

# Drawing Aside the Purple Curtain

## *The Papal System Today: an Analysis of the News*

# Ukraine, Russia, the US/EU: What's Going On?

by Shaun Willcock

---

## Understanding Five Important Points

As they say, the first casualty of war is truth. This is certainly the case with what has been unfolding in Ukraine in recent weeks. From all sides there are lies, distortions, and deliberate disinformation. But even so, Christians can have a good understanding of these momentous events if they clearly grasp five important points, and never lose sight of them.

The first point, and the most important of all, is this: *the nerve centre of all world events – biblically and historically – is Rome*. To be specific, the Roman Papacy; the Roman Catholic institution. This is the heart of Satan's activities and intrigues worldwide, religiously and politically (Rev. 17). Nowhere else! All roads truly do lead to Rome. It relentlessly seeks to expand its own influence and power over the nations of the earth.<sup>1</sup>

And so we must ask: what will Rome achieve by these events in Ukraine? And when we do this we find that *the Vatican supported the Ukrainian revolutionaries* who overthrew the government and established one of their own.

The second point is this: Communism is *not* dead; the so-called “collapse” of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s was a deliberate Communist deception; and Russia *is* still under Communist control.<sup>2</sup>

The third point is: the plans for the New World Order are now at a very advanced stage; and these involve a one-world government that is Socialist/Communist; the merging of East and West under Communism – of the USA with Russia and with the European Union (EU), and with all other regional entities worldwide (such as the African Union, etc.).

The fourth point: the United States of America is *not*, today, a bastion of anti-Communism. In fact, the Communists' decades-old plot to conquer the US government *has succeeded*, and that government today is Communist.<sup>3</sup> The evidence is plain for those with eyes to see. American expansionism across much of the globe is for the purpose of promoting the Communist one-world agenda. Once upon a time, when America led what was called the “free world”, anti-Communists and freedom-lovers looked with hope to America; but that time is long past. What a tragedy that much of the world now views America's global influence with the same dread as they would the influence of Russia or China. And with good reason: America's government is now no better than that of Russia and China. *All three are Red*.

Also, allied to the US, the European Union is a gigantic ultra-Socialist monstrosity, under the same one-worlders and working for the same Communist world, under a world government.

And a final point: although Russia has done so much to advance Communism worldwide, both as the leading nation of the Soviet Union and afterwards as the Russian Federation and leading nation of the

“Commonwealth of Independent States”; although it is still firmly Communist and committed to advancing world Communism; yet there has been a subtle change under Vladimir Putin’s presidency. Yes, Russia wants, and works for, a Communist world; but Putin wants Russia to *control* that Communist world. He does not want a world government centred elsewhere, with Russia being just one cog in the wheel of the one-world system. He wants Russia to *head up* the world system. And because of this, Russia under its present leadership, although Communist, actually *stands in the way* of the Communist one-world plans of the globalists in the USA and EU. And thus there is a clash between two versions of Communism, both wanting world domination on their own terms: the US/EU version, and the Russian version.

When these five points are understood, then what has happened, and is happening, in Ukraine today can be properly grasped. But without a clear understanding of these points, none of these events will make sense. And so, with these things as the backdrop, let us analyse what is happening in Ukraine:

## **On the Surface: the Revolution in Ukraine**

We all know the basic events, which the world has watched unfolding. The pro-Russian president of Ukraine rejected an EU offer of a bailout in favour of a much bigger Russian one. Instead of orienting Ukraine towards the West and the EU, he kept it oriented towards the East and Russia. When he did this, supposedly spontaneous uprisings of Ukrainian people occurred in Kiev, the capital. For weeks the demonstrators camped in Maidan Square, in Kiev, demanding that the president resign and a new government be formed. When he refused to heed their demands, they took matters into their own hands, storming the parliament and overthrowing the government. The president fled, and the protesters formed an interim government, pro-EU.

But now let us go behind the scenes; for very momentous things have been taking place. A vast conspiracy is afoot.

## **The Present Conflict Between the US/EU and Russia**

Russia and Ukraine have many and very long historical ties, going back centuries. They were also the two most powerful parts of the Soviet Union. And even when the deception of the supposed “break-up” of the Soviet Union occurred, they remained the two strongest parts of the new “Commonwealth of Independent States” which replaced the USSR. They both remained firmly Communist, and close allies, working together for the advancement of Communism as they had done for most of the twentieth century.

Throughout much of the twentieth century the one-worlders working behind the scenes made use of Russia (under the name of the Soviet Union) to advance world Communism. Gradually, inexorably, the US and Europe turned to Socialism/Communism as well, and finally were well into this camp. This being so, why then this conflict between the US/EU and Russia over Ukraine? Putin is a Communist, and Obama is a Communist, as are many of the EU leaders. Why, then, is there such anti-Putin sentiment from them? What is going on here? Let us see.

The one-worlders’ plan was (and is) to merge East and West, the US/EU and Russia, under a world government. But Russia, at least under Putin, stopped playing ball. In essence, he went rogue. Instead of closely following the one-world script, which called for this merger, where neither the USA nor Russia would be dominant, Putin had ambitions for Russia. He is a Russian nationalist who wants Russia to rule, not to be merged. He wants Russia to dominate the coming united world. Russia, under Putin, is seeking to expand, to build again the *open* union that existed as the Soviet Union (this union still exists clandestinely). He is even seeking to form a rival to the EU, to be known as the Eurasia Economic Union, the plan being to have it up and running by 2015.

Thus Putin’s Russian nationalism (a form of national Socialism actually) stands in the way of the one worlders absorbing Russia into the New World Order.

This simply shows that in the march toward a one-world government there are occasional setbacks. Despite Socialism/Communism now being triumphant across the USA and much of the EU, just as it is in Russia, this does not alter the fact that each side often still has its own ambitions. Just as both Russia and China are Communist, yet have often been at loggerheads through the years, so too it is presently the case with Russia and the US/EU. Even in the relentless drive towards the New World Order, individuals' personal ambitions sometimes get in the way. This is what has happened with Vladimir Putin.

But the shadowy one-world puppet masters behind the scenes were not going to let him get away with it. Putin's ambitions for his beloved Russia had to be curtailed. Russia had to be brought into line again. Hence, the Ukraine got tugged towards the EU.

Another reason for the US/EU commitment to isolating and eventually toppling Putin is that he has decided to follow a morally conservative path (at least externally), for various reasons too involved to go into here. In particular, he has taken a very vocal stance against homosexuality in Russia, and has also begun speaking of himself as a "Christian". He most certainly is not a true Christian. He is a member of the Russian Orthodox "Church", which is a false "church" allied to the Communist State, and a brutal leader who rose to power through the dreaded KGB.

## **Two Versions of Communism**

But let us understand what is going on here. In the world today there are two versions of Communism. The first is what we could call the original, traditional type of Communism, which swept the Bolsheviks into power in Russia in 1917, and conquered much of the world in the decades that followed. But the second version is what can be called Gramscian Communism. This is named after the leader of the Italian Communist Party at one time, Gramsci, who realised that the West would not be conquered by Communism using the tactics which had succeeded in Russia and elsewhere. It was morally too strong. He realised that for Communism to succeed in the West, the West had to be weakened morally; *destroyed* morally in fact. And so began a decades-long war against the West, fought not with guns and soldiers but in another way. An insidious, subtle assault began to be made on the West's morals, on its churches, on its youth, on the institution of the family, etc. Every kind of moral evil was promoted: divorce, fornication, pornography, sodomy, abortion, drugs, and much more. This promotion of immorality was done via Hollywood movies; rock music; the education system; and especially via thoroughly infiltrated, thoroughly compromised "churches" which preached a garbled, watered-down, weak, effeminate, powerless message that had nothing but a superficial resemblance to "Christianity".

