

# THE ULTRAMONTANE PAPACY: PART I

by Pierre Beaudry  
12/31/2006

\*\*\*\*\*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

\*\*\*\*\*

### PART I

**INTRODUCTION: PROPORTIONALITY OF RAPHAEL'S {DISPUTE OF THE HOLY SACRAMENT} AND {THE SCHOOL OF ATHENS}.**

- 1. WHAT IS IMPERIAL ULTRAMONTANISM?**
- 2. THE HILDEBRANDINE ERA OF A Gnostic PRIEST-EMPIRE.**
- 3. THE WAR OF INVESTITURE.**
- 4. INNOCENT III'S ABSOLUTE IMPERIAL THEOCRACY.**
- 5. THE TWO CONTRADICTORY LIKENESS OF GOD.**
- 6. THE DOMINICANS AND THE CATHARS EXPERIMENT.**
- 7. THOMAS AQUINAS AND THE THEOLOGY OF FORGERY, PREEMPTIVE WAR, ASSET GRABBING, AND MURDER.**
- 8. THE CATHAR-DOMINICAN EXECUTIONER, ROBERT THE BUGGER.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**INTRODUCTION: THE PROPORTIONALITY OF RAPHAEL'S {THE DISPUTE OF THE HOLY SACRAMENT} AND {THE SCHOOL OF ATHENS}**

Belief without knowledge is Gnosticism, but, belief with knowledge is seeing the truth “*as if through a glass darkly*.” In Corinthian 1, 13, the apostle Paul was communicating to mankind the reflection of an extraordinary discovery that he had made. Saint Paul was adopting, as a Christian principle, the universal physical principle of {*agape*} that Plato had earlier discovered and established as the basis for his Republic. With this Christianization of Plato, Saint Paul had made a considerable contribution to civilization by emphasizing the unique function of Christ's redemption of mankind by means of {*agape*}. It was precisely the paradoxical nature of redemption, reflected in the Holy Trinity character of the {*Filioque*}, that the Ultramontane papacy attempted to eradicate and destroy, with the bestiality of the crusades.



Figure 1. [*The School of Athens*. 1509. Fresco. Vaticano, Stanza della Segnatura, Rome. Olga's Gallery.htm]




Figure 2. [*Disputa*. 1510-1511. Fresco. Vaticano, Stanza della Segnatura, Rome. Olga's Gallery.htm]

I want to open this second part of this report on the subject of {**THE IMPERIAL ROOTS OF FASCISM BEHIND THE CRUSADES**} with these two extraordinary frescos of Raphael, the celebrated {*School of Athens*} and the less well-known {*Dispute of the Holy Sacrament*}, in order to show you how the crisis of the Ultramontane papacy, which had dominated the crusades during the last three centuries of the middle ages, was not Christian but Gnostic in character, and that this profound crisis of civilization was solved by Nicholas of Cusa who had not only restored the unity of the Church, but who also had established the unifying principle of the nation-state as exemplified by the France of Louis XI. In both of those frescos, Raphael uniquely identified this crisis representing this paradoxical anomaly between belief and knowledge, “{*as if in a glass darkly*}”.

It is the dissonance of this anomaly between knowledge and belief, that resonates in the irreconcilable opposition between Plato and Aristotle in {*The School of Athens*} and that is reflected darkly in the opposition between Augustine and Aquinas, in {*The Dispute of the Holy Sacrament*}, which has been at the core of the division within the Catholic Church for two millennia. There is a unique dynamic intention hidden behind the two frescos which bears upon what Nicholas of Cusa developed in {*Concordancia Catholica*} as the unity of distinction between belief and knowledge; that is to say, that the two frescoes are unified in a single integral whole which represents what Lyn once described as Raphael’s unity of effect in the simultaneity of eternity. As a student of Leonardo and of Cusa, Raphael followed their principle of proportionality and concordance in a very dynamic way.

However, that unity of effect excludes completely any conceivable compromise between Plato and Aristotle, because, as I will develop, the apparent Aristotelian Gnostic paradox between spirit and matter gets resolved on the basis of the cognitive difference between knowledge and belief. There are different ways of showing that unity of effect, and I will, throughout this report, develop several aspects of its self-developing composition. So, in order to help the spectator discover this unity of effect, Raphael included a number of clues to follow in each of the two frescos. One of them can be found in the {*Timaeus*} of Plato, and the other in the book of {*Sanguine Christi*} by Francesco Della Rovere.

### **ICONOGRAPHICAL IDENTIFICATION OF THE TWO FRESCOS IN THE STANZA DELLA SEGNATURA:**

When you enter the **Stanza della Segnatura** in the Vatican, and stand in the center of the room, you are quite overwhelmed by the two frescoes of {*The School of Athens*} and the {*Dispute of the Holy Sacrament*}, which immediately create in your mind an extraordinary powerful stereographic effect, a {*Geistesmassen*} thought object that pertains to what I would characterize as a crucial experiment of {*Sphaerics*} of the Riemannian domain. The two frescos are of the same size about 65 feet wide and about 30 feet high and are separated from one another by an interval of about 35 feet. The two

frescos bring alive into the mind of the spectator, in the center of the room, an extraordinary array of life-size historical figures who are debating the fundamental issue of truth between knowledge and belief. As if trapped inside of a sphere in the center of the room, the spectator is confronted by a tremendous Platonic irony, which seems to oppose the truth of scientific and philosophical knowledge projected onto one wall, and the truth of revelation and religious belief projected on the opposite wall.

### **THE DISPUTE OF THE HOLY SACRAMENT:**

The subject of the *{Dispute of the Holy Sacrament}*, is the paradox of the Eucharist represented as the central axis of the fresco by the three persons of the Holy Trinity. At the summit of the half circle stands the Father, blessing the universe from between two groups of angels; below Him is Christ sitting on an elevated cloud in the company of Mary and John the Baptist, and surrounded on a half circular cloud parallel to the floor plan by an assembly of prophets, apostles and Saints. On the left, are sitting St. Peter, Adam, St. John Evangelist, King David, St. Etienne, and the Prophet Jeremiah. On the right are sitting Judas McCabe, St. Laurence, Moses, St. Mathew, Abraham, and St. Paul.

Only a few characters of the earthly-floor below are identified. On the left side of the altar, stands the artist Fra Angelico in a Dominican cloak, the architect Bramante is leaning against the railing, and Francesco Maria della Rovere is pointing to the altar. Sitting in a lion arm-chair is Pope St. Gregory the Great in the likeness of pope Julius II (Julien della Rovere) is sitting with the *{Liber Moralium}* at his feet, and St. Jerome is the old man reading next to him.

On the right of the altar, the bishop sitting next to St. Ambrose with his eyes elevated to the heavens is St. Augustine, behind him stands Ultramontane theologian, Thomas Aquinas, staring at his master and creator, pope Innocent III, the Albigensian crusader, who is flanked on his left by St. Bonaventure. The pope dressed in a golden cope and with the book of *{De Sanguine Christi}* at his feet is the Ultramontane Sixte IV (Francesco della Rovere), who is being observed severely by Dante and who is being pointed at by an unknown Greek-like character near the right balustrade. Behind Dante, standing half hidden under his hood, is Savonarole.

### **THE SCHOOL OF ATHENS:**

Near the center of the Fresco, on top of the stairs, stands Plato. He is pointing to the heavens with one hand and holding his *{Timaeus}* in his other hand, and looking at Aristotle. Next to him stands, equal in stature, Aristotle, who is slightly off center and is pointing to the ground, while holding his *{Ethics to Nichomachus}* in his other hand, and looking back at Plato. Their positions, gestures, and respective books represent the

essence of their opposite doctrines. As Leonardo taught Raphael, painting is the art of representing the idea and not simply the reproduction of visible forms.

On the left of the two central figures stand Socrates in discussion with a group of youth including Alexander the Great in armor, Xenophon, and Alcibiades (or Eschine). On the far left and below there is Zeno and a child of a noble family, Federico Gonzaga, holding the book that Epicurius is reading against a column stand. Below them, on the main floor, Pythagoras is sitting and writing into a large book with Telauges (?) showing him a musical tablet and Averroes looking over his shoulder. Heraclites is sitting pensively over a large masonry block. Over his shoulder stands either Parmenides (or Xenocrates) holding an open book on his left knee. The isolated figure dressed in white behind Parmenides is, again, Francesco Maria della Rovere.

On the right, in the foreground, stands Archimedes among his students, bending down and extending a compass over the figure of a Star of David inscribed in a tablet. Behind him stands Zoroastra holding a celestial sphere in his right hand and Ptolemy, with his back to the spectator, holding the earth in his left hand. Raphael represented himself looking out at the spectator and wearing a black beret, on the extreme right corner of the fresco. The old man sitting in the middle of the stairs is the infamous existentialist hippie of Greece, Diogenes.

What is uniquely characteristic of this historical perspective is the simultaneity of eternity of the mental gallery of Raphael's mind. All of the historical figures portrayed by Raphael have lived in different historical times; yet, they are all together, simultaneously and forever present, in these two frescos revealing the truth about the contemporary period of Raphael and the 2000 years of history that preceded the Renaissance. To further emphasize this living moment of universal physical space-time, and to establish for future generations the polemical nature of his Platonic outlook, Raphael has given most of his characters the visual appearance of significant contemporary figures. For example, Plato has the traits of Leonardo, Heraclites has the traits of Michelangelo, Archimedes has the traits of Bramante, and so forth.

However, beyond these interesting and well-known correspondences, there are other more inconspicuous but serious identifications, which have a much greater significance in revealing the historical truthfulness of the subject matter being treated here. We are dealing, here, with a grandiose historical revelation of the truth about how the knowledge of wise men can no longer be humiliated by the manipulation of religious belief. Raphael has painted several indicators which all point to the crisis of the Ultramontane papacy.

For instance, take the multiple presence of the Maria della Rovere family in both of the frescos. They are present in no less than four instances. The *{Dispute}* has three: Francesco Maria della Rovere pointing to the altar, St. Gregory the Great is in the likeness of pope Julius II, (Julien della Rovere), who is the nephew of Sixtus IV, and the third is Sixtus IV himself (Francesco della Rovere), with his book *{De Sanguine Christi}*. As if this were not enough, Francesco Maria della Rovere appears again in

{*The School of Athens*}. Raphael's portrayal of the della Rovere family with such insistence represents a real irony. On the one hand, Raphael was paying homage to them as they had, after all, commissioned him to paint several rooms in the Vatican. On the other hand, and at the same time, his exaggerated portrayal of the family permitted to warn the spectator that he was delivering a most surgical and devastating exposition of the very nature of the Satanist enemies of Christianity within the Vatican itself. Let me explain this.

