

Whore of Babylon

Come Out of Her, My People...

Before we address the role Eusebius played in this crime, let's consider the manuscripts Emperor Constantine ordered him to compose. After all, they were the first to incorporate anti-Semitism into the text of the resulting "Gospel of Matthew." By coming to understand their origins and development, we will better appreciate how the Christian New Testament evolved through the centuries to serve an extraordinarily evil Church.

According to Eusebius, the Emperor's letter stated:

"Victor Constantinus, Maximus Augustus, to Eusebius: Great numbers have united themselves to the most holy church in the city which is called by my name. It seems, therefore, highly requisite, since that city is rapidly advancing in prosperity in all respects, that the number of churches should also be increased. Do you, therefore, receive with all readiness my determination on this behalf. I have thought it expedient to instruct your Prudence to order fifty copies of the sacred Scriptures, the provision and use of which you know to be the most needful for the instruction of the Church, to be written on prepared parchment in a legible manner, and in a convenient, portable form, by professional transcribers thoroughly practiced in their art. The Bishop of the Diocese has also received instructions by letter from our Clemency to be careful to

furnish all things necessary for the preparation of such copies.” (Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, Volume IV.36)

Yes, indeed, Eusebius would have means and motive.

In his introduction to the publication of the resulting codex, now called Sinaiticus, Kirsopp Lake concluded: “the intermediate correctors, and certainly the earliest, and possibly all, belonged to Caesarea,” which is where Eusebius was Bishop when the initial draft was created in the 4th century. It is assumed by most scholars that Vaticanus was also compiled in Caesarea, largely due to its similarity with Sinaiticus and to the Vulgate (which was written by Jerome who studied in Caesarea and was the first to introduce the chapter breaks shared between the three manuscripts). T.C. Skeat, among others, formed this conclusion for many reasons, all of which he articulates. One of which is that original portions of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus were written by the hand of the same scribe, and likely share two in common. Further, both feature the controversial conclusion of Mark at 16:8, when other early MSS include Mark 16:9-20.

T.C. Skeat, a paleographer at the British Museum, devoted sixty years to studying Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. He concluded: “they were among the 50 Bibles that the Emperor Constantine ordered Eusebius of Caesarea to produce in the 330s.” He would emphatically state: “no one working in this area should forget that Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus are from the same scriptorium. The common origins of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus have been regarded as axiomatic from the days of Tischendorf through Lake to the present and no responsible New Testament scholar should ignore this fact.” (*The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus and Constantine*, JTS 50, (1999))

Writing for the American Society of Papyrologists in 2013, Peter Malik concluded: “One of the most intriguing aspects of the production of Codex Sinaiticus is the corrections made at various stages in the scriptorium. Perhaps surprisingly, no one has yet undertaken to identify these corrections by scribal hands that authored them and by the correction stage at which they were made. Amongst the manuscript’s most striking features is the plethora of corrections made at different stages of its production and reception history. Especially intriguing are the earliest corrections made in the scriptorium, as they are illuminating regarding the copying process and early editorial activity. Moreover, corrections appear rather frequently in *apparatus critici*, yet their witness is not easy to interpret while some corrections merely remedy scribal errors, others betray a genuine shift of *Vorlagen* [the underlying text of the earlier version], and thereby provide an important datum concerning transmission history. My aim in this study is to scrutinize the corrections, to identify patterns of correcting activity, and to highlight their potential significance for textual criticism of the New Testament. As the extent of this article does not permit the study of all early corrections in Sinaiticus, the Gospel of Mark will be used as a test case; this portion of Sinaiticus exhibits the work of two scribes who also corrected the text and thus can be studied comparatively. Importantly, one of the most significant variation-units in the Gospel, namely Mark 1:1, involves an early correction, the interpretation of which is consequential for textual and exegetical purposes alike.”

Malik added: “The first scholar to study the manuscript’s many corrections was Constantin von Tischendorf. In the Prolegomena to the *editio princeps*, Tischendorf briefly depicts individual correctors and provides a concise commentary on all the corrections.

Tischendorf recognized groups of correctors that worked in the scriptorium.”

Tischendorf, the man who found the Codex in the Sinai Monastery, claimed that he “counted 14,800 alterations and corrections in Sinaiticus.” And that was just in the portion of the text, some two-thirds of it, that remained available to him. This scholar wrote: “Codex Sinaiticus abounds with errors of the eye and pen.” He acknowledged: “On nearly every page of the manuscript there are corrections and revisions, done by 10 different people...most of them in the 6th and 7th centuries.” Tischendorf would conclude: “the New Testament...is extremely unreliable.” Specifically addressing Sinaiticus, he revealed: “On many occasions 10, 20, 30, 40 words are dropped through carelessness. Letters, words, even whole sentences are frequently written twice over, or begun and immediately canceled. That gross blunder, whereby a clause is omitted because it happens to end in the same word as the clause preceding, occurs no less than 115 times in the New Testament.”

The ever-changing nature of these documents is important because it proves that they are not only unreliable, but that the Roman Catholic Church found it efficacious to change what they called “Holy Scripture” to suit their evolving agenda. It also conclusively demonstrates that the Christian New Testament isn’t the “inerrant word of God,” but is instead an amalgamation of the ever-changing words of deceitful men.

Equally condemning, Eusebius Sophronius Hieronymus, the Catholic priest and self-admitted sexual pervert, commonly known as Saint Jerome, who was born 347 CE and became the protégé of Pope Damasus, after being run out of Rome for bullying a woman to death, composed the Latin Vulgate. He did so shortly after Eusebius’ anti-Semitic embellishments were added

to the Gospel of Matthew and the resulting tome was canonized. As a result: Hebrew was circumvented by Greek and then whisked away by Latin, with the resulting Vulgate determining what would be considered “Christian Scripture” for a thousand years or more, thereafter.

Trying to turn back the pages of time and find the truth proves difficult. In the *Introduction of Codex Sinaiticus – New Testament Volume*, Tischendorf’s associate, Kirsopp Lake wrote: “The Codex Sinaiticus has been corrected by so many hands that it affords a most interesting and intricate problem to the paleographer who wishes to disentangle the various stage by which it has reached its present condition.”

It is interesting to note that, in the 16th century, Western scholars first became aware of Vaticanus as a consequence of the correspondence between Erasmus (who crafted the Textus Receptus) and the prefects of the Vatican Library. In 1521, Bombasius, who administered its contents, was consulted by Erasmus as to whether the Codex Vaticanus contained the *Comma Johanneum* (which provides the lone Christian basis for their Trinity), to which Bombasius supplied a transcript of 1 John 4:1–3 and 1 John 5:7–11 to show that it did not. Sepúlveda in 1533 cross-checked all places where Erasmus’ New Testament (the Textus Receptus) differed from the Vulgate and supplied Erasmus with 365 readings where the Codex Vaticanus supported the latter. Consequently, the Codex Vaticanus acquired the reputation of being an old Greek manuscript that agreed with the Vulgate rather than with the Textus Receptus. Not until much later would scholars realize it differed from both the Vulgate and the Textus Receptus – in addition to all other early Greek manuscripts. (Wikipedia.org/CodexVaticanus)

As one would expect from the Vatican, knowing that they had a horrible secret to hide, prior to the 19th century, no scholar was allowed to study the Codex Vaticanus. It was not until 1843 that Tischendorf was permitted to make a facsimile of a few verses. Tregelles, who was the third scholar allowed to inspect it, bemoaned the absurd restrictions and obstructions Roman Catholics placed upon his observations – playing childish games to distract him. Old secrets, especially those of this magnitude, don't die without a fight.

John Burgon, an Anglican divine, was the fourth scholar allowed to examine the codex, albeit only for an hour and a half. After considering 16 passages, he concluded that the Codex Vaticanus, as well as Sinaiticus, “were the most corrupt documents extant,” stating the codices clearly exhibit a fabricated text which is the result of arbitrary and reckless recension.” He specifically likened them to “the two false witnesses of Matthew 26:60.”

Henry Alford would then collate and verify the doubtful passages, describing errors, but his work was nullified by order of Cardinal Antonelli. Henry Alford's secretary, Mr. Cure tried to continue Alford's work, but the Vatican authorities placed all manner of obstacles in his way. The leading impediment, however is ancient and remains largely impenetrable, because the original text, and that of its correctors in Vaticanus is now obscured under the heavy hand of an 11th century scribe who inked over the entire manuscript.

Over the ensuing years texts of Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus would come to differ significantly from one another and markedly from the Textus Receptus, even the Vulgate. According to Herman Hoskier, there are 3,036 material variations between Sinaiticus and Vaticanus in the text of the Gospels, alone. Moreover, between them we find copious

apocrypha, including the discredited and spurious works entitled: Epistle of Clement, Baruch, the Epistle of Jeremiah, 1 and 2 Esdras, Tobit, Wisdom, Judith, 1 and 4 Maccabees, Ecclesiasticus, the Prayer of Manasseh, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Epistle of Barnabas. The Shepherd of Hermas is a Gnostic tome while the Epistle of Barnabas claims that 'Abraham knew Greek and said that baptism was required for salvation. Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are rife with Gnostic tendencies, as are all of Paul's letters.

