

THE ULTRAMONTANE PAPACY II

by Pierre Beaudry
01/01/2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART II

- 9. THE PARADOX OF THE TWO EMPIRES: THE SICILIAN VESPERS.**
- 10. BONIFACE VIII: THE BLACK BEAST.**
- 11. HOW NICHOLAS OF CUSA BROKE THE ULTRAMONTANE IDEOLOGY AND SOLVED THE PARADOX OF THE PEACE OF FAITH.**
- 12. RETURN OF THE ULTRAMONTANE MONARCHY: TRADITION FFAMILY AND PROPERTY.**

9. THE PARADOX OF THE TWO EMPIRES: THE SICILIAN VESPERS.

During the middle ages, prophecies were abundant and related usually to axiomatic changes that were about to occur within the political or ecclesiastical domains. Such predictions generally gave the impression of being great insights into periods that were troubled with excessive corruption. However, none of those prophecies were actual forecasts, as LaRouche understands them. Those prophecies were simply religious conspiracies dressed up in miraculous garb. The same type of popular mystification is exemplified in the cult of the Fatima prophecies today.

Sometimes kings or great men or women were prophesized to become instruments of such axiomatic changes. For example, in March of 1688, when William of Orange and his Dutch Party in England had taken the Venetian advice to overthrow King James II, and establish a new Venice of the north, there circulated a pseudo-Quaker leaflet warning that the Holy Ghost had revealed to a spiritual leader of that community the near precise timing when this invasion of England was to occur. In those days, if you had good intelligence, indeed, you also had good prophetic capabilities.

Historian Dollinger told of such a self-fulfilling prophecy with respect to the Hohenstaufen Empire. He wrote:

“{When the popes had determined to uproot the Hohenstaufen imperial house, and allow none of its offspring to attain either the German or Sicilian crown, there appeared in the year 1256 a prophecy in Latin verses, under the name of Cardinal Albius, - probably the Cardinal-Bishop of Albano. In this, after a general description of a chaotic period and of the suppression of the Church, it was announced: “Suddenly and unexpectedly a deliverer, a new king, will appear, who for the sake of the honor of the mother (the Roman See) will restrain the south, crush the Sicilians and Frederick’s race, and destroy all the works of the emperor Frederick and his sons and adherents. Besides this he will also make the perverse Romans bow under the yoke of the Pope”}.”
(Dr. J.J.I. Von Dollinger, {*Fables, the Popes in the Middle Ages*}, Dood & Mead, New York, 1872, p. 278.)

In order to make the prophecy come true, ten years later, in 1266, the Ultramontane papacy invested Charles of Anjou with the task of winning back Sicily from the house of Hohenstaufen and of organizing this papal outpost for future Crusades. As the following pages will show, Charles killed both sons of Frederick II, Manfred in 1266, and Conradin in 1268, captured Sicily, then, moved into the greater project of launching a crusade against the Byzantine empire. (4) However, the following report on the 1282 {*Sicilian Vespers*} provides us with a good example of how this prophecy was interrupted, and how Charles of Anjou was forced to wait until 1283 for his Fleet to leave the port of Messina in an expedition against Constantinople.

This is a moment in history when humanity comes to a major turning point. The patriotic fight of the {*Sicilian Vespers*} as reported by Alexandre Dumas in {*Le Speronare (1842)*}, and entirely documented from the Royal Palace Library of Palermo, represents such a historical moment, which Lyndon LaRouche had recently identified as the crucial battle between two empires, the Ultramontane imperial papacy, on the one hand, and the Hohenstaufen German empire, on the other; that is to say, the fight between the Guelphs and Ghibellines. LaRouche identified the conflict as follows:

{The key to all of the leading developments constituting actual medieval and modern European history, is the issue of law which erupted as the point of Thirteenth-Century conflict between the Welf League, on the one side, and the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II and his heirs, on the opposing side. Formally, both of these factions of European feudalism, were committed to a notion of the form of imperial law which medieval Europe had inherited from the imperial tradition of Babylon, and from such successors of evil Babylon as the Roman and Byzantine empires. This is the notion of imperial law addressed by Professor von der Heydte's Die Geburtsstunde des souveränen Staates. It was a conflict of the form of a struggle for survival between two empires, one "Ghibelline" (Waibling, Hohenstaufen), and the other "Guelph" (Welf). The actual, substantive issue of that conflict over the content of the then prevailing principles of international law, between Welf League and Emperor Frederick II, is

underlined in blood by that event to which later, Nineteenth-Century Italian patriots such as Giuseppe Verdi referred as "The Sicilian Vespers."

The issue thus, was not yet a conflict between empire and nation-state, but, rather, between two axiomatically opposing notions of imperial law. The Welf League represented the anti-Christian, or specifically gnostic reading of imperial law; the forces associated with Frederick II's faction, including, notably, Dante Alighieri, represented a Christian reform of Roman and Byzantine forms of imperial law. The one, the gnostics' Welf League, said to the chattels, "Submit to your feudal degradation to the culture and condition of human cattle now; you get your reward in the next life." The Christian principle of the mortal self-dwelling in the simultaneity of eternity, is opposite to the gnostic dogma characteristic of the Welf League.

The underlying, axiomatic issue, was a conflict respecting the manner in which the choice of notion of the nature of the human individual, determined the governing principle of law of nations. The crucial issue was, that the oligarchs of the Welf League, like the extremists among the Protestant fundamentalist cults of Britain (and the "Elmer Gantrys" of the U.S.A.) today, insisted that mortal man does not "possess the divine spark of reason," but is, rather, a hopelessly degraded, worthless creature, whose debasement and self-degradation make it attractive for purposes of the Creator's post-mortal redemption of such wretches. Thus, the Welf League, like the pagan Emperor Constantine earlier, rejected the notion called in Latin the Filioque; they rejected man as they had rejected Christ. Their view is typical of the specifically anti-Christian, oligarchical, or gnostic definition of "human nature."

The Christian principle, in opposition to the racialism inhering axiomatically in modern Zionist dogma, is that all men and women are equally made in the image of the Creator, endowed with the "divine spark of Reason," this without distinction on account of perceived differences among race or nationality, and that natural law must be so defined. The individual person, like Christ, dwells in the simultaneity of eternity; there, in the simultaneity of eternity, the purpose of the individual's mortal existence is resolved. Mortal man does not exist to be tested, as if in some freemasonic ritual; the mortal individual incarnate, exists to act efficiently in mortal life, for that cause which is the simultaneity of eternity. It is therefore the duty of the law of nations to protect and nurture this "divine spark of creative reason" within the mortal existence and action of each and every individual. This, as we shall elaborate below, was the core issue of the war between the two imperial factions of the Thirteenth Century; this is the core issue of the struggle against the primary evils of today's world, the implicitly satanic evils of "free trade" and "globalization." (Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. {Go With the Flow': Why Scholars Lied About Ulysses' Transatlantic Crossing} EIR, October 19, 1998.)

Viewed from the narrow standpoint of Italian politics, the {*Sicilian Vespers*} were a 1282 popular uprising for the independence of the Island of Sicily against the colonial presence of the French Duke, Charles d'Anjou. However, from a larger context of the fight to free mankind from oligarchical rule, as LaRouche just identified, the

{*Sicilian Vespers*} represent an excruciating paradox by which a people succeeded in extracting itself from a tyrannical form of imperial bestialization, only to replace it by a “gentler and kinder” form of imperial domination. Thus, after the liberation from the harsh yoke of this Angevin-Guelph imperial policy, the Sicilian population accepted with open arms the milder yoke of the Aragon-Ghibelline imperial policy, a yoke with Styrofoam padding in which the law of general welfare of the people did not exist.

The historical context of this dual imperial conflict is rather an important and complex one. This liberation paradox is a crucial example to look at and to study, because the fight between the partisans of the Ultramontane papacy and the partisans of the Hohenstaufen emperor reflected two forms of imperialism that the whole of humanity had been fighting to eradicate for millennia, and was only partially destroyed with the establishment of the first nation-state conception of Nicholas of Cusa, in France, under Louis XI, and in England, under Henry VII. I say “partially” because no true sovereign republican nation-state has ever been established in Europe, to this day.

As LaRouche clearly demonstrated, it was only when the same Cusa conception of {*Concordancia Catholica*} was applied to the American Constitutional Republic that all forms of imperial oligarchism were finally and definitely abandoned in its governing form. This is why the same Synarchist-Ultramontane forces, still alive today under the guise of the George W. Bush regime in Washington, are attempting to destroy this unique constitutional framework of the United States Republic, from within, and turn the clock back to Ultramontane times. So, a close look at previous historical attempts at establishing constitutional forms of nation-states in Europe is a very important exercise of mental hygiene if one is to cleanse one’s nation from the creeping slime mole of oligarchism.