At the time of Raphael, there was a resurgence of heretical satanic madness coming out of the Dominican and the Franciscan orders regarding the interpretation of the body and the blood of Christ. Both Orders were competing to see who could come up with the goriest physical signs of Christ. The most gregariously popular of all books was the tractatus {*De Sanguine Christy. De Potentia Dei*}, Ms. Vat. Lat. 1051 (1467-1470) written by the Master General of the Franciscans, Francesco della Rovere, who later became the Ultramontane pope Sixtus IV (1471-1484). His nasty political activities tell the whole story.

As soon as he became pope, Sixtus IV launched a new crusade against the Ottoman Turks in Smyrna. Sixtus IV was an Ultramontane pope who hated the Council of Florence and the ecumenical outlook of Nicholas of Cusa with a passion, and hated most of all the fact that Louis XI (1461-1483), his life-long contemporary, had succeeded in creating the first nation-state in France in the spirit of Cusa.

The plan of Sixtus IV was to use the power of Venice to impose his Ultramontane imperial policy against France. When Sixtus IV attempted to force the king of France to pay papal benefits, Louis XI used the Pragmatic Sanction that his father, Charles VII had issued on July 7, 1438, cutting off all benefits to Rome and reestablishing the Gallican Church as an administratively independent Church with respect to Rome. In 1478, Sixtus IV retaliated by having his Pazzi bankers organize assassination attempts against Lorenzo and Guiliano de Medici, and thus eliminate the most important source of funding to Louis XI. This became known as the failed {*Pazzi conspiracy*}.

Later, in 1482, Sixtus IV called on Venice to launch an aggression against the Duchy of Ferrara. The pope and Venice were strongly opposed by the Sforza in Milan, the Medici of Florence, and the King of Naples. In 1483, when Venice realized it was about to lose and tried to opt out of the conflict, Sixtus IV excommunicated the Doge and placed an interdict on the entire city of Venice.

It was also Sixtus IV who initiated the Spanish Inquisition with his Bull of 1478, establishing the first Dominican Inquisitor in Seville for the benefit of Ferdinand of Aragon. An example of nepotism of Sixtus IV is that out of the 32 cardinals who survived his death in 1484, 23 had been appointed by him and all of them had been chosen for their Ultramontane tendencies from the princely houses of Italy, Spain, and France.

Therefore, it is not insignificant that Raphael would give Sixtus IV such a prominent place in the {*Dispute*}, along the side of Innocent III who, as we shall see in a moment, was the supreme imperial pope of the 12<sup>th</sup> century. It is very instructive, but not surprising, to see that all of the popes portrayed in Raphael's {*Dispute*} were Ultramontane Venetian-controlled popes.

## 1. WHAT IS IMPERIAL ULTRAMONTANISM?

The idea of imperial power behind Ultramontanism can actually be traced back to the ancient imperial policy of the priesthood of the cult of Apollo at Delphi, in ancient Greece. The purpose of such a priesthood was to manipulate the opposing political interests between Sparta and Athens, to subvert them by means of sophistry, and to lead them into interminable Peloponnesian Wars. From that standpoint, Ultramontanism was merely a religious form of the same imperial oligarchical intention of treating human beings as animals. Thus, the self-proclaimed Ultramontane power of the papacy during the Middle Ages had the purpose of achieving their goal by usurping the powers of European emperors and kings in the name of God.

The first mention of the name "Ultramontanism" appeared in a letter from the papacy in Rome announcing the {*Second Banning and Dethronement of the German Emperor, Henry IV, Through Gregory VII. March 7<sup>th</sup>, 1080*}. The letter simply alluded to "...my master Gregory beyond the mountains (*ultra montes*).” From that day forward, the term {*Ultramontanism*}, that is literally, {*beyond the Alps*}, was used by German emperors and French kings in a derogatory way to identify the policy of all of the crusading popes, starting with the first Benedictine pope, Gregory VII, otherwise known as Hildebrand.

The advent of the Ultramontane papacy was a major turning point in the history of the world in general, and a terrible blow to the Catholic Church in particular, for this marked the beginning of the most extravagant claim by a Gnostic faction of the papacy, controlled by the Benedictine Abbey of Cluny-via-Venice, to take over the authority of kings in Europe, and prevent the formation of sovereign nation-states. This religious form of sophistry lasted for 230 years, starting with Gregory VII (1073-1085) and culminating with Boniface VIII (1294-1303) who best expressed the Ultramontane pretentious claim over the French king, Philippe le Bel, by asserting: "{*God has constituted us over kings and kingdoms.*}" The temptation of such great power for these Clunyac popes, under the guise of speaking in the name of the Holy Spirit, was too great to resist, and the Venetian oligarchy knew how to exploit it.

The idea and the practice of Ultramontanism was an intolerant form of imperial rule which, according to German historian and scholar, Johann Joseph Ignaz von Dollinger, had established the pope as the {*Summum Oraculum*}, "which can give at once an infallible solution of every doubt, speculative or practical." Dollinger was a German history scholar and a prominent Roman Catholic theologian who refused to



accept the dogma of papal infallibility, which was decreed by Pius IX at the First Vatican Council in 1869-1870. Dollinger stated: “{ *We owe it to Bellarmine and other Jesuits that in some documents the Pope is expressly designated “Vice-God.” [...] One recently returned from Rome had the impression that ‘some of the extreme Ultramontanes, if they do not say so in so many words, imply a quasi-hypostatic union of the Holy Ghost with each successive Pope.* } (Janus, { *The Pope and the Council* }, Roberts Brothers, Boston, 1870. p. ) Dollinger, who was for six years the personal tutor to British liberal historian, Lord Acton, published in Germany, in 1869, { *Der Papst und Das Concil* }, under the pseudonym of Janus, and for which he was excommunicated. He, no doubt, considered it an honor to be excommunicated by an Ultramontane “{ *God of Vice* }.

It is absurd, however, to identify Ultramontanism with the modern fight within the Roman Catholic Church between papacy and conciliarism over the infallibility of the pope. This 19<sup>th</sup> century “spin” given to the term Ultramontanism is a Delphic-Jesuitical trap and a cover up of the real issue of the matter as we have defined it above. The issue of Ultramontanism is not a matter of faith: it is a matter of historical and scientific truth. On the other hand, the dogma of papal infallibility is a matter of faith, as defined by the Council of Vatican I (1869-1870), and of Vatican II (1962-1965), which is, strictly speaking, a Catholic internal matter pertaining to the authority of the doctrinal teaching of the pope, otherwise known as Papal Magisterium, as defined by the Encyclical { *Lumen Gentium # 25* }, promulgated by pope Paul VI on Nov. 21, 1964. Thus, Ultramontanism and infallibility must absolutely not be confused with one another.

Moreover, there is a very revealing irony coming out of the article on { *Ultramontanism* }, in the Catholic Encyclopedia on the Internet, which states unequivocally that for Catholic believers, “{ *Ultramontanism and Catholicism are the same thing.* }” Whoever wrote this was an obvious liar, and any true Catholic can recognize it. But, why was this lie put forward? The reason for this becomes clear a few lines below in the same Encyclopedia article, when the reader is warned against anyone who would misinterpret the concept of { *Ultramontanism* } as the doctrine of the Middle Ages whereby popes had taken upon themselves the right to depose kings and usurp their sovereignty. Ooops! This Ultramontane writer claimed:

“{ *It is altogether false to attribute to the Church either political aims of temporal dominion among the nations or the pretense that the pope can at his own pleasure depose sovereigns that the Catholic must, even in purely civil matters, subordinate his obedience towards his own sovereign to that which he owes to the pope, that the true fatherland of the Catholic is Rome, and so forth. These are either pure inventions or malicious travesties. It is neither scientific nor honest to attribute to “Ultramontanism” the particular teaching of some theologian or some school of times past; or to invoke certain facts in medieval history, which may be explained by the peculiar conditions, or by the rights that popes possessed in the Middle Ages (for example, their rights in conferring the imperial crown).* ”



Indeed, “the Lady doth protest too much.” However, this is a fascinating confession by denegation, especially when there is so much documented evidence, from papal Bulls and Decretals of the Middle Ages demonstrating the very opposite, as the present report will go through. The point to be noted, here, is that this very denial on the part of the writer of that Catholic Encyclopedia article is clinically demonstrating that Ultramontanism is still very much alive today, and the implied threat is that if anyone peddles this “falsity” about Ultramontanism, “he will be excommunicated and burnt at the stake!” Now, as they say, this is how you get to know where the monkey sleeps. The modern form of Ultramontanism is today found in the form of the Integrism expressed by the right wing fascists such as Marcel Lefebvre in France, Civiltà Cattolica in Spain, and Tradition, Family, and Property (TFP) in the Americas.

So, from the standpoint of history, Ultramontanism is fundamentally associated with the institution of a global political power that was spuriously allowed to dispose of the sovereignty of nations. That is the concept, which the Venetians had introduced into the Catholic Church via the Benedictine, the Dominican, and the Jesuit orders during the middle ages and later. This power of usurpation is essentially an imperial concoction of a feudal type of theocratic oligarchy, which uses a satanic knighthood disguised as a priesthood, or vice versa, to justify holy wars and genocide.

Such Satanic-Knight-Monks survived in France for centuries and were revived during the proto-fascist religious-civil wars of the Guise frondes against Mazarin, then, reintroduced into Action Francaise through Charles Maurras, into the Synarchist-Vichy education system at Uriage during World War II, and into the colonial military operation of Algerie Francaise against both Algeria and Charles de Gaulle in the 1960's. That is the issue in France today, which is being revived under the policy of globalization with Le Pen and Sarkozy. The issue was never the superiority of the Church over the Nation-State, but the use of the Church by Venetian central bankers, that is, central banking systems, such as the Oracle of Delphi, the City of Venice, and the Anglo-Dutch City of London who use religious warfare for the purpose of establishing a one-world rule over legitimate governments of nations.