The question should be raised: if Vaticanus and Sinaiticus represent the original reading of the text, why do they differ so radically from the hundreds of Papyrus books and fragments found before and after them, and why were they changed tens of thousands of times?

Now that we have pondered some of what he wrote, let's shift our focus to the man who may be, second to Paul, the central villain in this tragedy. I have stated, and will now demonstrate, that Eusebius had the means and motive to implicate Jews and exonerate Rome by embellishing the Gospel of Matthew. And that's a tall order since Rome not only crucified Yahowsha', Rome destroyed Yahowah's Home in 70 CE and returned to annihilate Jews and decimate Yisra'el in 133 CE. A lot of blood would have to be swept into the catacombs.

As we know, Emperor Constantine is on record ordering Eusebius to produce fifty bibles, officially sanctioning their composition, giving him the means. As for motive, Eusebius was the consummate Roman apologist. He wrote the book glorifying Constantine – one which was used as the basis of the eulogy at his funeral. His reverence for the vicious and egotistical Roman Emperor and his devotion to his Church was so great, despite all evidence to the contrary, he presented the general who butchered his rivals and worshiped Mithras and Sol Invictus his entire life, as the patron

saint of Rome and Christianity. This reveals that he was more than willing to lie to shift blame from Romans to Jews.

For example, Eusebius would write in *Life of Constantine*: “Like the shining face of Moses, as the sun when he rises upon the earth, he liberally imparts his rays of light to all, as did Constantine, proceeding at early dawn from the imperial palace, and rising as it were with the heavenly luminary, imparting the rays of his own beneficence to all who came into his presence.”

Averil Cameron and Stuart Hall would lament in their presentation of *Life of Constantine*, “The most obvious device used by Eusebius in the *Life of Constantine* to bring home his ideological message is to regard Constantine’s reign as divinely ordained in the same way as Moses was chosen to lead his people out of Egypt and receive the law.” (Cameron and Hall, *Life of Constantine*, p35 and 28). According to Eusebius, like Moses, Constantine destroyed the tyrants, persecuting emperors who had preceded him, and freed his people (in 313 CE the Edict of Milan established legal tolerance of Christianity in the empire).

In his *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius would opine of his patron: “He, although he received no symbols and types of high priesthood from any one, although he was not born of a race of priests, although he was not elevated to a kingdom by military guards, although he was not a prophet like those of old, although he obtained no honor nor pre-eminence among the Jews, nevertheless was adorned by the Father with all, if not with the symbols, yet with the truth itself.”

As the Bishop of Caesarea, Eusebius promoted the conversion myth, writing, “Constantine saw with his own eyes the trophy of a cross of light in the heavens, above the sun, and bearing this inscription: conquer by

this. At the sight, he himself was struck with amazement and his whole army also.” (Eusebius, *The Life Of The Blessed Emperor Constantine: from AD 306 to 337*) It was eerily similar to a popular pagan play of the day and of what Paul had claimed occurred on the Road to Damascus.

Eusebius would use the line in his own correspondence that he likely added to the Gospel of Matthew: “Therefore I say to you, the kingdom of God will be taken from you and given to a nation bearing the fruits of it. — Matthew 21:43” He was a Roman Catholic and patriot who believed that he, his government, and his religion were divine. Of them he would say: “Whence it is evident that the perfect religion committed to us by the teaching of Christ is not new and strange, but, if the truth must be spoken, it is the first and the true religion. This may suffice for this subject.”

But, alas, he had more to say: “It is admitted that when in recent times the appearance of our Savior Jesus Christ had become known to all men there immediately made its appearance a new nation; a nation confessedly not small, and not dwelling in some corner of the earth, but the most numerous and pious of all nations, indestructible and unconquerable, because it always receives assistance from God. This nation, thus suddenly appearing at the time appointed by the inscrutable counsel of God, is the one which has been honored by all with the name of Christ.” At least we have evidence that “Christ” isn’t a title, but instead the last name of the Christian God.

In the Roman Catholic Bishop’s mind, one Roman was as important as two-thousand years of Jews, including the likes of Moseh, Dowd, and the prophets. He wrote: “the Roman who drew near to our Savior, was ONE (only), namely, the Chiliarch, who made a greater

and better profession of Him, than (did the whole) Jewish people; and, that our Savior prophesied that instead of ONE, those, who should like this man draw near to Him, should be MANY; and, that these should be of those residing in the East, and in the West: those (I say), who, by means of the knowledge of Him, and of the confession (made) of Him, should be considered worthy of honor with God, equal to that of the Hebrew Fathers: even of him who is preached of as being the Father of their Fathers, ‘Abraham, who went forth from among his idolatrous forefathers, and changed his manner of life; and, leaving the error of many Gods, recognized the ONE GOD who is over all.’”

Eusebius was an anti-Semite of the first order. His *Eemonstratio Evangelica* was an overt attack on Jews and the Towrah. Of them he would write: “It is my intention, moreover, to recount the misfortunes which immediately came upon the whole Jewish nation in consequence of their plots against our Savior and Lord Jesus Christ.” (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*) In a book where Eusebius attempts to demonstrate that the pagans got all their good ideas from the Jews, he lists as one of those good ideas Plato’s argument that lying for the benefit of the state is good and even necessary.

Eusebius is actually famous for admitting to being dishonest if doing so protected his religion from the truth: “I have repeated whatever may rebound to the glory and suppressed all that could tend to the disgrace of our religion.” (Eusebius, *Prae Paratio Evangelica*, C31, B12). By this admission, Eusebius has openly stated that given the opportunity to upend the truth, such as retelling the events in Jerusalem on Passover in 33 CE, he would willingly invent whatever story was necessary to exonerate Roman Catholicism from complicity.

Speaking of lies, the lone discredited statement attributed to Josephus in his *Antiquities of the Jews* (circa 94 CE) was actually composed by Eusebius. Desperately seeking some historical affirmation that Pilate considered “Jesus” to be the Messiah, and thus seen as innocent of the crime of sentencing him to be crucified, Eusebius, who as a result of his position had access to the text, did as he had done to the Gospel of Matthew, and reconstructed it such that it read as he wanted:

“About this time there lived Jesus, a wise man, **if indeed one ought to call him a man.** For he was one who performed surprising deeds and was a teacher of such people as accept the truth gladly. He won over many Jews and many of the Greeks. He was the Christ. And when, upon the accusation of the principal men among us, Pilate had condemned him to a cross, those who had first come to love him did not cease. He appeared to them spending a third day restored to life, for the prophets of God had foretold these things and a thousand other marvels about him. And the tribe of the Christians, so called after him, has still to this day not disappeared.” (Wrongly attributed to Flavius Josephus: *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book 18, Chapter 3)

This statement is not found in the early copies of Josephus’ *Antiquities*. It is not until the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius (circa 320 CE) that we come across it for the first time. The same Eusebius who said that it is lawful to lie for the cause of his religion altered yet another author.

Not only was Eusebius the first to cite this amazing “affirmation,” ostensibly because it didn’t exist previously, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Justin, Celsus, nor Photius, who wrote numerous articles on Josephus’ *Antiquities*, said nothing about a statement that would have done wonders for their credibility had it existed. In

fact, Origen expressly stated that Josephus, who had mentioned John the Baptist, did not recognize Jesus as the messiah (Origen, *Contra Celsum*, I, 47).

But should you want a smoking gun, the reason “if indeed it be proper to call him a man” was emboldened in the fictitious citation is that it came from Eusebius. Presenting his version of history, the Bishop of Caesarea wrote: “On account of Herod’s suspicion, John the Baptist was sent in bonds to the citadel of Machra, and there slain.” After relating these things concerning John, Eusebius wrote of his “Savior” in the same work, using the following words: “And there lived at that time Jesus, a wise **man, if indeed it be proper to call him a man.** For he was a doer of wonderful works, and a teacher of such men as receive the truth in gladness. And he attached to himself many of the Jews, and many also of the Greeks. He was the Christ.”

To reiterate: the early Christian Fathers such as Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen were well acquainted with what Josephus wrote and it is implausible that they would have ignored this passage had it existed. But this forgery does not stand alone. After falsifying the anti-Semitic conclusion to the Gospel of Matthew, and falsifying Josephus’ affidavit regarding it, the Church’s leadership forged a letter from Pilate to Tiberius about these same events, another from “Christ” to a Persian King, and finally regarding the Donation of Constantine. Should you be interested in the refutation of the Pilate letter to Tiberius, read Ann-Catherine Baudoin’s thesis: *Truth in the Details: The Report of Pilate to Tiberius as an Authentic Forgery*. (Splendide Mendax, *Rethinking Fakes and Forgeries in Classical, Late Antique, and Early Christian Literature*, 22 May 2017)

The Imperial Decree mentioned in this list of falsified documents supposedly transfers authority over

to Rome and to the Pope. In the purported Donation of Constantine, dated 30 March, 315 CE at the Fourth Consulate of Gallicanus (which actually occurred in 317 CE), there is a detailed profession of Christian faith and a recounting of how the Emperor, seeking a cure for his leprosy, was converted and baptized by Pope Sylvester I. In gratitude, he determined to bestow on “the Seat of Saint Peter power, dignity of glory, and vigor,” in addition to “Imperial Honor” and “Supremacy” over the four principal sees, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople, “as also over all the churches of God in the whole earth. For the upkeep of the Church of Saint Peter and that of Saint Paul,” Constantine gave estates “in Judea, Greece, Asia, Thrace, Africa, Italy and the various islands.” To “Pope Sylvester and his successors” he also allegedly granted “imperial insignia, the tiara, the city of Rome, and all the provinces, places and cities of Italy and the western regions.” Alas, it’s all fake news.

