

The Roman Catholic Church has taken a Sinister Step toward One World Government and a One World Religion

by Jeremy James



Roman Catholic bishops with high-ranking members of the sadistic Ustashe regime at an official ceremony in Croatia, 1941

Vatican-watchers have known for some time that Rome is working to substantially enhance its grip over world events and establish a global dominion, whether outright or in partnership with other players in the intercontinental power game. Until now its aims and ambitions have been couched in vague terms and Vatican-speak. However, to the average Roman Catholic the social and political philosophy of the Vatican seems nothing more than a curious mixture of benevolent aspirations and woolly theology, with no tangible implications for the real world. By and large he does not see it as a major participant in the global power game or a potential threat to democracy and freedom. After all, who can dispute its constant reference to the need to promote the “common good” and a better world for all?

Many fine books deal with the true global ambitions of the Roman Catholic Church and, more specifically, the powerful elite who are using it for their own purposes. Some of them also highlight the patently Marxist principles which underpin its socio-economic agenda. For example, *Ecclesiastical Megalomania* (1999) by John Robbins is essential reading for any Roman Catholic who is truly concerned about the very disturbing direction that his church is taking.

Background to World Domination

The Roman Catholic Church has long claimed the right to rule the world. For example, as early as 1493, Pope Alexander VI decreed that the world should be divided into two zones, one dominated by Catholic Spain and the other by Catholic Portugal. Millions of innocent people were murdered or enslaved on foot of this decree. Through the devious and deceitful machinations of the Jesuit Order the Roman Catholic Church has intrigued in countless ways to destabilize sovereign states and overthrow legitimate governments. The Jesuits organized the Counter-Reformation with a view to destroying all trace of true Biblical Christianity in Europe. This led to the Thirty Years War, in which Germany was torn apart and millions of innocent civilians murdered with great viciousness and cruelty.

Nevertheless, through providential intervention at crucial stages, Protestantism managed to survive and the war ended with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. Though largely forgotten in our modern world, the Peace of Westphalia assumed a new significance with the publication on October 24th, 2011, of an official Vatican paper entitled *Towards Reforming the International Financial and Monetary Systems in the Context of Global Public Authority* (which we will discuss shortly) [A copy of the Vatican paper may be found in **Appendix A**].

By recognising the principle of independent sovereign states the Peace of Westphalia allowed Protestantism to continue unmolested in selected parts of Europe. There is no doubt Rome despised this outcome and has long sought to reverse it. To that extent, the Counter-Reformation has never ended and continues to this day, albeit in a heavily disguised form. The aim is still the same however, namely to destroy true Biblical Christianity and replace it in all corners of the world with the corrupt manmade version concocted by the elite group of families that have controlled Rome for generations.

Papal Families

Over a period of 600 years or thereabouts, the Pope was selected from just 11 families – Orsini, Borgia, Piccolomini, De Medici, Colonna, Farnese, Caetani, Borghese, Barberini, Aldobrandi and Sforza. The first four held the papacy on no fewer than 9 occasions. The historian George L Williams has done some excellent work in establishing the overwhelming role that genealogy and dynastic succession has played in deciding the papacy. In *Papal Genealogy: The Families and Descendants of the Popes* (1997), he makes the following insightful observations [p.160]:

“The families of papal princes tended to intermarry with other titled papal families, and intermarriages between members of these families are still taking place in the twentieth century. While the popes during the Renaissance and Baroque periods advanced their families by officially presenting them with territories, titles and payments, their descendants often married into the old papal families as the Colonna, Orsini, Sforza-Conti-Cesarini (heirs of the Conti) and Caetani. But since the seventeenth century, the families of the Baroque popes (i.e. the Boncompagni, Ludovisi, Chigi, Albani, Altieri, Borghese, Aldobrandini, Ottoboni, Barberini, Pamphili, Rospigliosi, Odescalchi and Corsini) have been more inclined to intermarry with each other...”

Much the same system of patronage and nepotism operated in other powerful Italian city states. For example, Venice was one of the most influential political entities in the world for several centuries. However, the ruling class in that great city state comprised just a small group of families. Each family took a turn at the top – filling the life-long position of *Doge* – while continuing to ensure that most of the policies pursued were of benefit to the group as a whole. The success of this strategy is borne out by the longevity of this small state. In an age when formidable empires rose and fell, it survived and prospered from around 700 AD to 1798 AD, when it was finally overcome by Napoleon.

In the period 1190-1730, Venice had a total of 73 *Doges*, of which 36 came from just 9 families – Contarini, Mocenigo, Dandolo, Cornaro, Gradenigo, Priuli, Morosini, Donato and Venier. It was always in the interest of these leading families, as well as those with whom they intermarried, to support and defend the system. No one family dominated and yet the ruling elite kept everyone else in check. They could be ruthless in their treatment of outsiders, confident in the knowledge that the same methods would not be used against themselves. The city of Genoa used a similar system but it was less effective since a smaller number of families was allowed to dominate. For example in the period 1339-1527 the office of *Doge*, which changed 42 times, was secured on no fewer than 29 occasions by just 2 families, Adorno and Fregoso.

The Venetians also used another vital technique to consolidate their power – an extensive network of spies and informants. These were based in the courts of all the principal Italian cities, as well as other key cities across Europe. The intelligence gathered through this network enabled them to exploit commercial and military opportunities, to compromise their enemies, and through intrigue and disinformation to play one kingdom against another. The same system was adopted and applied by the Jesuit Order shortly after its foundation in 1540, and has undergone many refinements ever since.

Elite Families Rule

Dynastic succession and planned inter-marriage among the elite over many centuries has ensured that Europe and America are controlled today by a very small group of people. Most of the one percent who own 40 percent of the wealth are in his category. They all share one thing in common – a deep-rooted hatred of Christianity. Not the phony variety taught by Rome – which continues to exercise a superstitious grip over hundreds of millions of innocent people – but the version founded solely on the Word of God. True Christians look only to the Living God, while false Christians invariably look elsewhere – to the Pope, the clergy, the Virgin, the saints, the sacraments, and the common good.

Rome has consistently worked toward the creation of a global empire. In that sense the Catholic Church is the primary vehicle through which this elite group of families has been advancing its cause. Through it they control and exploit the masses on all five continents and keep them from worshipping and praying to the Living and True God – the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. They are also working behind the scenes, via the structures of the Roman Catholic Church and in other ways, to overthrow the system of sovereign states which was recognised by the Peace of Westphalia.

A great deal could be said here about their control over the international banking system, which is largely their own creation, and the system of secret societies which they and their allies have long used to influence and control independent states – the Jesuits, the Knights of Malta, the Freemasons, the Knights of Columbus/Columbanus, the Rosicrucians, the Theosophists, etc – but that it not the main focus of this paper. Please see my website (www.zephaniah.eu) for more information about these aspects.