Clearly, I repeat that my purpose, here, is not to take sides in the religious debate over the question of papal infallibility. I leave this question of belief to the priests. That is not my job. My job is to reveal the truth of what has to be known about the Ultramontane papacy and show that underneath it there is a monstrous imperial form of a one-world government, a satanic monster that is rearing its head again today. My intention is to identify the political-historical nature of the beast and indicate that the current Bush/Cheney regime in the United States is attempting to repeat the same evil objectives. As I shall demonstrate below, Ultramontanism has more affinity with the ancient Oracle of Apollo at Delphi, and its modern form of Synarchy Movement of Empire, than to the Catholic Church, as such. Ultramontanes are actually pagan Gnostics who parade as Christians in the guise of Catholic priests who are, in reality, neither priests nor Catholics.

## 2. THE HILDEBRANDINE ERA OF A PAGAN GNOSTIC PRIEST-EMPIRE.

Hildebrand, Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085), was probably the most powerful pope in the history of the Catholic Church. The only problem with his papacy, however, is that he was not a Catholic. He was not even a Christian in the general sense of the term. He was a Gnostic-Benedictine monk, and the reason he became so powerful was not because of his high moral and religious qualities. He was a vengeful ascetic monk from Cluny and his power did not come to him from the Holy Ghost, as he made believe, but from Satan's historical residence in the city of Venice. His summer residence, however, was Rome. Hildebrand was a Satanist pope controlled through the Venetian-led Benedictines of the Cluny Abbey of Burgundy, France. Cluny very cunningly oriented the vengeful Hildebrand to waste his entire papacy in the pursuit of avenging his predecessor, pope Gregory VI, and set the stage up for the first Crusade of 1095.

It should also be noted from the outset that Gregory VII was the pope that the synarchist and Martinist leaders, Joseph de Maistre and Saint-Yves d'Alveydre, admired the most, especially because of his sophistic mastery of forgeries that he concocted in order to create an imperial power out of the papacy. In commemoration of Gregory VII's death, the pompous founder of the Synarchy, d'Alveydre, wrote: “*{ With this great man, the supreme elevation of the papacy, the sovereign genius of its domination, the fulgurating eagle who raised its power to the zenith, and whose last cry, when gnawing at the dust of his tomb, still remained the soul of a conqueror who realized that with the passing of his life the law of his conquest had also been severed. }*” (Saint-Yves d'Alveydre, *{ Mission des Souverains }*, p. 125.) This admiration, or rather this adoration, came primarily from the fact that by brandishing the *{ Sword of excommunication }*, as his choice weapon of destruction, Gregory showed himself to be the most daring religious fanatic of a new form of globalist power which was to become a Gnostic-theocratic priest-empire. When people say, “I smell something rotten in the Catholic Church,” this is what they smell: Ultramontanism, and this is not an odor of sanctity. However strong that stench may be, the point is that Ultramontanism is not to be identified with Catholicism. Ultramontanism is satanic-gnostic in character, and was created as a tool of Venice to destroy the kingdoms of Europe and to re-establish a New Roman Empire World Order based on perpetual war.

The principle tenant of this new power was to violently destroy all sovereign government of European nations. Using forged Decretals (papal decrees) of previous times, Gregory VII announced to the Spaniards that he was the supreme sovereign of the Ibero peninsula, including all of its conquests, past and future; that the King of France was no longer allowed to nominate his own bishops; that the Normans, especially William the Conqueror, could only keep control over England, providing he sent regularly Saint Peter's Tithe to the Papal Central Bank. The same policy was imposed on Suenon of Denmark, Demetrius of Russia, and Wratlas of Bohemia.

However, this policy was not going to be successful in Europe unless Gregory first dealt with the Emperor of Germany, Henry IV (1056-1106). That was the key to the

{*Sovereign genius of his domination*,} as d'Alveydre put it. So, to bring the matter down to the bare essential, the pope had only one crucial task to accomplish: breaking the power of emperor Henry IV. Why? Because there could not exist two world empires, and the demise of Gregory VI had to be avenged. In fact, in 1046, Henry IV's father, Henry III, forced pope Gregory VI to resign after an investigation revealed that he had used simony to get himself elected. Henry chose a new pontiff, Clement II, after Gregory VI was forced to stand down from his papal throne and confess publicly:

**“{I Gregory, bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, on account of the simony which, by the cunning of the devil, entered into my election, decide that I must be deposed from the Roman bishopric.}”** (Peter de Rosa, {*Vicars of Christ, the Dark Side of the Papacy*}, Crown Publications Inc. New York, 1988, p. 55.)

This public humiliation did not bode well with the pope's young chaplain, Hildebrand, who was present at his master's demise, and who swore to never forget, neither to forgive. From that vantage point, the Venetians knew that if ever Hildebrand were to become pope, they could use that papacy to destroy the German Empire and conquer the rest of Europe. So, the Venetians did what they do best. A Venetian-Cluny plan was drawn up and put into action to have Hildebrand become pope. As if he were following a preordained Venetian script, upon becoming pope, Hildebrand took up the name of Gregory VII, and went on to spend his entire papacy to force the humiliation and abdication of Henry IV of Germany. This was the process by which the Venetians launched the Crusades.

From the beginning of his reign, pope Gregory VII, and his Benedictine-led Venetian faction of the papacy began an all out attack against Henry IV, masqueraded under the veil of promoting reforms in the Catholic Church. The first step of this operation began with the humiliation of the Emperor as a means of creating a public display of papal moral superiority.

Hildebrand was an ascetic flagellant who was seeking to treat publicly the Emperor as wretchedly as he had been treating himself. However, the young Henry IV was not wise to him and foolishly endorsed his papacy. Gregory VII was to become the last pope ever to be consecrated by an emperor. Once in power, Gregory sought out ways to capture his victim. He consulted the spurious Donation of Constantine and revived the Decretals that Pseudo-Isidor had forged during the 9<sup>th</sup> century to bolster the power of pope Nicholas I (858-867) during the last days of the Carolingian Empire.

The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals had two objectives. One was to create independence of the bishops from civilian rule, and the other was the establishment of a unique papal power against the empire of Charlemagne. In Canon 17 of the Chalcedon Decretals, Nicholas I declared the pope to be the supreme judge of all the bishops in the world (*primas dioceseos*). The documents that the pope introduced to the Frankish bishops and which he presented to them as authentic documents from the Archives of the Roman Church, were, in fact, fabricated by Isidor for the Rome Synod of 863. At the Synod, Nicholas I anathemized anyone who rejected the new papal ordinances. These

forged Decretals were savagely defended by the Jesuit Cardinal Robert Bellarmine at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century and were still maintained as papal edicts as late as the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

What Gregory VII was attempting to do was to establish a new constitution of the Church, giving it the right to rule over emperors and kings. He surrounded himself with specialists in church law who were all connected with Cluny and Venice, namely, bishop Anselm of Lucca, Peter Damiani, Humbert, Deusdedit, and Bonizo. It was Anselm of Lucca, nephew of pope Alexander II, who put together a compendium of forged documents that became, between 1080 and 1086, the new Gregorian system of church legislation. Everything about the Isidorian forgeries that was useful to establish papal absolutism was gathered, and new concoctions were invented in line with the Gregorian plan. Pietro Damiani, the Benedictine monk who created the *{flagellants}*, was the pope's assistant. Deusdedit, another Benedictine monk, and Bozino of Sutri, the controller of Countess Matilda of Tuscany, aunt of Henry IV, were the two ghostwriters of the infamous forty-seven propositions that exalted Gregory VII's prerogatives against the Emperor of Germany, and which became known as the *{Dictatus}* Decretals. Add to this the *{Polycarpus}* of cardinal Gregory of Pavia, which was made to adhere to Anselm's falsification, and voila! There it was: the "executive orders" of the New Gregorian Constitution. Here are some of the most extravagant dictates that those monks invented. They declared:

*"{...That the Roman Pontiff alone can with right be called universal.  
That he alone can depose or reinstate bishops...  
That he alone may use the imperial insignia.  
That he can dethrone emperors and kings and absolve their subjects from allegiance.  
That princes are obliged to kiss the feet...  
That his legates, even when not priests, have precedence over all bishops.  
That a rightly elected Pope is, without question, a saint.  
That he himself may be judged by no one on earth...  
That the Roman church has never erred; nor will it err to all eternity, the Scripture bearing witness...  
That he who is not at peace with the Roman church shall not be considered Catholic...}* (*{Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages}*, translated by Ernest F. Henderson, Biblo and Tannen, New York, 1965, p. 366-7. And, from Peter de Rosa, *{Vicars of Christ}*, p. 58.)

These were some of the fraudulent powers that Gregory created for himself to give himself a semblance of legal authority in order to excommunicate the German emperor and take control over his bishops. No one ever dared do something so outrageous before. But, think of the effect these statements must have had when the emperor's German nobility, his bishops, and his peoples who suddenly discovered they were formally forbidden to deal with him, simply by this declaration of a pope. So, by the sophistry of forging these new Decretals and by confusing the difference between canon law with civil law, Gregory VII dared the ultimate bluff, that is, he turned religious

excommunication into a political weapon. The following public statement was issued and was circulated throughout Germany in which Gregory VII anathematized Henry IV in the following terms:

***“{Blessed Peter, chief of the apostles, incline thy holy ear to us, I pray, and hear me, thy servant, whom from infancy thou hast nourished and till this day hast delivered from the hand of the wicked, who have hated and do hate me for my faithfulness to thee... Especially to me, as thy representative, has been committed, and to me by thy grace has been given by God the power of binding and loosing in heaven and on earth. Relying, then, on this belief, for the honour and defense of thy church and in the name of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, through thy power and authority, I withdraw the government of the whole kingdom of the Germans and of Italy from Henry the King, son of Henry the Emperor. For he has risen up against thy Church with unheard of arrogance. And I absolve all Christians from the bond of the oath, which they have made to him or shall make. And I forbid anyone to serve him as king.}”***{*Deposition of Henry IV by Gregory VII, February 1076.*} In {*Documents of the Christian Church*}, selected by Henry Bettenson, Second edition, Oxford University Press, London, 1963, p. 144.)