Replacement history would usher in Replacement Theology. Eusebius wrote: “And so the Jewish polity began about that time with Moses and continues in accordance with the voices of their own prophets until the coming of our Savior Jesus Christ. For this also was a prophecy of Moses himself and the prophets who followed, that the customs and ordinances of Moses should not fail before those of the Christ appeared, the ordinances, that is, of the New Covenant, which has been proclaimed to all nations through our Savior; and thus these ordinances found a fulfilment in the way which had been announced.”

Proving that Christianity is a blend of Babylonian myths and twisted verses lifted from the Towrah, Eusebius penned:

“As to the Hebrews, and their philosophy and religion which we have preferred above all our ancestral

system [the Greco-Roman religion], it is time to describe their mode of life. For since it has been proved that our abandonment of the false theology of Greeks and barbarians alike has not been made without reason, but with well-judged and prudent consideration, it is now time to solve the second question by stating the cause of our claiming a share in the Hebrew doctrines.

“When therefore we have the necessary leisure, we shall prove that our borrowing what was profitable from barbarians brings no blame upon us; for we shall show that the Greeks and even their renowned philosophers had plagiarized all their philosophic lore and all that was otherwise of common benefit and profitable for their social needs from barbarians: but that nothing at all has yet been found among any of the nations like the boon which has been provided for us from the Hebrews, will become manifest in the following manner. So, when these have been thoroughly discussed, we will pass over to the doctrines of the Hebrews—I mean of the original and true Hebrews, and of those who afterwards received the name Jews. And after all these we will add our own doctrines as it were a seal set upon the whole.”

That is breathtaking in its implications. If Catholics, indeed, Christians, were rational, the religion would evaporate at the site of this admission. But let us leave the doubters with this pithy statement: “It is an act of virtue to deceive and lie, when by such means the interest of the Church might be promoted” – Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea.

In conclusion, each time we examine the Christian New Testament it proves itself untrustworthy. It was created by men of the worst kind. They cannot be trusted.

We have long known that nothing in the Christian New Testament, unlike the Towrah, Prophets, and

Psalms, was inspired by God. But it's far worse than that. All but a sprinkling of Matthew and John, some of Revelation and perhaps a little of Mark and Luke, is deliberately misleading. Further, the embellishments to Matthew and all of Paul's 14 Epistles are likely Satanic.

⌘ ✎ ⌘ ✎

Eusebius was only part of the problem. He was the victim of a pandemic disease: Christianity – the Plague of Death. Few exemplified this contagion more adroitly than Early Church Father, Saint John Chrysostom (meaning: Golden Mouthed). In his first eight sermons, all against Jews, beginning in 386 CE, immediately after being ordained as a presbyter / priest of Antioch, and from his pulpit at the Golden Church, during the reign of Emperor Theodosius, this man whose character was admired by his fellow Roman Catholics preached hatred for Jews:

“Jews are immoral and vicious such that Christians are corrupted in morals and orthodoxy by contact with them.” He issued denunciations against visiting synagogues at times of the Mow'ed Miqra'ey. According to Saint John, “To attend the Jewish Passover is to insult Christ. To be with Jews on the very day when they murdered Jesus is to ensure that on the Day of Judgment He will say, ‘Depart from me! for you have had intercourse with my murderers.’”

“The Jews do not worship God but devils, so that their feasts are Unclean. God hates them and indeed has always hated them. Since their murder of Jesus He allows them no time for repentance. He concentrated all their worship in Jerusalem so that He might more easily destroy it.”

Speaking on behalf of Roman Catholicism, Emperor Theodosius, Pope Innocent, and Eusebius, Saint John roared: “The Jewish pretense that all their misfortunes were caused by Rome is nonsense, for it was not the power of the Caesars, but the wrath of God which destroyed the Jews. It is foolish for the Jews to imagine that God will ever allow the Jews to rebuild their Temple or return to Jerusalem, for He has rejected them. Since God hates the Jews, it is the duty of Christians to hate them, too. He who has no limits in his love of Christ must have no limits in his battle with those who hate Him.”

“I hate the Jews,” Chrysostom shrieked, “for they have the Law and they insult it.” A mirror might have done this scumbag some good.

In one particular case of a Christian woman who took an oath in the house of a Jew, because she believed a vow taken in the Jewish manner was more binding than any other, Chrysostom denounced it as a heinous crime, not only because the oath was Jewish, but also because a Christian woman had been taken into the house of a Jew. He issued edicts in his homilies decrying “Judaizers,” anyone who observed the Shabath, children subjected to circumcision, and anyone who befriended a Jew.

If it were not for the exegetical background which has already been implicated, it would have been impossible to explain his tone. In the Greek rhetorical form known as *psogos*, or blaming so as to censure, he said: “the Jews sacrificed their sons and daughters to devils;” “they are an outrage to nature and have become worse than wild beasts;” “for no reason at all, with their own hands they murder their offspring to worship the avenging devils who are the foes of our life.”

“The synagogues of the Jews are the homes of idolatry and devils, even though they have no images in them. They are worse than heathen circuses, and the very idea of going from a church to a synagogue is blasphemous. Some say that the synagogue is hallowed by the presence of the Bible, but one might just as well say that the temple of Dagon was hallowed by the ark. Actually, the presence of the Bible makes the synagogues more detestable, for the Jews have introduced it not to honor God, but to insult and dishonor Him.” If he had wanted to see the Devil, he didn’t have to look beyond Paul’s letters or past his own Church. Satan, himself, in the guise of Allah, wasn’t this bad in the Qur’an. This even makes *Mein Kampf* appear tame.

In Chrysostom’s discourses there is no sneer too mean or gibe too bitter to fling at the Jews. No text is too remote, no argument too caustic, or blasphemy too startling for him to employ. The only explanation for his bitterness is the overtly anti-Semitic nature of his Scriptures, nation, and religion.

“I am present here before you and confess my guilt. I proclaim that I set the synagogue on fire or at least ordered others to do so, so that no building should be left where Christ is denied. If you ask me why I have not burned the local synagogue, I answer that the judgment of God had already begun its destruction, so my intervention was not needed.”

These are the words of a Saint celebrated by the Roman Catholic Church, Oriental Orthodox Church, the Eastern Orthodox Church, Anglican and Lutheran Churches, all of whom recognize his death as a holy day to be observed annually. This is the man who, during Lent in 387 as the citizens of Antioch went on the rampage mutilating statues of the Emperor Theodosius, entreated the people to see the error of their ways. As a

result, for unifying Caesar and the Church, Chrysostom was appointed Archbishop of Constantinople.

It was short-lived, however, because of Church infighting. Saint John the Golden-Mouthed was considered a devotee of Origen, whom Theophilus, the Patriarch of Alexandria despised. But since there was an earthquake the night of his arrest, many took it as a sign of God's anger and sought his reinstatement. No matter, when next we see Saint John, he is off lending moral and financial support to Christian monks who were enforcing Emperor Theodosius' edict to destroy all traces of other religions, including their Scriptures and Temples. He was so effective being destructive, Pope Innocent repealed Saint John's banishment from Constantinople. The Catholic voice of anti-Semitism died shortly thereafter and was immediately venerated as a saint who was said to be the Embodiment of Christian Orthodoxy. Anti-Semitism had become institutionalized.

Nothing has changed. In the summer of 1942, Hitler's Pope, Pius XII, explained to his College of Cardinals the reasons for the great gulf that existed between Jews and Christians: "Jerusalem has responded to His call and to His grace with the same rigid blindness and stubborn ingratitude that has led it along the path of guilt to the murder of God."

May I recommend a real God, Yahowah, whom man cannot kill? And don't gloat, Protestants. Martin Luther was every bit as bad, if not worse.

To better understand the Roman Catholic Church, let's consider some of its popes. For no reason other than it was handy, and easily validated, I've seized upon the research done in 2006 for the publication of *The Criminal History of the Papacy*. What we will find in this and many other sources, many Catholic, is that the Roman Church mimicked Imperial Rome with a long

succession of twisted monarchs. These are some of the leaders Paul wrote in Romans 13 that were authorized by God for good...

Augustus (27 BCE – 14 CE) Murdered his way to the top, betraying long-time friends and family members along the way for no other reason than they obstructed his lust for absolute power. He was the first Roman Emperor to bequeath upon himself the title of *Pater Patriae* | Father of Fathers – or Pope.

Tiberius (14-37 CE) The second Roman emperor to declare himself both Father and God, he inflicted a reign of terror and repression on the people of Rome from his palace on the island of Capri. He reinstated the ancient accusation of *maiestas* (treason) so that he could sentence anyone he disliked to death. He ordered his subjects to worship his statues. A depraved sexual predator, he molested and brutally tortured hundreds of little children, sadistically abusing anyone who challenged his depravity. He is known for his constant orgies, and for having young boys and girls frolic like pans and nymphs. He kept an illustrative book on perverted sexuality so that performers would know what was required of them. He threw infants and toddlers to their death on the rocks below the walls of his castle. He was a dictatorial and mercurial tyrant.