The issue of the {*Sicilian Vespers*} has many sides to it and cannot be, strictly speaking, reduced to Sicily. On the French side, the decisive factor in this complex puzzle of oligarchical maneuvering was the coordinated roles of the Plantagenet queen and mother of the inept king John, Eleonore of Aquitaine, and her granddaughter, Blanche de Castille, daughter of Alfonso VIII of Castille. As queen of the huge kingdom of the Plantagenet, spreading from Scotland to Spain, Eleonore wished to consolidate her kingdom by organizing a peace between England and France. The key to the peace was the marriage between Blanche de Castille and Louis, son of Philippe August, king of France, who had been excommunicated by the pope for refusing to follow his dictats.

Blanche had been brought up in a very cultured troubadour milieu in Spain, and had also, herself, become a poet at an early age. When Blanche left Castille to marry Louis, in 1200, they were both 13 years old. Since Innocent III had imposed an interdict against Louis’s father, Philippe Auguste, the young couple had to get married in enemy territory, that is, in Normandy, after which they escaped to Paris without any official ceremony. Blanche gave Louis 12 children, only five of which survived. Very early on, Blanche realized the political role that her position required of her, especially because she was the mother of Louis IX (Saint Louis) and of Charles d’Anjou who both represented two very different and irreconcilable views of the empire.

Blanche reigned over a royal family, which was divided between the two imperial outlooks that Lyn identified, that is, Ghibelline and Guelph. The family represented an important and far-reaching network of fractionalized royal households throughout Europe. Blanche was related to the ecumenical Spanish king, Alfonso Sabio (the Wise), who had married her sister, Berengere, queen of Castille. A second sister, Urraque, married Alfonso II, king of Portugal, and a third sister, Alienor, married Jacques I, king of Aragon. Her brother, Henry, became king of Castille, and her own marriage with Louis VIII, had the purpose of stopping the wars between France and England, and thus, uniting the Capetian family with the Plantagenais. The family combinations were, therefore, very complex and were constantly shifting between Guelph and Ghibelline interests.

In 1223, at the death of his father, Philippe August, Louis VIII was taken into the Guelph camp and intervened militarily in southern France for the Ultramontane pope. As a result of his victory, however, he was able to annex to his crown, the cities of Beziers, Nimes, and Carcassone. In November 1226, his army was decimated by an epidemic of dysentery and he died of the disease in Montpellier. From that moment on, Blanche had to take charge of the kingdom and became the Queen Regent of her young son, Louis IX (Saint Louis), who was then only 11 years old.

Twice, Blanche de Castille had to fight the Venetian-manipulated French baronies to maintain the kingdom of France intact. Pierre Mauclerc, Duc de Bretagne, and Henry III, king of England, backed her up and succeeded in stopping the first revolt of the feudal barons in 1227. Then, she had to repress a second revolt in the Languedoc against the Albigensians in 1229. By this second victory over Raymond VII, Comte de Toulouse, she prepared the reunification of the Provence region to the French crown, which was to be finalized later, in 1271. Louis IX took over the kingdom from her in 1242. She again had the responsibility of the kingdom when Saint Louis left for the seventh crusade in 1248. When she died, in 1252, Blanche de Castille represented the pivot of a quadruple alliance of forces between the English, the Spanish, the French, and the German Hohenstaufens that led the Ghibelline fights against the Guelph forces of Venice, the pope, and Charles of Anjou in Sicily. It was the consolidation of this alliance that triggered the Sicilian Vespers of 1282.

On the Spanish side of the {*Sicilian Vespers*}, there were extensive Ghibelline and ecumenical alliances. For example, an early attempt at establishing constitutional law for nation-states was the legislative work of Spanish ecumenical king of Castille, Alfonso Sabio X (the Wise) (1221-1284). This was very useful for Sicily, in part, though it was entirely garnished with benign imperial oligarchism. His son, Alfonso XI, also pursued the legislative works in what became known as the {*Ordenamiento de Alcala*}.

Among some of the most important works that Alfonso Sabio commissioned to a group of jurists was the {*Siete Partidas (1251-1265)*}, which was a seven-book compendium of legislative laws superseding the feudal {*Forum Judicum*} (the {*Fuero Juzgo*}, in Astoria & León) established by the Visigoths. The new {*fueros*} (rights/privileges) were laws ambiguous enough to acknowledge human rights, but were

also interpreted as privileges for the nobility. Though these laws were still couched within the framework of an imperial design, following the "Ghibelline" (Waibling, Hohenstaufen) line against the "Guelph" (Welf) line of the Ultramontane papacy, it was nonetheless oriented toward the common good of all people, especially the principle of *{general welfare}*, in an ecumenical society that respected Jews, Muslims, and Christians. The Alfonso X doctrine of tolerance, for example, was based on the Koran fostering "*{vital and legal harmony}*" between believers of different religions.

From that vantage point, king Alfonso X was part of an international humanist faction that included Peter of Aragon, the Queen of France, Blanche de Castille, Louis VIII and his son, Louis IX (Saint Louis), the Lord of the Sicilian Isle of Procida, John of Procida, who with the two sons of Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, Manfred and Conradin, were part of the Ghibelline faction of the German empire. However, by force of circumstance, after the deaths of Manfred and of Conradin, the Ghibelline Sicilian leader, John of Procida, became a member of the council of Charles d'Anjou. As a fifth column inside of the Guelph leadership, John of Procida, was the most important element in the liberation of Sicily.

This Ghibelline alliance began to be consolidated just after the seventh crusade where Louis IX (Saint Louis), was killed by the plague in Egypt, in August of 1270. However, while the evil brother Charles was preparing the siege of Tunis, instead of pursuing the ostensible goal of the papacy, and avenging his brother, as was to be expected of a "Christian Knight," he entered into a conspiracy with the king of the Moors, with whom he shared his future intentions for expansion of his domains to the East. So, Charles quickly declared the crusade at an end, and entered into his capital of Naples.

John of Procida considered this behavior as most strange and began to investigate his new master's intention. When he discovered the plan of Charles, he traveled throughout Sicily in order to find a brave leader who would join him in defeating him and get him off the throne of Naples and Sicily. He found general support from the little nobility all over Sicily, but no one was strong enough to take on the Angevin. John finally chose a Spanish Ghibelline king, Pedro III of Aragon, who was the son-in-law of Manfred and cousin of the young Conradin, who had just been executed on the public place of Naples by Charles d'Anjou, in 1268.

In Barcelona, Pedro of Aragon, who was rather cautious but had been already meditating on some action to undertake against the Norman Guelph, received John of Procida to his court. The Barcelona king had gotten the glove of Conradin from Henri of Apifero, and he had it suspended, as a constant reminder, between his dagger and his sword at the foot of his bed. Furthermore, during the three years that Henry of Apifero had remained in Barcelona, a coalition against Charles d'Anjou began to emerge between Castille, Valence, and Aragon.

According to the biographer of Pedro of Aragon, Ramon de Muntaner: *{The Western world offered him no ally to fight Charles d'Anjou, his coffers were empty,*

and if he were to breath a single word of his project of unseating the king of Naples and Sicily, the popes who were supporting Charles would no doubt excommunicate him as they had done with Frederick, Manfred and Conradin. And, all three had ended most pitifully: Frederick by poison, Manfred by the sword, and Conradin on the scaffold.” (Alexandre Dumas, {*Le Speronare (1842)*})

So, Pedro’s decision to intervene in Sicily was not based on courage alone. He required guarantees and put forward three conditionalities: foreign money, local Sicilian support, and papal backing. These almost sounded like the conditionalities of some Democratic Presidential candidate in a U.S. election. At any rate, Pedro of Aragon also had a French ally whom he hoped, would be sympathetic to the Ghibelline faction as his own. Years before becoming king, Pedro had paid a visit to Philippe le Hardi, his brother-in-law and son of Saint Louis, who was then not yet king of France. As a child, Pedro had been received at the French court of Saint Louis with great honors, and a close relationship was forged between the two, during several months, such that they had sworn to each other fidelity to never raise arms against each other’s families. They sealed their mutual pledge of honor by taking communion from the same host.

To impress their friendship upon each other’s people, both the King of France and the King of Aragon had put on their horses’ saddles, the Armory of France on one side, and the Armory of Aragon on the other. Better alliance of kings could not have been better established. However, the problem that stood as a thorn between them was that their Ghibelline alliance called for a secret declaration of war against Philippe le Hardi’s uncle, Charles d’Anjou. So, Philippe le Hardi, the son of Saint Louis and of Marguerite de Provence, found himself caught between a rock and a hard place, and had to decline Pedro’s proposal.

There was also a fifth element that joined the forces against Charles d’Anjou in Sicily, and that was the Byzantine emperor, Michel Paleologue, who had once pushed the Angevin out of Constantinople in 1204. As his advisor, John of Procida had discovered that Charles d’Anjou had been making plans to invade Constantinople in an alliance with the Moors, and intended to restore his son-in-law Philippe on the throne of the Byzantine Empire. That was enough to convince Michel Paleologue to put up the money for Pedro of Aragon’s army and fight Charles d’Anjou. Thus, the first of Pedro’s three conditionalities was fulfilled. Michel Paleologue gave John of Procida 100,000 ounces of gold to finance Pedro’s army.