Papal Encyclicals and One World Government

The political structure favoured by the Roman Catholic Church is fascism. Whenever it has been in the ascendant in any country it has tended in that direction – for example Spain under Franco, Italy under Mussolini, Portugal under Salazar, Croatia under Pavelic, Paraguay under Stroessner, Chile under Pinochet, Argentina under Videla, and the Philippines under Marcos. Many other examples could be given, where a powerful elite, endorsed unofficially by the Roman Catholic Church, employs military force to exercise complete control over a country and routinely abducts, tortures and murders anyone who dares to oppose it.

The mentality behind this is predicated on the belief that the end justifies the means, that the Church has the moral authority to govern without restrictions, and that any initial difficulties will be ironed out in due course as the population bows to the supreme will of a supposedly beneficent, centralised authority.

The same mentality has been evident in Vatican pronouncements for decades. For example, in the encyclical *Populorum Progressio* (1967), Pope Paul VI said:

...each man has therefore the right to find in the world what is necessary for himself. The recent Council [*Vatican II*] reminded us of this: “God intended the earth and all that it contains for the use of every human being and people. Thus, as all men follow justice and unite in charity, created goods should abound for them on a reasonable basis.” All other rights whatsoever, including those of property and of free commerce, are to be subordinated to this principle.

Note the totalitarian maxim, “All other rights whatsoever...are to be subordinated to this principle.” Since these rights include freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, etc, the Vatican clearly sees a future, under its own control, where all men everywhere will be compelled to do as they are told, for the common good. The Vatican itself will decide what will count as ‘the common good’ and will prescribe suitable penalties for anyone who fails to comply.

Numerous other encyclicals over the past century have condemned what the Vatican describes as ‘individualism,’ ‘free competition,’ and ‘private property.’ For example, in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (1987), Pope John Paul II stated that

Private property, in fact, is under a “social mortgage,” which means that it has an intrinsically social function, based upon and justified precisely by the principle of the universal destination of goods.

As far as the Vatican is concerned, private property has a moral justification only when it exists within a framework that guarantees the “universal destination of goods.” For “destination” read “distribution”, since that is how the “social mortgage” would work in practice. In short, if the central authority decides that certain goods are needed by another group, they will be redistributed accordingly for the greater good. The fact that these goods belong to someone else is immaterial. Their “social function” demands it. Thus the Vatican rejects the principle of private property.

This is indistinguishable from Marxism and, like Marxism, is predicated on the belief that, to work effectively, it must be implemented on a global basis. It also requires a strictly centralised system of economic management:

It pertains to the public authorities to choose, even to lay down the objectives to be pursued, the ends to be achieved, and the means for attaining these, and it is for them to stimulate all the forces engaged in this common activity. - Pope Paul VI, *Populorum Progressio*, 1967

Any reasonable person should find this prospect deeply disturbing. Furthermore we should be concerned that over a billion Roman Catholics seem largely oblivious to what their leaders are planning. Remember, if the Vatican has its way, their system of strict social control won't apply just to Roman Catholics but to all people everywhere, both “faithful and infidels”.

A Papal World Empire

As we have already noted, the Papacy has long claimed to be the rightful ruler of the world. As early as 1250, Pope Innocent IV wrote that

the pope, who is vicar of Jesus Christ, has power not only over Christians but also over infidels, for Christ has power over all...All men, faithful and infidels, are Christ's sheep by creation...the pope has jurisdiction and power over all *de jure* though not *de facto*.

- from *The Crisis of Church and State, 1050-1300* by Brian Tierney, 1964

By working stealthily behind the scenes, the Vatican is now planning to transform this supposed jurisdiction and power over all men from a purely legal right into a global reality. Lest the reader be tempted to dismiss this as an antiquated ideal, here is how it was stated in the 1983 revision of the official *Canon Law of the Catholic Church*:

To the Church belongs the right always and everywhere to announce moral principles, including those pertaining to the social order, and to make judgments on any human affairs to the extent that they are required by the fundamental rights of the human person or the salvation of souls.

There is no doubt that many Roman Catholics, who are aware of the Vatican's global ambitions, regard them as acceptable, and perhaps even admirable. In their minds, the ultimate control of the world by the Roman Catholic Church would benefit all. In adopting this naive, albeit sincere, attitude, they overlook the church's long legacy of cruelty, torture, and murder, her ruthless persecution of her 'enemies' (namely anyone who disagreed with her), and the sadistic police state that she maintained for centuries across large parts of Europe under the banner of the Inquisition.

Somehow they imagine that the church has 'changed' and entered a state of benign enlightenment, committed wholly to preaching, peacemaking, and charitable work. They don't seem to recognize the major role that she has played in world events over the past hundred years, usually behind the scenes, installing and directing oppressive regimes and corrupt leaders on every continent. To the extent that they perceive the underlying trend, they imagine it to be a temporary phase, an unintended consequence of the church's high aspirations in the long term for all people. If the church ruled outright, without restriction, they reason, she would set the highest standards, a model that the rest of the world could admire and emulate.

Well, let's look at a recent example of a country that was ruled for a time by the Roman Catholic Church with virtually no outside interference and shielded throughout from the gaze of world opinion, namely Croatia in the period 1941-1944.

The Roman Catholic Slaughterhouse in Croatia

The independent state of Croatia came into being on 10 April 1941 after the invasion of Yugoslavia by the Axis powers. It comprised not just the original territory of Croatia but the annexed territories of Bosnia, Herzegovina and Slovenia, as well as part of Serbia. The fledgling state was controlled under Nazi supervision by the fascist Ustashe movement, led by the notorious Ante Pavelic.

Pavelic was received by Pope Pius XII in a private audience in Rome on 18 May, 1941. Many historians regard this act as de facto recognition by the Holy See of the new Croatian state. As supreme dictator of Croatia, Pavelic enjoyed the unconditional support of his countrymen. Virtually without delay he set in motion a programme of ethnic cleansing, expulsion and enforced conversion to Catholicism of all Serbs living in the territory under his control. His goal was the creation of a purely Croatian, Roman Catholic state.

At the commencement of his programme, the territory as a whole included 3.3 million Roman Catholic Croats, 2.2 million Orthodox Serbs, a small population of Moslems, and about 45,000 Jews. By 1944, all of the Jews had been murdered by the Ustashe or despatched to Nazi death camps, while a vast number Serbs – men, women and children – were systematically slaughtered. The total number is disputed since reliable documentary evidence is not available, but informed estimates put it at somewhere between 600,000 and 900,000. A figure of 750,000 is commonly quoted.