It was a very long-term strategy, slow and careful. But it worked! Gradually the West moved away from its moral and religious foundations, and embraced an immoral, essentially pagan culture that has utterly transformed the USA and other western countries into the most decadent, vile, morally filthy countries on earth. And in their weakened state they were easily picked off by the one-world globalists. The US government became Communist, and the American people embraced Gramscian Communism.

Russia has been Communist for a long time and there is no need for Putin to promote immorality in his own country to destroy the people's morals; in fact, he wants a morally strong Russia. In the West, however, it is a very different matter. Thus what we have is a situation where two forms of Communism are clashing. The western Communists have been so indoctrinated in Gramscianism that they truly believe it is best. And thus to them, Putin is a dinosaur: a man who should be extinct, a man who hates the filthy immorality of the West. They want him out.

## **Going Through Ukraine to Weaken Russia**

For the reasons given above, therefore, it was decided to weaken Russia by breaking its ties with its

old ally, Ukraine. A way had to be found to shift Ukraine's loyalties from Russia to western Europe; specifically, to eventually bring Ukraine into the EU. But how? There was only one way: Ukraine's pro-Russian government had to be removed.

And thus Ukraine became the object of a geopolitical tug-of-war between Communist Russia in the east, and the Socialist/Communist European Union in the west. And thus what has occurred, and is occurring, in Ukraine, is *an orchestrated US/EU attempt to weaken Russia's power and curtail its ambitions, forcing it to again fall into line with the one-world plans of the globalists*. It is true that both sides desire a New World Order under a world government; but just at present Russia is going it alone, trying to set itself up as top dog. And this is unacceptable to the one-worlders.

And so the US/EU conspirators supported and encouraged a so-called "spontaneous uprising" of the Ukrainian people that was *by no means* spontaneous, but well-planned and following a definite script; nor was it a popular uprising of disgruntled citizens, but a ruthless revolution *controlled from Washington and Brussels!*

And what's more, all of this was just to the Vatican's liking as well, as we shall see in due course.

## **An Orchestrated US/EU Revolution in Ukraine**

Ukraine, although with a decidedly pro-Russian, Communist government under President Viktor Yanukovich, was a country with two main divisions: the eastern part has always been historically, culturally and ethnically close to Russia, whereas the western part has leaned towards western Europe. And this division is what the EU and US game masters used to their advantage to stir up the conflict.

In November 2013 Yanukovich decided to keep to a pro-Russian, rather than a pro-European Union policy. Ukraine's hard currency reserves had dwindled drastically, and in effect the country was bankrupt. Yanukovich turned down a financial aid package offered by the EU, consisting of \$160 million per year for five years, and instead accepted a much more generous one – \$15 billion in loans and discounts on natural gas – offered by Russia.

But his plan was opposed by pro-EU forces within Ukraine, who started protesting against it in the streets of Kiev, the capital. They demanded that Ukraine join the EU and move away from alignment with Russia. The protesters – they should really be called revolutionaries, for this is what they were – occupied Independence Square, in Kiev, for three months. They called it Maidan Square. And their demands broadened out from merely the original demand for Ukraine to orient itself towards the EU by accepting the financial aid the EU was offering, to other "grievances" – such as government corruption, "human rights" abuses, etc. – and to the demand that the president should share power and hold new elections.

When President Yanukovich refused to budge and give in to their demands, they resorted to violence, hurling petrol bombs and paving stones at the police to drive them out of the plaza. Inevitably people were killed, including policemen. They seized government buildings and burned the headquarters of the ruling party. But of course, the violence was blamed on the government and the police for refusing to cave in to the protesters' demands!

These protests were *not* spontaneous demonstrations. The protesters were not just frustrated ordinary citizens of Ukraine, and the protests were deliberately planned long before, and were *supported by the EU and the USA!* They were well-organised, well-financed, and even well-armed! A statement from Yanukovich's office was not wrong when it said: "They [the protesters] are working in organised groups. They are using firearms, including sniper rifles. They are shooting to kill."<sup>4</sup> This was not just typical Communist disinformation because it was confirmed by other sources. Television showed protesters dressed in combat fatigues, leading captured, uniformed police officers across the square.<sup>5</sup>

The US/EU leaders told the world that the Ukrainian people did not want to be aligned to Russia, but to the EU. This of course is only partially true, and these leaders know it; but they only emphasise what suits them. The reality is that *not* all Ukrainians supported the pro-EU protesters/revolutionaries. Huge numbers of those in the eastern part of Ukraine – that part always closely tied with Russia – wanted to remain tied to Russia. "One video, widely circulated on the internet, depicts a political rally

yesterday (February 22) in Kerch, in the eastern part of the Crimean peninsula (the most southerly and easterly part of Ukraine, formerly part of Russia, and where Russia has leased a Black Sea naval base). The rally degenerates into a brawl. A woman speaking in favour of the Kiev protests is hit by an egg, then her podium is overturned. Her assistants handling her microphone and loudspeaker are then punched, thrown to the ground and kicked. It is only one scene, and in other parts of eastern Ukraine there has been support for the developments in Kiev, but this video suggests the intensity of the opposition to the Kiev protests in eastern Ukraine. At the very end of the video, a US flag is set on fire.”<sup>6</sup> Which shows that many within eastern Ukraine were well aware of America’s involvement in the massive destabilisation of their country.

## **Evidence of US/EU Involvement in Ukraine’s Revolution**

Let us look at the evidence for the massive involvement of the US/EU in the revolution in Ukraine. And it consists of far more than the fact that US officials went into the streets of Kiev and handed out cookies to the revolutionaries – although this speaks volumes as well.<sup>7</sup>

The fact that the US helped to finance the Ukrainian protesters/revolutionaries was actually *admitted* on December 13, 2013, by Victoria Nuland, the US Assistant Secretary of State. She said in a speech that Washington had spent \$5 billion since 1991 to support initiatives aimed at bringing Ukraine into the European Union!

Further evidence that the US government was very much involved in the planning of the kind of regime that would replace President Yanukovich in Ukraine, is to be found in a February 4, 2014 phone conversation between Nuland and US Ambassador to Ukraine, Geoffrey Pyatt, which was leaked. They discussed who would be “in” and “out” of the new government. The US State Department did not contest this conversation’s authenticity.<sup>8</sup>

And as so often happens with US/EU one-world plans in recent times, one name keeps cropping up: billionaire financier George Soros. It has been American and Soros money, and lots and lots of it, which has funded various revolutions in one country after another in recent times, including Iraq; Kuwait; Uzbekistan; Moldova; Georgia; Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Tunisia, Iran, Syria, etc. Going back further, one can see American funds being channelled to the various Communist terrorist organisations that came to power in southern African countries, including South Africa under the ANC of Nelson Mandela. And let us not forget the “Occupy Wall Street” protests which erupted in America in recent times – protests actually fed by the Vatican, the US government and George Soros’ money! All deliberately orchestrated, for a definite purpose.<sup>9</sup>

The revolutionaries who stormed the Kiev Justice Ministry in January came from the Soros-funded *Splina Sprava* organisation.<sup>10</sup> Soros’ Open Society Foundations (OSF) has given grants to activist NGOs in central Europe seeking to undermine the Russian Federation.<sup>11</sup> He has openly admitted that he founded the Renaissance Foundation in Ukraine in 1990; and the Soros Foundation admitted that “all funds allocated for Ukrainian programs are being spent on the development of the open and democratic society and for helping Ukrainian citizens”. Doublespeak for financing a revolution.