This was the most explosive bombshell of the 11<sup>th</sup> century. Emperors had deposed popes before, but never did a pope ever dare depose an emperor, especially under such fraudulent circumstances. The shock was so great inside of all of Germany that most noblemen feared, because of public opinion, that their exposure by excommunication would be a greater threat to them than the loss of their title in the hierarchy of the empire. So, immediately after this letter was made public, Princes began to withdraw their allegiance to Henry, one after the other. The powerful aunt of Henry, Countess of Tuscany, Matilda, joined the Black Guelph pope who had already discussed with her how to dethrone Henry and replace him with an emperor-puppet, Rudolph, Duke of Swabia, the next in line to the German throne. Regime change was the order of the day. Even Henry's own mother, empress Agnes, was convinced to join the forces of Gregory. The gamble had succeeded and Henry, who was then only 21 years of age, was shaken to the core, and, with his back against the wall, feared he was about to lose everything.

Consequently, during the midwinter of 1077, Henry announced that he was going on a pilgrimage to beg for the pope's forgiveness. The emperor crossed the snow-covered Alps into Tuscany, where Gregory was waiting for him at Matilda's triple-wall fortress in Canossa. Gregory set the rules and Henry had to give him his crown and other royal accoutrements, and publicly confess his "baseness and unworthiness." The story of this humiliation process was reported as follows:

***“{Having indicated his agreement, Henry climbed up the white slope to the fortress, fearful and alone. Passing through the first portal, he was stopped in the next enclosure. High above him, the pope appeared in full pontificals to savor his humiliation.***

*With an east wind whistling around him, Henry was stripped of his royal ensigns and made to remove his clothes. A woolen tunic was thrown to him, rough as a hair shirt.*

*{Put it on.} Gregory, his own hair-shirt close to his well flogged back and hidden by his clothing, gestured without deigning to speak to one who was out of communion with God and the Church.*

*Henry, teeth chattering, flesh blue with cold, obeyed. With bare head and bare feet, he stood, ankle-deep in snow in the hair-cloth of beggary and penitence. He held a beson broom in one hand and a pair of shears in the other, tokens of his willingness to be whipped and shorn.*

*The emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, heir of Charlemagne, stood there for three days and nights, fasting from daybreak till long after the glittering stars came out, a sight so wretched his relatives on the battlements wept noisily, unable to look anymore. Hour after hour, Henry, his hair and eyebrows stiff with frost, prayed with deep shuddering sighs to God and the pope for mercy.*

*Gregory gave an account of his own actions in a letter to the German Princes later that year.*

*‘The persons who interceded for Henry murmured at the Pope’s great heartlessness. Some even dared say that such behavior was more like the barbarous cruelty of a tyrant than the just severity of an ecclesiastical judge.’*

*What had hardened Gregory was the distant memory of what Henry’s father had done to his predecessor. As the Italians say, revenge tastes better cold.*

*Only when his hostess Matilda pleaded on the fourth day that her cousin would die if he stayed any longer in the snow did the pope relent.*

*Henry was dragged in, a lump of frozen flesh, to stand in rags before the tiara’s pontiff. Tall and handsome, he towered over this ugly swarthy Tuscan dwarf with his large nose and cold unblinking eyes.*

*Henry had to swear to submit to the pope’s judgment in the time and place to be announced. Meanwhile he was not to exercise sovereignty until the pope spoke the word. As Machiavelli remarked in his *{History of Florence}*, ‘Henry was the first prince to have the honor of feeling the sharp thrust of spiritual weapons.’ (Peter de Rosa, Op. Cit. p. 63.)*

### **3. THE WAR OF INVESTITURE**

Thus, the first and most important reform of the Church, papal obedience of the empire, had been accomplished successfully. Next, Gregory VII introduced his second reform, which entailed the restoration of the obedience of European Bishops to the Church of Rome. The reform became known as the “*{War of Investiture}*” (1059-1122). This has been detailed somewhat in my previous report, but there is more to be said in the way this second fallacy of composition was realized. When Henry returned home from

his barbaric humiliation, he realized that the pope wanted to have much more than the humbling obedience of the emperor. He wanted the empire itself. Henry then realized that even if the bishops' reform had all of the earmarks of a legitimate reorganization of the internal affairs of the Church, Gregory's plan was to use papal authority as a means of waging war against the civil authority of kings, of deposing them, and usurping their sovereign powers.

This Ultramontane coup d'état had been initially prepared under pope Nicholas II (1059-1061) and set into motion earlier by Hildebrand – though not yet pope – but who was the real power behind the papacy of Nicholas. It was Hildebrand who was the ghostwriter of the initiative of having popes elected exclusively by the cardinal-bishops as was established by the **{Decree of 1059 Concerning Papal Election}**. There was nothing more apparently sensible than to have bishops and popes elected from within their own ranks, and thus, deny the Emperor the right to vote for the pope. Since German Emperors had nominated popes of their choice, from 1047 to 1057, the Cluny Abbott, under the guidance of Venice, took the opportunity to find the German Emperor at fault and took measures appropriately.

This was, indeed, a very cunning Venetian operation of usurping the powers of the Emperor and other kings, under the disguised pretense of accomplishing the task of a church reform. By eliminating the German Emperors and French kings from voting for bishops and a pope of their choice, the famous decree of 1059, written by Hildebrand and promulgated by pope Nicholas II, had all of the trappings of having the Church of Rome become independent from lay powers. However, as this independence was being asserted publicly, it was, by the same token, privately creating a supra-national authority, a one-world globalist power that became an independent and supreme authority over all European kingdoms. This Church reform had one ultimate goal, which was to pit the kings of Europe against each other and lead them in Holy Crusades.

This first war that lasted the lifetime of both Henry and Gregory was to exceed far beyond both their mortalities. Gregory VII was not only responsible for this Venetian break between the altar and the throne, but also for the Venetian launching of the crusades, the Reformation, and the Spanish Inquisition. Ultramontanism thus became identified with one world imperialism. According to historian Peter de Rosa, during their lifetime, there had been no less than seventy-five battles waged between the armies of Gregory and Henry, and for centuries after the passing of Gregory, there were no less than eight emperors deposed. De Rosa noted:

***“{Had he put an emperor in his place he would have been without reproach. He did far more. By introducing a mischievous and heretical doctrine, he put himself in place of the emperor. In the name of the poor man of Nazareth who renounced all kingships, he claimed to be not only Bishop of bishops but also King of kings. In a parody of the gospels, the devil took him up to a very high mountain and showed him all of the kingdoms of the world, and Gregory VII exclaimed: ‘These are all mine.’}”***  
The centuries have not erased the significance of this imperial pretense. After the battle



of Austerlitz, even Napoleon himself concurred, probably at the suggestion of Joseph de Maistre: “*{If I were not me, I would like to be Gregory VII.}*” (Peter de Rosa, Op. Cit., p. 66.)

In 1085, Gregory VII died in exile among his Norman Knights while, twenty-one years later, Henry IV was despoiled and killed by the same Normans, led by pope Urbain II in alliance with his patricide sons.

#### 4. INNOCENT III'S ABSOLUTE IMPERIAL THEOCRACY.

When Innocent III (1198-1216) became pope, the Roman Church had become nothing else but an Imperial European Monarchy with the pope as Emperor and the *{Roman Curia}* as his government and banking arm. Innocent III had become Constantine reincarnate. At his coronation, the Cardinal Archdeacon declared solemnly:

*“{Take this tiara and know that thou art Father of princes and kings, Ruler of the World, the Vicar on earth of our Saviour Jesus Christ, whose honor and glory shall endure through all eternity.}*” (Peter de Rosa, Op. Cit., p. 67.)

This meant that not only were the sovereignty of European kingdoms to be destroyed, but also that the ecumenical heritage left by Charlemagne and Haroun al-Rashid would be trampled under foot. Just to cite an example of anti-Semitism, this is how Innocent III greeted a rabbi at the Tower of Stephen Petri by declaring: “*{We acknowledge the Law but we condemn the principles of Judaism; for the Law is already fulfilled through Christ, whom the blind people of Judah still expect as their Messiah.}*” (Peter de Rosa, Op. Cit., p. 67)

In 1203, Innocent III was at the height of imperial power and to prove it, he sent his Knights of the Fourth Crusade to sack Constantinople, rape the Santa Sophia Church and desecrate the tombs of Byzantine emperors buried within. As if to put the icing on the cake, after this greatest act of Roman Christian vandalism against Orthodox Christians, Innocent III appointed a Venetian prelate as his Latin Patriarch of Byzantium. Thus, through the Ultramontane papacy Venice had early control of both the Western and the Eastern parts of the Holy Roman Empire.

During his 20-year reign, Innocent III had taken over control of Germany, Spain, France, and England. He had nominated Otto IV as German emperor and “King of the Romans,” he had crowned Pedro king of Aragon, and John Lackland king of England. Though king John rebelled against the pope, he was no match for Innocent III. The pope forced an interdict on the entirety of England and imposed the closing of 8,000 cathedral and parish churches for a period of over 6 years. Then, the pope summoned the French king, Philippe Auguste, to expel John and take over the throne of England. John was ultimately forced to capitulate in 1212, promised the pope full restitution of church funds and lands, and gave England up to the Holy See in return for having his

excommunication lifted. When, in 1333, pope Urban V demanded that England pay back 33 years of arrears of Peter's Pence, king Edward III refused to pay any more blackmail dues to the pope and declared John's donation of England to the Ultramontane papacy a violation of his coronation oath. Hence, the donation of John was declared null and void.

Momentarily, the drawing up of the Magna Carta by king John's barons established the rights of the English Church, king, and people, created a semblance of sovereignty, but Innocent III ranted against it saying: “**{By St Peter, we cannot pass over this insult without punishing it.}**” The pope condemned the new charter as “**{Contrary to moral law,}**” and excommunicated anyone who adopted it. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen Langton, rejected the pope's negative sentence and declared that even the pope was subject to a higher law: “**{Natural law is binding on princes and bishops alike: there is no escape from it. It is beyond the reach of the pope himself.}**” What this war of investiture had led to was the fact that the pope was above the law and no one could pass judgment on his actions. This will go as far as this outrageous claim by Innocent III who declared: “**{Every cleric must obey the pope, even if he commands what is evil; for no one may judge the pope.}**” So, by the time of Innocent III, the fight to establish some sort of lawful right of sovereignty for the state had turned into a total brawl.