Caligula (37-41) A sadist who derived pleasure by torturing people – starting by suffocating his father, Tiberius. He had incestuous affairs with his sisters and is known to have raped the wives of his allies. Establishing a model popes would follow, he turned his palace into a brothel, whose whores included his sisters. Beset by paranoia, he ordered random executions, killing relatives and foes alike to maintain order through fear. He is infamous for declaring himself “God” while imposing an absolute dictatorship based upon his infallibility. He found pleasure in humiliating rival politicians, at one

time even saying that his horse, Incitatus, would make a better consul. In a moment of absolute insanity, this lustful libertine went to wage war against the sea god, Neptune, and had his troops attack the waves with swords and gather seashells as booty. He financed his lavish lifestyle through legalized looting. Before he could move to Egypt to be worshiped as the sun god, he was publicly assassinated by one of the Praetorian guards that he had insulted, all while protesting that he was immortal.

Nero (54-68) He ascended to the throne at sixteen, quickly squandering the wealth of Rome. He murdered his mother, beating her to death, his step-brother because he didn't want to share power, and then his wife, Octavia, whom he deserted for his lover, Poppeaea, charging her with adultery. Poppeaea didn't fare much better because after becoming pregnant with Nero's child, the emperor kicked her to death. His third "wife" was a slave whom he had castrated. He was indiscriminate in his propensity to execute his critics.

It is said that he set Rome ablaze so that he could enlarge his home and burned Jews alive to illuminate his gardens. Like Paul, who was writing at the same time, Nero was particularly fond of his pension for poetry and prose, compelling audiences to endure long speeches.

Vespasian (69-79) Infamous for hunting down and killing Jews while a general.

Titus (79-81) Infamous for destroying Jerusalem and the Temple while using the confiscated treasure to construct the Colosseum in Rome with Jewish slaves.

Domitian (81-96) Found solace torturing Jews who wouldn't worship the Roman gods, goddesses, and emperors. He poisoned his brother and squandered Rome's resources as a patron of the arts. He nominated himself as public censor and outlawed all contrarian

views, becoming the model of the Catholic Inquisition with his cruel and sadistic, indeed paranoid, approach to diversity. He was particularly fond of promoting conspiracies. He is known to have assassinated twelve consuls and two cousins. Domitian demanded that he be treated like a god. He turned against the writers and academics of his day, and arranged the judicial murder of the chief of the Vestal Virgins, having her buried alive in a special tomb he had constructed for the occasion. For all the joy he brought to Rome, his own wife sought to kill him.

Hadrian (117-138) Man responsible for destroying and renaming Judea, murdering countless Jews, renaming Jerusalem after himself, and erecting shrines on the Temple Mount to declare his divinity, all while worshipping Dionysus and engaging in pedophilia with young boys.

Commodus (180-192) This arrogant, self-obsessed, and ruthless Roman ruler renamed himself Hercules and announced that he was a “living god.” His favorite vices were homosexual rape, pedophilia, and bestiality. He was a gladiatorial fanatic and aspirant. This pleasure-seeker nearly bankrupted Rome. His solution was to have wealthy citizens executed for treason so that he could confiscate their property. For his entertainment, and that of fellow Romans, he, himself, publicly slaughtered elephants, giraffes, ostriches, and humans he didn’t like. Although, he did not do so freely, but instead charged Romans massive fees to watch his performances. This megalomaniac would rename Rome, its legions, the senate, the imperial palace, and its citizens after himself – sort of like the Christian Church calling its institutions, houses of worship, and subjects, “Christian.” He was assassinated by his wrestling partner.

Septimius Severus (193-198) Came to power the traditional Roman way, by killing his predecessor. He persecuted (i.e., tortured) everyone whose religion differed from Rome's, but was especially fond of abusing Jews. He imposed a draconian interpretation of Roman Law and was particularly brutal in its enforcement.

Caracalla (198-217) Noted for sibling rivalries, he had his brother, Geta, executed – along with brutally exterminating most of Geta's supporters. He solidified his power by granting aliens citizenship, ostensibly to increase the number of his subjects and then lavished pay increases on the military to solidify their support for his regime. And yet he was so vengeful and sadistic that after assassinating another brother, he led Rome into a civil war. Nonetheless, obsessed with war, he went off trying to better Alexander the Great, copying his now obsolete military tactics in conquests of Africa and the Middle East. He was assassinated by a soldier whose death he had ordered.

Elagabalus (218-222) He longed for the good old days of Roman paganism – albeit with a twist. He became the chief priest of the cult of the Syrian god, Elah-Gabal, which he introduced into the Roman pantheon. He even had himself circumcised to show his devotion. It may have been a precursor to Islam because he established a conical Black Stone as the symbol of the sun god Sol Invictus Elagabalus on Palatine Hill. He then capitalized in Muhammadan fashion by claiming the vestal virgin for himself, calling her his wife. For giggles, he tortured and sacrificed children to his gods. Like Muhammad, Elagabalus was also a sexual predator and pervert, with countless wives, sex slaves, homosexual lovers, and children to satiate his carnal desires. Ahead of his time, he was also transgender. He was ultimately murdered by his grandmother.

Maximus Thrax (235 to 238) This soldier-turned-emperor feasted on carnage, setting fire to towns and villages just to watch the inhabitants burn. He exhausted his empire with war. Finally, his own troops turned on him, killing him, his sons, and advisors. His reign became known as the “Great Military Anarchy” of the third century. After bludgeoning German tribes at a terrible cost, he fought the Dacians and Sarmatians simultaneously. Then in papal fashion, Thrax assassinated every leader that his predecessor had established.

Diocletian (284-305) He is best known for the Pauline concept of division, dividing the Roman Empire into two, one old, the other new. He forced everyone under his control to worship the Roman gods and goddesses or die. This is what caused so much grief for Christians, and especially Jews as he is credited with being deliberately vicious toward both. He saw them as a threat to Roman religious, political, and social traditions. Little did he know that there would soon be no distinction between Imperial Rome and Roman Catholicism. He was also an economic failure, as the first to impose wage and price controls to curb inflation.

Constantine (306-324) He murdered his way to the top, killing his rivals. Gloating, he placed the opposing general’s head on a stick as he paraded through town. Ruthless, he killed both of his brothers-in-law so that he could reign unchallenged. He had his son, Crispus, executed for an unproven affair. While a pagan, he empowered and enriched Roman Catholic bishops, including Eusebius – whom he paid by taxing Jews and pagans. He moved the Roman capital to Byzantium, where in megalomaniac fashion, he renamed it after himself, “Constantinople.” The man credited by many as the catalyst behind transforming Imperial Rome into Roman Catholicism, he created a Police State to insure

the continuance of his corrupt administration. He reestablished the Roman caste system to control the people, making it possible for the Church to subjugate them.

Constantius II (324-337) This largely incompetent monster was one of Constantine's three sons who would share the empire after their father's death. His rise to power commenced with him overseeing the massacre of eight relatives. He was adept only in civil war.

Theodosius (392-395) Decreed the Roman Catholic Church as the lone legal heir to Imperial Rome, making Christianity the only legal religion within the Empire. He also instituted the feudal caste system of lords and serfs which would enslave Europeans for a thousand years. He launched an especially brutal era of intolerance and persecution under Roman Catholicism. He was responsible for the destruction of most ancient Greek and Roman temples, using their sites and stones to build grand churches. He even ordered the destruction of the Library in Alexandria because he viewed its contents as a threat to his religion.

Honorius (395-423) As Theodosius' son, he carried on his father's work of inquisitor, religious persecutor, and xenophobe. In a power sharing arrangement with popes, he became increasingly jealous, paranoid, and extravagant, killing his own generals to maintain loyalty. Then following a pogrom against the Germanic people, whom Honorius deemed inferior, the Empire became vulnerable with the best generals and soldiers dead. It tipped the scales, allowing Alaric his revenge in sacking Rome. To be sure, Honorius' bigotry, racism, ignorance, and incompetence hastened the fall of Imperial Rome, leaving the Roman Catholic Church as its heir.

While “Peter” was no more “Pope” than an astronaut, the Catholic Church naturally credits one of Paul’s cronies as the second “Supreme Pontiff.” Without evidence to back the claim, the Roman was said to have become the “Holy See” circa 67 CE. He is mentioned as being with Paul in Rome in Paul’s farewell to Timothy in his second epistle to his lover. The next mention of the man was over one-hundred years later by “Saint” Irenaeus, who wrote in 180 CE that “the blessed apostles, then, having founded and built up the Church, committed into the hands of Linus the office of the episcopate.” Unfortunately for Catholics, the Apostles didn’t do as he claimed. Worse, when he is next mentioned by Eusebius, the Catholic apologist claimed that “Peter,” who had been condemned by Paul, appointed him – which would not have been possible considering his affiliation with his tormentor. He would opine, “Irenaeus was the first to receive the episcopate of the church at Rome, after the martyrdom of Paul and Peter.”