Consequently, John of Procida left Aragon for Sicily in order to organize his patriots into an army and fulfill the second conditionality. After rallying the patriotic lords of Sicily, John enjoined them to sign a letter to the king of Aragon, asking him to lead them into battle against Charles d’Anjou. Alexandre Dumas copied this letter from the Royal Archives of Palermo in 1842, and which said:

{To the magnificent, illustrious, and powerful lord of Aragon and count of Barcelona, we are recommending ourselves to your grace. And first, Messir Alaimo, count of Lentini, then, Messir Palmieri Abbate, then Sir Gualtieri de Galata-Girone, and all the other barons of our Island of Sicily, we salute you with total reverence and

pray you to have pity of our persons which are as sold and reduced to the level of beasts.

We are recommending ourselves to your lordship and to Madame your wife who is our mistress, and to whom we give our allegiance.

We pray you to deliver us and to pull us out of the grip of our enemy, which is also yours, in the same manner that Moses delivered his people from the hands of the Pharaoh.

Believe, therefore, magnificent, illustrious, and powerful lord king, in our devotion and in our recognition, and, whatever is not included in this letter, please relate to what sir John of Procida should tell you. }

Thus, both this letter signed and sealed by the Sicilian nobility and the letter of Michel Paleologue were brought to Pedro of Aragon by John of Procida. But, before going to Spain, John of Procida stopped in Rome and had an audience with the newly elected pope Nicholas III, whom he approached in the same manner, by stating that the Sicilians were being treated worse than animals by Charles d'Anjou, and requested from him also a letter commanding the king of Aragon to be the secret representative of the papacy against Charles d'Anjou. Nicholas III wrote:

“{ We are giving you our benediction with this holy recommendation that our Sicilian subjects, who are being ill-governed and tyrannized by king Charles, be saved, and we are asking and commanding you to go to this Island of Sicily as its conquering son, to take and to master this kingdom, in the name of the Holy Roman Church. }”

Then, John of Procida left for Barcelona with the three letters of the Holy Father, the Emperor of Constantinople, and of the local Sicilian nobility, which were fulfilling all three conditions initially established by Pedro. This is how Pedro III of Aragon accepted to lead the war against Charles d'Anjou. The only remorse he had was caused by the fact that he had to break his childhood oath with the king of France to never wage war against his family.

John of Procida set the liberation date of Sicily for Easter Monday, March 30, 1282. Consequently, all of the lords of the island had prepared themselves for that date and were ready to respond both in Palermo as well as throughout the island. The signal was going to be given after the Vespers were to be celebrated at the church of the Holy Spirit of Palermo.

On Easter Monday, after the vespers, at the sound of the bells, an incident was created outside the church, which led to a confrontation between the Sicilians and the Angevin troops. Very rapidly, the Angevins were outnumbered and had to flee by sea or go into hiding. The bells began to ring all across the city of Palermo and armed Sicilians began to go on a rampage against the French. A systematic search was carried out and all those who were asked to pronounce the Sicilian name {*ciciri*} (for Cicero) and could not do it correctly were killed on sight. In fact the name has a very special pronunciation in the Sicilian dialect that no Frenchmen was able to replicate. So, whenever a Frenchman was to say a flimsy {*sisiri*}, instead of the Italian {*chichiri*}, he was immediately put to death. This may be the source origin of the word {*sissy*}.

On Tuesday, March 31st, the Byzantine emperor, Michel VIII Paleologue, publicly announced his support for the revolt as it began to rapidly spread everywhere across Sicily. Within a few weeks, the insurrection spread all over the Island. From April 15 to 18, 1282, Charles d'Anjou, hiding in Messina, decided to leave Sicily with half of his army. By April 28, the other half of his army had been captured and destroyed and the Sicilian Vespers War was over. About 8,000 Frenchmen were reportedly killed during the four weeks of the conflict.

After the insurrection was over, Pedro of Aragon brought his own army over to Sicily in support of the patriots. Pedro III of Arago entered the port of Trapani in August of 1282. Incensed at the return of the Hohenstaufen-Ghibelline retaking Sicily, the new pope Martin IV excommunicated Pedro of Aragon and declared the opening of a new crusade against Aragon. The pope gave indulgences for all their sins to those who would fight with the papacy and with Charles d'Anjou against Pedro, and declared the kingdom of Aragon and all other territories attached to it to be forfeited by the papacy. The pope gave Pedro's kingdom to Charles de Vallois, the son of his childhood friend, king Philippe le Hardi. This was not an usurpation by way of violence, but an usurpation by way of divine intervention, that is, by divine right, the same divine right that pope Clement IV had made use of, in 1265, to sell the flock of several million Sicilians to Charles d'Anjou against a yearly tribute of 800 ounces of gold that Charles was not always paying to the pope on time.

The war between the French Capetian House and the Aragon House lasted 20 years, until the Peace of Caltabellota in 1302 gave Sicily back to Anjou. However, the Treaty of Aversa ultimately gave Sicily back to Aragon in 1373. In 1855, in celebration of the valiant Sicilians who liberated their homeland, Giuseppe Verdi wrote an opera called {*The Sicilian Vespers* }.

On the Hohenstaufen side of the empire, Martin IV also compelled several German bishoprics, such as Liege, Metz, Verdun, and Basle, to pay France for war reparation with a tenth of their ecclesiastical property. When Rudolf of Habsburg complained about such an exorbitant cost, he was weighing the cost of excommunication against the cost of submitting himself "patiently to the exaction out of reverence for the Papal See" (See Raynald, {*Annal. Eccles.* }, (ed. Mansi) vol iii. P.600-1). The successor of Martin, pope Honorius IV exhorted Rudolph to be respectful, and in return he would become the head of a great dynasty. Rudolph bowed down to the pope, kissed his feet, and became the first Habsburg emperor to endorse the Ultramontane papal policy. From that moment on, the Hapsburg dynasty became the constant Ultramontane imperial watchman of Europe, the Venice-led instigator of religious warfare, and, by its matrimonial control over Alsace, Lorraine, and Burgundy, it would remain for centuries to come a constant thorn in the eastern side of France, including today under the current Maastricht Treaty.

10. BONIFACE VIII: THE BLACK BEAST.

The papacy had ultimately triumphed under pope Innocent IV who pronounced the solemn deposing of the German emperor, Frederic II, at the Council of Lyon in 1245. This councilor decision showed to the world that the pope had then acquired an absolute power of jurisdiction over every subject in every kingdom of Europe and, therefore, had the right to depose any king or emperor as he pleased. It was Boniface VIII who was to become the consummate imperial champion of the Ultramontane *{theocratic-gnostic doctrine}*. The year 1300 was declared a jubilee year by Boniface VIII in order to celebrate the triumph of the papacy over the civil authorities of Europe. As I indicated in my previous report, jubilee years that ended up being at every 50 years, then 25 years, was essentially meant for raking indulgence money from pilgrims into the Vatican Central Banking vaults.

Cardinal Llanduff said of Boniface VIII (1294-1303) that: “*{He’s all tongue and eyes, and the rest of him is all rotten.}*” In the Jubilee Year of 1300, Boniface declared, sitting on the throne with the crown of Constantine on his head: *{I am pontiff, I am emperor, and the breast of the Roman pontiff is the repository and fount of all law. This is why blind submission to his authority is essential to salvation.}*” It was Dante who identified Boniface VIII as the “*{Black Beast}*” when he “*{turned Peter’s burial place into a sewer.}*”

Actually, Boniface VIII, born Benedict Gaetani, had tricked everybody in order to make himself pope. His predecessor, an austere and recluse monk, became pope Celestine V after the stalemate conclave of Perugia, which had momentarily considered the selection of Gaetani in 1292. Celestine V disapproved of the licentious ways of Rome and exiled himself at the Castello Nuovo of Naples in which, Gaetani, in order to gain the pope’s grace and confidence, had built for him a wooden cell in the middle of one of the large castle rooms. The pope preferred seclusion to the public life of princes, hated the practice of simony, and preached the return to the poverty of Jesus. Benedict Gaetani was not of the same persuasion, and he found a way to alter the course of events.

One day, Gaetani bore a hole through the wooden cell of the pope, and, put a tube in it. In the middle of the night, he would whisper gravely through the speaking tube: “*{Celestine, Celestine, lay down your office. It is too great a burden for you to bear.}*” After several nights of listening religiously to the grave voice that could not be any thing else but the divine voice of the Holy Spirit, Celestine decided to abdicate. Peter de Rosa wrote: “*{Gaetani, a lawyer, had engineered this successful outcome; he, the antithesis of Celestine, now claimed the throne by right. He took over in December 1294 and immediately returned to Rome. But, fearing that Celestine might reappear with spiritual fanatics like Jacopone da Todi, he took the precaution of locking him up in the castle of Fumone; the old hermit died there a few months later of starvation and neglect.}*” When he discovered the treachery of Boniface, Celestine declared, “Boniface would die like a dog.” For this ignominious act of barbarity, Dante gave Boniface VIII a

fitting punishment in the Eight Circle of Hell. He buried him upside down with his head stuck between two rocks.