The United States is most decidedly on the side of the Ukrainian protesters/revolutionaries. President Obama warned the Ukrainian government (before its president fled) that it must not “cross a line” in dealing with the protesters.<sup>12</sup> And on February 23, US National Security Advisor, Susan E. Rice, warned that if Russia sent troops to Ukraine, this would be unacceptable, a “grave mistake”. And she made the US/EU position clear when she said on American TV: “This is not about the US and Russia. This is about whether the people of Ukraine have the opportunity to fulfill their aspirations and be democratic and be part of Europe, which they choose to be.”<sup>13</sup> Hogwash. This *is* about the US and Russia; and as no referendum has been held, and no election, she simply cannot know that the people of Ukraine choose to be part of Europe, or that this is fulfilling their aspirations. She was stating America’s support for violent revolutionaries who ousted the president and took over; but this is not the same as saying the entire country wanted this to happen. She was lying through her teeth.

All these events are about *Russia* rather than Ukraine. Russia is the real target here. And what is unfolding is just the latest aspect of the New World Order that is forming. Being “part of Europe” is what the EU *and the USA* want for Ukraine. And this was even admitted by the *Washington Post* when it reported Rice’s remarks, for it stated that Ukraine was “*bitterly divided*”.<sup>14</sup>

And the *Washington Post* declared, on February 24, that “recent developments in Ukraine, including a peace agreement signed Friday, *reflect the interests of the United States and Europe*.”<sup>15</sup> Indeed they do.

In fact, so arrogant was the US about its own part in the collapse of the government in Ukraine, that – as pointed out by a Roman Catholic journalist – Rice even “spoke as if she and the US government are going to decide the outcome in Ukraine: ‘We are going to have a unity government,’ she said. ‘We are going to have near-term elections. We are going to have constitutional reform.’”<sup>16</sup>

As for evidence of active EU support for Ukraine’s violent revolutionaries, this is found in an open letter, published in February, and signed by various European globalists and one-worlders. The letter said, among other things: “The new authoritarians in Kyiv [meaning Ukraine’s now-ousted president and his government] should know that there will be a high price to pay for their repressive policies and for abandoning the European aspirations of the people. It is not too late for us to change things for the better and prevent Ukraine from becoming a dictatorship. Passivity in the face of the authoritarian turn in Ukraine and the country’s reintegration into a newly expanding Russian imperial sphere of interests pose a threat to the European Union’s integrity.” What is particularly revealing – other than the veiled threat contained in these pro-EU words – is who actually signed the letter. It was signed by (among others) Chris Stone and Aryeh Neier of the Open Society Institute of George Soros! But that’s not all: it was also signed by members of the European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR), which is strongly linked to the one-world-order Bilderberg group and is modelled on the American Council on Foreign Relations (CFR),<sup>17</sup> which is another one-world-order organisation under the control of the Illuminati.

And the Illuminati is under the Jesuit Order of Rome!<sup>18</sup>

It is true that President Yanukovich was not a good man. But even so, the fact remains that when he was elected in 2010, *the European Union itself* certified that the election was free and fair! Yes – the same EU that has now – just a few short years later – ousted him by supporting violent protesters/revolutionaries! This is not to say that his election was necessarily genuine – the EU and US, after all, have often declared elections “free and fair” that were anything but, South Africa’s 1994 election being a notable example – but the point being made is simply that the EU *claimed* Ukraine’s 2010 election was free and fair, because this suited it at the time, and now it has supported the revolutionaries who ousted the president, because this suits them now.

Not a single country in the EU, and certainly not the US, would ever allow violent demonstrators in the streets of their own capital cities! And yet these lying hypocritical leaders claim that what occurred in Kiev was “the will of the people” and must be respected and accepted. How sad that countries such as the US and western European ones now claim that it is “democracy” when mobs overthrow governments by force!

As even Roman Catholic journalist, Pat Buchanan, could see, this is blatant hypocrisy: “President Obama telling the Yanukovich government to respect the protesters. No violence. But how would Obama react if thousands of Tea Party members established an encampment on the Mall, burned down the DNC, occupied the Capitol and demanded he either repeal Obamacare or resign? Would Barack Obama negotiate?”<sup>19</sup> He most certainly would not. Ukraine’s government had every right to clamp down, and hard, on the protesters/revolutionaries. This is any government’s – even a bad one’s – duty: to maintain law and order (Rom. 13:1-7).

Furthermore – a point also conveniently overlooked – elections were scheduled for 2015 anyway. If the demonstrators really were interested in “democracy”, that election would have been the time to vote for a new government peacefully. Why take to the streets now, and use mob violence to

overthrow a government that had been elected just a few years before? This all just proves the sinister agenda, and the sinister forces at work behind the scenes.

## Identifying the Revolutionaries

So who exactly were the revolutionaries who toppled Ukraine's pro-Russian government? Yes, certainly there were disgruntled citizens among them. They were the cannon fodder, the usual "useful idiots" revolutionaries the world over make use of. There are always those who can be incited to protest, rebel, demonstrate and generally cause mayhem. But there was much more to these "street protests" than disgruntled ordinary Ukrainian citizens. At the forefront of the demonstrations, in control of them and guiding them along the path they desired, were what have been called nationalist Ukrainian groups. They were equipped with helmets, masks, protective gear, weapons and Molotov cocktails.<sup>20</sup> Where did these supposedly "spontaneous" demonstrators get such weapons? Clearly they had been well-supplied a long time before the protests even started. This was all very well planned, months in advance.

These nationalist groups bore such names as Euromaidan, Patriot of Ukraine, White Hammer, and the Right Sector. Their members, mostly males in their 20s and 30s who wore dark clothing and masks, were very aggressive during the demonstrations. They were well-armed, and began to loot abandoned properties and to shake down businesses for money to support their revolution.

The most prominent of the nationalist groups involved in the protests that toppled Ukraine's pro-Russian president, was the Pravy-Sektor (the Right Sector), led by Dmitry Yarosh. It is opposed to Russia and to Russian influence in Ukraine. Yarosh was selected as a member of the National Security and Defence Council, which is part of the new interim government; but he warned that the Right Sector will resume violent demonstrations if the interim government does not make the changes it promised.