In 1941, Fitzroy Maclean, who was Britain's military liaison with the anti-Ustashe partisans, wrote:

Bands of the Ustase roamed the countryside with knives, bludgeons, and machine guns, slaughtering Serbian men, women and little children, desecrating Serbian churches, murdering Serbian priests, laying waste Serbian villages, torturing, raping, burning, drowning. Killing became a cult, an obsession.

Details of what one commentator called “torture orgies” were often so gruesome, so utterly repellant, that they are unsuitable for inclusion in a paper of this kind.

When the Pope first received Pavelic in May, 1941, the Vatican already knew that he was a criminal and a psychopath. He had been convicted by a French court of the murder of Yugoslavian King Alexander and French Foreign Minister Barthou in 1934 and sentenced to death. However, after he escaped from the French authorities, Mussolini gave him asylum in Italy, largely out of deference to the Vatican. Then, using funding from both the Vatican and Mussolini, he built up the dreaded Ustashe. The Nazis themselves, who favoured the efficient dispatch of their victims, were unsettled by the sadism of the Ustashe who routinely tortured and mutilated their terrified victims, sometimes for hours, before finally slitting their throats. Despite the wave of genocidal butchery unleashed by Pavelic, the Pope refused to cut diplomatic ties with the Ustashe regime and even met Pavelic again in 1943.



Official reception of the Ustashe militia at the Vatican in September, 1943

The Catholic bishops of Croatia, headed by Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, met in synod in November 1941 but refused to denounce the programme of enforced conversion of all Orthodox Serbs which had been in operation since the summer of that year. Neither did they denounce the systematic murder of all Serbs who refused to convert. By their official silence they gave their tacit approval to the atrocities that had taken place and to the ongoing programme of genocide which would result ultimately in the murder of around three-quarters of a million Serbian civilians. Most of Croatia’s Catholic clergy were fanatical supporters of Pavelic and his unbelievably sadistic regime. Virtually all of the bishops and senior clerics gave their oral endorsement to the state policy of enforced conversion, while many priests and monks actually took an active part, and sometimes a lead role, in the slaughter. Pavelic even awarded medals to priests and monks who did so.

About a dozen concentration camps were established by the Ustashe to facilitate their campaign of genocide. By far the largest was Jasenovac which, for a period of two years or so, was run by a psychopathic Franciscan monk named Miroslav Filipovic. There is no doubt that Jasenovac ranks alongside Dachau, Auschwitz and Treblinka as one of the most appalling monuments in history to human depravity and sadism. However, most people today have not even heard of Jasenovac, mainly because Vatican pressure to suppress knowledge of its existence has been largely successful.

The Catholic Church simply does not want the world to know what it did in Croatia during the period 1941-1944. For example, when a respected Irish historian, Hubert Butler, tried during the 1960s to draw attention to the prominent role played by the Catholic clergy and the Vatican in the Croatian genocide, he was publicly vilified by the Irish Catholic hierarchy and denounced as a liar.

The Vatican was well aware of developments in Croatia

The Vatican actively promoted Croatian nationalism, gave de facto recognition to an independent Croatia, endorsed Pavelic and his regime, and approved the Croatian interpretation of Balkan history. A senior official in the Vatican's Secretariat of State, Giovanni Montini, kept track of developments in Croatia and reported daily to the Pope. It is a mark of the importance attaching to this activity that the Pope had assigned it to rising-star Montini – who later became Pope Paul VI. With so many Catholic clergy in Croatia there is no doubt that Montini knew exactly what was happening on the ground. According to the English historian, John Cornwell, Pius XII was better informed of the situation in Croatia than he was about any other area in Europe (outside Italy). His apostolic legate, Ramiro Marcone, came and went between Zagreb and Rome at will. In addition, the Croatian bishops, some of whom sat in the Croatian parliament, communicated freely with the Vatican and continued to make regular visits to the Pope in Rome.



Ustashe soldiers pose with evident pride over the corpses of their victims.

After the war the Pope gave refuge to Pavelic in Rome and even enabled him to escape via the Vatican ratline to South America. He also elevated Stepinac to the rank of Cardinal in 1952, even though he had been convicted in a court of law of complicity in serious war crimes. Incredibly, he was beatified by another pope – John Paul II – in 1998. Thus a man who played a role in the torture and slaughter of hundreds of thousands of men, women and children is considered 'saintly' by the Vatican.

In his analysis of the action taken by Pope Pius XII during this period, Cornwell summarised the horror as follows:

An act of “ethnic cleansing” before that hideous term came into vogue, it was an attempt to create a “pure” Catholic Croatia by enforced conversion, deportations, and mass extermination. So dreadful were the acts of torture and murder that even hardened German troops registered their horror. Even by comparison with the recent bloodshed in Yugoslavia [*during the 1990s*] ... Pavelic’s onslaught against the Orthodox Serbs remains one of the most appalling civilian massacres known to history.

The situation in Croatia in the period 1941 to 1944 was an open partnership between church and state, the kind of relationship most favoured by the Catholic Church in its long and bloody history. Former BBC commentator Avro Manhattan, who was an expert on Vatican politics, captured perfectly the chilling reality behind this when he wrote:

The uniqueness of the Independent Catholic State of Croatia lies precisely in this: that it provided a model, in miniature, of what the Catholic Church, had she the power, would like to see in the West and, indeed, everywhere. (*The Vatican’s Holocaust*, 1986)

Rome’s longstanding contempt for true Christianity

If you find it difficult to understand how the Roman Catholic clergy in Croatia could participate in a programme of genocidal sadism or how their contempt for Orthodox Serbs could be so intense that they would experience no moral revulsion when carrying out acts of the utmost barbarity, then please consider the document set out in **Appendix B**. It details the confession which the Jesuits required all Hungarian converts from Protestantism to make in the early 19th century. The same dark spirit which informed that wretched document was behind the mass sadism seen in Croatia, and is alive today at the heart of the Catholic Church.



The Pit of Death

An Orthodox Serb being thrown alive into a mass grave in the notorious Jasenovac concentration camp in 1942.

The Latest Vatican Blueprint for Global Control

We will now examine the latest strategic policy document released by a leading Vatican think-tank in which the global ambitions of the Roman Catholic Church are well and truly evident. As we examine it, please bear in mind that its low-key, bureaucratic language conceals a full-blown fascist agenda. We won't find any of the bluster and vitriol of *Mein Kampf* but, rather, the calm and measured jargon of an academic document mixed here and there throughout with altruistic platitudes.

Firstly, the paper sets out its broad philosophy using fairly innocuous terms, for example:

“...to shape a new vision for the future...”

“...an efficient allocation of available resources...”

“...embracing the logic of the global common good...”

“...a new humanism open to transcendence...”

