *“If the Reformation was of God, and it was, then this unity movement is of the devil. If light and liberty were the fruits of the Reformation, and they were, then darkness and bondage can but result from ecumenism. If holiness and enlightenment of mind were the blessings of the Reformation, and they were, then impurity and corruption, the hallmarks of Rome, will flood our land again”.*

See remarks above, with respect to the abominable machinations of the ‘Crown’ Prosecution Service, all of which have advanced along with the stygian tide of ecumenism.

Rev Foster concludes. *“What have we to say to those Christians who are in membership of churches involved in the ecumenical movement? It is a simple message – GET OUT!”*

Amen!

“In the long run the reuniting of ALL churches would seem to fit Jesus prayer of john (sic) 17 (and cannot be viewed as fitting the government of the beast as such a unified church would not be the political and economic force necessary to fit such a prophecy)”

Another display of appalling ignorance of the scriptures.

The unity for which the Lord Jesus Christ prayed in John 17 was a *spiritual* unity of believers, who collectively make up **“the church, Which is his body”**, as the following scriptures show.

“And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, Which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all” Ephesians 1:22, 23.

“For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church: For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones” Ephesians 5:29, 30.

“Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body’s sake, which is the church” Colossians 1:24.

This church is an invisible church, which is a mystery, Ephesians 5:32 and which will not become visible until the Lord's return and **"the manifestation of the sons of God"** Romans 8:19. It is not an earthly, religious political monstrosity that split in two, part way through the 11th century and – like a certain nursery rhyme character – is now to be artificially glued back together again by the dubious machinations of ecumenism.

Of course, the New Testament often uses the term **"church"** in the singular in an earthly context but it does so to denote a local assembly, e.g. Acts 8:1, 13:1, Romans 16:1, 5, 1 Corinthians 1:2, Colossians 4:16 etc. The New Testament pattern for local churches is therefore that they should be independent and autonomous, not federated. Thus the word **"churches"** plural is used, to indicate that there were many local assemblies, which were separate and self-governing, Acts 9:31, Romans 16:16, 1 Corinthians 16:19, 2 Corinthians 8:1 etc.

When Paul is stating matters of doctrine, he also refers to **"churches"**, e.g. 1 Corinthians 7:17, 14:34, 16:21, because it was the Lord's will that the local assemblies of the members of His body should all follow true apostolic doctrine and be of like mind. See Philippians 2:1, 2 **[If there be therefore any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies, Fulfil ye my joy, that ye be likeminded, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind]**, 2 Thessalonians 2:15 **[Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle]** and 1 Timothy 6:3 **[If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness].**

When the glorified Lord Jesus Christ addressed the seven churches of Asia Minor, He addressed them individually, not as a collective, indicating once again that there was never any one single visible church.

Finally, an artificial re-union of apostate denominations under Rome does fit prophecy of the government of the beast because **"all the world...worshipped the beast"** indicating that his government is in part religious, Revelation 13:3, 4, 12. Rome already possesses vast **"political and economic force"** (12) but even if this were not so, the government of the beast will receive virtually unbridled power from Satan because according to Revelation 13:2 **"the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority"**. Note that the dragon's power is global, Luke 4:5, 6 **[And the devil, taking him up into an high mountain, shewed unto him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it]** – something that the Lord Jesus Christ never disputed.

"Multi faith unity requires a belief alien to most faiths as well as most Christians, that ultimately all faiths are really the same, their differences being cultural and not on substantial issues"

"Multi faith unity" is the goal of ecumenism – according to the ecumenicists. – and the differences *are* substantial Consider the following:

"The...World Council of Churches' leaders have united in prayer with the leaders of Jewish, Hindu, Buddhist, and other pagan religions of the world! There is even "the multifaith calendar", which in no way sets Christianity apart from the pagan faiths! This calendar seeks to delete "B.C."... "A.D." from all calendars, substituting "C.E." (the Common Era) and "B.C.E." (before the Common Era). This is all part of the W.C.C.'s ecumenical "love wish" to merge Christianity into a one-world, Christ-denying religion!" (48) p 2. The document summarises the essential beliefs of Hinduism, Buddhism, Shintoism, Islam, Judaism, Communism and Mormonism, showing that these are in complete contradiction to the Christian Gospel, yet the W.C.C. is attempting to amalgamate all these faiths aboard *"The Ecumenical Ship"*:

"A new type of craft, on its maiden voyage, headed for an unknown destination, with an inexperienced crew, speaking different languages, embarking in the midst of the worst storm in history" Dr. Visser 'Thooft, 1948, Amsterdam".