After his cold-blooded murder of Celestine V, Boniface VIII spent the rest of his life in the perpetual worry that his crime would be punished. The time for punishment, indeed, came when Philippe le Bel of France launched a campaign to depose him as a heretic, a murderer, and a fraud. Boniface had issued a Bull *{Unam Sanctam}* that a great number of popes wished he had never written, because it was a direct provocation against Greek Orthodox, Judaism, and Islam. Boniface represented the Catholic Church as the only true Church. The words rang like a call for the crusades. *{Unam Sanctam, Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam...}* (“*{There is but One Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church ... outside of which there is no salvation or remission of sins.}*”) Those were a direct and explicit affront to other great religions and a final blow to the ecumenical heritage of Charlemagne. This was Boniface’s declaration of war. As he wrote in the same Bull:

“{Truly he who denies that the temporal sword is in the power of Peter, misunderstands the words of the Lord, ‘Put up thy sword into the sheath’. Both are in the power of the Church, the spiritual and the material. But the latter is to be used for the Church, the former by her; the former by the priest; the latter by kings and captains, but at the will and by the permission of the priest. The one sword then should be under the other, and temporal authority subject to spiritual.} (*{Unam Sanctam}*, 1302. In *{Documents of the Christian Church}*, Op. Cit., p. 160.)

These statements explain why, on the day of his papal inauguration, Boniface flaunted his imperial theocracy by having the kings of Hungary and of Sicily hold the reins of his horse throughout the parade route. Similarly, at the dinner reception, while wearing Constantine’s crown that night, Boniface had the same kings serve him his meal.

This imperial usurpation of temporal power by Boniface VIII led to two irreversible consequences. First, the king of France, Philippe IV, le Bel, (1285-1314), immediately replied to *{Unam Sanctam}* by cutting off the French supply of money to Rome. He then sent his legal advisor, Guillaume de Nogaret, to capture Boniface and bring him back to France for a trial by Council. Nogaret joined his forces to those of Sciarra Colonna, nephew and brother of the former cardinals who had been ousted by Boniface. However, the eighty six-year old pope had been saved by the armed town folks, but died 35 days later half mad and nibbling at one of his arms as a dog on a bone. Celestine V had correctly foretold his last days.

Secondly, Philippe le Bel put an end to the Ultramontane Crusades by destroying its infrastructure: the Knights Templars. In doing this, Philippe was putting an end to the hegemony of the Benedictine-Dominican terror operations throughout France, and began to institute the first modern kingdom-state of Europe by establishing a Parliamentary judicial system.(5)

It is important to understand that the Venetian Ultramontane plan was to constantly keep France internally divided, either by using internal religious conflicts or external interventions by the Normans, the Germans, or the English. Consequently, the Ultramontane popes were not very happy with the kings of France ever since Louis IX (Saint Louis), under the guidance of Blanche de Castille, had secured a peace with Henry III of England and had restored Anjou and Normandy to the crown of France. The unity of the French nation had been somewhat reestablished, and Saint Louis's grandson, Philippe le Bel, had further improved on unifying the nation by restoring Champagne, Brie, Franche Comte, la Marche, Angoumois, and Lyon to the crown. Philippe further decreed that the money allocated for crusades would no longer be used for crusades but for the restoration of France. France began to look as a nation, but still had a long way to go. Philippe le Bel reestablished the temporal powers of kings as being "dependent on God alone," and no longer on the papacy. This was also the origin of the French {*Gallican doctrine*} which became the flip side of the {*Ultramontane doctrine*}. (6)

The successful war waged by Philippe IV against the papal imposter was critical and finally put an end to the political Ultramontane papal monarchy by relocating the Holy See in Avignon. For the first time in three hundred years, the Ultramontane political power had been successfully challenged. However, the stay in Avignon, as it turned out, did not improve the papacy. This change merely had the effect of moving the seat of evil into a different place. In 1303, Philippe le Bel had a French pope elected. In 1309, that French pope, Clement V, left Rome to reside in Avignon. During a period of 68 years, from 1309 until 1377, all of the successors of Clement V resided in Avignon. The Ultramontane papacy had been replaced by the {*Whore of Babylon*}. Petrarch described the papal court of Avignon as "{*the shame of mankind, a sink of vice, a sewer where is gathered all of the filth of the world. There God is held in contempt, money alone is worshipped and the laws of God and men are trampled under foot. Everything there breaths a lie: the air, the earth, the houses and above all the bedrooms.*}" [I will report later on the Avignon papacy.]

This Avignon/Gallican interlude led to the {*great schism of the West*} which was to last from 1378 to 1449, that is, 71 years until the Renaissance. It was the Council of Florence of Nicholas of Cusa that ultimately put an end to this 1400 years crisis of the Church at the Council of Florence of 1434. With the seminal work of {*Concordancia Catholica*}, Nicholas of Cusa was not only able to stop the Ultramontane poison from spreading, but was able to restore Christianity to its former ecumenical dignity, and give birth simultaneously to the sovereign nation-state.

11. HOW NICHOLAS OF CUSA BROKE THE ULTRAMONTANE THEOCRACY AND SOLVED THE PARADOX OF THE PEACE OF FAITH.

On the one hand, it was Philippe le Bel who put an end to the strategic danger of Ultramontane crusading by destroying the Order of the Templars. That was necessary,

but that was not enough to completely destroy that enemy. On the other hand, it was Nicholas of Cusa who destroyed the Ultramontane ideology and saved civilization from a new dark age with the Council of Florence. As a secondary effect of accomplishing this extraordinary civilizing task, Cusa also saved the Catholic Church from being swamped by heresy, and established the true ecumenical conciliar authority that a universal Church required and never had before. In explicit opposition to the Ultramontane papacy, Cusa discovered the universal physical principle upon which he could accomplish a triple task.

Firstly, in *{De Pace Fidei}*, Cusa discovered how ecumenicism was able to solve the paradox between different religious faiths; secondly, in *{Concordancia Catholica}* he discovered how to solve the apparent contradiction between the authority of kings and the authority of popes; and thirdly, in *{Learned Ignorance}*, he discovered how to solve the fallacies of a mechanistic objectivist approach to modern science. It was this triple revolution that brought humanity out of the Dark Age of the middle ages and into the modern era.

The manner in which Cusa solved the Ultramontane crisis was itself quite a momentous event. He did not attack the problem head on, but, as Lyn always recommends, he created a flanking maneuver. Knowing that whoever contradicted a papal decision incurred the guilt of heresy; Cusa was not going to take that confrontational road head-on. He knew only too well the words of the Benedictine pope, Paschal II, who had laid down the Ultramontane principle: “*{Whoever does not agree with the Apostolic See is without any doubt a heretic.}*” What Cusa noticed was that this tyrannical view was the same in the Church as in the worst monarchies in history. So, what Cusa did was to increase the power of the pope by increasing the power of his mind. Cusa did not raise the issue of infallibility of the pope because the issue was not infallibility but rather accountability of either pope or king. He flanked the issue by addressing a more profound principle relating to both the ecclesiastic and the secular domains: the issue was oligarchism, otherwise known today in the Spanish Church as Integrism as established by the Carlist Nocedal in the 19th century.

Oligarchism, whether it is expressed in ecclesiastic terms or in secular terms, represents the same problem. Oligarchism is justified by the bestial idea of *{vassality}*, that is, of blind obedience to other-directed authority. In other words, Cusa realized that *{inner-directedness}* had to replace *{other-directedness}*, and this could only be accomplished through the mental exercise of solving paradoxes. So, in the political organizing of his Florence councilor movement, *{vassality}* had to be replaced by a completely new idea of authority, the idea of *{consent}* for the general welfare of the people. Thus, with the discovery of the governing function of inner-directed *{consent}*, Cusa established, for the first time in history, the form of accountability that was required for any form of governing body. This is how Cusa became the precursor of Mazarin, because he put accountability at the service of the *{other}*, and to the extent that the *{other}* was willing to give his consent to someone who was willing to represent him, a truthful process of governing was created.

Look at this historically, and the meaning of Cusa's action becomes clear. Philippe le Bel thought he could break the Ultramontane rule by displacing the papacy to Avignon. That could never work because the oath of obedience or vassality that the bishops owed to the king or to the pope corresponded to the same subjection binding them politically or ecclesiastically. Thus, the oath of the bishops that Philippe le Bel used to exclude the Ultramontane authority from Rome was the same that Innocent III had used to exclude the Hohenstaufen from the throne of the Roman Empire. In fact, the transfer of the papacy to Avignon only aggravated the situation in the Church to the point that it had to lead to a schism, which it did.

On the other hand, Cusa broke away from this bestializing process of oligarchical authority by making the *{advantage of the other}* the very foundation of ecumenicism. The idea is that the foundation of ecumenicism is the principle by which one is willing to sacrifice one's own self-interest for the sake of avoiding a conflict with the other. Thus, ecumenicism became the social form of *{agape}*. This means that ecumenicism does not belong to one religion or another, but is derived from a physical principle of natural law reflecting God's love for all of mankind. So, from that universal standpoint, *{ecumenical consent}* does not have a religious character, as such, but a political character. This is precisely what was lacking in the ecumenical movement of Charlemagne and Haroun Al-Rashid, and that is why it did not succeed.