Despite their nebulous nature, these phrases are loaded with significance. For example, the Bible already sets out a vision for the future, so why is the Vatican advocating a new one? The efficient allocation of available resources, which the paper also highlights, is a key concern of Marxism. Note, in particular, the phrase, “a new humanism”. This is a remarkable term for a so-called Christian document to employ since “humanism” is a patently anti-Christian philosophy. The three *Humanist Manifestos* of 1933, 1973 and 2003 are virulently atheistic in both tone and content and utterly opposed to the application of Biblical values in any walk of life.

One World Government

Our next excerpt confirms that the Vatican has long sought the creation of a world political authority or one-world government:

“In the prophetic *Encyclical Pacem in Terris* of 1963, he [*Pope John XXIII*] observed that the world was heading towards ever greater unification. He then acknowledged the fact that a correspondence was lacking in the human community between the political organization “on a world level and the objective needs of the universal common good”. He also expressed the hope that one day “a true world political authority” would be created.”

This envisages and welcomes greater world unification, where independent states will cede their sovereignty to a central authority. Marxism has exactly the same goal. Once implemented, all local, regional and national autonomy will have disappeared and the seven billion human inhabitants of this planet will be under the complete control of an all-powerful central authority.

Such an authority would be no more ‘democratic’ than the EU or the UN, both of which are controlled from the wings by the ultra-wealthy elite who run this world, albeit with much mutual rivalry and internal dissension. These institutions continue to have a veneer of democracy since prevailing global conditions require that such a pretence be maintained for the time being, but a “true world political authority” could dispense with any semblance of democracy. The Roman Catholic Church has never been democratic in any manner or form, so the emergence of an anti-democratic, all-powerful global authority would be fully consistent with its political philosophy.

The paper then makes the following comment:

“So the world Authority should consistently involve all peoples in a collaboration in which they are called to contribute, bringing to it the heritage of their virtues and their civilizations.”

The proposed “collaboration” of “all peoples” during the creation of this utopian world government is designed to convey the impression that it will come about only through the operation of democratic principles and informed consent. That this will not happen in practice is made very clear by the subsequent steps in the Vatican’s strategy. For example, it goes on to say that

“The establishment of a global political Authority cannot be achieved without an already functioning multilateralism, not only on a diplomatic level, but also and above all in relation to programs for sustainable development and peace. It is not possible to arrive at global Government without giving political expression to pre-existing forms of interdependence and cooperation.”

Only by fostering ever greater interdependence between national and international institutions, as well as the promotion of elaborate pan-national programmes which bypass local controls, can the proposed new world-encircling entity be brought into being. In other words, it will be imposed incrementally by gradually enlarging existing international institutions and programmes. Since none of these have been developed on a democratic basis, but have been created and shaped by the dictates of powerful vested interests, the emerging world government system will be brought about in much the same way. Whatever public consultation is undertaken will be purely cosmetic. So, whether or not seven billion people withhold their consent or voice their objections will be utterly irrelevant. They will gradually lose whatever autonomy and independence they currently enjoy and will be obliged to submit to an all-powerful global authority.

Given the way dictatorial regimes have operated in the past, the path to world government will likely be greatly foreshortened by the deliberate engineering of global or international crises, such as a collapse of the world financial system and a major war in the Middle East, in order to soften popular resistance and convince the masses that the ‘old’ system is no longer workable.

As part of this process, the Vatican paper envisages a “commitment to create some form of global monetary management.” This same goal is also being pursued by the ultra-rich elite who control the international banking system. By bringing the existing system to the brink of destruction and wiping out the wealth of the middle classes in both Europe and America, they plan to secure wide popular support for a ‘better’ system. This better system, an international currency controlled by a world central bank, corresponds to what the Vatican calls “some form of global monetary management.” What the global elite call a world central bank, the Vatican paper calls “a public Authority with universal jurisdiction.” It also envisages the suppression of independent national currencies and their replacement by a global currency:

“It is obvious that to some extent this is equivalent to putting the existing exchange systems up for discussion in order to find effective means of coordination and supervision.”

The Planned Dissolution of Nation States

Next, in the cause of “universal brotherhood” and “universal common good” – terms which figure prominently in the social agenda pursued by Humanists, Marxists and Freemasons – the Vatican paper proceeds to attack the nation state:

Modern States became structured wholes over time and reinforced sovereignty within their own territory. But social, cultural and political conditions have gradually changed. Their interdependence has grown – so it has become natural to think of an international community that is integrated and increasingly ruled by a shared system – but a worse form of nationalism has lingered on, according to which the State feels it can achieve the good of its own citizens in a self-sufficient way.

Nationalism has “lingered on” and its continued existence in our modern world “seems anachronistic and surreal” (see text in Appendix A). In other words, unless we get rid of nation states and create a unified global political entity, governed by a supreme ruling authority, the only alternative is perpetual war, “a never-ending struggle.”

This kind of reasoning is utterly absurd and flatly contradicts the plain facts of history. Consider, for example, the countless wars fought between predominantly Catholic countries! Or the appalling carnage caused by the church of Rome during the Thirty Years War in order to keep Germany under her control. When it comes to having her own way, the Roman Catholic Church has never been slow to resort to war, terror, torture, and murder on a horrifying scale. Moreover, the existence of large sovereign entities has never been a guarantee of peace within their borders. Look, for example, at the countless millions of Chinese murdered by Mao or the millions of Soviet citizens starved to death or murdered by Stalin.

The paper also argues that, “now that vital goods shared by the entire human family are at stake, goods which the individual [nation] States cannot promote and protect by themselves”, overall control and corresponding powers should be handed to “institutions with universal competence”. Again, this is bogus reasoning of the most devious kind. There are no “vital goods” needed by the “human family” which individual nation states cannot provide for their citizens, whether through indigenous enterprise or international trade.

The authors dismiss the existing system of sovereign states as ‘Westphalian’, an obvious reference to Peace of Westphalia, 1648, in which the Catholic Church had to resign herself to the existence of a number sovereign European states outside her control. She now wants to “seize the opportunity to integrate their respective sovereignties for the common good of peoples”, to overturn the principles underpinned by the Peace of Westphalia and bring all nations under the control of a global political entity.

If an international regime of this kind ever came into being, it would be indistinguishable from fascist regimes of the past. There is no doubt that the Roman Catholic Church, through her astonishing wealth and weight of numbers, would expect to be a leading member, if not outright leader, of the elite cabal that exercised ultimate control. Under such circumstances non-Catholics the world over could expect at some stage to be offered the ‘Croatian’ option, convert or die.

Anguish and Suffering

The paper then proceeds to endorse a very disturbing proposition, namely that the changes envisaged – creation of a one-world government from the remains of nation states – “will not come about without anguish and suffering.” Incredibly, the authors recognise that, even with extensive coercion and intimidation, imposed economic stress and international intrigue, the outcome they seek must necessarily be preceded by a period of widespread violence and strife!