There was a report that they hoisted Nazi SS and white power symbols on toppled memorials and destroyed a memorial to Ukrainians who died fighting Nazi occupation during World War Two, and that Nazi salutes and the Nazi Wolfangel symbol were displayed prominently in the demonstrations; also, that neo-Nazi groups established "autonomous zones" around Kiev.<sup>21</sup> There was also a report that these neo-Nazi groups, in addition to being anti-Russian, were also anti-Jewish, and that they smashed up Russian Orthodox church buildings and Jewish synagogues and said the Russian language would be outlawed in Ukraine.<sup>22</sup> These groups, it was reported, were using the same slogans and Nazi symbols which they had used back in World War Two, when they murdered 200 000 - 300 000 Poles and Jews; and again in the years after the war, when they murdered tens of thousands of Ukrainians who refused to join them.<sup>23</sup>

Opposed to this picture, one writer, anti-Russian and pro-EU, put it like this: "A rule of thumb for understanding Vladimir Putin's propaganda regarding the Ukraine is to assume the truth is usually the opposite of what he says. Hence, the Nazis and anti-Semites in the conflict are not, as Putin says, part of the revolutionary, anti-communist forces in Ukraine, but rather in the Putin camp."<sup>24</sup> It was also reported, by the Jewish news agency JTA in Ukraine, that a Jewish-led militia force took part in the revolution, and that those who said the revolutionaries were anti-Jewish were merely regurgitating the misinformation deliberately being spread by the KGB. Jewish leaders in Ukraine were quoted as saying they believed "pro-Russian provocateurs are behind the attacks on their synagogues" in Ukraine. One Jewish leader said: "Russian propaganda has exaggerated the role of neo-Nazis in the new Ukrainian government".<sup>25</sup> What this does show is that synagogues *were* attacked, and people claiming to be neo-Nazis *are* in the new government. But are these really who they claim to be?

Who were the real provocateurs? Where does the truth lie? Were the shadowy figures controlling the revolution really neo-Nazi, nationalist Ukrainian groups, or were they actually pro-Russian groups *pretending* to be neo-Nazi groups? It is certainly true, as the writer quoted above said, that the truth is so often the opposite of what a Communist says. However, his statement is, sadly, equally true of the *other* side today: a good rule of thumb for understanding the *US/EU's* propaganda regarding Ukraine is

to assume the truth is usually the opposite of what *they* say! Hence, when the US/EU people say the protesters were just disgruntled Ukrainians, the opposite is true: they were well-organised, well-financed revolutionaries. When they say the protesters were merely democratically-minded citizens, the opposite is the truth. When they say there were no neo-Nazi groups involved in the demonstrations, there were. The bottom line is that one must read between the lines, *regardless* of whether Russian or US/EU leaders are speaking. They are *all* liars. Neither side is good or innocent in this conflict. There are no “good guys.” The days when the US could be trusted as the “good guy” are long gone.

Even accepting that Russia is a past master at disinformation, it is nevertheless difficult to see what Putin stood to gain by sending in pro-Russian agitators, pretending to be nationalist anti-Russian, pro-EU agitators, to stir the people up to bring down the pro-Russian government in Ukraine. In this particular conflict, then, the likelihood that Russia was involved behind the scenes in controlling the revolutionaries appears *less* believable than the likelihood that nationalist pro-EU groups were the ones involved behind the scenes.

## **International Socialists, National Socialists**

Be very careful here: all is not as it seems. Remember that the US/EU are Socialist/Communist. They would not support any Ukrainian group that would not advance their Socialist/Communist cause. This means that if they backed Ukrainian nationalistic, neo-Nazi groups, these were in fact groups they could use to advance Socialism! Furthermore, the Ukrainian nationalist groups want Ukraine to be part of the Socialist EU.

But it all starts to make sense when we move away from the idea that Nazism is “far-Right”, and Socialism/Communism is “far-Left”. Would the “far-Left” EU back “far-Right” groups which would be at opposite poles from it? And would “far-Right” groups want to promote integration with the “far-Left” EU? No on both counts.

The truth is that Nazism was (and is) *not* a “far-Right” (meaning extreme conservative) ideology: this is a lie propagated by leftists. Nazism was, and is, a leftist ideology as well!

In calling it “Nazism”, unfortunately the world has forgotten what this was short for: “National Socialism”. What is forgotten is not only its name, but what it means: that Nazism was and is Socialist!

Whereas Communism is *international* Socialism, Nazism is *national* Socialism. *Both are Socialist*; but the Nazi version puts the well-being of its mother-country (in Hitler’s case, Germany, and in the present case, Ukraine) above all other considerations, whereas the *international* Socialists have little or no interest in national sovereignty or nationalism, and desire a Socialist world above all else.

“It is now clear beyond all reasonable doubt that Hitler and his associates believed they were socialists, and that others, including democratic socialists, thought so too.”<sup>26</sup> “Goebbels never doubted that he was a socialist. He understood Nazism to be a better and more plausible form of socialism than that propagated by Lenin. Instead of spreading itself across different nations, it would operate within the unit of the Volk.”<sup>27</sup> There are two versions of Socialism: Nazism (national Socialism) and the Communist kind (international Socialism).

The Socialism of the Nazis was even seen in their posters and slogans during World War Two. To give just one example: a Dutch Nazi image bore the legend: “Our Socialism, Your Future.”

And it cannot get any clearer than this, from Hitler himself: he stated that “the whole of National Socialism” was in fact “*based on Marx*”! But Marx had erred, according to Hitler, by fostering class war instead of national unity. Hitler said: “What Marxism, Leninism and Stalinism failed to accomplish, we [Nazis] shall be in a position to achieve.”<sup>28</sup>

Understanding this, it becomes clear that from the US/EU perspective, supporting national Socialist groups in Ukraine serves the short-term goal of breaking Ukraine away from Russian influence; and at least these groups are still Socialist, even if nationalistic. And in the same way, the Nazis during World War Two were heavily financed by Illuminati organisations such as the CFR. Yes! – Nazism in



Germany was financed by American and European internationalists.<sup>29</sup>

These globalists will support anyone, any organisation, that can further their plans. Today we see it in the financial and other support given by the US/EU alliance to radical Islamic groups in the Middle East because of what they can achieve through them, even though they are ideologically quite different.

And from the Ukrainian national Socialist groups' perspective, being supported by the US/EU alliance enables them, in the short term, to take over Ukraine, thereby satisfying their nationalistic cravings; and eventually joining the Socialist EU is certainly not against their Socialist desires. Even Hitler, after all, desired to rule Europe. He just wanted Germany to rule it. International Socialists want a New World Order in which borders and national sovereignty are abolished; national Socialists want a New World Order in which their own nation dominates. Both want a Socialist world.

Understood like this, then, the US/EU support for nationalist Ukrainian groups, even neo-Nazi ones, makes sense. The ultimate goal is *international* Socialism; but *national* Socialism is a useful stepping-stone to that goal, if it can be controlled.

It can be seen that Putin's own version of Socialism could even be called national Socialism too. But Putin's brand cannot be controlled by the international Socialists; therefore he is under attack from them.

## The Objective

Thus the situation that developed was as follows: the Communist president of Ukraine was forced to flee the country, and the government was overthrown by an orchestrated violent revolution, supported financially and in other ways by the EU and the US; and those same violent national Socialist thugs began to form the new government of Ukraine.

This new government is certainly *not* a free and democratic one! It came to power by violence, and is intent on holding power by violence if need be. In fact, it stated that it has absolute power, and that "anti-revolutionary districts" in Ukraine must submit to the new government. This new government is Socialist, but pro-EU Socialist.

The European Union wants Ukraine to be absorbed into the EU. But ultimately it would like Russia to join it as well (as a German member of parliament said directly).<sup>30</sup> Thus this revolution in Ukraine was aimed at weakening Russia in the long run, and bringing about similar changes there eventually. If Russia can be weakened – perhaps even, one day divided up – it would be a "non-factor" in the New World Order that is developing. This is what the international Socialists desire: a one-world government over a New World Order: an Order that sees nation-states disappear into gigantic regional super-states, leading eventually to no states at all, a single united world.