Ecumenicism is a matter of knowledge and not a matter of religious belief. From the standpoint of Cusa, ecumenicism was the scientific truth of a more advanced society that accepted other peoples, other creeds, and other religions. This is why people who don't understand this scientific fact are Gnostics because they don't believe in knowledge, they simply believe in belief. Paolo Sarpi proved his misunderstanding as soon as he denounced the idea of Cusa's "learned ignorance." Moreover, it was the same principle of the advantage of the other that pope Jean Paul II had embraced, when he took the *{Filioque}* clause out of his own creed during an ecumenical mass held jointly with the Greek Orthodox Prelate a few years ago. If a pope is willing to take out of his own creed the most important feature of his belief, in order not to offend the faith of another religious leader, then that pope is ecumenical.

So, the point that I wish to conclude this report with is that Cusa was able to solve the Ultramontane crisis by developing a completely new conception of lawfulness, which he identified as inner-directed *{consent}*. After a period of no less than about 1600 years of bestial imperial rule over Europe, Cusa's conception of *{consent}* not only became the basis for the conciliar movement, but also became the basis for the creation of sovereign nation-states, including a community of sovereign states, thus eradicating the backward and anti-human idea of empire.

It is important, at this point, to characterize more precisely the difference between *{other-directedness}* and *{inner-directedness}*. *{Other-directedness}* is essentially propitiation of any authority, be it the authority of a lord, of a pope, or even of God himself. To the contrary, *{inner-directedness}* is taking personal responsibility, as for instance the historical figure of Jeanne d'Arc, who acted for the betterment of mankind,

regardless of rank, creed, or religion. By breaking with the monastic Jesuitical type of blind obedience and replacing it by the inner authority of the mind's discovery of principle, Cusa enabled the individual to discover the unity of effect between the sovereignty of the individual and the sovereignty of the nation-state. Thus, the Cusa discovery of the power of *{consent}* was the discovery of a Promethean individual who had discovered his own mind's ability to make discoveries of principle in science, art, and statecraft, by fundamentally resolving the ontological paradox of the One and the Many. Such was the discovery of the *{concordance principle.}*

The explicit opposition of Cusa to other-directed blind obedience implies that the individual's relationship to God and the universe is based on his discoveries of universal physical principles within himself and the universe, thus, leading to a Promethean individual becoming a true citizen of a sovereign nation-state. In *{Learned Ignorance}*, Cusa designed his pedagogy specifically to enable individuals of whatever rank in society to discover those mental powers within him, thus fundamentally proving that the individual is not an animal but is created in the image of God. It is that knowledge of man created in the image of God that delivered the deathblow to Ultramontane oligarchism and sets the stage for republicanism as the only form of government of, by, and for sovereign individuals. It is in this light that Christopher Columbus's discovery of America based on the Cusa group of mapmakers must be understood.

The point is that *{consent}* among responsible representatives of a governing body is the solution to the sovereign government of the nation-state as well as to the sovereign governing of a church. The characteristic, which must dominate both institutions, is required to be ecumenical because the characteristic of a universal religion and of a community of nations must embody the acceptance and defense of other faiths and of other national economies based on what they require for their maximum development. Unless maximum development of mankind becomes the driver, the crisis that needs to be resolved will not be resolved.

Strictly speaking, the Ultramontane papacy represented the exact opposite of the ecumenical characteristic of what a universal religion should be, because it precluded a true development of mankind. The very fact that Ultramontanism represented the all-exclusive authority of an all-exclusive faith precluded even the possibility of a dialogue between religions and cultures, and became an open invitation to conflict. Therefore, the very idea of a pope's fanatical defense on one's own faith against all other faiths was the same as Thomas Hobbes "war of each against all," and that pope became an easy prey for the Venetian overlords to manipulate and control. That was the side-door that Satan used to enter into the papacy. Thus, those who believed without actual knowledge became the puppets of religious warfare. This was the deadlock that Cusa's ecumenical Council of Florence had broken.

Furthermore, if fear of moral constraint and intimidation, corruption, propitiation, etc., dominate a council, in favor of a pope, then there is no longer a council, and the result is a complete loss of freedom and of sovereign judgment on the part of every participant, including the pope. So, the Council of Florence was successful because it

rejected the idea that rebel bishops were heretics, especially those of other faiths, who dared express opposing views. The necessity of resolving opposing views, not by choosing one member of the contraries as Aquinas did, but by solving paradoxes like Augustine did, became the very nourishments of the ecumenical debates of Cusa, just as in the time of Charlemagne and Harun Al-Rashid when disputes were organized between Jews, Muslims, and Christians. Only under such Augustinian dialogues and debates can mistakes and anomalies become the basis for further development and perfectibility of mankind and its institutions.

In Chapter VIII of his (*Concordancia Catholica*), Cusa used the authority of the councils explicitly based on {*consent*}. In doing so, Cusa was flanking the authority of the Decretals of popes of the preceding five centuries. He stated:

“{THE AUTHORITY OF COUNCILS DOES NOT DEPEND ON ITS HEAD BUT ON THE COMMON CONSENT OF ALL. IT IS DECLARED THAT THE MANY SIGNATURES TO THE ACTS OF THE COUNCIL PROVE THAT THE POPE DEFINES AND LEGISLATES ON THE BASIS OF CONSENT [OF THE OTHERS] NOT MERELY OF THEIR ADVICE. ALL THE BISHOPS ARE JUDGES AND AUTHORS OF CONCILIAR DEFINITIONS AND LEGISLATIONS, AND THEIR SIGNATURES SHOULD STRENGTHEN AND CONFIRM THE ACTS OF THE COUNCILS. (Capitalized in the original)} (Nicholas of Cusa, {*The Catholic Concordance*}, edited and translated by Paul E. Sigmund, Cambridge University Press, 1995, p. 76.)

From Chapters VIII to XII of {*Concordancia Catholica*}, Cusa argued in favor of the fact that the way to solve the ontological paradox of the One and the Many, that the Church found itself boxed in during previous centuries of the Ultramontane papal authority, was to have the authority of the Church be decided on the basis of the unity of consent among the many. This is not {*consensus*}, as the Jesuits would have it, but “{*assenting*}, {*consenting*}, {*decreeing*}, or {*defining*}” as determined by the authority of {*concordance of the council*}. Thus, in Book II, para. 100, Cusa established:

“{From this it follows that the signatures cited above prove that the force of canons adopted in council is derived not from the pope nor from the head of the council but only from a single concordant consent. The Nicene Council directed that heretics who returned to the faith should profess those decrees that had been adopted by common consent and no others see [C.] I q. 7 [c.8] {*Si qui voluerint*}. And if sometimes it is found that the pope decreed something ‘with the advice’ of the council [this usage never appears, however, in the ancient councils], this is to be understood as advice which was also an approval which is equivalent to consent.} (Cusa, Op. Cit., p. 79.)

Here, Cusa is very conscious that he is establishing the authority of the pope based on increasing his power by acquiring the consent of the council, and he makes the case very clear that any pope who wishes to enter a decision in the canons of the church would have a greater unity of effect by seeking the advise of the council. This is in total opposition to what pope Gregory VII had established in his outrageous Decretals. Also

Cusa made the case of previous consent to the authority of other councils, and emphasized that this was where the true power of popes resided. It is the council that has the **{power of binding and loosing}** as opposed to what Aquinas had stated above. In Book II, para. 101, Cusa wrote:

{It has been demonstrated above that the council derives its authority from the power of binding and loosing given to the church and to the priesthood by Christ... From this it is evident that since a council is established by consent, because where there is dissent there is no council, see D. 15 [c.1] {Canones para Synodus}, no more basic foundation for the canons can be discovered than that of concordance. For church canons can only be adopted by the church gathering called a synod or meeting. And therefore if anyone whether he be pope or patriarch, promulgates decrees that are not in accordance with the church canons, those statutes cannot be called canons or church laws and they have no special binding power whatsoever except to the extent that they are confirmed by acceptance and use or consent or they agree with the canons.}” (Op. Cit., p. 81)

Furthermore, in Book II, para. 102, Cusa made sure that the authority of **{consent}** in the church council was also valid for civil government. And so, he declared:

“{I do not wish to deny that by the authority and power of God who commanded us to obey those set over us and to be subject to kings, rulers have the power to legislate and command in accordance with the responsibility entrusted to them. But I say that the obligatory force of the statutes also requires consent through use and acceptance.}” (Op. Cit., p. 81)

In other words, with these few wise strokes of the pen, Cusa made the forged decretals of Ultramontane popes retroactively null and void, demonstrating that the rule of **{consent}** in council, or in congress, had to become the basis of the authority of any governing body, be they Church Councils or nation-state governments. The authority no longer existed in a One without the concordance with the Many. This became the first expression of representative government in which the many were able to consent to delegate their power to a representative who would speak for them, and in their name, as opposed to his own, as in the advantage of the other. Thus, the sovereign self-representative government was born and its representatives became such by becoming elected by the consent of the people through the peers. This is how Louis XI of France, for example, established in his **{Rosier de Guerre}** the rule whereby the king was to be elected by his peers, and therefore he founded and presided over the first elected nation-state in the world.