It wasn’t until the time of Constantine, Eusebius, Jerome, and Chrysostom in the 4th century that Romans began ascribing the Emperor’s *Pater* | Pope title upon “Peter,” making the initial line of popes entirely mythical. It was contrived by the likes of Saint Jerome, who would write: “Irenaeus was the first after Peter to be in charge of the Roman Church.” Saint John Chrysostom, the raging anti-Semite, preached, “This Linus, some say, was second Bishop of the Church of Rome after Peter,” thereby contradicting Eusebius and Jerome. Nothing about Linus or Irenaeus is known or knowable, making them the stuff of legend. Further, there is no agreement even among Church Fathers, with Tertullian saying that Clement I was the successor of Peter, while Jerome had Clement I fourth on his list.

What we know of these early myths and legends is that the Church claims they were all saints and that most of them (9 of the initial 12) were martyred. They were overwhelmingly Roman and Greek – albeit with a couple of token Jews tossed into the mix. The first of interest would be Saint Clement I who established apostolic authority for clergy, Saint Alexander who fabricated the notion of holy water, and Saint Pius I, who in 81 CE decreed that Easter should only be celebrated on a Sunday.

Out of myth and into history, following the lineage of Imperial Roman carnality, we find a long succession of Roman Catholic popes who were as bad if not worse than the emperors. It was as if nothing changed. Proving this point, let's begin our comparison with the likes of Gregory I (590-604). He became infamous as the first pope to market fake memorabilia. He convinced a nobleman that the cross he sold him for an exorbitant amount contained the filings from the chains worn by Saint Peter, himself, and that it would free him forever from sins. After this successful venture, he made duping gullible Christians into a thriving business, selling all manner of phony relics. But with a limited supply of artisans to secretly create them, he postured a different scheme. He convinced land and slave owners that the end of the world would come in 600 CE and argued that "a man with possessions had as much hope of getting through the eye of a needle as getting through the gates of heaven." This misappropriation of God's message worked so well that he received so much land and so many slaves, the pope became the largest land and slave owner on earth. Lordy, lordy. As his final decree, the pope, who also opposed secular education, ordered the burning of the Julian library in Rome. At that time it contained 120,000 books. It's easier to fool fools when the foolish remain ignorant. That was Paul's motto, too.

Sergius III (904-911) was known to his fellow cardinals as “the slave of every vice.” He inherited the Seat of Saint Peter by murdering his predecessor. He fathered his first child with his teenage mistress, Marozia, a prostitute thirty years his junior. And in Catholic fashion, the Holy Father’s son grew up to become pope. But before Christ’s Vicar left the Vatican for his long dirt nap, he auctioned off every top clerical job to pay for his indulgent lifestyle. It was the beginning of another dark century for the Church.

During this time, Theodora, a courtesan of noble status, and her daughter, the aforementioned, Marozia, ruled the papacy. Vatican historian, Cardinal Caesar Baronius, called it the “Rule of the Whores” – affirming the Church’s place as the Whore of Babylon. It all began when Theodora seduced a young priest, and once he was under her control, used her charms to have him appointed Archbishop of Ravenna. Later, she got him elevated to pope, becoming John X (914-928). Her lover immediately took to arms, fighting against the Saracens. He was also known for indulging in nepotism, enriching his family through the Church’s coffers. With their newfound wealth, they hired Hungarian mercenaries to protect them, bringing a plague upon the nation. Having been empowered, enriched, and protected the old-fashioned way, through religion and politics, he spurned Theodora for a younger model, bedding the daughter of Hugh of Provence.

Jealous, Theodora “married” Guido, the Marquis of Tuscany. He and his charming bride carried out a *coup d’état* against the noble courtesan’s former lover, Pope John X. But adding injury to insult, Theodora was poisoned and died, leaving the pope to squabble with her daughter, Marozia. She turned the nobility of Rome against him, which wasn’t difficult because he had given the most profitable Church offices to his family,

depriving the nobility of what they came to see as their private preserve. In their fight over power and money, the Roman nobility drove John and his brother Peter from Rome. Thereafter, the Pope increased the size of his mercenary forces and returned, only to see Marozia's army enter the Lateran Palace and murder Peter before the pope's eyes. John was taken prisoner, deposed, and smothered to death.

Sweet little Marozia and her faction of wealthy Romans capitalized upon the vacancy and appointed Leo VI pope in 928. Dissatisfied, the Whore replaced him a few months later with the short-lived Stephen VI, who died under questionable circumstances, giving way to Stephen VII. His predecessor's untimely death, however, was evidently insufficient because he ordered the VI's corpse exhumed. Demonstrating boorish behavior even for a Roman, he propped up the former pope's dead body on a throne and tried the corpse for perjury, finding his supposedly infallible predecessor guilty of the crime. VII stripped VI of his papal vestments, and then cut off the fingers he had used for consecrations. He would bury the body a second time, only to dig it up and cast it into the Tiber River. The Devil must have loved this guy.

The whore's daughter, following in her mother's footsteps, finagled her son onto the throne. Known as John XI (931-935), he was "fathered" illegitimately by Pope Sergius III. While I understand that with all of the Roman names and Roman numerals that it gets confusing, John XI's "Holy Father" is the fellow who murdered his way to the top of the religious realm and who used his bedroom connections to earn the title, "Slave to Every Vice." While Catholic apologists managed to justify Sergius murdering two previous popes, in doing so, the religious manifestation of Imperial Rome inadvertently revealed that he wasn't the

only pope who was sexually involved with Theodora's daughter, the seductress, Marozia – who was in all but title, pope for three decades. The “Holy Mother” was a whore, unscrupulous and ruthless. And yet at least four popes served at her appointment and pleasure. While scandalous, the Church accepts the five popes she and her mother installed as “legitimate successors of Saint Peter.”

This wasn't the last pope to elicit Satan's favor. Born as Octavianus from the same noble Italian family that had dominated the papal office, the sixteen-year-old, John XII (955-964) opened a brothel within the Vatican. He was accused at his trial of sleeping with both of his sisters and routinely raping nuns. But with incest and perversity failing to satisfy his libertine lust, he invented his own catalog of disgusting new sins. He is infamous for beginning his inglorious career by invoking the support of pagan gods and goddesses. As an alcoholic, he was intoxicated most of the time. An incompetent manager, he put his mistress, a prostitute named Marcia in charge of his whorehouse in the Lateran Palace. They drank so much during one or their orgies, they accidentally set the palace ablaze.

A host of cardinals and bishops testified that “he had been paid for ordaining bishops, including a ten-year-old, that he was an adulterer, that he had sexual relations with the widow of Rainier, with Stephana, his father's concubine, with the widow Anna, and with his own niece. They said that he turned the sacred palace into a whorehouse and then blinded his confessor, Benedict.” They accused him of murdering a cardinal after castrating him. He, they said, routinely toasted with the Devil, and invoked the support of Jupiter, Venus, and other Greek and Roman gods and goddesses.

It is said that he found recompense by battering in his skull with a hammer. The lowest of humanity, he

was murdered at age 27 when the husband of one of the women he was raping burst into his bedroom and discovered him in the act. The intrigue and infighting around his papacy was reminiscent of how wannabe Roman Emperors jostled for position by pitting legions of Romans against one another. These were the worst of men.

Satan's next little helper was a teenager when the College of Cardinals "elected" him. Theophylactus I of Tusculum was the son of Count Alberic III of Tusculum, and the nephew of popes Benedict VIII and John XIX. He was the last to reign from the powerful and corrupt Tusculani family. His was a twisted family tree. Theophylactus was the great-grandson of the Roman seductress, Marozia, who was the mistress of Pope Sergius II and others. Pope John IX was their illegitimate child.

Under the moniker, Benedict IX (1032-1044, April to May of 1045, and 1047-1048), this wayward child, who at the age of fourteen was hosting orgies and debauching young boys in the Lateran Palace, was elected pope. Since some within the religious community took exception to a sexual pervert becoming the Holy Father, and complained, in response to his critics, Benedict IX excommunicated the clerics who spoke out against the presence of orgies, bestiality (having sex with animals), and priestly pedophilia within the Church – establishing a standard that would be followed until the present day. He became the reincarnation of Nero and Caligula, with a dash of Tiberius.

He stepped down as Holy Father on two occasions, selling the papacy to the highest bidder. His violent and licentious conduct provoked Romans to insurrection, causing Benedict to flee Rome in 1044. Bishop John of Sabina briefly succeeded him as Sylvester III, but he

was driven away by Benedict's brothers. Whereupon, Benedict sold the papacy to his godfather, Giovanni Graziano, who earned the right to call himself, Pope Gregory VI by buying the Seat of Saint Peter and by granting his godson a lavish Church pension for all of the good work he had done abusing young boys, women, and animals.

The following year, however, Benedict disavowed the sale of the papacy to his godfather and, to make matters worse, Sylvester also returned to Rome and claimed that he was pope. The Council of Sutri was orchestrated in 1046 by King Henry III of Germany to resolve these "godly" issues. Therein, Sylvester was declared a false claimant and imprisoned. Benedict was deposed. Gregory was charged with simony (buying or selling a church office), rejected as a legitimate pope, and excommunicated. All three were replaced by a fourth aristocrat, Saxon bishop Suidger of Bamberg, a German, of course. It was a setup, as the nobleman accompanied the German king to the Council. Nonetheless, Suidger was consecrated Clement II on Christmas Day and crowned by Henry as Holy Roman Emperor. But that is not the end of the story.