Ecumenism has long been a cancer in Britain. Smith (49) p 9 states:

“What remains of the Christian character of our country is under attack from many quarters, not least of which is the ecumenical movement urging the Christian Churches into promiscuous intercourse with other religions. The following is a report from a diocesan newsheet: “On Saturday 22nd January a unique occasion took place in St. Alban’s Abbey. Over 200 people came to hear a remarkable blend of East and West. After Richard Bond had played a Bach Chorale, Fr. Eric Doyle, a Roman Catholic Franciscan, spoke on Yoga and Christ, and then Manesh Chandra played an Evening Raga on the Sitar. Then followed readings from St John’s Gospel, from St John of the Cross and from Rabindranath Tagore. Later Pandit Vishnu Narayan chanted from the Katha Upanishad. The evening closed with a blessing from the Pandit and also from the Dean and we left to the sound of Bach.”

“Was that what St Alban was martyred for?”

Dr. Sadler answers the question in the negative (31) p 244 and affirms the true ‘nature of the beast’, revealing the link between ecumenism, heathenism, the Vatican and the EU:

“The Ecumenical Movement in reality seeks the union of all religions, and not only Christian denominations. A current example of this is the European Union’s “Soul for Europe” project. The idea that all religions, including Christianity each have an element of truth, originated with Gnosticism and has since been carried forward by Freemasonry. Like all of the most insidious errors, they are based on a half-truth. As we have shown in previous chapters the occult religions, Paganism, Islam, Romanism and Eastern Mysticism are all ultimately derived from the religion of Babylon. They therefore have a spiritual basis for unity, but this is to be found in the false religion of Nimrod and the Mysteries. The union spoken of by the Ecumenical Movement is not the one in the Lord Jesus Christ”.

It is no accident that one of the most potent symbols of the EU is in fact the Tower of Babel *ibid.* p 268 (50) – although the poster depicting this symbol was evidently quickly withdrawn, the designers having realised that perhaps they were giving too much away!

In other words, the group leader’s reference to ecumenism as the fulfilment John 17 is totally misleading.

Ecumenism is quite clearly a satanic removal of **“the bounds”** Isaiah 10:13, to prevent men from seeking the Lord, Acts 17:26, 27, thus damning humanity ‘to hell in a hand cart’.

The above examples demonstrate that ecumenism is also confusion, and **“God is not the author of confusion”** 1 Corinthians 14:33.

Therefore the scripture rightly says **“Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you”** 2 Corinthians 6:17.

Only a [spiritually] blind fool 2 Corinthians 4:4 **[In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them]** would ignore the Lord’s admonition, as it applies to ecumenism.

Thus ends this evaluation of your group leader’s comments. I trust that it proves to be helpful.

Yours in the Lord Jesus Christ, 2 Chronicles 14:11

Alan O’Reilly

Post-script, May 11th 2008

The Real Conspiracy

From *Romanism and the Reformation*, by H. Grattan Guinness, DD, written in the 1880s. See below.

The 120 years that followed have borne out his horrific vision, e.g. from the beginnings of the IRA to the two world wars, including the death camps and the Croatian massacres of WW2, through to the resurgence of the EU ‘golden garrotte’ superstate, which is really a rehash of Charlemagne’s ‘Holy’ Roman Empire and Hitler’s Third Reich.

Born in Dublin, Dr Grattan Guinness (1835-1910) was a great evangelist, author and Bible teacher, who spoke for the genuine believers of his time.

The *Daily Express* said of a service he held in 1858, aged 23:

“An enormous crowd pressed for admittance. Judges, members of Parliament, orators, Fellows of College, lights of the various professions, the rank and fashion of the metropolis have been drawn out. Among them the Lord Lieutenant, the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Justice of Appeal, etc. Such a preacher is a great power, prepared and sent forth by God, and as such Mr. Guinness has been hailed by all denominations.”

Can’t imagine the DE writing that about anyone today, though.

Dr Grattan Guinness spoke at length about the real conspiracy, which he called “*the great apostacy*.” Note that, despite the Crusades of the Middle Ages, the Muslims eventually get in as the servants of this conspiracy, like the WW2 Muslim SS Divisions. (All the leading Nazis were members of the apostacy/conspiracy and it is well-known that the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem was a friend and ally of Hitler’s, who orchestrated acts of sabotage against the British 8th Army in North Africa during WW2.)