## And Then: Russia's Annexation of Crimea

The next development in the ongoing chaos in Ukraine was when armed men seized the regional government headquarters and parliament in the Crimean region of Ukraine on February 27, raising the Russian flag. Russia claims Crimea as its own, for although it has been part of Ukraine for many long years it is the only region in Ukraine with an ethnic Russian majority, and the Crimean Russians did not support the new Ukrainian rulers who came to power via the violent anti-Russian revolution in Kiev. Crimean Russians demanded to be part of Russia, and Russia's leadership supported them in this. This move alarmed the new Ukrainian rulers, with the acting president, Olexander Turchinov, saying: "Any military movements, the more so if they are with weapons... will be seen by us as military aggression."<sup>31</sup> But Russia did not back down, and the EU and US rapidly issued weak warnings to Russia as well.

Crimea became the focal point of a standoff between Russia and Ukraine. After the pro-Russian forces took control of Crimea's regional parliament, Putin sent Russian troops into Crimea to occupy strategic sites. Further, Putin submitted this appeal to the Russian parliament: "In connection with the extraordinary situation that has developed in Ukraine and the threat to citizens of the Russian

Federation... I hereby appeal to the... Russian Federation to use the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation on the territory of Ukraine until the social and political situation in that country is normalised.”<sup>32</sup> Approval was immediately given, enabling Putin to send in troops to “protect” Russian citizens (the reason given). But considering that Russian citizens can be found throughout Ukraine and not just in Crimea, Putin was really given the authority to deploy troops anywhere in Ukraine, which meant he could effectively take occupation of the entire country if he so desired, and for as long as he liked (as he could decide when the social and political situation in Ukraine is “normalised”). He could, in effect, annex Ukraine for Russia.

Russia is militarily far more powerful than Ukraine and would easily win in any armed conflict. Whether Putin would actually go so far as to start an all-out war in the rest of Ukraine, invading and annexing various Ukrainian regions, remains to be seen at this writing.

It is interesting to look at the history of the past few centuries and to realise how often Russia has invaded its neighbours, usually using the excuse that it needed to protect its people in these territories. Since the eighteenth century Russia has employed the very clever tactic of granting Russian nationality to people living in neighbouring countries, thereby giving Russia the excuse it needs to invade them whenever the time is ripe – to “protect Russian citizens” – and thereby to annex large amounts of territory for itself. This continued to be done throughout the Soviet Union period. And then afterwards, when the USSR broke up (a deliberate break-up but *not* the collapse of Communism as many believe), Russia continued to use this pretext to invade neighbouring countries: that its own citizens were being threatened. For example, during the Putin regime Russia has distributed large numbers of Russian passports to people living in the neighbouring countries of Azerbaijan, Belarus, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Kazakhstan – and Ukraine!<sup>33</sup> Using this excuse of protecting Russian citizens, Putin in 2000 forced Tajikistan to host thousands of Russian soldiers in bases there. Then again, in 2008 Putin ordered the invasion of Georgia, and annexed South Ossetia and Abkhazia, using the same pretext of “protecting Russian citizens”.

And now he has used the same pretext to send troops into Ukraine!

According to an Iranian writer, Amir Taheri, writing in the London-based paper *Asharq Al-Awsat* on March 7: “Last month... Vladimir Putin ordered that the Black Madonna of Kazan, the holiest icon of the Russian Orthodox Church, be flown over the Black Sea... Over the centuries, the ‘Black Virgin’ has been taken to battlefields to bless Russian armies fighting Swedish, Polish, Turkish, Persian, French and German invaders. Stalin sent it to Stalingrad in 1943 to ensure victory over the German invaders... With Putin’s troops in control of Crimea and threatening to move further into Ukraine, we now know that the icon was brought in to bless a military operation this time as well.”<sup>34</sup> The icon is considered to be a “miracle-working” one, and has come to be called the “Protection of Russia.”<sup>35</sup> Thus Putin is invoking a religious element in his attitude to Ukraine, and this will definitely stir up Russians to see in his actions something of an historic religious crusade to conquer territory for Russia in the name of the Russian Orthodox Mary!

The world expressed “outrage” at Russia sending troops into and occupying Crimea – yes, the same world that expressed *no* outrage at the violent demonstrations, by US/EU revolutionaries, that toppled Ukraine’s government. The hypocrisy is nauseating. US Secretary of State John Kerry, frothing with indignation, blubbered: “You just don’t invade another country on a phony pretext to assert your interests”<sup>36</sup> – which is precisely what the *US* has done, more than once, in the very recent past!

Significantly, although western nations screamed that Russia had launched an “invasion” of Crimea, it is not as simple as that: “Russian troop movements on the Crimean Peninsula are permitted under a 1997 Partition Treaty signed between Russia and Ukraine, as long as there are not more than 25,000 Russian troops. At present, the Russians have about 16,000 troops on the peninsula, which means a further increase of troops would be permitted.”<sup>37</sup>

Ukraine’s population is divided between pro-Russian and pro-EU supporters, and nothing is as cut and dried as the US/EU wants the world to believe. In Crimea, where a majority of the population identifies itself as Russian, the region was divided into pro- and anti-Russian camps, just as in other

parts of Ukraine. Some saw the Russian troops in Crimea as an invasion, others as a liberation. Those in favour of Russia were frightened by the nationalist rhetoric emanating from the Ukrainian revolutionaries who took over Ukraine's government, who were saying things like they wanted to ban the Russian language in Ukraine. Crimean Russians feared they would become second-class citizens in their own land.<sup>38</sup> On the other hand, Ukrainians in Crimea fear they will become second-class citizens in their own land if Crimea joins Russia.

On 6 March Crimea's parliament voted unanimously to leave Ukraine and join Russia. A referendum was promised. Again there were noises from the US/EU camp; warnings; threats. But what will the United States and the European Union actually do about Russia's annexation of Crimea? Go to war? This is a highly unlikely scenario. A war with Russia would be madness, and utterly destructive to both sides. Besides, Russia is Europe's biggest supplier of gas. Europe relies on it to such an extent that it can hardly afford to go to war against it. In addition, German companies have billions invested in Russia, British banks profit from facilitating Russian investment, and France has a deal to sell warships to Russia.<sup>39</sup> There might be symbolic and weak gestures made against Russia, but outright war is an extremely remote possibility.

On 16 March the referendum was held in Crimea, and – at least according to Russian State media – Crimeans voted overwhelmingly to secede from Ukraine and join Russia. 93% supposedly supported Russia's annexation of Crimea, according to one Russian news agency; 80% according to another. Of course, Russian media cannot be trusted to be truthful, so perhaps we will never truly know what percentage voted in either direction. Communists are notorious about rigging votes. But then again, if this referendum had been conducted under the auspices of the US/EU, we could not be any more certain of the truthfulness of the results. The US and EU, after all, have given their stamp of approval to some notoriously unfree, unfair elections – including in the US itself in recent years.

So the fact that Washington and Brussels did not accept the outcome of the referendum does not mean it was rigged (it may well have been, although Crimea does have a Russian-speaking majority). The fact is, neither Russia nor the US/EU alliance can be trusted to tell the truth. Ever.