The Roman Primates would become especially primal. Not beneath murdering his way to the top, Benedict had his supporters (whom there were many) within the Roman Church poison Pope Clement II as the highest-ranking Church official was returning from a meeting with the Holy Roman Emperor in Germany. With the rubble cleared out of his way, Benedict IX waltzed back into the Vatican and reclaimed his throne.

Displeased, the Holy Roman Emperor ordered Boniface of Tuscany to hire other malcontents to assassinate Benedict. But as the gang of attackers set upon him while he was celebrating Mass, Benedict slipped out of Rome for the final time. On this occasion,

the Holy Roman Emperor dispatched an army to Rome to see to it that Benedict and his cronies were kept at bay, allowing him to fill the vacant seat with Bishop Poppo of Brixen, becoming Damasus II. Unfortunately for Henry III, Damasus II died of malaria twenty-four days later. All the while, Benedict was dispatched to a monastery where he conveniently repented and died of natural causes at age thirty-five.

Today Benedict IX is best known for running a brothel and toasting to Satan in the headquarters of the Roman Catholic Church. Saint Peter Damian, in comparing the Vatican to Gomorrah, would say of him, “he was a wretch who feasted on immorality, a demon from hell in the disguise of a priest.” In his book *Dialogues*, Pope Victor III wrote of Benedict IX: “His life as pope was so vile, so foul, so execrable, that I shudder to think of it.” When an organization infamous for crafting its own public image and whitewashing its own history, an institution responsible for the Crusades, Indulgences, witch hunts, the gruesome tortures of the Inquisition, and priestly pedophilia, states that one of its own “feasted on immorality,” it’s likely he deserved the criticism.

The *Catholic Encyclopedia* gives additional accounts of papal debasement during the post “Rule of the Whores” era: “The Popes ‘Benedict’ from the IV to the IX inclusive, belong to the darkest period of papal history.... Benedict VI (973) was thrown into prison by the anti-pope Boniface VII (d. 983). He was then strangled by his orders in 974. Benedict VII was a layman and became pope by force. He drove out Boniface VII. Pope Benedict IX had long caused scandal to the Church by his disorderly life. His immediate successor, Pope Gregory VI (1044-46), had persuaded Benedict IX to resign the Chair of Peter, and to do so

bestowed valuable possessions on him.” (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, I, p 31)

The so-called, “Anti-Pope,” Boniface VII, was described by Pope Sylvester II, (999-1003) as “a horrible monster that in criminality surpassed all the rest of mankind” with the exception of the “scandal” of Pope Benedict IX. Born, Grottaferrata Teofilatto, in 1032 he won the murderous scramble for the wealth of the papacy. He immediately excommunicated leaders who were hostile to him and quickly established a reign of terror. He officially opened the doors of “the palace of the popes” to homosexuals and turned it into an organized and profitable male brothel. (*The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, Horace K. Mann, Kegan Paul, London, 1925).

Upon his death, undertakers refused to build him a coffin. He was surreptitiously buried in a cloth under the cover of darkness. Four succeeding popes then briefly held the papal position, and the following paragraph from the *Catholic Encyclopedia* is pregnant with evidence of the moral depravity of the entire priesthood:

“At the time of Leo IX’s election in 1049,” according to the testimony of St. Bruno, Bishop of Segni, “the whole Church was in wickedness, holiness had disappeared, justice had perished, and truth had been buried; Simon Magus was lording it over the Church, whose popes and bishops were given to luxury and fornication. The scientific and ascetic training of the popes left much to be desired, the moral standard of many being very low and the practice of celibacy not everywhere observed. Bishops obtained their offices in irregular ways, whose lives and conversations are strangely at variance with their calling, who go through their duties not for Christ but for motives of worldly gain. The members of the clergy were in many places regarded with scorn, and their avaricious ideas, luxury

and immorality rapidly gained ground at the center of clerical life. When ecclesiastical authority grew weak at the fountain head, it necessarily decayed elsewhere. In proportion, as the papal authority lost the respect of many, resentment grew against both the Curia and the papacy.” (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, vi, pp. 793-4; xii, pp. 700-03)

Even the Catholic Church admits, “Pope Leo IX was an unscrupulous adventurer who spent his pontificate touring Europe with armed knights and left the world worse than he found it.” The Church said of him, “Leo coyly admitted that he defected from the faith...by actually offering sacrifices to false gods...although it is not known why he recanted his religion.” (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, Pecci ed., iii, p. 117).

The aforementioned, Saint Peter Damian, the fiercest censor of his age, unrolled a frightful picture of decay in clerical morality in the lurid pages of his *Book of Gomorrah*, a curious Christian record that remarkably survived centuries of Church cover-ups and book-burnings. He said: “A natural tendency to murder and brutalize appears with the popes. Nor do they have any inclination to conquer their abominable lust; many are seen to have employed into licentiousness for an occasion to the flesh, and hence, using this liberty of theirs, perpetrating every crime.”

After a lifetime of research into the lives of the popes, Lord Acton, an English historian and founder-editor of *The Cambridge Modern History*, summarized the militarist papal attitude when he observed: “The popes were not only murderers in the great style, but they also made murder a legal basis of the Christian Church and a condition of salvation.” (*The Cambridge Modern History*, vol. 1, pp. 673-77)

They had become the living embodiment of their false god: “‘And as for these enemies of mine who didn’t want me to be their king over them, bring them here and execute them right here in front of me.’ After Jesus has said this, he went on ahead, going up to Jerusalem.” (Luke 19:27-8) While there is no chance Yahowsha’ said any of this, it reads right out of the Roman Catholic playbook.

That was so repulsive, it would take the likes of Urban II (1088-1099) to follow in the line of wretched men. He was yet another charming fellow. He introduced sex taxes to fund the First Crusade. At the Council of Piacenza in 1095, he had some 4000 church officials and 30,000 lay-Catholics outlaw the marriage of priests – laying the foundation for the thousand years of unmitigated priestly pedophilia that would follow. At the time, and for the money, the Church sold the wives of every priest into slavery. Then seizing upon the opportunity, he introduced his infamous cullagium sex tax. It allowed a priest to keep a mistress as long as he rented her annually from the Church.

By launching the First Crusade to “liberate” Jerusalem from the Muslims, Urban II’s crusaders, who were all promised a direct ticket into heaven, killed more Christians and Jews than they did Muslims – their intended target. But no matter. The RCC was so pleased with the pope that snuffed out the lives of 56 million people, that in 1881 Urban II was canonized and is now Saint Urban. How’s that for demonic?

Pope Innocent IV (1243-1254) was anything but guiltless. He actually declared that the Roman Catholic Church had “sovereign dominion over the entire world,” and hence owned all of the wealth to be found or confiscated on earth. He also claimed the Church had “legal authority over all people.” While the Towrah isn’t

Law, we cannot say as much for the religion that sought to “replace the Law with Grace.”

In actually it gets worse: Pope Innocent officially authorized the use of torture for eliciting confessions from those who sought to be free of his arrogant and dictatorial edicts, especially non-Catholic Christians. He is responsible for making the Inquisition a scene of abject horror. Those who survived his tortures were flagellated with whips designed to rip the skin off of the victim. “Relapsed heretics,” a.k.a., courageous critics of his sadistic ways, had their assets seized before they were burnt alive. Midwives were commonly roasted for his pleasure while their children were whipped as they watched their mothers burn.

After massacring the population of an entire Italian town, Boniface VIII (1294-1303) indulged in a *menage a trois* with a married woman and her daughter. Unsatisfied, he became a prolific pedophile, declaring that “having sex with young boys was no more a sin than rubbing one hand against the other.” The poet Dante “reserved a special place for him in the eighth circle of hell.”

In 1410, thirty-seven of his own clergy witnessed and condemned Pope John XXIII committing adultery, incest, sodomy, selling indulgences and privileges, theft, and murder. And if that didn’t keep the Holy Father sufficiently busy, he kept a harem of 200 mistresses in Boulogne, mostly nuns.

The papacy hit an especially sour note with Sixtus IV (1471-1484). He turned the Vatican into a palace of political graft and expensive whores. He had at best count, six illegitimate sons, one with his sister. He even collected a Church tax on prostitutes and charged priests for keeping mistresses, thereby increasing the

prevalence of clerical homosexuality which was free from taxation.

Innocent VIII (1484-1492), as he chose to call himself, is known as the Holy Father of the Inquisition – the most overtly sadistic institution in religious history. This stalwart of Roman Catholic values acknowledged siring eight illegitimate sons between mistresses, concubines, and prostitutes. He was so twisted, on his death bed he insisted that a wet nurse supply him with mother's milk right from her bosom. Lurking in the shadows and catacombs, we will never know the full scope of the pain this pope inflicted, especially on Jews.