12. THE RETURN OF THE ULTRAMONTANE IMPERIAL MONARCHY TODAY: THE CURRENT AMERICAN TFP OLIGARCHY (7)

This report did not intend to go through the entire history of the papacy and identify who was an ultramontane and who was not. The intention was merely to identify the characteristic of the beast, to recognize that the animal is still alive inside of the Catholic Church today, and that it is forcefully attempting to reinstitute the crusades, especially in and around the present Bush-Cheney administration in the United States.

In this respect, I want reference a book that Tony Chaitkin brought to my attention, *{NOBILITY and Analogous Traditional Elites in the Allocutions of Pius XII: a Theme Illuminating American Social History}*, by the Brazilian oligarch, Plinio Correa de Oliveira, which was published by the American Tradition Family and Property (TFP). Tony wrote two short reports which can be found in [A6456AHC001] and [A6464AHC002]. What I wish to add is that the goal of this resurgence of nobility in the United States is to rally the American population behind a one-world synarchist empire of secular and ecclesiastical monarchies based on the Ultramontane imperial monarchical model of the Catholic Church that I have outlined above.

This is a very revealing book because it shows that the oligarchical principle upon which the Portugese-American Catholic cult of *{Tradition, Family, and Property (TFP)}*, which should be rather called *{Time For Pestilence (TFP)}*, run by Raymond E. Drake of New York, has been active in the U.S. since the 1970's, and that American sycophants of European nobility, such as Morton C. Blackwell, president of the Leadership Institute and the Republican National Committeeman of Virginia and former Republican Youth coordinator for the Reagan administration, have been very active in attempting to restore its Ultramontane ideology in the United States along the lines of a crusade theology of Thomas Aquinas and Bernard de Clairvaux. The undeclared immediate objective of this TFP subversive operation is to recruit the Catholics, Episcopalians, and Southern Baptist leadership of the United States into creating an American ruling aristocracy centered on the Biltmore Estate in Ashville, North Carolina, run by the Duchy of Marlborough, that is, centered on the American continuation of the ridiculous Cecil and Churchillian bloodlines.

I will cite a few quotes, which I find relevant for this present report on Ultramontanism. The entire last section of Oliveira's book includes a dozen or so *{Allocutions of Pius XII}*, a series of oligarchical justifications for *{Social Inequalities}*, and an apologetic series of arguments justifying *{The Lawfulness of War}*. The book confirms with extensive documentation, that the last Ultramontane Pope of modern times was the World War II Nazi compromiser, pope Pius XII, who, by affiliating himself with the old black Guelph remnants of the Italian oligarchy, rejected the ecumenical doctrine of the Church.



Courtesy of Giulio Patrizi di Ripacandida

"You, the guard of Our person, constitute Our armor, refulgent with that nobility which is the privilege of blood and which shone in you as the pledge of your devotion even before your admission into the Corps."

(Words of Pius XII to his Noble Guard)

Above: Christmas 1945. The Pontifical Noble Guard pays homage to the Pope. From left to right: unidentified, Marquis Francesco Theodoli, Prince Giulio Pacelli (the Pope's nephew), noblemen Agostino Sacconi and Angelo Antonucci Lucidi, Count Federico Moroni, and nobleman Fabio Petrucci. Behind the Pope is Prince Francesco Chigi della Rovere, Commandant of the Corps.

Right: Giulio Patrizi di Ripacandida, Duke of Castelgaragnone.



Courtesy of Giulio Patrizi di Ripacandida

Figure 1. [Pius XII and his Noble Guards. This post World War II blessing of modern day knights by Pius XII reflected a definite intention to have his papacy return to the Ultramontane policy of the Crusades.]

Allocution of Pius XII to the Roman Patriciate and Nobility, January 8, 1940.

“{...*The history of centuries past rings in such esteem. Among those presently gathered round Us, more than a few bare names that for centuries have been intertwined with the history of Rome and the Papacy, in days of light and of darkness, in joy and in sorrow, in glory and in humiliation, sustained by that intimate sentiment arising from the depths of a faith inherited with the blood of their ancestors, surviving all trials and storms, and always ready, in its passing deviations, to take the path back to the house of the Father. The splendor and greatness of the Eternal City reflects and refracts its rays over the families of the Roman Patriciate and Nobility. The names of your forebears are indelibly etched in the annals of a history whose events have in many respects played a great part in the origins and development of so many peoples of today’s civilized world. If indeed one cannot write the secular history of many nations and kingdoms and imperial crowns without mentioning Rome and her noble families, the names of the Roman Patriciate and Nobility recur even more often in the history of the Church of Christ, which rises to an even loftier greatness, surpassing every natural and political glory, in its visible Head, which, by the benign disposition of Providence, has his See on the banks of the Tiber...*}” (Oliveira, Op. Cit., p. 431.)

THE TFP CALL FOR A NEW CRUSADE

According to Oliveira, in 1956, during the reign of Pius XII, Msgr. Rosalio Castillo Lara wrote a voluminous study on the Roman Catholic Church’s contribution to the Holy Roman Empire, and especially on the Church {*Right and Power to Convoke and Lead a Crusade.*} To my knowledge, no pope ever denounced this book since Pius XII authorized it. In his book, Lara stated: “{*All the authors are in agreement in conceding to the Church a right to the {vis armata virtual}, without which any material coercion would be useless. This consists in the power to demand, under authority, that the State provide the service of its armed forces for purely ecclesiastical ends. This is commonly understood as invoking the help of the secular arm.*}” (Msgr. Rosalio Castillo Lara, {*Coaccion Ecclesiastica Sacro Romano Imperio*}, (Turin: 1956), p. 69.) There is, I believe, a version of this book translated into Spanish.

Bishop Lara, who became Cardinal soon after this extraordinary contribution, introduced this call for a new Crusade, using all of the spurious Medieval Decretals as authoritative, and most emphatically flaunted the Bulls of Innocent III, which had placed the Catholic obligation to participate in a crusade on the oligarchical principle of {*vassalage*} that linked the Catholic aristocracy to its King, Jesus Christ. The implications are considerable, especially when the principle of the secular {*oligarchical hierarchy*} becomes officially identified with the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the Catholic Church, under the spurious pretense that Jesus, himself, came from a noble family. Oliveira’s purpose in quoting Lara extensively is aimed precisely at confirming this identification. Of particular significance is the following ultra-feudalistic letter of Innocent III to Philippe Auguste, king of France and that all TFP sycophants swear by. This is the basis of the cult known as {*Christ the King*}.

“{Just as it would be a crime of lese-majeste for a vassal to fail to assist his lord, were the lord expelled from his land and perhaps held captive, in a similar way, Jesus Christ, King of Kings and Lord of Lords... would condemn you for the sin of ingratitude and as a culprit of infidelity if, He being expelled from the land that He bought at the price of His Blood and retained as a slave by the Saracens on the salutary wood of the cross, you neglected to come to His aid.} (Plinio Correa de Oliveira, *{NOBILITY, and Analogous Traditional Elites in the Allocutions of Pius XII, a Theme Illuminating American Social History}*, Hamilton Press, 1993, p. 517.)

Though this argument did not succeed in rallying Philippe Auguste for the crusade, nor will it go very far in convincing American Catholics to adopt the sophistry of feudal nobility and aristocracy, it did, however, convince a number of oligarchical-minded Catholic neo-cons like William Buckley in the United States to launch a crusade against Iraq. Furthermore, Oliveira justified his new crusade based on the Thomas Aquinas doctrine of war.

“Doctrine of Thomas Aquinas on War.”

“{1. When the war is brought on by simple individuals or through some secondary authority... but always through the authority that exercises the highest power in the State;

{2. When the war is motivated by a just cause; that is to say, when the adversary is fought because of a proportionate offense that he really committed...}

{3. When the war is conducted with a right intention; that is to say, in faithfully making every effort to promote good and to avoid evil in all ways possible...}” (Quoted from Yves de la Briere *{Dictionnaire Apologetique de la Foi Catholique}*, entry “Paix et Guerre”, Gabriel Beauchesne Editeur, Paris, 1926.)

Oliveira further justified the new crusade by drawing on the inspiration of the founder of the Templars, Bernard de Clairvaux.

“To Die or to Kill for Christ Is not Criminal, but Glorious”

“{But in truth the knights of Christ fight the battles of their lord with all tranquility of conscience, fearing neither sin by the death of their enemies nor the danger of their own death, because death inflicted or suffered for Christ’s sake bears no trace of crime and often brings the merit of glory. In the former case, there is a gain for Christ; in the latter, Christ is gained. Who doubtless both willingly accepts the death of an enemy for punishment and more willingly offers Himself to the soldiers for consolation. The knight of Christ, I say, kills with tranquil conscience and dies even more tranquilly.}” (In Oliveira, Op. Cit., p.514.)