After the results of the referendum were announced, Putin said that Russia would annex Crimea, regardless of Ukrainian protests or US/EU threats of sanctions.

## **The Vatican's Support for the Ukrainian Revolutionaries**

We have examined the conflict, and the behind-the-scenes intrigues and manoeuvres of the world powers: Russia, the EU and the US. We have seen the US/EU's reasons for supporting a change of government in Ukraine. We have seen why Russia opposes this, and what its own ambitions are, under Vladimir Putin.

But now it is time to head to the great city on seven hills (Rev. 17:9). As we said at the beginning, all roads lead to Rome. Rome has been the headquarters of the world's intrigues and plots for many, many centuries. Rome is the place to which the Holy Spirit Himself directs our attention in the Word of God: Moscow and Washington and Brussels are not identified in Holy Scripture; *Rome is*. If we want to understand world events, we must – must – *must* – above all else, see where the Vatican's support lies, and where it stands to gain. There may be other significant players (as there are in this present conflict); but the Mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, that sits upon the seven hills, is the most significant of all (Rev. 17:5). The devil's great masterpiece, the counterfeit "church" that has always been not only the greatest enemy of the true Christian Church in all history, but also, politically, "that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth" (Rev. 17:18).

Let us turn our attention there. We must be in no doubt whatsoever of which side the Vatican has been on in this conflict. It has been on the side of the pro-EU revolutionaries. After examining the evidence for this fact, we will turn our attention to the question of why.

In February the Roman pope, Francis I, during his weekly general audience in St Peter's Square in the Vatican, said: "With a troubled heart I am following what is happening in Kiev. I assure the Ukrainian

people of my closeness and I pray for the victims of the violence.... I call on all sides to stop every violent action and seek agreement and peace.”<sup>40</sup> Nice-sounding words, seemingly spoken from his heart – but as always with any pope of Rome, words designed to deceive. Whenever the Papacy is up to its neck in wicked deeds, be assured its pope will come out and say something that makes everyone believe Rome is neutral, and cares for everyone without distinction. It is a lie. Rome supports the revolutionaries.

It cannot get any clearer than these words, spoken by Ukrainian Byzantine-rite Catholic archbishop, Sviatoslav Shevchuk, major archbishop of the Ukrainian Catholic “Church” in Kiev – and a man who is a close friend of the pope of Rome: “Those holding power [i.e. the pro-Russian Ukrainian government] bear full responsibility for what is happening in our country.”<sup>41</sup> It couldn’t be plainer, could it? The Vatican, from the beginning, supported the revolutionaries against the government of Ukraine.

Another clear statement of where Rome’s sympathies lie, this time from the Catholic University of Ukraine (UCU) on February 19: “We unequivocally affirm that responsibility for the current escalation rests solely on the government – personally Viktor Yanukovich and his ‘hawkish’ command.... The leadership and all faculty of UCU are in solidarity with the strike declared today by the students and support its demands.”<sup>42</sup>

Rome’s support for the Ukrainian revolutionaries was also shown by a message from the president of Canada’s Roman Catholic bishops, delivered to Sviatoslav Shevchuk, the major archbishop of the Ukrainian Catholic institution quoted above, and to the Ukrainian Roman Catholic archbishop of Winnipeg, metropolitan of Ukrainian Roman Catholics in Canada.<sup>43</sup> The message was given on 24 January 2014. The bishop said: “Over the past weeks, we have seen news stories and read reports of the efforts of the people of Ukraine to manifest their dignity and freedom, protect their human rights, and ensure just and peaceful relations with both West and East...”

Exactly how violent revolutionary actions, including murder and widespread arson, could be equated with “dignity and freedom” and a “protection of human rights”, let alone with what is “just and peaceful”, the good bishop conveniently failed to explain. Rome deliberately supported the violent revolution in Ukraine to bring about forceful change. History is replete with examples of how it has done this countless times in the past. Recent notable examples would include (among others that could be mentioned) South Africa<sup>44</sup> and Rwanda.<sup>45</sup> If it perceives that revolution will achieve its objectives, then it will not hesitate to use revolution, even if there is widespread bloodshed as a result. And always in modern times, it will cloak this support in terminology which is diametrically opposite to the reality on the ground: “manifesting dignity and freedom, protecting human rights, working for just and peaceful relations...” It has adopted Orwellian doublespeak with vigour.

The Canadian bishops’ president went on: “On behalf of all the Eastern and Latin bishops of Canada, I ask you to assure the people of Ukraine that Canadian Catholics and their Bishops are united with you in prayer and solidarity.... We are in solidarity with your priests and deacons who at great personal risk accompany the demonstrators through prayer and pastoral care.” Well, his words left no doubt of the side the bishops were on! And they also revealed that priests and deacons in Ukraine itself were most decidedly on the side of the revolutionaries, mingling with the crowds, praying with them, and beyond all question *stirring them up*.

And note these words: “We ask our own political leaders to continue prevailing upon Ukrainian authorities to find constructive and just solutions to the present crisis, and to ensure a democratic process that respects the rule of law and protects minorities and all citizens.” Note that as far as the Romish bishops are concerned, it was *Ukraine’s government* that was at fault – not the revolutionaries! And as for “a democratic process that respects the rule of law”, what about the fact that the very revolutionaries it was voicing its support for were not following any democratic process, nor the rule of law when they acted as a lawless mob? Such facts are very conveniently overlooked.

Lastly, the message spoke of Ukrainian “government repression”, and of this being Ukraine’s “latest chapter of a long and painful struggle for freedom and democracy.” No ambiguity here: Rome’s bishops were on the side of the revolutionary protesters against the Ukrainian government.

Further evidence of the support of Rome for the revolution in Ukraine is to be seen from these words, spoken by one of Ukraine's most senior bishops, the archbishop Mieczyslaw Mokrzycki. He is president of Ukraine's Latin-rite Catholic Bishops' Conference. In late February he said: "We are experiencing a great solidarity with the faithful, not only from the neighbouring countries, but also from the whole world. So many are supporting us with their prayers. They are remembering us and offering humanitarian aid. These gestures of solidarity are very important and dear to us."<sup>46</sup> By "the faithful", of course, he meant Roman Catholics worldwide. He also said of the revolutionaries: "On Maidan Square, there was an atmosphere of solidarity, regardless of denomination, rite, and ethnicity. All were one. All were united."

Soon after his interview, the archbishop mentioned above, Sviatoslav Shevchuk, said at a press conference held at Vatican Radio: "I would like to ask Europeans to wake up because what is happening in Ukraine, sooner or later, will touch all of you. Because Ukraine is part of Europe. And if people continue to pretend that nothing is happening, not only will things worsen in Eastern Europe, but this will cause great lack of faith in European values in the Western nations."<sup>47</sup> Thus he not only hinted darkly at the conflict possibly spreading in time to other parts of Europe, but also made it clear that as far as Rome is concerned, Ukraine belongs to Europe, not Russia, and called on Europeans to support Ukraine in its revolution.

As for Crimea, just days before the referendum a Ukrainian Catholic priest was taken captive by uniformed men, and questioned on whether he had been organising anti-Russian riots. He was released, but was taken to a safe place outside Crimea; and he and other priests were urged to evacuate with their families to mainland Ukraine.<sup>48</sup> These actions against Ukrainian priests reveal a number of things. One, that Russia knows Ukrainian priests have been supporting the revolutionaries. Two, that Russia is still very much anti-Rome. Three, that no sides in this conflict are innocent: Ukrainians, including Ukrainian priests, supported the revolutionaries; and Russians are threatening Ukrainians, especially in Crimea.