The 13th (Muslim) Waffen SS Division was the Bosnian Handzar Division, noted for extreme nervousness in the face of actual opposition and sickening cruelty to civilians. Its sister division, the 21st Skanderberg, consisted of Kossovans and Albanians. This unit had a 50% desertion rate - and no doubt an identical viciousness towards vulnerable civilians.

These Muslims, along with their Asian and Arab co-religionists, are now on our streets in increasing numbers, with undiminished viciousness, when they get the chance to inflict it, e.g. on the white Roses of Keighley and other English towns. (And they also demand your head, if you draw attention to the true nature of their ‘religion’ - while our police ‘service’ struggles to make up its collective mind about whether or not an offence has been committed. It would have acted with much greater decision had professing Christians appeared on the streets of the capital baying for the head of Jerry Springer.)

This is what Dr Grattan Guinness said about the conspiracy that brought it all here in the first place:

“I see the great Apostacy, I see the desolation of Christendom, I see the smoking ruins, I see the reign of monsters; I see those vice-gods, that Gregory VII, that Innocent III, that Boniface VIII, that Alexander VI, that Gregory XIII, that Pius IX; I see their long succession, I hear their insufferable blasphemies, I see their abominable lives, I see them worshipped by blinded generations, bestowing hollow benedictions, bartering lying indulgences, creating a paganized Christianity; I see their liveried slaves, their shaven priests, their celibate confessors; I see the infamous confessional, the ruined women, the murdered innocents; I hear the lying absolutions, the dying groans; I hear the cries of the victims; I hear the anathemas, the curses, the thunders of the interdicts; I see the racks, the dungeons, the stakes; I see that inhuman Inquisition, those fires of Smithfield, those butcheries of St Bartholomew, that Spanish Armada, those unspeakable dragonnades, that endless train of wars, that dreaded multitude of massacres. I see it all,

“And in the name of the ruin it has brought in the Church and in the world, in the name of the truth it has denied, the temple it has defiled, the God it has blasphemed, the souls it has destroyed; in the name of the millions it has deluded; the millions it has slaughtered, the millions it has damned,

“With holy confessors, with noble reformers, with innumerable martyrs, with the saints of ages, I denounce it as the masterpiece of Satan, as the body and soul and essence of antichrist.”

A timeless warning, really. Ignore it at your peril.

Dr Grattan Guinness is speaking about the Catholic Church and has given an admirable summary of its altogether less than honourable history.

References

1. *Britain under Siege* Alan O'Reilly, Christian Watch, PO Box 2113, Nuneaton, CV11 6ZY, 1999, www.christianwatch.org.uk/.
2. *Biblical Bulwarks* Alan O'Reilly, Christian Watch, 2000.
3. *Why Unionists Say No* Peter Smith, The Joint Unionist Working Party, 1985.
4. *Christianity through the Ages* Earle E. Cairns, Academie Books, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids Michigan, 1981.
5. *The Trumpet Sounds for Britain, Volume 1* David E. Gardner, Christian Foundations Publications, Manchester, 1983.
6. *Celt, Druid and Culdee* Isabel Hill Elder, Covenant Publishing Co. Ltd., 8 Blades Court, Deodar Road, London SW15 2NU, 1994.
7. *Patrick, The Apostle of Ireland* Rev. Ivan Foster, Kilskeery Free Presbyterian Church, 1990.
8. *Secrets of Romanism* Anthony Zachello, Loizeaux Brothers, Neptune, New Jersey, 1983.
9. *The History of the New Testament Church Volume 1* Dr. Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, P.O. Box 7135 Pensacola FL. 32504, 1982, store.kjv1611.org/.
10. *Which Bible?* 5th Edition David Otis Fuller, D.D., Grand Rapids International Publications, P.O. Box 2607, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501, 1984, kjv.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html.
11. *The Battle of the Celtic Church* Dr. Peter Trumper, PTS Publications, 184 Fleet Street, London, EC4A 2HJ.
12. *The Vatican Billions* Avro Manhattan, Chick Publications, P.O. Box 3500, Ontario, Calif. 91761-1019 USA, 1983. See taroscopes.com/othersites/germanophobia/books/VB.pdf.
13. *What do we owe to the Reformation?* Bishop J.C. Ryle, The Protestant Truth Society, 184 Fleet Street, London, EC4A 2HJ.
14. news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/correspondent/1879407.stm.
15. *Our Protestant Throne and Constitution* J.A. Kensit, The Protestant Truth Society.
16. *Smokescreens* www.chick.com/catalog/catholicism.asp, Jack T. Chick, Chick Publications, 1983.
17. *Fox's Book of Martyrs* W.B. Forbush, Editor, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506, 1967.
18. *Why were our Reformers Burned?* Bishop J.C. Ryle, The Protestant Truth Society.
19. *Jesuit Plots from Elizabethan to Modern Times* Albert Close, The Protestant Truth Society.
20. *History of Protestantism Part 2, Volume III* Rev. J.A. Wylie, Mourne Missionary Trust.
21. *The Babington Plot* J.E.C. Shepherd, Wittenberg Publications, Toronto, Canada, 1987.
22. *The Secret History of the Jesuits* Edmund Paris, Chick Publications, 1975.
23. *Halley's Bible Handbook* Dr. Henry H. Halley, Zondervan Publishing House, 1965.
24. *James II and the Seven Bishops* J.C. Ryle, reprinted by Focus Christian Ministries Trust, 6 Orchard Road, Lewes, E. Sussex, BN7 2HB, 1988.
25. *History of the Church of God* Cushing Biggs Hassell, 1886, available from Way of Life Literature, www.wayoflife.org/.
26. *The Pilgrim's Progress, The Second Part* Everyman's Library, London, 1964.
27. *Oliver Cromwell* Sir Charles Firth, London, Oxford University Press, 1961.