From the standpoint of its Gnostic doctrine, the Ultramontanism of Innocent III showed to what degree it was deeply rooted in Manicheism. For a period of 300 years, Rome had become a Manichean Church. This synthetic pagan religion was essentially based on Aristotelian dualism developed in the early period of Christianity. Saint Augustine spent a great part of his ministry fighting the Manicheans who claimed that the universe was based on two fundamental principles of Evil and Good and that history itself was alternately dominated by Evil and Good periods, that is to say, dominated alternately by satanic matter or divine spirit. The Masonic Martinist order of Louis-Claude de Saint Martin and of Joseph de Maistre was a direct secretion of this ancient secret society cult of the “Superior Unknowns” who were behind the terrorist act of Bastille Day that sparked the French Revolution in 1789.

The teachings of Innocent III expressed such warfare relationship between Church and State as a Manichean battle between Good and Evil, between Light and Darkness. The Church represented the spiritual forces of the Good while the State represented the material forces of Evil. According to the eternal cycle of fight between good and evil, the political absolutism of Innocent III merely reflected a so-called historical period when the Good won over Evil. The following Manichean doctrine is reflected in the following Epistle of Innocent III on Empire and Papacy, entitled **{The Moon and the Sun:}**

“**{The Creator of the universe set up two great luminaries in the firmament of heaven; the greater light to rule the day, the lesser light to rule the night. In the same way for the firmament of the universal Church, which is spoken of as heaven, he appointed two great dignities: the greater to bear rule over souls (these being, as it were, days, the lesser to bear rule over bodies (these being, as it were, nights). These dignities are the pontifical authority and the royal power. Furthermore, the moon**

*derives her light from the sun, and is in truth inferior to the sun in both size and quality, in position as well as effect. In the same way the royal power derives its dignity from the pontifical authority: and the more closely it cleaves to the sphere of that authority the less is the light with which it is adorned; the further it is removed, the more it increases its splendor.*” (Innocent III, {*The Moon and the Sun*}, October 1198, In {*Documents of the Christian Church*}, Op. Cit., p. 156.)

This is an excellent example showing how a fallacy of composition is fabricated. The metaphor is reduced to literal meaning of Aristotelian sense perception. Is it any surprise that the opposite of this sophistry will be embraced, verbatim, by the great Aristotelian of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Louis XIV, the Sun King himself? However, the deeper epistemological implications of this fallacy require more attention.

## 5. THE TWO CONTRADICTORY LIKENESS OF GOD.

Sometimes people inquire about how to make the difference between what is good and what is bad in religion. The short answer to this question, as LaRouche has been emphasizing, is located in the difference between man and animal, that is to say, in the fact that man was created in the likeness of God. So, it is the characteristic of the {*likeness of God*} that should be investigated, if we are to properly address that question. Therefore, how is this {*likeness*} to be characterized?

If God is considered to be completely outside of the universe, accessible only in the other life, then the likeness to Him can only be a mystery accessible only by pure faith without knowledge; and he who is like God, in that form, can only be an oligarchical figure completely isolated from the rest of humanity. On the other hand, if God is considered as a creative and companionate personality characteristic, involved in the perfectibility of the self-development of the universe, and in love of mankind, then the likeness to Him can only be brought about through the fostering of creativity in each and every single individual human mind.

According to Innocent III’s standard, the pope had reached the highest level of authority on earth and, by implication, had attained the ultimate fixed perfection. He had become a {*Vice-God*}, literally, a god of vice. But, that likeness of God was not creative, because his Gnostic conception of God was that of an unreachable and unknowable God, beyond all human understanding. In this form, to be God-like was the equivalent of being dead-like. In other words, it was as if God had wound up the clock of the universe, once and for all times, at the beginning of time, and then had gone to sleep ever since. Meanwhile, the universe had been inevitably winding down, and while God was still asleep, in the great outside darkness, the Ultramontane pope decided it was time to take his place on earth and enlighten mankind. Thus, the pope’s reference to the sun.

But the fallacy was that Innocent III made believe he was enlightened from the inside by the Holy Ghost Himself, a light sufficient unto itself that required no other

guidance but its own self-sufficiency. But the problem was that he had mistakenly replaced God by a pagan Sun God. And, if ever such a pope were to require the council of someone else, say from some philosopher king, for example, he would necessarily reject such counseling, because it would be like bringing a lantern to aid the light of the noonday sun. Thus, the apparent truth of his infatuation was but a fallacy of composition with respect to the likeness of God. He had been, as they say, in the sun too long. As a result, the oligarchical pope had to conclude:

*“{Thou wilt shudder thyself at the likeness of God.}”*

Thus, from the vantage point of Innocent III, it became clear and distinct that since the pope was as the sun, he obviously did not need any light from anyone else. As the Bull *{Unam Sanctam}* put it, “*{if the supreme power err, it can only be judged by God, not by man; for the testimony of the Apostle is 'the spiritual man judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged by no man.'}*”

On the other hand, a republican pope would have said:

*“{Thou wilt rejoice thyself at the likeness of God.}”*

This implies that change and perfectibility means that God is not outside of the universe, but is present, within human reach of the simultaneity of eternity, within an ever changing universe, *{limited and self-bounded}*, embracing it universally with a principle of the redemption of Christ that guides its harmonic orientation as expressed by the joy of the creative process of its composition by universal physical principles. So, the *{likeness of God}* is the creative principle which, when guided by love of mankind, *{agape}*, fosters the advantage of the other, in the form of the general welfare, that is, without expectation of anything else in return but the joy of improving and perfecting the other.

Thus, the test of truth on this matter is that when a religious doctrine presents people with a paradox, it is good because it is creative. However, when a religious doctrine presents people with fixed perfection, it is evil because it is dead. The former is *{inner-directed}*, the latter is *{other-directed}*.

## 6. THE DOMINICANS AND THE CATHARS EXPERIMENT

The Bogomils originated in Bulgaria during the 10<sup>th</sup> century and their belief was based on a religious version of Aristotelian dualism, reflected in the struggle between Good and Evil, each of which taking turn to rule entire periods of history, thus, establishing the basic tenant of the Manicheans. The Cathar religious belief also included the opposition between the forces of light and of darkness, spirituality versus materiality, which is also characteristic of the Masonic Martinist Order. Bogomil was a Bulgarian priest who was teaching that all material things are the work of the devil and thus, the

divinity of Christ was impossible and represented a typical Aristotelian contradiction in terms. Consubstantiality of spirit and matter is an absolute contradiction. As we shall see, this duality was the axiomatic tripwire of Dominican theology. The belief of the Cathars also included self-denial of eating meat, drinking of wine, the enjoyment of sex between man and woman, and marriage. So men had to find an expedient somewhere else.

The Bogomil cult was very significant in the Orthodox Byzantine Empire and one of their leaders, Basil, was burnt as a heretic in Constantinople in 1100. Many of his followers were either imprisoned or exiled into southern France where they became known as Cathars, the Greek term, {*katharoi*}, meaning “pure.” It was Aristotle at the Oracle of Delphi who concocted out of bad poetry and tragedy the method of purification of emotions, known as {*catharsis*}. The “Pure ones” were also an outgrowth of the ancient Babylonian Gnostic cults extolling the belief in the principle of {*deliverance*} by means of self-flagellating and self-deprecation. This method was later adopted by freemasons for their ritualistic elitist initiations known as {*Mithraic stoicism*}, and for developing popular culture based on manipulating people’s emotions by fostering anti-Platonic arts of imitation {*mimesis*}. As a rule of thumb, the difference between Gnosticism and Christianity can easily be recognized: Gnosticism manipulates people’s belief structures while Christianity confronts people with paradoxes.

In France and Italy, during the 12<sup>th</sup> century, there were no less than eleven Cathar Bishops. By the turn of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the Ultramontane papacy decided to make full use of the Cathar heresy in order to introduce the Inquisition as a means of terrorizing the local nobility and the general population. The French regions of Champagne in the north and of Toulouse in the south became the two main targets. In 1206, right after he had founded the Dominican Order, Pope Innocent III sent Dominic, accompanied with a Spanish bishop, to Toulouse. The founder of the Dominican system, in fact, encouraged the Christians to follow the example of the simple and austere life of the Cathars. By his new method of teaching, the head of the new order got the backup of the pope to establish a convent in Prouille, near Carcassone, where he would convert Cathar women directly into a Dominican nun community. The point to understand, here, is that heresies were a concoction of the Venetians; and the creation of religious orders, as a counter-force to the heresies, was also a Venetian concoction. This was a typical gang-counter-gang operation within the Church. This is the reason why it was so easy to convert one into the other.

In 1207, Innocent III decided to launch a new crusade against France and targeted Raymond VI, Comte de Toulouse, Duc de Narbonne, Marquis de Provence, Comte de Queray, d’Albi, de Rouergue et de Nimes. His titles alone show that he was in control of the entire Mediterranean region of France and, therefore, he had to be eliminated if the pope were to gain control of France. So, Innocent III issued an official reprimand against Raymond VI for having been too tolerant with the Cathar heretics. That was the trick. When in 1208, Raymond still refused to hunt the heretics down, he was excommunicated. This gave the green light for launching the Albigensian Crusade in the whole of France and to factionalize the entire French nobility. As a result, the royal family itself was divided between the two imperial factions of Guelph and Ghibelline.

In 1215, the same pope created a new order called the Dominicans and established their headquarters in Toulouse for the express purpose of dealing with the inquisition of the Cathars and Albigensians. Innocent III sent two Spaniards, Bishop Diego of Osma and Dominic who joined the Bishop Fulk of Toulouse to establish the Order of the Dominicans. Again, the purpose of the Ultramontane-Guelph plan was to use the cover of heresy as a means of usurping the civil authority of the nobility of France. However, Innocent III had miscalculated the fact that Louis VIII would take this opportunity to reconquer the whole region of Provence in the name of the crown.

For several decades, these terrorizing inquisitions brutalized and hunted down the Cathars in every corner of France as a means of carving up and politically weakening civil authorities and reorganizing the different cities and regions into imperial satrapies linked to the papacy. First, the lower nobility was recruited, such as Philippe Hurepel, Imbert de Beaujeu, Comte de Saint Pol, Archambaud de Bourbon, and Amauri de Monfort. Then the higher nobility was recruited, such as Thibaud IV, Comte de Champagne et de Brie (king of Navarre) and Pierre Maucler, Comte de Bretagne. In this Albigensian Crusade, the counties and cities of Toulouse and Avignon became the two main geopolitical targets of the Norman Ultramontane papacy. From 1209 to 1218 the cities of Beziers, Narbonne, and Carcassone were also taken over and ravaged by the crusade.