Having made this alarming disclosure, they say no more in the matter. It is obvious from the magnitude of what they are proposing that the “anguish and suffering” which they believe is inevitable must involve death on a large scale. It says a lot about the mentality of its authors that an implication of such seriousness can be glossed over in a major strategic paper as though it were a mere detail.

The Vatican’s Gross Distortion of Scripture

Perhaps the most unsettling part of the Vatican paper is its gross distortion of the Bible itself, in particular verses 1-9 of Genesis 11. Here is what it says:

“Through the account of the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11:1-9), the Bible warns us how the “diversity” of peoples can turn into a vehicle for selfishness and an instrument of division. In humanity there is a real risk that peoples will end up not understanding each other and that cultural diversities will lead to irremediable oppositions. The image of the Tower of Babel also warns us that we must avoid a “unity” that is only apparent, where selfishness and divisions endure because the foundations of the society are not stable. In both cases, Babel is the image of what peoples and individuals can become when they do not recognize their intrinsic transcendent dignity and brotherhood.

“The spirit of Babel is the antithesis of the Spirit of Pentecost (Acts 2:1-12), of God’s design for the whole of humanity: that is, unity in truth. Only a spirit of concord that rises above divisions and conflicts will allow humanity to be authentically one family and to conceive of a new world with the creation of a world public Authority at the service of the common good.”

Anyone who knows the Bible from a truly scriptural perspective will know that the Genesis account of Babel is very different from the twisted interpretation given here by the authors of the Vatican paper. Yes, God condemned the attempt by Nimrod and his cronies to create a centralised world government. But He did not do so because they had failed to go about it in the right way. Rather He condemned it because it *was* a world government, a centralised system of control to which all people of the time would be subject. Through the account in Genesis God is telling us that world government itself is evil and will not be tolerated by Him.

It is difficult to believe, when the authors of the Vatican paper finally try to present some kind of scriptural support for their position, that they should make such an outrageous mess of it. Even a fledgling Bible scholar from a born-again Christian background would know that the account of Babel in Genesis is an expression of God’s total revulsion at Nimrod’s attempt to create a system of global governance!

Incredibly, the Vatican authors display even greater ignorance of the Bible, the Word of God, when they try to imply that the original attempt failed because the participants did not understand each other and that the resulting “cultural diversities” led to internal conflicts. This is complete and utter nonsense! The LORD cursed mankind with a multiplicity of languages in order to thwart any attempt by an elite power group to create a one-world government.

The book of Genesis makes it abundantly clear that God HATES world government.

There is no doubt that what the Vatican paper proposes is evil, that the programme of world government which it is planning is Satanic in nature, and that it will lead to the series of catastrophic events described in the Book of Revelation.

Jeremy James
Ireland
10 November 2011

APPENDIX A

Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace*

TOWARDS REFORMING THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL AND MONETARY SYSTEMS IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBAL PUBLIC AUTHORITY

Vatican City
2011

Table of Contents

Preface

Presupposition

Economic Development and Inequalities

The Role of Technology and the Ethical Challenge

An Authority over Globalization

Towards Reforming the International Financial and Monetary Systems in a way
that Responds to the Needs of all Peoples

Conclusions

Preface

“The world situation requires the concerted effort of everyone, a thorough examination of every facet of the problem – social, economic, cultural and spiritual. The Church, which has long experience in human affairs and has no desire to be involved in the political activities of any nation, ‘seeks but one goal: to carry forward the work of Christ under the lead of the befriending Spirit. And Christ entered this world to give witness to the truth; to save, not to judge; to serve, not to be served.’”

With these words, in the prophetic and always relevant Encyclical *Populorum Progressio* of 1967, Paul VI outlined in a clear way “the trajectories” of the Church’s close relation with the world. These trajectories intersect in the profound value of human dignity and the quest for the common good, which make people responsible and free to act according to their highest aspirations.

***Full Text: Note on financial reform from the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace.**
2011-10-24 Vatican Radio. Please find, below, an unofficial translation of the Note on the reform of the international financial and monetary systems in the context of global public authority, released Monday [*October 24th 2011*] by the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace.

The economic and financial crisis which the world is going through calls everyone, individuals and peoples, to examine in depth the principles and the cultural and moral values at the basis of social coexistence. What is more, the crisis engages private actors and competent public authorities on the national, regional and international level in serious reflection on both causes and solutions of a political, economic and technical nature.

In this perspective, as Benedict XVI teaches, the crisis “obliges us to re-plan our journey, to set ourselves new rules and to discover new forms of commitment, to build on positive experiences and to reject negative ones. The crisis thus becomes an opportunity for discernment, in which to shape a new vision for the future. In this spirit, with confidence rather than resignation, it is appropriate to address the difficulties of the present time.”

The G20 leaders themselves said in the Statement they adopted in Pittsburgh in 2009: “The economic crisis demonstrates the importance of ushering in a new era of sustainable global economic activity grounded in responsibility.”

The Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace now responds to the Holy Father’s appeal, while making the concerns of everyone our own, especially the concerns of those who pay most dearly for the current situation. With due respect for the competent civil and political authorities, the Council hereby offers and shares its reflection: Towards reforming the international financial and monetary systems in the context of global public authority.

This reflection hopes to benefit world leaders and all people of good will. It is an exercise of responsibility not only towards the current but above all towards future generations, so that hope for a better future and confidence in human dignity and capacity for good may never be extinguished.

- Cardinal Peter K.A. Turkson and Mario Toso

President Secretary

Presupposition

Every individual and every community shares in and is responsible for promoting the common good. Faithful to their ethical and religious vocation, communities of believers should take the lead in asking whether human family has adequate means at its disposal to achieve the global common good. The Church for her part is called to encourage in everyone without distinction, the desire to join in the “monumental amount of individual and collective effort” which men have made “throughout the course of the centuries ... to better the circumstances of their lives.... [T]his human activity accords with God’s will.”

1. Economic Development and Inequalities

The grave economic and financial crisis which the world is going through today springs from multiple causes. Opinions on the number and significance of these causes vary widely. Some commentators emphasize first and foremost certain errors inherent in the economic and financial policies; others stress the structural weaknesses of political, economic and financial institutions; still others say that the causes are ethical breakdowns occurring at all levels of a world economy that is increasingly dominated by utilitarianism and materialism. At every stage of the crisis, one might discover particular technical errors intertwined with certain ethical orientations.

In material goods markets, natural factors and productive capacity as well as labour in all of its many forms set quantitative limits by determining relationships of costs and prices which, under certain conditions, permit an efficient allocation of available resources.

In monetary and financial markets, however, the dynamics are quite different. In recent decades, it was the banks that extended credit, which generated money, which in turn sought a further expansion of credit. In this way, the economic system was driven towards an inflationary spiral that inevitably encountered a limit in the risk that credit institutions could accept. They faced the ultimate danger of bankruptcy, with negative consequences for the entire economic and financial system.