His successor to the Seat of Saint Peter, was Rodrigo Borgia, who became the rotund Pope Alexander VI between 1492 and 1503. During the height of the Inquisition, he hypocritically presided over more orgies than masses. In 1501 he staged the "Joust of the Whores," so that 50 dancers could strip off their clothes around his table. They were taunted with scraps of food tossed onto the floor such that the women were forced to grovel at their feet like swine. Pope Alexander offered prizes, including clothing and jewelry, to the man who fornicated with the most women. To his credit, he may have been the only pope to welcome Jews, and was likely himself, a Jew. On the other hand, he had four illegitimate children and is alleged to have slept with one of them.

Pope Julius II (1503-1513) was a warmongering and drunken degenerate, and father of five, all out of wedlock. He declared "Christians represent the unstable, unlettered, superstitious masses." This Vicar of Christ advised his secretary "to take three mistresses at one time in memory of the Holy Trinity." He was both the pope responsible for commissioning Michelangelo to paint the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, and the first of many to become infected with syphilis. He, like so many

after him, contracted the venereal disease by frolicking with Rome's male prostitutes. On Good Friday in 1508, the progression became so obvious he could no longer offer his feet to be kissed by the faithful as they were covered in syphilitic sores.

It was the next to claim the "Seat of Saint Peter," Pope Leo X (1513-1521), who spoke the most clearly about what the Roman Catholic Church had become. On 11 March 1513, Giovanni de' Medici was elected pope and assumed the aforementioned title of the 10th Lion. At the time, he hadn't even been ordained as a priest, a defect that was remedied four days later as the Vatican was celebrating the death of "Divine Julius Caesar." Yes, indeed, Imperial Rome had become the Roman Catholic Church. And now they had their Caligula. Even the most Eusebius of Catholic apologists, those who attempted a defense of Julius II, abandoned Leo X to the wolves. Of him the *Catholic Encyclopedia* states: "He satisfied only those who looked upon the Papal Court as a center of amusement."

This Lion of the Vatican began to "indulge in unnatural vice" to such a degree, the Church did its best to cover it up. But still, Guicciardini couldn't help but note that the new pope was "exceedingly devoted to the flesh, especially those pleasures which cannot, with decency, be mentioned." His biographer claimed the "he had penetrated the secrets of the night. He shared an improper love of some of his chamberlains, who were members of the noblest families of Italy."

So now with the Church having been exposed for having sexually abused hundreds of thousands of young boys, modern Roman Catholics are trying to wipe away their long history of horrid behavior. They are now saying that Leo X "was a man who lived a moral life and was sincerely religious," (The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church), adding that his "pious qualities

were responsible for his unanimous election by the cardinals.” (*Zondervan Dictionary of the Christian Church*)

History, however, tells a different story: When Pope Julius II died, Giovanni de’ Medici (who would soon become Leo X) was so stricken with venereal disease, he was carried from Florence to Rome in a litter. Upon his arrival, an ulcer broke and the fluid which ran from it exuded such a stench that everyone in the enclave was poisoned by it. Thereafter, the cardinals consulted with physicians to better understand the matter. But they, being bribed earlier by Giovanni de’ Medici himself, said that he would not live a month. That being the case, the syphilitic lord of Medici, then 38 years of age, was elected pope on false information. But to the surprise of the cardinals, he soon recovered his health, giving the church a reason to repent. (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, 3rd ed., vol. ix, p. 788)

His first declaration was: “God has given me the papacy, now let me enjoy it.” His second act was to more fully develop the sale of “indulgences” into Christianity so that he could fund yet another military strike: the 18th Crusade since 1096. He was known to sell dispensations to the rich, on the promise to keep them from burning, absolving them from crimes such as murder, polygamy, perjury, and witchcraft. (*Indulgences: Their Origin, Nature and Development*, Quaracchi, 1897).

The “Holy Father” was broke. In less than two years he had squandered the entire wealth of the Vatican. So for a sum of money, a pardon was conveyed, a release from the pains of purgatory. Forgiveness of sins was granted to any person who bestowed their wealth to the Church. The year after his election, he engaged in human trafficking, selling the archbishop of Mainz and two bishops to a rich, loose-living young noble, Albert

of Brandenburg, for a huge sum. Then he permitted the perverted libertine to recover his investment by authorizing him to market his own version of indulgences, something which inflamed Martin Luther.

Some 500 years before the Vatican received its first banking license, Lord Bryce, British jurist and statesman, summarized the moral qualities of the priesthood that indulgences reflected. He called it “a blatant fraud against the naïve...a portentous falsehood and the most unimpeachable evidence of the true thoughts and beliefs of the priesthood which framed it.” (*The Holy Roman Empire*, Lord Bryce, 1864, ch. vi, p. 107; Latin text, extracts, p. 76).

To replenish the coffers and maintain his luxuriant lifestyle, Leo X expanded the sale of indulgences into the leading source of Church revenue and developed a large body of priests to collect the payments. In forming his plans, he was assisted by his relative Laurentius Pucci, whom he made Cardinal of Santi-quattro, and Johann Tetzel, a former military officer of the Teutonic Knights in Prussia. They appointed a series of retailers to keep pace with the disposal of goods given to pay for sins to be forgiven. He and his team would take their show on the road, traveling throughout Italy to entice more sales.

“The indulgence-seekers passed through the country in gay carriages escorted by thirty horsemen. The pontiff’s Bull of Grace was borne in front on a purple velvet cushion, or sometimes on a cloth of gold. The chief vendor of indulgences followed with his team, supporting a large red wooden cross; and the whole procession moved in this manner amidst singing and the smoke of incense.”

“The pope was the last speaker and cried out, ‘Bring money, bring money, bring money.’ He uttered this cry

with such a dreadful bellowing that one might have thought that some wild bull was rushing among the people and goring them with his horns.” (Diderot’s *Encyclopédie*, 1759)

The Teutonic Knight, Tetzels, and the priests associated with him, routinely exaggerated the value of indulgences so as to lead people to believe that “as soon as they gave their money, they were certain of salvation and the deliverance of souls from purgatory.” (Diderot’s *Encyclopédie*).

So resounding was the Protestant opposition to the sale of indulgences that Pope Leo X issued a bull called “*Exsurge Domine*,” whose purpose was to condemn Martin Luther for the audacity of claiming that “indulgences are frauds against the faithful and criminal offences against God.” (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, 3rd ed)

Forty-five years later, the eighteen-year-long Council of Trent pronounced an “anathema against those who either declare indulgences to be useless or deny that the Church has the power to grant them.” (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, vii, pp. 783-4). Hiding this blemish was the reason why Pope Clement XIII (1758-69) ordered all evidence of these indulgences destroyed. (*The Censoring of Diderot's 'Encyclopédie' and the Re-established Text*, D. H. Gordon and N. L. Torrey, Columbia University Press, New York, 1947)

To finance his lifestyle, Leo borrowed prodigious amounts of money from bankers at 40 per cent interest. The booming brothels simply did not bring in enough tax money, even though there were 6,800 registered prostitutes servicing a male citizenry of fifty thousand. His gifts to relatives, friends, artists, writers and musicians, his lavish maintenance of an unprecedented court, the demands of the new St. Peter’s, the expense of

the Urbino war and payments to Tetzels for preparation for the next crusade were all leading him to bankruptcy. God's work was evidently expensive.

He even indulged in nepotism, appointing his son to Cardinal when he was just fourteen. When the College of Cardinals who had elected him tried to kill him, he had the flesh of their servants ripped off with burning pincers to extract information.

Leo X's religious army was defeated when the French King Francis I invaded Italy in 1515. The Vatican was forced to concede control over the French Church and lost a meaningful source of revenue. In Rome, however, the bankers despoiled themselves. The Bini firm had lent Leo X 200,000 ducats, the Gaddi 32,000, the Ricasoli 10,000. Cardinal Pucci lent him 150,000 ducats and Cardinal Salviati 80,000, all so that the cardinals would have first claim on anything they could salvage from the Vatican. (*Crises in the History of the Papacy*, op. cit., ch. vi)

Leo X died worse than bankrupt. As security for his loans, he pledged churches, monasteries, nunneries, the Villa Medici, the Vatican silverware, tapestries, manuscript collections, jewelry, even the infamous "Chair of Saint Peter" built by King Charles the Bald in 875 and displayed in the Vatican foyer until 1656 as a true relic upon which St. Peter once sat.

Desperate for money, Leo created 1,353 saleable offices, for which appointees paid a total of 889,000 ducats (US \$9,524,800,000 in 2019 values). He nominated 60 additional chamberlains and 141 squires to the 2,000 persons who made up his ménage at the Vatican and received from them a total of 202,000 ducats – worth over \$2 billion today. In July 1517, he named 31 new cardinals, chosen "not of such as had the most merit, but of those that offered the most money for

the honor and power.” Cardinal Porizzetti, among Leo’s appointees on this occasion brought in another half a million ducats for the treasury – another \$4.3 billion today.

Some cardinals received an income from the Church of 40,000 ducats a year (over \$3.5 million in today’s dollars) and lived in stately palaces manned by as many as 300 servants and adorned with every art and luxury known to the time. Leo X was so extravagant, he spent 4,500,000 ducats during his pontificate and died owing 400,000 (countless billions of dollars) more. (A History of the Popes, op. cit., vol. 2).