Innocent III started by recruiting a key Ultramontane allie, Simon de Monfort, whom he pitted against the Comte de Toulouse, Raymond VI. This was an actual war of barony. Under the cover of a crusade against the heretic, Raymond VI was defeated at Muret in 1213 and Toulouse was lost to the pope. In 1215, the pope granted Simon de Monfort all of Raymond's territories of Provence. Thus, by this papal usurpation, Simon de Monfort became Comte de Toulouse, Duc de Narbonne, and Marquis de Provence. In 1224, however, the wind turned and the son of Simon, Amauri de Monfort, was forced to cede the county of Toulouse to king Louis VIII, who, in exchange, had agreed to launch a full-fledged crusade against the Cathars throughout France. This time the pope was forced to accept the compromise and reluctantly agreed the Louis VIII lead the crusade.

On May 17, 1226, Louis VIII left Paris to join his crusader Knights in the south near Avignon. The announcement throughout France that the king was going on a crusade against his own people created a complete terror across the land and forced even some of the more tolerant nobles, like Thibaud IV, Comte de Champagne de Brie, to join the Ultramontane crusade. The knights rallied near Avignon by June 17, 1226, and by the end of the month, most of the nobility of southern France had been forced to submit to the ecclesiastic authorities. All of the towns of the Languedoc, including Avignon, were turned over to the new pope of the Ultramontane alliance, Honorius III.

This victory of the pope in southern of France had the result of breaking up a lot of small communities of Cathars, but it had more significantly the result of dismembering the southern region of France and splitting it into parcels between the papacy in Rome, Honorius III, the king of France, Louis VIII, the German emperor, Frederick II, the

Spanish, Count Raymond-Beranger, and even Henry III of England. However, this also had the effect of consolidating the crown of France with several Ghibelline leaders.

For several centuries, the powerful lords of southern France, the Counts of Toulouse, had been attempting to turn Provence into an independent Mediterranean State. However, Spanish leaders also had the same idea of incorporating Provence with Barcelona. In 1125, count Raymond –Beranger III of Barcelona, succeeded in doing exactly that. Forming an alliance with Louis VIII of France, Raymond-Beranger won the war against Raymond VI of Toulouse and divided the Provence region into two separate entities, each of which was soon to become subdivided into more pieces. Desperately, the Count of Toulouse attempted to regain his territories through new marriage arrangements, but without success. However, for his part, the Spaniard, Raymond-Beranger V made very successful arrangements by marrying three of his daughters to foreign leaders. Marguerite married the king of France, Louis IX (Saint-Louis) in 1234, Eleanor married the king of England, Henry III, in 1236, and Sancie married the brother of Henry III, Richard of Cornouailles, in 1243.

However, when Raymond-Beranger died in 1245, and left all of his domains to his fourth daughter, Beatrix, Raymond VI of Toulouse attempted to seize the opportunity to reconquer his territory and attempted a marriage of convenience with her. But, Blanche de Castille, in collusion with the new pope, interfered and arranged for her third son, Charles, Duke of Anjou, to marry Beatrix. So, Charles of Anjou led his army down to Aix en Provence and married Beatrix in 1246. Blanche de Castille had momentarily played her Ultramontane son against the Ultramontane papacy and attached Provence to the crown of France. This created two very significant changes that would eventually lead to the demise of the Ultramontane military policy two generations later.

On the one hand, the pope had secured a strong military alliance with Charles d'Anjou, who was given the kingdom of Naples and Sicily, and was made the titular king of Jerusalem after defeating the German imperials Manfred and Conradin, thus, putting an apparent end to the century old Guelph and Ghibelline wars between the papacy and the empire.

On the other hand, by the addition of Provence to the first family of France, the maneuvers of Blanche de Castille, of Ghibelline persuasion, had brought about a greater unity of France and a new alliance of kings between Louis VIII of France, Alfonso the Wise of Castille, the House of Barcelona, and the king of England. The count of Toulouse's dream of an independent state on the Mediterranean Sea was definitely shattered and the Pope failed to control southern France. In the end, after the death of Louis VIII, the result of the Provence reintegration into the Capetian royal family, put an end to the feuding baronies in that region and opened France to a new economic expansion which was celebrated by the opening of Aigues-Mortes, the first French sea port on the Mediterranean since Charlemagne. There is an important historical paradox not to be missed here, which is that by her paradoxical move of giving Provence to her Ultramontane son, Charles of Anjou, Blanche of Castille saved France from the Ultramontane papacy!



The Albigensian Crusade lasted until the Cathar stronghold of Montsegur was besieged during a period of ten months, from May 1243 until March 1244, when the fortress capitulated, about 200 people refused to deny their faith and they were all burnt alive in a great holocaust. What the Albigensian Crusade had proven was that the newly created Dominican Order had become the best instrument of terrorism and torture that Venetian-Ultramontane money could buy.

## **7. THOMAS AQUINAS AND THE THEOLOGY OF FORGERY, PREEMPTIVE WAR, ASSET GRABBING, AND MURDER.**

In 1233, the new pope, Gregory IX, issued a circular letter to all of the Bishops of France telling them that he was sending them Dominican monks, as his personal inquisition police to clean out their dioceses of heretics. These inquisitors worked precisely like a Gestapo system where local people were made to denounce who they suspected of heresy and to reveal everything they knew about their neighbors. By 1252, the Bull of Innocent IV had given the Dominicans the right to torture suspects in order to obtain a confession. However, since the Church forbade the shedding of blood, the Dominicans considered that burning alive was the best way to go around that difficulty. Purification by fire appealed to them as a good option because it involved more suffering and less shedding of blood. However, in their new execution role, the Dominicans also required official theological sanctioning in order to secure themselves against any legal adversarial entanglements. That job was going to be fulfilled by Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), who was the son of Count Aquino and Countess of Teano, a young promising 27-year-old aristocratic monk.

The legal matters of the Dominicans' Inquisition mission presented delicate problems to resolve because the execution activities required an extensive sophistical cover. With the Inquisition, the Supreme Court of Rome had become an office of extortion of money and property from the rich baronies of France, but it could obviously not admit this openly, so, it had to be justified morally and theologically as much as legally. Very simply Dollinger explained the way the looting of the nobility worked.

*“{The binding force of the laws against heretics lay not in the authority of secular princes, but in the sovereign dominion of life and death over all Christians, claimed by the Popes as God’s representatives on earth. Every prince or civil magistrate, according to the constant doctrine of the Court of Rome (The Curia), was to be compelled simply to carry out the sentence of the inquisitors, by the following process: first, the magistrates were themselves excommunicated on their refusal, and then all who held intercourse with them. If this was not enough, the city was laid under interdict. If resistance was still prolonged, the officials were deprived of their posts, and, when all these means were exhausted, the city was deprived of intercourse with other cities, and its bishops’ see removed.}”(Dollinger, Op. Cit., p. 196)*

The papacy had the upper hand over the king and the nobility, and there was nothing they could do, legally, to stop them. The pope had the authority and the papal Curia was the means of bringing in the money for the central bank of the Ultramontane papacy. In this respect, historian Peter de Rosa had the following brief description of the role of the Curia:

*The Curia was made up of men who had bought office and were desperate to recoup their enormous outlay. Every office in every department had its price. These courtiers wielded day-to-day power with tremendous sanctions at their command. They could excommunicate anyone. Bishops and archbishops trembled before them.*

*It was the Curia that drew up the tariff of simony. For every benefice of see, abbey and parish, for every indulgence where there was a set fee. The pallium, the two-inch-wide woolen band with crosses embroidered on it in black silk, was paid for by every bishop. These modest woolen trimmings, brought in over the years hundreds of millions of gold florins to the papal coffers, so that the Council of Basle in 1432 was to call it 'the most usurious contrivance ever invented by the papacy.' By the sixteenth century, in Germany, whole dioceses were farmed out to bankers like the Fuggers and to joint-stock companies who retailed church livings to the highest bidder.*

*Dispensations were another source of papal revenue. Extremely severe even impossible laws were passed so that the Curia could grow rich by selling dispensation. Payment was demanded for dispensation from fasting during lent. Also allowing a sick or aged monk to stay in bed instead or rising in the night to recite the office. Marriage in particular was a rich source of income. Consanguinity was alleged to hold between couples who had never dreamed they were related. Dispensation from consanguinity in order to marry amounted to a million gold florins a year." (Peter de Rosa, Op. Cit., p. 99)*

It was the general rule that the accused heretic did not have a right of legal council, and if a lawyer did present himself for that purpose, he would also be excommunicated. Furthermore, the families of accused heretics were to be deprived of all of their properties by legal confiscation, without recourse. The papal Curia would collect the first half of the property values, and the Dominican inquisitors would get the second half. Since the inquisitors were 99% Dominicans, they followed the Thomist rule whereby heretics must be put to torture and then to death, on theological ground only. So, since in the midst of this systematic killing by the inquisition, the Dominican Order needed to justify theologically the preemptive religious war called the Albigensian Crusade they were launching in France, Thomas Aquinas concocted the following theological justification:

*"{(1) There is the sin, whereby they (the heretics) deserve not only to be separated from the Church by excommunication, but also to be shut off from the world by death. For it is a much more serious matter to corrupt faith, through which comes the soul's life, than to forge money, through which temporal life is supported. Hence if forgers of money or other malefactors are straightaway justly put to death by secular*

*princes, with much more justice can heretics, immediately upon conviction, be not only excommunicated but also put to death.*

*(2) But on the side of the Church there is mercy, with a view to the conversion of them that are in error; and therefore the Church does not straightaway condemn, but {after a first and a second admonition}, as the Apostle teaches [Tit. Iii. 10]. After that, if he be found still stubborn, the Church gives up hope of his conversion and takes thought for the safety of others, by separating him from the Church by sentence of excommunication; and, further, leaves him to the secular court, to be exterminated from the world by death...}*” Thomas Aquinas, {*Summa Theologia*}, ii, Q. xi. Article III. {*Whether heretics should be tolerated.*}, in {*Documents of the Christian Church*}, Op. Cit., p. 186-187.)