One last irony can be found in the TFP propaganda book of Oliveira flaunting the modern day return of the Italian Ultramontane crusaders. **Figure 1 [Pius XII and his Noble Guards]** shows not only the 1945-generation of the Black Guelph-Ultramontane Italian princely oligarchy kneeling before the pope to get his blessing, but Commandant of this modern-day Noble Guard Corp, standing behind Pius XII, is none other than prince Francesco Chigi Della Rovere, representing the very same oligarchs that Raphael had identified as the Ultramontane family dominating the dark side of the *{Dispute of the Holy Sacrament}*.

In conclusion, there is a proportional optical measure to be tested in order to validate what I have said respecting the differences between the Ultramontane Gnostic disease and the Catholic Church. Let us remember that the Vatican has been, throughout history, a choice residence for hiding the presence of Satan. And let us not forget, either, that what the papacy represents is both a Church and a political organization. The Vatican may well appear to be an insignificant little State with colorful diplomatic representatives, but it also represents, as a universal religious organization, a world power which has had, built into its foundation, from its very beginnings, two clearly opposed epistemological orientations that five hundred years ago, the genial Raphael Sanzio represented in the simultaneity of eternity of his poetic principle; that is, the *{Dispute of the Holy Sacrament}* and the *{School of Athens}*. When viewed stereographically together as a single *{solid thought object}*, a Riemannian *{Geistesmassen}*, the Aristotelian and the Platonic factions in the School of Athens, on one side of the Stanza della Segnatura, and their corresponding Gnostics and Catholics in the Dispute, on the opposite wall of the same room, those two irreconcilable factions become a unique reminder that the quiescent incenses of their cloistered battles have constantly permeated the souls of men and the walls of history with completely different odors of sanctity for two millennia, and will likely continue to do so for centuries to come. However, we must be thankful that since pope John XXIII, the papacy has essentially been Platonic, that is, Catholic in character.

FIN OF PART II

FOOTNOTES OF PARTS I AND II

(1) The following statement by Aquinas on *{Whether it was fitting that God should be made flesh}* is a good example of how he was incapable of understanding the paradox of Adams original sin and its blessed consequence, that is, the paradox of *{Felix Culpa!}*. Though Aquinas ultimately redeemed himself by referring the matter to St. Augustine, his Gnostic rationalization shows the limit of Aristotelian logic and how the paradox of the Trinity cannot truthfully be subsumed by it.

{Article I. {Whether it was fitting that God should be made flesh}}

...I {reply} that what is fitting to any given thing is that which belongs to it in accordance with the principle of its own nature; thus it befits man to reason inasmuch as man is rational by nature. Now the nature of God is the essence of goodness... and hence whatever pertains to the principle of the good befits God. It pertains to the principle of the good that it should communicate itself to others... Hence it pertains to the principle of the highest good that it should communicate itself to creation in the highest way; and this communication reaches its highest when 'he so joins created nature to himself that one person comes into being from three constituents, the Word, the Spirit, and the flesh' (Augustine, {De Trinitate}, xiii. 17.). Hence it is manifest that it was fitting that God should be made flesh... } (Quoted from {Documents of the Christian Church} Selected and edited by Henry Bettenson, Second Edition, London, Oxford University Press, 1963, p. 398.)

(2) The following is a section of the Jesuit rule of obedience. This represents for the Knight-Monk Orders of religious warfare, the most important rule of all. Note how the emphasis on {*other-directedness*} is being stressed with complete and explicit rejection of {*inner-directedness*}. This is the pure slave-like obedience principle of breeding animals pertaining to the hierarchy of oligarchical rule. Useless to say that this is also the traditional method applied for breaking horses.

OBEDIANCE OF THE JESUITS. Const. Vi. I [Institutum I, 407 f.]: Mirbt, 431.

“{Let us with the utmost pains strain every nerve of our strength to exhibit this virtue of obedience, firstly to the Highest Pontiff, then to the Superior of the Society; so that in all things, to which obedience can be extended with charity, we may be most ready to obey his voice, just as if it issued from Christ our Lord ..., leaving any work, even a letter, that we have begun and have not yet finished; by directing to this goal all our strength and intention in the Lord, that holy obedience may be made perfect in us in every respect, in performance, in will, in intellect; by submitting to whatever may be enjoined on us with great readiness, with spiritual joy and perseverance; by persuading ourselves that all things [commanded] are just; by rejecting with a kind of blind obedience all opposing opinion or judgment of our own; and that in all things which are ordained by the Superior where it cannot be clearly held [definiri] that any kind of sin intervenes. And let each one persuade himself that they that live under obedience ought to allow themselves to be borne and rule by divine providence working through their Superiors exactly as if they were a corpse which suffers itself to be borne and handled in any way whatsoever; or just as an old man’s stick which serves him to hold it in his hand wherever and for whatever purpose he wish to use it...}” (Documents of the Christian Church} Selected and edited by Henry Bettenson, Second Edition, London, Oxford University Press, 1963, p. 367.)

Why should obedience be such a {*strain*} on people who join the Society of Jesus unless it were forced on them by some tyrannical measure? Why should such a dire-warning be made so explicit unless, by its very institution, it meant that people entering the Society of Jesus accepted to sacrifice their identity to a master-slave relationship? Contrary to the Jesuit approach, the solution to this {*paradox of obedience*}, especially

as it is expressed in the context of obedience to Jewish Law, has been disputed and resolved very nicely during the first half of the 12th century by the founder of the University of Paris, Pierre Abelard (1079-1142), in his *{Dialogue between a Philosopher, a Jew, and a Christian}*. In Sections 28 to 32 of his dialogue, Abelard showed how universal law must be dealt with not from the vantage point of *{other-directedness}*, but from the standpoint of its intention of becoming self-confident in understanding the necessity of the law by *{inner-directedness}*. Contrary to the Aristotelian Jesuit logic, Abelard showed how to resolve this case known as the paradox of freedom and necessity.

(3) It was a sad day when Pope Leo XIII crowned Thomas Aquinas the official theologian of the Catholic Church. Although Leo XIII had proposed useful labor reforms in basic economics for the poor, as formulated in his encyclical *{Rerum Novarum}*, he was, as the son of Count Ludovico Pecci, a strong defender of the aristocracy and a staunch advocate of temporal power of the Holy See. On August 4, 1879, Leo XIII issued a proclamation entitled *{On the restoration of Christian Philosophy, Aeterna Patris}*, in which he stated: “*{We exhort you venerable brethren, in all earnestness to restore the golden wisdom of Saint Thomas, and to spread it far and wide for the defense and beauty of the Catholic faith... Let carefully selected teachers endeavor to implant the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas in the minds of the students...}*”

Leo XIII looked at Thomas Aquinas as the aristocrat of Catholic theology and had planned to create a Thomas Aquinas Academy as early as 1858, when he was bishop of Perugia. Leo’s restoration of Thomas Aquinas was also endorsed enthusiastically by his follower and successor, the Ultramontane Integrist pope Pius X, who made the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas the exclusive dogmatic philosophy of the Catholic Church. Those two popes were very close allies in their Ultramontane outlook. It was Leo XIII who, in 1893, had made bishop Sarto, the future Pius X, a cardinal in a secret consistory and a few days later made him the new Patriarch of Venice. This move was made to upset the authority of the newly unified Republic of Italy, and had the effect of stirring up the old Hildebrand-Gregory VII prerogatives over the Emperor of Germany.

Moreover, it is interesting to note that the conclave, which voted Cardinal Sarto as pope Pius X, in 1903, was a complete farce. There were three candidates to the papacy and on the first vote of the conclave, cardinal Rampolla got 25 votes, cardinal Gotti got 17 votes, and cardinal Sarto got 5 votes. However, after it was announced that the Emperor of Austria, Francis Joseph, had used his veto against Rampolla, the last vote was Rampolla 10, Gotti 2, and Sarto 50. I wonder what happened in the meantime? Thus, cardinal Sarto was elected Pius X through political machinations and thanks to the imperial veto.

The first two things that Pius X did, as soon as he became pope, were to restore Gregorian chant and confirm the rehabilitation of Thomas Aquinas. As early as 1903, the Catholic youth was being theologically prepared for a new anti-communist crusade. On the subject of Aquinas, Pius X wrote:

*“{So far as studies are concerned, it is Our will, and We hereby explicitly ordain that the Scholastic philosophy be considered as the basis for sacred studies... We have in mind particularly the philosophy which has been transmitted to us by Saint Thomas Aquinas... We renew and confirm them [all the enactments of Our Predecessor Leo XIII] and order them to be strictly observed by all concerned. Let Bishops urge and compel their observance in future...The same injunction applies also to Superiors of Religious Orders...The principles of philosophy laid down by Saint Thomas Aquinas are to be religiously and inviolably observed...The capital thesis in the philosophy of St. Thomas are not to be placed in the category of opinions capable of being debated one way or another, but are to be considered as the foundation upon which the whole science of natural law and divine things are based...}” (Pius X, {*Doctoris Angelici*}, June 29, 1914.) All of the {*Sedes Sapientiae*} philosophy faculties of the world have been based on the teachings of Aquinas Scholasticism ever since.*

(4) The following correspondence extracts are samples of the dispute between Frederick II and pope Innocent IV.