Russia has been accused of abusing, torturing and threatening minorities in Crimea, such as Ukrainians, Tartars and Ukrainian Catholics.<sup>49</sup> Is it true? Almost certainly. But are the minorities, both ethnic and religious, innocent of any such wrongdoings themselves? Certainly not.

## **Rome's Objective: the "Conversion" of Russia**

So it is clear: the Roman Papacy supports the revolutionaries against Ukraine's government. But the question that cries out for an answer is: *why*?

It is really quite simple: Rome's desire is nothing less than the conquest of Russia for Roman Catholicism! This is the great prize, as it has been for centuries. The Vatican wants Russia "converted"!

To keep this as simple as possible, we will quote from our book, *Satan's Seat*:

"The eastern half of the false 'church' system established by Constantine had eventually broken away from Rome, and its headquarters became the city of Constantinople. The 'Eastern Catholic' institution became known as the 'Orthodox Church'. In reality, it was a close sister of the Roman Catholic institution, but it refused to recognize the authority of the pope. The two became bitter enemies. And ever since then, it has been the Papacy's desire to destroy the Russian Orthodox institution, and to rule over the land of Russia."<sup>50</sup>

To do this it had to destroy the Czar of Russia, protector of the Orthodox institution. It did this by financing the Communists seeking to overthrow the Czar, through the Illuminati, which was Jesuit-controlled (and evidence is given in *Satan's Seat*). The Vatican actually supported the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. And it came up with a very useful and powerful tool to convince its faithful followers of the need to conquer (it would say "convert") Russia to Roman Catholicism: the Fatima revelations of 1917.

We cannot go into these in detail now. Suffice it to say that in 1917, the very year of the Russian

Bolshevik Revolution that swept the Communists to power there, three children in a place called Fatima, in Portugal, claimed to receive revelations from Mary. She told them that “in the end, Russia shall be converted”. The Vatican thought that the Bolshevik Revolution would usher in the “conversion” of Russia to Rome, because of Rome’s support for the revolutionaries. But this did not happen. Its Communist “daughter” rebelled against it, and Rome became decidedly anti-Communist for decades. Under the Roman pope, Pius XII, it sided with the US against the Soviet Union.

But when, with the passing of time, it became clear that the Soviet Union was a stronger superpower than the US, and that Communism would become the dominant ideology of most of the world, the Vatican decided to throw its weight behind world Communism. This it did, under the papacies of John XXIII and Paul VI, both of them pro-Communist, pro-Moscow popes. The Vatican was now decidedly on the side of international Communism, and priests – especially Jesuits – were actively supporting Communist revolutions worldwide.

This state of affairs lasted throughout their pontificates, from 1958 to 1978. But with the coming to power of John Paul II in 1978, things changed somewhat; and this change is deeply significant. Quoting again from *Satan’s Seat*: “John Paul II, while pro-Marxist, was *not* pro-Moscow. He believed in a version of Communism controlled from the Vatican, not Moscow.... he continued to promote Marxism – [but] the Vatican’s own brand.... he justified ‘Catholic-Communism’, but opposed Moscow-controlled, atheistic Communism.”<sup>51</sup>

Rome still desired the “conversion” of Russia to Roman Catholicism. And so, under John Paul II, it instigated all kinds of trouble for the Soviet Union, to weaken and destroy Moscow. For example, it threw its support behind Solidarity, a Polish trade union organisation. Solidarity was a Communist movement, but a Catholic-Communist one, not a Moscow-Communist one.

Furthermore, the Vatican supported (and still supports) the EU – it was very involved in setting up the EU, in fact. In its early years the EU was described as “the greatest super-Catholic state in the history of the world”. With the passing of time, secular humanists and others hijacked much of the instruments of power within the EU, and there is today a clash between the Vatican and these others on various matters; but even so, Rome believes it can use the EU, not least to help bring about the conquest of Russia in time.

Eventually, in the years 1989-1992, the Soviet Union “collapsed” (or so the world thought). In truth it did not; Communists remained in power in almost all of the old Soviet republics. It was a giant smokescreen, designed to fool the West into thinking that “Communism was dead”, that Russia could not be trusted as an ally, and that the threat of world Communism had disappeared. It was all a lie.

The Vatican thought that perhaps this was the time to bring about the “conversion” of Russia. It actually made certain high-profile noises giving the impression that this *might*, after all, be the time of Russia’s “conversion.” But in typical Vatican fashion, it was very cautious, in case things went wrong.

And things did. As the years went by it became increasingly obvious that, despite improved relations between Moscow and Rome, Russia was not on the brink of “conversion” to Roman Catholicism. In fact, under Putin’s presidency there has been a reviving of much of the power of the Russian Orthodox institution. This religio-political system has been under KGB control since the earliest years of the Bolshevik Revolution, and it still is today. But Putin is allowing it much more freedom and influence than it has enjoyed for many decades. He himself is a member, and speaks often in very religious ways. But it has become evident to the Vatican that for all his religious talk, his nice words about the pope of Rome, his visit to the Vatican, etc., Russia remains firmly opposed to being “converted” to Roman Catholicism.

Which brings us to the present conflict in Ukraine. Rome realises that to conquer Russia, it has to isolate it and thereby weaken it, and even support military action against it if that ever becomes possible. Hence its support for the Ukrainian rebels, and for the US/EU stance against Russia in this recent conflict. Let a top Vatican journalist, a devout Roman Catholic, explain it. Here are the words of Robert Moynihan, editor of *Inside the Vatican* magazine: “since Russia is at the heart of the message of Fatima – ‘in the end, Russia shall be converted, and a period of peace shall be granted to

the world,’ as the Lady said to the three children in Portugal in 1917 – what is happening now in Kiev must also be seen in the context of the Fatima message: in the context of the future of the Christian faith in Russia and of a coming age of peace.”<sup>52</sup>

The kind of Communism Rome supports, under the present pope of Rome, Francis I, is still the Catholic-Communism kind, in opposition to the Moscow-Communism kind. Francis is, after all, a *Jesuit* from Latin America and therefore well-versed in liberation theology (Catholic-Communism). If Russia can be weakened by various means – by splitting off Ukraine from alliance with Russia, and getting it firmly into the EU camp; by isolating Russia; and eventually, even, by supporting massive riots in Moscow itself along similar lines to those in Kiev – the day may yet come when Russia will be “converted” to Roman Catholicism. Not by persuasion, but by force: the Vatican’s preferred method of “conversion” throughout its history.

As Vatican journalist Moynihan went on to write: “The question becomes: Will the revolution unfolding in Ukraine – a revolution some hope may also unfold in Russia – bring about a ‘post-Christian’ culture in the former Soviet space, within a highly secularised European Union, and not a religious conversion? Or might what is unfolding, with the presence of many religious leaders from both the Catholic and Orthodox sides, lead to an unprecedented religious conversion?”<sup>53</sup>

The latter option is certainly the plan. How far the Lord will allow it to proceed remains to be seen. But we can be absolutely certain of this: it is the Roman Catholic *Jesuit Order* which controls the various international Socialist groups seeking to rule the world and enforce a New World Order. This is documented in our book, “*Holy War*” *Against South Africa*.<sup>54</sup> The founder of the Jesuits was also the founder of the Illuminati; the Illuminati created Communism; international Communism was funded by international financiers working for the Illuminati; etc. And so it is a certainty that Jesuits of Rome, or their agents, are hard at work in the unfolding drama in Ukraine, via the CFR and other Illuminati organisations working for the New World Order; and that they are making use of neo-Nazi and other nationalist groups in Ukraine, just as they did in World War Two.