And the following statement was devised spuriously solely to justify legalized murder and wars of aggression:

*“{There are some unbelievers such as the Gentiles and the Hebrews who have never accepted the Christian faith. These should in no way be forced to believe...Appropriate force may be used by the faithful to prevent them from interfering with the faith through blasphemy or evil inducements, or open persecution. This is the reason that Christians often make war on unbelievers, not to force them to believe...but to prevent them from interfering with the Christian faith. However there are other unbelievers, such as heretics and all apostates who once accepted and professed the faith. These are to be compelled, even by physical force, to carry out what they promised and to hold what they once accepted.}*” (Thomas Aquinas, {*Summa Theologia*}, ii, ii, Q. 10, Art. 8.)

Furthermore, in case a pope were to be accused of usurpation, Aquinas invented the following protective measure:

*“{Secular power is subject to the spiritual power as the body is the subject to the soul, and therefore it is not usurpation of authority if the spiritual prelate interferes in temporal things concerning those matters in which the secular power is subject to him, or concerning those matters the care of which has been entrusted to him by the secular power.}*” (Thomas Aquinas, {*The Political Ideas of St. Thomas Aquinas*}, Dino Bogongiari, Editor Hafner Publishing Company, 1953, p. xxxiv.)

From the standpoint of the Christian {*principle of redemption*}, these excerpts by Thomas Aquinas speak volume for themselves. He could not have been more explicit. His writings show clearly how the imperialist forms of Ultramontane-Dominican policy of murdering the heretics and justifying preemptive wars against Jews and Muslims stemmed from his theology. Indeed, if one were to give up hope on his fellow man each time man sinned against faith, and on the ground that after two unsuccessful attempts, “{*the Church gives up hope of his conversion*},” then, there would barely be any humanity left to redeem. As everyone can see, this outrageous casuistic defense of the Ultramontane papacy is a purely oligarchical justification for population reduction, that

is, a pretext for culling the herd of human cattle down to size. The key question resided in how the believers could be convinced to walk themselves to the slaughterhouses.

On the one hand, it is easy to see that such imperialist sophistry justifying the inquisition is diametrically opposed to the Christian principle of redemption. On the other hand, there is the Augustinian view and understanding of what came to be known as **{Felix culpa!}**; that is, the proclamation of the paradox of Adam's fault and of the blessed consequence that was derived from that transgression. As John Paul II put it so aptly: "**{Oh happy fault, which deserved to have so great and glorious a redeemer!}**" (1)

Regardless of the fact that such problems of faith could have been resolved through appropriately chosen ironies, Aquinas chose to take the brutal **{catharsis}** path of Aristotle and ignore Platonic solutions. The Thomist defense of excommunication and murder was further backed up by Dominican forgeries that Aquinas personally made in giving the popes the theological justification for the pursuit of their terrorist policy. During the twelfth century no theologian of the Catholic Church dared occupy himself with writing a doctrine of papal authority, and quite conspicuously, most of them, such as Hugo and Richard of St. Victor, Robert Pulleyen, Pierre de Poitiers, Pietro Lombardi, Rupert of Deutz, Guillaume de Paris, Vincent de Beauvais, and more, all avoided even discussing the subject of papal authority as a matter of theology.

Similarly the great scholastics of the thirteenth century, such as Alexander of Hales, Alanus of Ryssel, and even the teacher of Thomas Aquinas, Albertus Magnus, who were known as the most prominent theologians of that period, avoided altogether any discussion of papal powers. It was simply not considered pertinent as a matter of theology. However, this was not the opinion of Thomas Aquinas, and he was the only exception to do it. What Aquinas had perceived was something that George W. Bush is still looking for; that is, the necessity to justify preemptive war and regime change. Aquinas used the same method that Bush used; he created the intelligence he needed.

According to Dollinger, in 1261, a Dominican monk who had lived among the Greeks "**{composed a series of spurious passages of Greek Councils and Fathers, St. Chrysostom, the two Cyrils, and a pretended Maximus, that contained the dogmatic basis for these novel Papal claims.}**" I do not have this documentation in hand, but they can be gotten in Raynald, **{Annal}** Ann. 1261- 63. This documentation was presented to pope Urbain IV, in the guise of 800 year-old Eastern Orthodox manuscripts, and the pope passed them onto Thomas Aquinas as conclusive evidence that the Greek Orthodox Church had also agreed that the apostolic throne of Rome was the exclusive authority in doctrinal matters. [See **{Contra errores Graecorum}** (Against the Errors of the Greeks). So, the issue, here, is not infallibility. It is not whether the pope has exclusive authority or not, but whether that authority is based on a true church tradition or on a fallacy of composition based on fabricated documents.

Thomas Aquinas inserted the entire forgery into his work against the Greeks as if it were Gospel truth. Dollinger noted: "**{Thomas Aquinas therefore did what the**

*scholastics had never done before: he introduced the doctrine of the Pope and his infallibility, as he got it from these spurious passages, and often in the same words, into the dogmatic system of the {Schola}, - a step the gravity and the momentous result of which can hardly be exaggerated.* } (Janus, Op. Cit., p. 216)

Dollinger summarized the Aquinas trickery of the {*Summa Theologia*} in his own words:

*“{Christ has conferred on Peter his own plenary authority, and thus it is the Pope alone who can command, bind, and loose. Everyone is under him as though he were Christ himself, and what he decrees must be obeyed. For ‘Christ is fully and completely with every Pope in sacrament and authority.’ The Apostolic See rules, ever remaining unshaken in the faith of Peter, while other churches are deformed by error, and thus, the Roman Church is the sun from which they all receive the light. A Council derives its whole authority from the Pope; he has the right of establishing a new confession of faith, and whoever rejects his authority is a heretic for it belongs to him alone to decide on every doctrinal question.}*” (Thomas Aquinas, {*Summa Theologia*}, ii. 2. Q. I, ART. 10; and Q. xi. ART. 2, 3.)

Thus, the {*Summa Theologia*} shows that Thomas Aquinas built this Ultramontane papal authority system on pure sophistry and forgeries, the same type of forged lies that Gregory VII had used to increase his own authority, a century earlier. Such were the initial steps that prepared the inquisition measures necessary for Sixtus IV to launch, in 1478, his best Dominican executioner of all, Thomas de Torquemada, against the Jewish population of Spain.

Lastly, let us examine more closely how Aquinas dealt with believers. This is the centerpiece justifying the Aquinas method of epistemological terror. Modern time crusade-synarchists have studied very closely the method of Aquinas and have discovered how he was able to institute cooptation of {*belief*} against {*knowledge*} through manipulation of truth by logical sophistry. In his {*De Veritate*}, Aquinas wrote about his method of capturing {*belief*}, as distinct from {*knowledge*}, and thus, established his rule of how to “motivate” the axioms of someone for the crusades. The distinctions he made are worth quoting extensively.

*{... Our understanding, existing in potentiality, is moved to activity by one of two things; either by its proper object, which is an intelligible form...or by the will...So then our understanding, in potentiality, is variously situated with respect to the members of a contradiction. For sometimes it is not inclined more to one member than to the other, either because of lack of evidence or because of the apparent equality of the evidence for both sides; and this is the state of {doubt}, when a man wavers between two contradictory opinions. But sometimes the understanding is inclined more to one side than to the other, yet the evidence, which so inclines it, is not of sufficient weight to determine the complete acceptance of that side, and hence a man accepts one conclusion, but without fully excluding the contradictory; and this is the state of {opinion}...Sometimes, however, the understanding, in potentiality, is determined to*

*the extent of complete adhesion to one side; and it is thus determined sometimes by the intelligible object, sometimes by the will. It may be determined by the object either mediately or immediately: immediately, when the truth of intelligible propositions appears at once and without doubt from consideration of the intelligible object; and this is the state of {the man who understands} the axioms [principia], which are at once recognized as true when their terms are known...; it is determined mediately when the understanding, upon the recognition of the definitions of the terms, is determined to one side of a contradiction in virtue of these fundamental axioms; and this is the state of {knowledge}. But sometimes, the understanding cannot be determined to one side of a contradiction either at once, through the very definition of the terms, as in the case of axioms, or in virtue of the axioms, as in the case of demonstrable conclusions; but it is determined through the agency of the {will}, which chooses to assent to one side, definitely and positively, **THROUGH SOME INFLUENCE WHICH IS SUFFICIENT TO MOVE THE WILL** (capital emphasis added) but not the intellect, namely the fact that it seems good or fitting to assent to this side; this is the state of {belief}, as when a man believes in the words of someone because to believe seems becoming or advantageous; and thus we are moved to believe in certain sayings inasmuch as eternal life is promised to us as a reward for belief, and by this reward our will is moved to assent to what is said, although our understanding is not so moved by any evidence presented to it...*

*The state of {understanding} involves assent...but it does not involve reasoning (cogitatio)... While the state of {knowledge} involved both reasoning and assent; but the reasoning is the cause of the assent and the assent brings reasoning to a close. For as a result of the application of axioms to conclusions assent is given to conclusions by resolving them into axioms, and at that point the movement of reason is stayed and brought to rest...and thus assent and reason are not in this case involved on, as it were, equal terms; but reasoning induces assent, and assent brings the process to rest. In the case of belief, however, assent and reasoning are on, as it were, equal terms. For here assent, as has been said, is not caused by reasoning but by the will. But since the understanding is not in this way brought to its one proper termination, viz, to the vision of the intelligible object, hence it is that its motion is not brought to rest but is still employed in reasoning and enquiry on the objects of faith, however firmly it assents to them...And hence the understanding of the believer is said to be taken captive (2 Cor. X.5), **BECAUSE IT IS DETERMINED BY EXTERNAL CONSIDERATIONS, NOT BY ITS OWN PROPER PROCESS.** (capital emphasis added). Hence too, it comes that in a believer, motions may surge up contrary to that which he most firmly holds, a thing which does not happen in a man who understands, or in one who knows...} (Thomas Aquinas, {*De Veritate*}, Q. xiv. Art. I.)*

This Aquinas doctrine is very useful for a Gestapo type of inquisitor who is involved in a heresy case. Either you accept your fate or suffer the consequences in the bull of Phalaris. The method is based on the Aristotelian logic of non-contradiction such that between a pair of contrary propositions, only one member can be true. The rest is a matter of manipulation. For example, the axiomatic underlying assumption, here, is that *{all men are willing to die in the crusades because they believe in a better life after*

*death.*} This is what Aquinas believed. That belief is in contradiction with the opposite assumption whereby {*some men are not willing to die in the crusades because they don't believe in a better life after death*}. However, since those two statements, taken together, cannot be true without entering into a contradiction, Aquinas based his entire case on {*the man who understands*} this fundamental axiom of Gnostic immortality and knows how to use it for the benefit of the Ultramontane purpose.