{Sentence of Deposition, Council of Lyons, June 1245}

He has committed four very grave offences, which cannot be covered up by any subterfuge...he has abjured God on many occasions; he has wantonly broken the peace which had been established between the Church and the Empire; he has also committed sacrilege by causing to be imprisoned the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, and the prelates and clerics...coming to the council which our predecessor had summoned; he is also accused of heresy...

We therefore, who are the vicar...show and declare on account of the above-mentioned shameful crimes and many others...that the aforesaid prince...is bound by his sins and cast out and deprived of all honor.... We absolve forever all who owe him allegiance in virtue of an oath of fealty.... Whoever shall in future afford him advice, help or goodwill as if he were Emperor or king, shall fall "ipso facto" under the binding force of excommunication.

Letter of Frederick to the kings of Christendom, 1246

The ancients called happy those who learned caution from the danger of others...as wax receives its impression from a seal, so the character of human life is shaped by example. ... those who are considered clerics, grown fat on the alms of princes, now oppress princes' sons.... What is implied by our maltreatment is made plain by the presumption of Pope Innocent IV for, having summoned a council--he has declared to pronounce a sentence of deposition against us who were neither summoned nor proved guilty of any deceit or wickedness, which sentence he could not enact without grievous prejudice to all

kings. You and all kings of particular regions have everything to fear from the effrontery of such a prince of priests when he sets out to depose us who have been divinely honored by the imperial diadem and solemnly elected by the princes with the approval of the whole church at a time when faith and religion were flourishing....

Encyclical letter Eger cui levia, c. 1246

If then Frederick, formerly Emperor, strives to accuse with noisy widespread complaints the sacred judge of the universal church through whom he was declared cast down by God so that he might no longer rule or reign, it ought not to seem anything new or marvelous, for he is behaving in the same fashion as others in like case.... } [“Source. Hanover College Texts Site [part of a larger document]. This text is part of the {*Internet Medieval Source Book*}.“]

(5) Created by the Cistercian, Bernard de Clairvaux, the Order of the Templars was the central banking operation for the crusades and represented the privatized permanent army of the papacy. The Templars were both warriors and monks, Knight-Monks who had been ostensibly established to protect the pilgrims going to Jerusalem, during the first crusade of 1096. They were, along with the Order of Saint John and Jerusalem, a one world supranational corporation, and a militarized version of today’s Halliburton deployment in Iraq, with the additional feature of “special forces.” When Philip le Bel decided to bust up the Templars, he first went after their financial operations, seized their assets, and used their funds to consolidate the kingdom of France. The Templars were disbanded on Friday 13, 1307 by the first Avignon pope, Clement V. This began the Satanic tradition of the unlucky Friday the 13th.

Later, Philippe le Bel created the emergency system of the Three Orders known as the Clergy, the Nobility, and the Third Estates, as a sort of crisis management institution that would be called upon by the king in case of national emergency. It was last called upon by Louis XVI at the beginning of the French Revolution and was transformed into the French National Assembly by Jean-Sylvain Bailly and Lafayette at the Tennis Court Oath of 1789.

(6) During the second half of the 17th century, Louis XIV entered into a conflict with pope Innocent XI over the nomination of French Bishops. The pope refused to accept the French king’s appointments and declared them invalid. As a result, a General Assembly of the French Bishops was held in 1681 to support the king’s right of nomination. In 1682, bishop Bossuet drew up the following {*Gallican Declaration*} for the French clergy. Pope Alexander VIII condemned the declaration in 1690, and Louis XIV was forced to retract it in 1693. A century later, in 1786, the bishop of Pistoia, Ricci, argued in favor of the same articles of the {*Gallican Declaration*} and was forced to resign under the accusation of being a Jansenist.

The Gallican Declaration, 1692. Reddaway, {Select Documents}, p. 155. Mirbt, 535.

{Many people are striving to overthrow the decrees of the Gallican Church ... and to destroy the foundations of its liberties, which are based on the sacred canons and on the tradition of the Fathers; others, under the pretext of defending them, have the audacity to attack the supremacy of Saint Peter and his successors, the Popes of Rome ... The heretics, for their part, are doing their utmost to make this power, which keeps the peace of the Church, intolerable to kings and peoples...}

Wishing to remedy this state of affair...

Article I ... We declare that Kings and Sovereigns are not, by God's command, subject to any ecclesiastical power in temporal matters; that they cannot be deposed, directly or indirectly, by the authority of the heads of the Church; that their subjects cannot be dispensed from obedience, not absolved from the oath of allegiance ...

Article II [The plenitude of power in spiritual matters possessed by St. Peter and his successors, none the less remains, as laid down by the decrees of the Council of Constance.]

Article III. Thus the use of the apostolic power must be regulated, by following the canons made by the Holy Spirit and sanctified by universal reverence. , The rules, customs, and constitutions accepted in the realm and Church of France, must have their strength and virtue ... since the greatness of the Holy See requires that the laws and customs established with its consent and that of the Churches remain invariable.

Article IV. Although the Pope has the chief voice in the questions of faith, and his decrees apply to all churches and to each particular church, yet the decision is not unalterable unless the consent of the Church is given.

Article V. [These maxims sent to all the French Bishops that they may be unanimous.]} (Quoted from {Documents of the Christian Church} Selected and edited by Henry Bettenson, Second Edition, London, Oxford University Press, 1963, p. 380.)

The Gallican Bossuet raised an interesting question about the Ultramontane papacy: “*{To what purpose were so many councils held in the Church, with so much trouble and expense, if the infallible Popes could have finally settled every doctrinal controversy by a single utterance of their own?}*” Eighty years later, Joseph de Maistre answered back by saying: “*{Do not ask these questions to Popes who never imagined they required ecumenical councils in order to repress (the heretics of Arius, etc.). Ask the question to emperors who absolutely wanted to have councils, who have convoked them, who have demanded the agreements of Popes, who have uselessly instigated all of this chaos within the Church.}*” (Quoted by Janus, Op. Cit., p. 344.) This reply represents Joseph de Maistre’s pledge of allegiance to Ultramontanism. Indeed, this dialogue shows how Gallicanism and Ultramontanism had their horns locked over the fallacy of papal infallibility. As we shall see with Nicholas of Cusa, the issue is not the

opposing authorities of the council versus the pope, but rather the power of **{consent}** in a representative government.

(7) The last important resurgence of Ultramontanism before the twentieth century occurred with the writing of the **{Civilta Cattolica Syllabus}** by the Society of Jesus in 1869, which went as far as denouncing the Austrian Constitution of 1868. Johann Joseph Ignaz von Dollinger reported the following pronouncement by the Jesuits on June 22, 1868:

“{By our apostolic authority we reject and condemn the above mentioned (New Austrian) laws in general, and in particular all that has been ordered, done, or enacted in these and in other things against the rights of the Church by the Austrian Government or its subordinates; by the same authority we declare these laws and their consequences to have been, and to be for the future, null and void (nulliusque roboris fuisse ac fore). We exhort and adjure their authors, especially those who call themselves Catholics, and all who have dared to propose, to accept, to approve, and to execute them, to remember the censures and spiritual penalties incurred, {ipso facto}, according to the apostolical constitution and decrees of the Oecumenical Councils, by those who violate the rights of the Church.}” (Janus, Op. Cit., p. 24.)

By this declaration, the Jesuits representing pope Pius IX essentially declared null and void the entire Constitutional framework of the Austrian Empire and placed it under ban, with emperor Joseph at its head. Thus, in 1868, **{Civilta Cattolica}** had reinstated the spirit of the Middle Ages and was restoring the Ultramontane rule whereby Catholics no longer lived under the constitutional law of their nations but under the Ultramontane Law of the Church of Rome.

In his Bull of November 20th, 1648, pope Innocent X condemned in the same manner the Peace of Westphalia as **“{null and void, and of having no effect or authority for past, present, or future.}”** (*Zelus Domus Dei.*) That Gnostic pope added that regardless of the fact that the Catholics had sworn to observe the Peace, they were not bound to keep the oath. It was especially the principle of the **{Advantage of the other}**, that is, the principle of giving the advantage to the Protestant faith that infuriated the pope. In 1789, Pius VI also declared the continuation of exclusion pronounced by Innocent X against the Peace of Westphalia, in full agreement with Robespierre, Marat, and Danton. Similarly, in 1805, Pius VII wrote to his Nuncio in Venice that the Church did not recognize the Peace of Westphalia [*Pacem Westphalicam Ecclesia numquam provabit*] and made a public call to restore the punishments imposed by the feudal Innocent III against heresy.