After World War II, national economies made progress, albeit with enormous sacrifices for millions, indeed billions of people who, as producers and entrepreneurs on the one hand and as savers and consumers on the other, had put their confidence in a regular and progressive expansion of money supply and investment in line with opportunities for real growth of the economy.

Since the 1990s, we have seen that money and credit instruments worldwide have grown more rapidly than revenue, even adjusting for current prices. From this came the formation of pockets of excessive liquidity and speculative bubbles which later turned into a series of solvency and confidence crises that have spread and followed one another over the years.

A first crisis took place in the 1970s until the early 1980s and was related to the sudden sharp rises in oil prices. Subsequently, there was a series of crises in the developing world, for example, the first crisis in Mexico in the 1980s and those in Brazil, Russia and Korea, and then again in Mexico in the 1990s as well as in Thailand and Argentina.

The speculative bubble in real estate and the recent financial crisis have the very same origin in the excessive amount of money and the plethora of financial instruments globally.

Whereas the crises in the developing countries that risked involving the global monetary and financial system were contained through interventions by the more developed countries, the outbreak of the crisis in 2008 was characterized by a different factor compared with the previous ones, something decisive and explosive. Generated in the context of the United States, it took place in one of the most important zones for the global economy and finances. It directly affected what is still the currency of reference for the great majority of international trade transactions.

A liberalist approach, unsympathetic towards public intervention in the markets, chose to allow an important international financial institution to fall into bankruptcy, on the assumption that this would contain the crisis and its effects. Unfortunately, this spawned a widespread lack of confidence and a sudden change in attitudes. Various public interventions of enormous scope (more than 20% of gross national product) were urgently requested in order to stem the negative effects that could have overwhelmed the entire international financial system.

The consequences for the real economy, what with grave difficulties in some sectors – first of all, construction – and wide distribution of unfavourable forecasts, have generated a negative trend in production and international trade with very serious repercussions for employment as well as other effects that have probably not yet had their full impact. The costs are extremely onerous for millions in the developed countries, but also and above all for billions in the developing ones.

In countries and areas where the most elementary goods like health, food and shelter are still lacking, more than a billion people are forced to survive on an average income of less than a dollar a day.

Global economic well-being, traditionally measured by national income and also by levels of capacities, grew during the second half of the twentieth century, to an extent and with a speed never experienced in the history of humankind.

But the inequalities within and between various countries have also grown significantly. While some of the more industrialized and developed countries and economic zones – the ones that are most industrialized and developed – have seen their income grow considerably, other countries have in fact been excluded from the overall improvement of the economy and their situation has even worsened.

After the Second Vatican Council in his Encyclical Letter *Populorum Progressio* of 1967, Paul VI already clearly and prophetically denounced the dangers of an economic development conceived in liberalist terms because of its harmful consequences for world equilibrium and peace. The Pontiff asserted that the defence of life and the promotion of people's cultural and moral development are the essential conditions for the promotion of authentic development. On these grounds, Paul VI said that full and global development is "the new name of peace".

Forty years later, in its annual Report of in 2007, the International Monetary Fund recognized the close connection between an inadequately managed process of globalization on the one hand, and the world's great inequalities on the other. Today the modern means of communication make these great economic, social and cultural inequalities obvious to everyone, rich and poor alike, giving rise to tensions and to massive migratory movements.

Nonetheless, it should be reiterated that the process of globalisation with its positive aspects is at the root of the world economy's great development in the twentieth century. It is worth recalling that between 1900 and 2000 the world population increased almost fourfold and the wealth produced worldwide grew much more rapidly, resulting in a significant rise of average per capita income. At the same time, however, the distribution of wealth did not become fairer but in many cases worsened. What has driven the world in such a problematic direction for its economy and also for peace?

First and foremost, an economic liberalism that spurns rules and controls. Economic liberalism is a theoretical system of thought, a form of “economic apriorism” that purports to derive laws for how markets function from theory, these being laws of capitalistic development, while exaggerating certain aspects of markets. An economic system of thought that sets down a priori the laws of market functioning and economic development, without measuring them against reality, runs the risk of becoming an instrument subordinated to the interests of the countries that effectively enjoy a position of economic and financial advantage.

Regulations and controls, imperfect though they may be, already often exist at the national and regional levels; whereas on the international level, it is hard to apply and consolidate such controls and rules.

The inequalities and distortions of capitalist development are often an expression not only of economic liberalism but also of utilitarian thinking: that is, theoretical and practical approaches according to which what is useful for the individual leads to the good of the community. This saying has a core of truth, but it cannot be ignored that individual utility – even where it is legitimate – does not always favour the common good. In many cases a spirit of solidarity is called for that transcends personal utility for the good of the community.

In the 1920s, some economists had already warned about giving too much weight, in the absence of regulations and controls, to theories which have since become prevailing ideologies and practices on the international level.

One devastating effect of these ideologies, especially in the last decades of the past century and the first years of the current one, has been the outbreak of the crisis in which the world is still immersed.

In his social encyclical, Benedict XVI precisely identified the roots of a crisis that is not only economic and financial but above all moral in nature. In fact, as the Pontiff notes, to function correctly the economy needs ethics; and not just of any kind but one that is people-centred. He goes on to denounce the role played by utilitarianism and individualism and the responsibilities of those who have adopted and promoted them as the parameters for the optimal behaviour of all economic and political agents who operate and interact in the social context. But Benedict XVI also identifies and denounces a new ideology, that of “technocracy”.

2. The Role of Technology and the Ethical Challenge

The great economic and social development of the past century, with their bright spots and serious shadows, can also be attributed in large part to the continued development of technology and more recently to advances in information technologies and especially their applications in the economy and most significantly in finance.

However, to interpret the current new social question lucidly, we must avoid the error – itself a product of neo-liberal thinking – that would consider all the problems that need tackling to be exclusively of a technical nature. In such a guise, they evade the needed discernment and ethical evaluation. In this context Benedict XVI's encyclical warns about the dangers of the technocracy ideology: that is, of making technology absolute, which “tends to prevent people from recognizing anything that cannot be

explained in terms of matter alone” and minimizing the value of the choices made by the concrete human individual who works in the economic-financial system by reducing them to mere technical variables. Being closed to a “beyond” in the sense of something more than technology, not only makes it impossible to find adequate solutions to the problems, but it impoverishes the principal victims of the crisis more and more from the material standpoint.

In the context of the complexity of the phenomena, the importance of the ethical and cultural factors cannot be overlooked or underestimated. In fact, the crisis has revealed behaviours like selfishness, collective greed and the hoarding of goods on a great scale. No one can be content with seeing man live like “a wolf to his fellow man”, according to the concept expounded by Hobbes. No one can in conscience accept the development of some countries to the detriment of others. If no solutions are found to the various forms of injustice, the negative effects that will follow on the social, political and economic level will be destined to create a climate of growing hostility and even violence, and ultimately undermine the very foundations of democratic institutions, even the ones considered most solid.