Now, take this Aquinas manipulation of the question of immortality and compare it with what Lyndon LaRouche has said on the same subject. Do you see the difference between them standing out? By identifying the participation in immortality as a contribution that individuals make toward the ever lasting and developing life of future humanity, Lyn demonstrated that the individual continues to live through the human species, regardless of his bodily death. Thus, the immortality of Raphael Sanzio represented in the Room of the Signature in the Vatican: on one side of the room, you have the {*School of Athens*}, on the other side, you have the {*Dispute of the Holy Sacrament*}, and the stereographic unity of the two frescos depicts and resolves the central paradox of the Catholic Church, in the knowledge of simultaneity of eternity. Do you believe that, or do you know that?

So, you see that by using Aristotelian logic, Thomas Aquinas could not reach that level of Platonic knowledge that Lyn identified as everlasting life in the “{*simultaneity of eternity*}.” And so, because of that shortcoming, the Benedictines, the Dominicans, and later the Jesuits, have used this Aristotelian method of brainwashing to kill millions of human beings by sending them to the slaughterhouses of the crusades. Now the way to solve this problem is to solve the paradox of freedom and necessity that Lyn once identified with the contrary opposition between {*other-directedness*} and {*inner-directedness*}. How do you do that?

Note that in the above Aquinas statement, the process of victimizing is directed from an outside authority, that is, by imposing on the individual a total submission and obedience to {*other-directedness*}, as opposed to a process of decision-making that would stem from an internal authority of {*inner-directedness*}. (2) Note also that the same Aquinas method is used today to lead the Muslim population into a jihad against America and is being used to fuel a conflict between the Sunni and Shiite. Furthermore, compare this Aquinas parody and subversion of the degrees of knowledge with what Plato discussed at the end of Chapter VI of {*The Republic*}, leading to the metaphor of the Cave, and you will discover that Aquinas was essentially developing the theory of the “captive” {*Nietzschean Will*} as the means of sacrificing people into the Venetian furnaces of perpetual religious warfare. I will discuss, below, how it was Nicholas of Cusa who solved that Ultramontane crisis in and around the great Council of Florence.

By the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the {*Summa Theologia*} had fully established the right to initiate preemptive wars, plunder the rich, torture, and murder heretics as an integral part of Church theology. Thomas Aquinas represented a tremendous victory for the Ultramontane papacy, so much so that one of the Avignon popes, Jean XXII, declared that Aquinas had created such miracles with his writings that he should be canonized



without any other miracles. And so, he became sanctified on that basis. As a final tribute to Aquinas, another Ultramontane-Avignon pope, Innocent VI, even went as far as considering his works as infallible and declared that “{*whoever assailed Thomas Aquinas’s teaching incurred suspicion of heresy.*}Vie de S. Thomas}, p. 590 seq.) (3)

In reality, the Thomas Aquinas theology was nothing but a sophisticated Gnosis that provided the foundation for the Guelph-Ultramontane imperial papacy to impose a one-world dictatorship over Europe during the entire period of the Middle Ages. Thus, in the name of vengeful God, and without the saving grace of redemption, Thomas Aquinas had established the theological justification for treating mankind as a bestial flock of sheep to be culled by wars or to be sacrificed to the holocausts of the so-called Holy Inquisition.

## **8. ROBERT THE BUGGER: THE CATHAR-DOMINICAN EXECUTIONER.**

On May 13, 1239, in the heart of the Champagne region of France, a horrific cry of terror rose from Mont-Aime, as if the bowels of hell had been opened amidst a sulfurous cloud of black smoke emanating from a great inferno. According to the French chronicle of Aubri des Trois-Fontaines, about 70,000 fear-stricken people stood in the surrounding fields in silence, frozen with terror, as they were witnessing a most horrifying spectacle. All of them had been given 30 years of indulgences just to attend the hellish event of that fateful day, in person. All of the leading notable civil and religious authorities from northern France were in attendance: “ {*The King of Navarre, Thibaud IV, Count of Champagne and of Brie, the Barons of Champagne, sixteen Bishops came from Reims Soissons, Tournai, Cambrai, Arras, Therouanne, Noyon, Laon, Senlis, Beauvais, Chalons-sur-Marne, Orleans, Troyes, Meaux, Verdun, and Landres.*}the spectacle of a very great holocaust agreeable to God, that involved the burning of 183 heretics, buggers, Manicheans, and Cathars.}

The executioner of this great inquisition holocaust was an associate of Thomas Aquinas, the Dominican monk, Robert the Bugger (Robert le Bougre), who was of Bulgarian origins and who had been recruited to the cult of Catharism in Bulgaria where he had been a leading figure as a “Perfect Cathar”, during the first quarter of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. He became known as “the Bugger” because he had been associated with Bogomilism, which was the pagan cult that had been used against the Greek Orthodox faith during earlier centuries. In France, the Dominicans had recruited Robert the Bugger for the purpose of hunting down Cathars and executing them for the sin of heresy.

The use of the inquisition method of terrorizing the population had the political purpose of inducing total fear among the leadership of the clergy, of the nobility, and force their obedience to the Ultramontane Pope in Rome. In 1233, Robert the Bugger was nominated official inquisitor of the Vatican for the region of Burgundy. His first great

success was to convict 50 heretics that he burnt at the stake, or buried alive, in Charite sur Loire. This unprecedented act of barbarity revolted the Archbishops of Reims and of Sens to the point of forcing the pope Gregory IX to suspend him in 1234. [Thomas Aquinas was 14 et the time] The Pope was forced to recall Robert the Bugger under charges of “violence and cruelty.”

Since the Ultramontane plan was to use the *{shock and awe}* method of terrorism to force the nobility to follow in the footsteps of Louis VIII, who had already been forced to submit Toulouse and Avignon to the authority of Rome, Robert the Bugger was reinstated in 1235 and, this time, promoted to the post of General Inquisitor for all of France. From 1236 to 1239, Robert the Bugger hunted down the Cathar heretics mercilessly and brought men, women, and children into his torture chambers in order to have them admit to their crimes of heresy. He was particularly notorious for his cruelty and his enjoyment of torture. The number of those who, under torture, recovered their catholic faith and avoided the death sentence was estimated at approximately three quarters or two thirds of all of the accused. This meant that the mass of the accused who had gone through the inquisition of Mont-Aime in 1239 was probably somewhere between 500 and 600 people.

However, Robert the Bugger had misestimated the power of the Archbishop of Sens and of the local civilian authorities. After the autodafe of Mont-Aime, which resulted in a general popular reprobation, a public investigation was launched against Robert the Bugger, and he was tried and convicted to life imprisonment.

This had been the precursor event that set the stage for the infamous holocaust of Montsegur that put an end to the Albigensian Crusade, five years later, on March 12, 1244, when 210 Cathars were burned alive. These were the Ultramontane experiments serving as forerunners to the other notorious Dominican inquisition that Thomas Torquemada orchestrated against the Jews of Spain, and the Jewish holocaust of World War II, that Adolph Hitler organized in Auschwitz and elsewhere in Nazi Germany. Is it any surprise that it was also the Dominicans priesthood that ran the education program of the Knight-Monks of the Vichy regime at Uriage, in France during World War II? Note that it was always the Dominicans who were in charge of the Inquisition and had adopted the Aristotelian practice of *{catharsis}* as the method of purification by fire. The Gestapo torture chambers and the Bush administration Guantanamo torture chambers are following the very same method.

Two things need to be clarified with respect to the Cathars and the Mont-Aime holocaust. First, there is the question of why Mont-Aime was chosen by the Ultramontane papacy. And, secondly, there is the question of whether it was the Dominicans who had deployed the Cathars against the Augustinian movement across France. The second question may never be answered but the first one may be clarified by the fact that Church chroniclers of the period claim that Mont-Aime had been for centuries the traditional hotbed of heresy in the region of Champagne. From the standpoint of “medieval geopolitics”, Mont-Aime was reported by several chronicles of the time of the holocaust that it was the *{cross road of dogs}* (lieu de convergence des

chiens), which is not foreign to the fact that the Dominicans were known as the dogs of God, {*Dominus canis*}. It also appears that Cathars and Dominicans were two expressions of the same Gnostic pagan cult. There are at least three chroniclers who reported that the Mont-Aime castle had been the rendezvous' place for **{a congress of dogs.}** Among them, Aubri de Trois-Fontaines forecasted that the 1239 execution of these **{buggers worst than dogs}** was the precursor of an upcoming furious war. He was right.

Secondly, the same chronicler also reported a strange story called “{*The Devil's Mare.*}” (*{La jument au diable}*) which is about the devil traveling from Normandy on a horse that was badly shod, and who was worried about not making it to “Moimer” (Mont-Aime) before midnight. The legend goes on to say that a “bugger” by the name of Imer had originally built the castle of Moimer and had been chased out of Africa by Saint Augustine.

Like Montsegur, Mont-Aime later became a cult shrine for high degree freemasons, and especially for the “superior unknowns” of the Martinist Order of early synarchist origin. From that standpoint, it is not surprising to discover that, after the retreat of Napoleon from Russia and his defeat at Waterloo, the Tsar of Russia, Alexander 1<sup>st</sup>, made a surprising pilgrimage to Mont-Aime, on September 10, 1815, with an army of 350,000 men and 85,000 horses. As an enthusiast of secret societies and of the mystical Manichean-Aristotelian doctrine of dualism, as it was embraced by the Cathars, Joseph de Maistre, and Saint-Yves d'Alveydre, the Emperor of all of the Russias had come, as a representative of the Martinist Order, on a pilgrimage in conformity with the Manichean doctrine of Good and Evil. He represented the Good coming from the north and Napoleon represented the evil being destroyed in the south.

The Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia, the Duke of Wellington, and the royal prince of Bavaria all accompanied Alexander to this Mont-Aime shrine and participated in a 300 plate dinner to commemorate the ‘spirits’ of the Cathars. A modern day researcher on this subject, Albert Mathieu, stated on The internet that he was absolutely convinced that Mont-Aime “**{was a Cathars center for a period of more than 250 years. That there is substantial evidence that it was the holy shrine of the Cathars well before 1239, and more so since that date. And that there is great probability that Mont-Aime was the cradle of Catharism in the West, just like Montsegur had been its burial place.}**”

**FIN: PART I**