28. *Men of Purpose* Peter Masters, The Wakeman Trust, Elephant & Castle, London SE1 6SD, 1989.
29. *Operation World, A Handbook of World Intercession* P.J. Johnstone, STL Publications, P.O. Box 48, Bromley, Kent, 1978.
30. www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/irf/2005/51582.htm.
31. *Mystery, Babylon the Great*, 2nd Edition I.A. Sadler, published by the author, available from Christian Watch, P.O. Box 62, Royston, Herts SG8 7UL, 2001.
32. *The Last Days of Britain* Lindsay Jenkins, Orange State Press, Washington D.C., 2001.
33. *Convert...or Die!* Edmund Paris, Chick Publications.
34. *Resist The Invader!! & The Traitor Within* Christian Watch, 2002.
35. *The Violation of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in France* A.M.S. International Support Committee, Ravenhill Road, Belfast, United Kingdom.
36. *The Principality and Power of Europe* 2nd Edition Adrian Hilton, Dochester House Publications, Box 67, Rickmansworth, Herts WD3 5SJ, December 2000.
37. *Vigilance A defence of British Liberty* Ashley Mote, Tanner Publishing, P O Box 67, Petersfield, Hampshire GU32 3Y2, 2001.
38. *The Common Salvation* May/June 2002 D. Owers, 27 Troak Close, Christchurch, Dorset, BH23 3SR.
39. www.cps.gov.uk/legal-guidance/sexual-orientation-cps-guidance-stirring-hatred-grounds-sexual-orientation, www.cps.gov.uk/legal-guidance/homophobic-biphobic-and-transphobic-hate-crime-prosecution-guidance.
40. *The Pink Swastika* Scott Lively and Kevin Abrams, Veritas Aeterna Press, PO Box 3691, Sacramento, California, 2002, obtainable from www.thepinkswastika.com/.
41. *The Vatican Against Europe* Edmund Paris, The Wickliffe Press, 184 Fleet Street, London EC4, 1961.
42. www.eu-facts.org/en/background/dark_roots_europe_lecture.html.
43. *All Roads Lead To Rome?* Michael de Semlyen, Dochester House Publications, Gerrards Cross, Bucks SL9 8HA, 1993.
44. www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-36311644.
45. *The Book of Revelation, The Bible Believer's Commentary Series* Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1982.
46. *The Christian, Ecumenism and the Bible* Rev Ivan Foster, Kilskeery Free Presbyterian Manse, 51 Old Junction Road, Kilskeery, Co. Tyrone, BT78 3RN.
47. TBS *Quarterly Record*, No. 529, October to December 1994.
48. *Ecumenism's Descent into Paganism* International Council of Christian Churches, 756 Haddon Avenue, Collingwood, New Jersey 08108, 1988.
49. *Ecumenical Soup* Bernard Smith, Christian Affirmation Campaign, 30 Clifton Road, Worthing, West Sussex, 1982.
50. *Christian Voice* www.christianvoice.org.uk/.