Recognizing the primacy of being over having and of ethics over the economy, the world’s peoples ought to adopt an ethic of solidarity as the animating core of their action. This implies abandoning all forms of petty selfishness and embracing the logic of the global common good which transcends merely contingent, particular interests. In a word, they ought to have a keen sense of belonging to the human family which means sharing the common dignity of all human beings: “Even prior to the logic of a fair exchange of goods and the forms of justice appropriate to it, there exists something which is due to man because he is man, by reason of his lofty dignity.”

In 1991, after the failure of Marxist communism, Blessed John Paul II had already warned of the risk of an “idolatry of the market, an idolatry which ignores the existence of goods which by their nature are not and cannot be mere commodities.” Today his warning needs to be heeded without delay and a road must be taken that is in greater harmony with the dignity and transcendent vocation of the person and the human family.

3. An Authority over Globalization

On the way to building a more fraternal and just human family and, even before that, a new humanism open to transcendence, Blessed John XXIII’s teaching seems especially timely. In the prophetic Encyclical *Pacem in Terris* of 1963, he observed that the world was heading towards ever greater unification. He then acknowledged the fact that a correspondence was lacking in the human community between the political organization “on a world level and the objective needs of the universal common good”. He also expressed the hope that one day “a true world political authority” would be created.

In view of the unification of the world engendered by the complex phenomenon of globalization, and of the importance of guaranteeing, in addition to other collective goods, the good of a free, stable world economic and financial system at the service of the real economy, today the teaching of *Pacem in Terris* appears to be even more vital and worthy of urgent implementation.

In the same spirit of *Pacem in Terris*, Benedict XVI himself expressed the need to create a world political authority. This seems obvious if we consider the fact that the agenda of questions to be dealt with globally is becoming ever longer. Think, for example, of peace and security; disarmament and arms control; promotion and protection of fundamental human rights; management of the economy and development policies; management of the migratory flows and food security, and protection of the environment. In all these areas, the growing interdependence between States and regions of the world becomes more and more obvious as well as the need for answers that are not just sectorial and isolated, but systematic and integrated, rich in solidarity and subsidiarity and geared to the universal common good.

As the Pope reminds us, if this road is not followed, “despite the great progress accomplished in various sectors, international law would risk being conditioned by the balance of power among the strongest nations.”

The purpose of the public authority, as John XXIII recalled in *Pacem in Terris*, is first and foremost to serve the common good. Therefore, it should be endowed with structures and adequate, effective mechanisms equal to its mission and the expectations placed in it. This is especially true in a globalized world which makes individuals and peoples increasingly interconnected and interdependent, but which also reveals the existence of monetary and financial markets of a predominantly speculative sort that are harmful for the real economy, especially of the weaker countries.

This is a complex and delicate process. A supranational Authority of this kind should have a realistic structure and be set up gradually. It should be favourable to the existence of efficient and effective monetary and financial systems; that is, free and stable markets overseen by a suitable legal framework, well-functioning in support of sustainable development and social progress of all, and inspired by the values of charity and truth. It is a matter of an Authority with a global reach that cannot be imposed by force, coercion or violence, but should be the outcome of a free and shared agreement and a reflection of the permanent and historic needs of the world common good. It ought to arise from a process of progressive maturation of consciences and freedoms as well as the awareness of growing responsibilities. Consequently, reciprocal trust, autonomy and participation cannot be overlooked as if they were superfluous elements. The consent should involve an ever greater number of countries that adhere with conviction, through a sincere dialogue that values the minority opinions rather than marginalizing them. So the world Authority should consistently involve all peoples in a collaboration in which they are called to contribute, bringing to it the heritage of their virtues and their civilizations.

The establishment of a world political Authority should be preceded by a preliminary phase of consultation from which a legitimated institution will emerge that is in a position to be an effective guide and, at the same time, can allow each country to express and pursue its own particular good. The exercise of this Authority at the service of the good of each and every one will necessarily be *super partes* (impartial): that is, above any partial vision or particular good, in view of achieving the common good. Its decisions should not be the result of the more developed countries' excessive power over the weaker countries. Instead, they should be made in the interest of all, not only to the advantage of some groups, whether they are formed by private lobbies or national governments.

A supranational Institution, the expression of a “community of nations”, will not last long, however, if the countries' diversities from the standpoint of cultures, material and immaterial resources and historic and geographic conditions, are not recognized and fully respected. The lack of a convinced consensus, nourished by an unceasing moral communion on the part of the world community, would also reduce the effectiveness of such an Authority.

What is valid on the national level is also valid on the global level. A person is not made to serve authority unconditionally. Rather, it is the task of authority to be at the service of the person, consistent with the pre-eminent value of human dignity. Likewise, governments should not serve the world Authority unconditionally. Instead, it is the world Authority that should put itself at the service of the various member countries, according to the principle of subsidiarity. Among the ways it should do this is by creating the socio-economic, political and legal conditions essential for the existence of markets that are efficient and efficacious because they are not over-protected by paternalistic national policies and not weakened by systematic deficits in public finances and of the gross national products – indeed, such policies and deficits actually hamper the markets themselves in operating in a world context as open and competitive institutions.

In the tradition of the Church's Magisterium which Benedict XVI has vigorously embraced, the principle of subsidiarity should regulate relations between the State and local communities and between public and private institutions, not excluding the monetary and financial institutions. So, on a higher level, it ought to govern the relations between a possible future global public Authority and regional and national institutions. This principle guarantees both democratic legitimacy and the efficacy of the decisions of those called to make them. It allows respect for the freedom of people, individually and in communities, and at the same time, allows them to take responsibility for the objectives and duties that pertain to them.

According to the logic of subsidiarity, the higher Authority offers its subsidium, that is, its aid, only when individual, social or financial actors are intrinsically deficient in capacity, or cannot manage by themselves to do what is required of them. Thanks to the principle of solidarity, a lasting and fruitful relation is built up between global civil society and a world public Authority as States, intermediate bodies, various institutions – including economic and financial ones – and citizens make their decisions with a view to the global common good, which transcends national goods. As we read in *Caritas in Veritate*, “The governance of globalization must be marked by subsidiarity, articulated into several layers and involving different levels that can work together.” Only in this way can the danger of a central Authority's bureaucratic

isolation be avoided, which would otherwise risk being delegitimized by an excessive distance from the realities on which it is based and easily fall prey to paternalistic, technocratic or hegemonic temptations.