## What Will Happen Next?

What will be the end result of all these things? There are a few scenarios, and time will tell which one will come to pass:

- a) Ukraine, now under a pro-EU government, will allign itself with Europe, join the EU, and thereby come under EU/US Socialism/Communism. In this scenario, the Vatican’s own goals are achieved for Ukraine, by it being broken away from Russian influence and placed in a position where Rome can influence it far more easily, and at the same time bring Russia’s “conversion” that much closer.
- b) Russia will force Ukraine back into allignment with itself, via the military overthrow of the present pro-EU government, and Ukraine will thereby remain within the orbit of Russian Socialism/Communism. For the Vatican this would not be a desirable solution at all; it will mean that Rome will have to go back to the drawing board and continue working out other ways of “converting” Russia (i.e. Russia and all its allies, Ukraine included) to Roman Catholicism in the long-term.
- c) Ukraine will split into two (or more) countries, with the eastern part alligned to Russia and the western part alligned to Europe. From the Vatican’s perspective, this may not be too bad. After all, when Yugoslavia broke up, one part of it became the Roman Catholic state of Croatia, a state which Rome had controlled during World War Two and could now exercise great influence over again. And the same thing could happen with Ukraine. If split into two, it would be much weakened, with the western part coming under Vatican influence, and the eastern part left for conquest another day. Not as good, from Rome’s perspective, as having influence over the entire country, but better than option b) by far.

Time alone will tell, as events continue to unfold.

March 2014

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

---

## ***ENDNOTES:***

---

1. See *Satan's Seat*, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2013. [www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk).
2. See *New Lies for Old: the Communist Strategy of Deception and Disinformation*, by Anatoliy Golitsyn. Dodd, Mead and Company, New York, 1984. Also *The Perestroika Deception*, by Anatoliy Golitsyn. Edward Harle Ltd., London, 1990.
3. See *America: Communism Triumphant*, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2012. Also *Comrade Barack Obama: President of the United Socialist States of America*, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2008. [www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk).
4. *The Mercury*, February 21, 2014.
5. *The Mercury*, February 21, 2014.
6. *Letter No.5, 2014: Ukraine (continued)*, February 23, 2014. Urbi et Orbi Communications, New Hope, Kentucky, USA. [MoynihanReport@gmail.com](mailto:MoynihanReport@gmail.com).
7. *Letter No.5, 2014: Ukraine (continued)*.
8. *Letter No.5, 2014: Ukraine (continued)*.
9. See *The Vatican and the "Occupy Wall Street" Movement*, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2011. [www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk).
10. *Christian Voice*, March 14, 2014. [www.christianvoice.org.uk](http://www.christianvoice.org.uk).
11. *Christian Voice*, March 14, 2014.
12. *Letter No.3, 2014: Ukraine: End Game*, February 19, 2014. Urbi et Orbi Communications. [MoynihanReport@gmail.com](mailto:MoynihanReport@gmail.com).
13. *Letter No.5, 2014: Ukraine (continued)*.
14. *Letter No.5, 2014: Ukraine (continued)*.
15. *Letter No.5, 2014: Ukraine (continued)*.
16. *Letter No.5, 2014: Ukraine (continued)*.
17. *Christian Voice*, March 14, 2014.
18. See *"Holy War" Against South Africa*, by Shaun Willcock. Bible Based Ministries, 2011. [www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk). See also *Satan's Seat*, by Shaun Willcock.
19. *The American Conservative*, February 21, 2014. Quoted in *Letter No.5, 2014: Ukraine (continued)*.
20. *Russians: U.S. Siding with Neo-Nazis*, March 5, 2014. WND, [www.wnd.com](http://www.wnd.com).
21. *Russians: U.S. Siding with Neo-Nazis*.
22. *Russians: U.S. Siding with Neo-Nazis*.
23. *Russians: U.S. Siding with Neo-Nazis*.
24. *Exposing Putin's Propaganda*, March 8, 2014. [NewsWithViews.com](http://NewsWithViews.com).
25. *Putin's Big Lie Against Ukraine*, March 5, 2014. [NewsWithViews.com](http://NewsWithViews.com).
26. *The Lost Literature of Socialism*, by George Watson, quoted in *The Telegraph*, February 25, 2014. <http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk>.
27. *The Telegraph*, February 25, 2014. <https://blogs.telegraph.co.uk>.
28. *The Telegraph*, February 25, 2014.



- 
29. See *Trading with the Enemy: How the Allied Multinationals Supplied Nazi Germany Throughout World War Two*, by Charles Higham. Robert Hale Limited, London, 1983. See also *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, by Antony C. Hutton. 76 Press, Seal Beach, California, 1976.
  30. *Letter No.3, 2014: Ukraine: End Game*.
  31. *The Mercury*, February 28, 2014.
  32. *The Mercury*, March 3, 2014.
  33. *The Black Madonna and the Russian Problem*, published in *Asharq Al-Awsat*, March 7, 2014; and referenced in *Letter No.8, 2014: Ukraine (continued)*, March 13, 2014. Urbi et Orbi Communications, New Hope, Kentucky, USA. MoynihanReport@gmail.com.
  34. *Letter No.8, 2014: Ukraine (continued)*.
  35. *Letter No.8, 2014: Ukraine (continued)*.
  36. *The Mercury*, March 7, 2014.
  37. *Oh, Russia Didn't Invade Ukraine After All!* March 6, 2015. WND, www.wnd.com.
  38. *The Mercury*, March 3, 2014.
  39. *The Mercury*, March 7, 2014.
  40. *Letter No.3, 2014: Ukraine: End Game*.
  41. *Letter No.3, 2014: Ukraine: End Game*.
  42. *Letter No.3, 2014: Ukraine: End Game*.
  43. *Zenit.org*, January 27, 2014.
  44. See "Holy War" Against South Africa.
  45. See *Holocaust in Rwanda*, by Peter Hammond. Frontline Fellowship, Cape Town, South Africa, 1996.
  46. *Zenit.org*, February 24, 2014.
  47. *Zenit.org*, February 25, 2014.
  48. *Zenit.org*, March 17, 2014.
  49. *Zenit.org*, March 17, 2014.
  50. *Satan's Seat*, pg. 41.
  51. *Satan's Seat*, pg.52.
  52. *Letter No.3, 2014: Ukraine: End Game*.
  53. *Letter No.3, 2014: Ukraine: End Game*.
  54. "Holy War" Against South Africa, pgs. 69-77.

## **Bible Based Ministries**

[info@biblebasedministries.co.uk](mailto:info@biblebasedministries.co.uk)

[www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk)

This article may be copied for free distribution if it is copied in full

**WORLDWIDE CONTACT FOR BIBLE BASED MINISTRIES:**

### **Contending for the Faith Ministries**

42055 Crestland Drive  
Lancaster, CA 93536  
United States of America  
[BBMOrders@aol.com](mailto:BBMOrders@aol.com)