A favorite satire regarding him at that time was called the “Gospel according to Marks and Silver: In those days, Pope Leo said to the clergy: ‘When Jesus the Son of Man shall come to the seat of our Majesty, say first of all, “Friend, wherefore art Thou come hither? And if He gives you naught in silver or gold, cast Him forth into outer darkness.”’” (A History of the Popes, Dr Joseph McCabe, *ibid.*, vol. 2, chapter on “The Age of Power”)

It was Pope Leo X who made the most infamous and damaging statement about Christianity in the history of the Church. His declaration revealed the Vatican’s ultimate fraud and unashamedly exposed the infantile nature of the Christian religion. At a lavish Good Friday banquet in the Vatican in 1514, and in the company of seven intimates, Leo X made an amazing announcement that the Church has since tried to invalidate. Raising a chalice of wine into the air, Pope Leo toasted: “How well we know what a profitable superstition this fable of Christ has been for us and our predecessors.” (Annales Ecclesiastici, Caesar Baronius, Folio Antwerp, 1597, tome 14)

The pope's pronouncement is recorded in the diaries and records of both Pietro Cardinal Bembo (*Letters and Comments on Pope Leo X*, 1842 reprint) and Paolo Cardinal Giovio (*De Vita Leonis Decimi*, op. cit.), two associates who were witnesses to it. It is even validated by none less than Cardinal Caesar Baronius who was Vatican librarian for seven years. He wrote a 12-volume history of the Church, known as *Annales Ecclesiastici*. He was the Church's most acclaimed historian (Catholic Encyclopedia, New Edition, 1976, ii, p. 105) and his records provide vital inside information for anybody studying the rich depth of falsification in Christianity. Cardinal Baronius, who turned down two offers to become pope in 1605, added the following comments about Pope Leo's declaration: "The Pontiff has been accused of atheism, for he denied God and called Christ, in front of cardinals Pietro Bembo, Jovius and Iacopo Sadoleto and other intimates, 'a fable.'" (*Annales Ecclesiastici*, op. cit., tomes viii and xi)

In an early edition of the Catholic Encyclopedia (Pecci ed., iii, pp. 312-314, passim), the Church devoted two-and-a-half pages trying to nullify the most destructive statement ever made in the name of Christianity. They wrote that what the pope meant by "profitable" was "gainful," and "fable" was intended to mean "tradition." Hence, the revisionist history would claim, "How well Christians have gained from this wonderful tradition of Christ." But that isn't what "the Holy Father" and "Christ's Vicar on Earth" said.

It is from Roman Catholicism's own records that Pope Leo X's statement became known to the world. In his diaries, Cardinal Bembo, the Pope's secretary for seven years, added that Leo: "was known to disbelieve Christianity itself. He advanced contrary to the faith and that in condemning the Gospel, therefore he must be a heretic; he was guilty of sodomy with his chamberlains;

was addicted to pleasure, luxury, idleness, ambition, unchastity and sensuality; and spent his whole days in the company of musicians and buffoons. His Infallibility's drunkenness was proverbial, he practiced incontinency as well as inebriation, and the effects of his crimes shattered the people's constitution.” (*Letters and Comments on Pope Leo X*, *ibid.*)

Thereafter, John Bale (1495-1563) seized upon Pope Leo's confession and the subsequent Vatican admission that the pope had spoken the truth about the “fable of Christ” and “put forward this knowledge truly.” (*Annales Ecclesiastici*, *ibid.*) Bale was an Englishman who had earlier joined the Carmelites but abandoned the order after the Inquisition slaughtered his family. (*Of the Five Plagues of the Church* [originally titled *The Five Wounds of the Church*], Count Antonio Rosmini [Catholic priest and papal adviser], 1848, English trans. by Prof. David L. Wilhelm, Russell Square Publishing, London, 1889)

Seventy-nine years after the fact, the Vatican would issue the following statement about him: “As an ecclesiastic, his deficiency in professional knowledge, his utter indifference to the restraint of his character, the reputed laxity of his principles, his proneness to dissimulation, his deeply rooted voluptuousness and his fondness for the society of musicians, jesters and buffoons rendered him contemptible, or something worse. By a course of lavish expenditure in the indulgence of his own taste for luxury and magnificence, by the part which he took in the troublous politics of the day.... Leo completely drained the papal treasury.” (*Annales Ecclesiastici*, Caesar Baronius, Antwerp, 1592-97, folio iii)

They would go on to say: “Leo gathered about him a company of gross men: flatterers, purveyors of indecent jokes and stories, and writers of obscene

comedies which were often performed in the Vatican with cardinals as actors. His chief friend was Cardinal Bimmienna, whose comedies were more obscene than any of ancient Athens or Rome and who was one of the most immoral men of his time.

Leo, who was morbidly fat, staged banquets which were as costly as they were vulgar. The coarsest jesters and loosest courtesans sat next to him and alongside the cardinals who played along. Since these things are not disputed, the Church does not deny the evidence of his vices. In public affairs he was the most notoriously dishonorable Vicar of Christ of the Renaissance period, but it is not possible here to tell the extraordinary story of his alliances, wars and cynical treacheries. His nepotism was as corrupt as that of any pope, and when some of the cardinals conspired to kill him he had the flesh of their servants ripped off to extract information.” (*Crises in the History of the Papacy*, op. cit., ch. v, “The Popes React with Massacre and Inquisition”)

Should apologists on behalf of the Whore of Babylon claim that we have plucked the likes of Paul, Constantine, Theodosius, Eusebius, Jerome, Chrysostom, Gregory I, Sergius III, Theodora, Marozia, John X and XII, Stephen VI and VII, Benedict IX, Boniface VII and VIII, Leo IX and X, Urban II, Innocent IV and VIII, Sixtus IV, Alexander VI, Julius II, out of an otherwise saintly crowd, let’s linger in hell a while longer.

Along came Paul IV (1555-1559). He earned his promotion as the former Grand Inquisitor and thus master torturer of the Inquisition. He took it to a whole new level, inventing some of the most heinous devices ever conceived by men – all in the name of Christian supremacy. He was so devoted to his sadistic and demonic craft that he gleefully reimbursed the inventors for the cruelest devices.

Paul IV was the first to order Jews to wear yellow hats at all times, reminiscent of the Nazi's yellow stars. He forbade Jews from engaging in any form of commerce to ensure that they remained impoverished and in ghettos. Paul IV was so inhumane, the population of Rome was halved during his brief reign. Upon his death, the statues of this sadistic man that the Church had commissioned were torn down and dragged through the sewers. A yellow cap was placed upon them and then they were tossed into the Tiber. When his dungeons were opened, even cardinals were freed.

This is getting wearisome but let's hold our noses through three more popes. Urban VIII (1623-1644) is infamous for persecuting his former friend, Galileo. Put before the Inquisition, the scientist was forced to kneel before the pope and swear with his hands on the Gospels, that his theory that the earth revolved around the sun was a lie and a "damnable heresy." He was ordered to write: "having been admonished by this Holy Office entirely to abandon the false opinion that the Sun was the center of the universe and immovable, and that the Earth was not the center of the same and that it moved, I abjure with a sincere heart and unfeigned faith, I curse and detest the said errors and heresies, and generally all and every error and sect contrary to the Holy Catholic Church." The Father of Lies had the Church of his dreams.

With deception and debauchery in every corner, Pius IX (1846-1878) did the unthinkable. He invented the "Doctrine of Papal Infallibility." The Church born of lies would now claim: "Divine revelation is perfect and, therefore, it is not subject to continual and indefinite progress in order to correspond with the progress of human reason... No man is free to embrace and profess that religion which he believes to be true, guided by the light of reason... The Catholic religion shall be the only

true religion.... The Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the state, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship.... The Roman Pontiff cannot and ought not to reconcile himself or agree with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization.” This same delusional narcissist was notoriously anti-Semitic. He forced all Roman Jews into ghettos. He took their children away from them and forcibly baptized them, raising them in horrible conditions in Catholic orphanages. For his hatred of Jews and repudiation of freewill, Pope John Paul beatified Pius IX. So now we know what it means to be a good Catholic.

This leads us to Hitler’s Pope, Pius XII (1939-1958). His overt support for the rise of Adolf Hitler, the Nazi regime, and the Final Solution led to the deaths of 50 million people, 6 million of whom were Jews – one million of whom were children under the age of two. I wonder when he will become Saint Pius.

Tonight as I write these words, former Nuncio, Archbishop Carlo Maria Vigano, has made news accusing a number of prelates of dereliction of duty in dealing with the Church’s sex abuse scandal. He specifically accused the current pope, Francis, of having elevated Cardinal Theodore McCarrick, knowing that he had committed acts of pedophilia with young boys. To which Francis said during his morning homily at Mass in the chapel of the Santa Marta residence in the Vatican, “The Great Accuser, as he, himself, tells God in the first chapter of the Book of Job, roams around the earth looking for someone to accuse. In these times it seems that the Great Accuser has been unleashed and has it in for the bishops. It is true, we are all sinners,” he said, “but the Great Accuser seeks to unveil sins so that they may be seen to scandalize the people.”

To be a professing Roman Catholic, you must be out of your mind.