However, a long road still needs to be travelled before arriving at the creation of a public Authority with universal jurisdiction. It would seem logical for the reform process to proceed with the United Nations as its reference because of the worldwide scope of its responsibilities, its ability to bring together the nations of the world, and the diversity of its tasks and those of its specialized Agencies. The fruit of such reforms ought to be a greater ability to adopt policies and choices that are binding because they are aimed at achieving the common good on the local, regional and world levels. Among the policies, those regarding global social justice seem most urgent: financial and monetary policies that will not damage the weakest countries; and policies aimed at achieving free and stable markets and a fair distribution of world wealth, which may also derive from unprecedented forms of global fiscal solidarity, which will be dealt with later. On the way to creating a world political Authority, questions of governance (that is, a system of merely horizontal coordination without an authority super partes cannot be separated from those of a shared government (that is, a system which in addition to horizontal coordination establishes an authority super partes) which is functional and proportionate to the gradual development of a global political society. The establishment of a global political Authority cannot be achieved without an already functioning multilateralism, not only on a diplomatic level, but also and above all in relation to programs for sustainable development and peace. It is not possible to arrive at global Government without giving political expression to pre-existing forms of interdependence and cooperation.

4. Towards Reforming the International Financial and Monetary Systems in a way that Responds to the Needs of all Peoples

In economic and financial matters, the most significant difficulties come from the lack of an effective set of structures that can guarantee, in addition to a system of governance, a system of government for the economy and international finance. What can be said about this prospect? What steps can be taken concretely?

With regard to the current global economic and financial systems, two decisive factors should be stressed. The first is the gradual decline in efficacy of the Bretton Woods institutions beginning in the early 1970s. In particular, the International Monetary Fund has lost an essential element for stabilizing world finance, that of regulating the overall money supply and vigilance over the amount of credit risk taken on by the system. To sum it up, stabilizing the world monetary system is no longer a “universal public good” within its reach. The second factor is the need for a minimum, shared body of rules to manage the global financial market which has grown much more rapidly than the real economy. This situation of rapid, uneven growth has come about, on the one hand, because of the overall abrogation of controls on capital movements and the tendency to deregulate banking and financial activities; and on the other, because of advances in financial technology, due largely to information technology.

On the structural level, in the latter part of the last century, monetary and financial activities worldwide grew much more rapidly than the production of goods and services. In this context, the quality of credit tended to decrease to the point that it exposed the credit institutions to more risk than was reasonably sustainable. It is sufficient to look at the fate of large and small credit institutions during the crises that broke out in the 1980s and 1990s, and finally in the 2008 crisis.

Again in the last part of the twentieth century, there was a growing tendency to define the strategic directions of economic and financial policy in terms of ‘clubs’ and of larger or smaller groups of more developed countries. While not denying the positive aspects of this approach, it is impossible to overlook that it did not appear to respect the representative principle fully, in particular of the less developed or emerging countries. The need to heed the voices of a greater number of countries has led to expanding the relevant groups; for instance, there is now a G20 where there was once just a G7. This has been a positive development because it became possible to include developing and emerging countries with larger populations in shaping the economy and global finance.

In the area of the G20, concrete tendencies can thus mature which, when worked out properly in the appropriate technical centres, will be able to guide the competent bodies on the national and regional level towards consolidating existing institutions and creating new ones with appropriate and effective instruments on the international level.

Moreover, the G20 leaders themselves said in their final Statement in Pittsburgh 2009: “The economic crisis demonstrates the importance of ushering in a new era of sustainable global economic activity grounded in responsibility”. To tackle the crisis and open up a new era “of responsibility”, in addition to technical and short-term measures, the leaders put forth the proposal “to reform the global architecture to meet the needs of the 21st century,” and later the proposal “to launch a framework that lays out the policies and the way we act together to generate strong, sustainable and balanced global growth”. Therefore, a process of reflection and reforms needs to be launched that will explore creative and realistic avenues for taking advantage of the positive aspects of already existing forums.

Specific attention should be paid to the reform of the international monetary system and, in particular, the commitment to create some form of global monetary management, something that is already implicit in the Statutes of the International Monetary Fund. It is obvious that to some extent this is equivalent to putting the existing exchange systems up for discussion in order to find effective means of coordination and supervision. This process must also involve the emerging and developing countries in defining the stages of a gradual adaptation of the existing instruments. In fact, one can see an emerging requirement for a body that will carry out the functions of a kind of “central world bank” that regulates the flow and system of monetary exchanges similar to the national central banks. The underlying logic of peace, coordination and common vision which led to the Bretton Woods Agreements needs to be dusted off in order to provide adequate answers to the current questions. On the regional level, this process could begin by strengthening the existing institutions, such as the European Central Bank. However, this would require not only a reflection on the economic and financial level, but also and first of all on the

political level, so as to create the set of public institutions that will guarantee the unity and consistency of the common decisions.

These measures ought to be conceived of as some of the first steps in view of a public Authority with universal jurisdiction; as a first stage in a longer effort by the global community to steer its institutions towards achieving the common good. Other stages will have to follow in which the dynamics familiar to us may become more marked, but they may also be accompanied by changes which would be useless to try to predict today. In this process, the primacy of the spiritual and of ethics needs to be restored and, with them, the primacy of politics – which is responsible for the common good – over the economy and finance. These latter need to be brought back within the boundaries of their real vocation and function, including their social function, in consideration of their obvious responsibilities to society, in order to nourish markets and financial institutions which are really at the service of the person, which are capable of responding to the needs of the common good and universal brotherhood, and which transcend all forms of economist stagnation and performative mercantilism.

On the basis of this sort of ethical approach, it seems advisable to reflect, for example, on:

- a) taxation measures on financial transactions through fair but modulated rates with charges proportionate to the complexity of the operations, especially those made on the “secondary” market. Such taxation would be very useful in promoting global development and sustainability according to the principles of social justice and solidarity. It could also contribute to the creation of a world reserve fund to support the economies of the countries hit by crisis as well as the recovery of their monetary and financial system;
- b) forms of recapitalization of banks with public funds making the support conditional on “virtuous” behaviours aimed at developing the “real economy”;
- c) the definition of the domains of ordinary credit and of Investment Banking. This distinction would allow a more effective management of the “shadow markets” which have no controls and limits.

It is sensible and realistic to allow the necessary time to build up broad consensus, but the goal of the universal common good with its inescapable demands is waiting on the horizon. Moreover, it is hoped that those in universities and other institutions who educate tomorrow's leadership will work hard to prepare them for their responsibilities to discern the global public good and serve it in a constantly changing world. The gap between ethical training and technical preparation needs to be filled by highlighting in a particular way the inescapable synergy between the two levels of practical doing (praxis) and of boundless human striving (poiësis). The same effort is required from all those who are in a position to enlighten world public opinion in order to help it to brave this new world, no longer with anxiety but in hope and solidarity.

Conclusions

Under the current uncertainties, in a society capable of mobilizing immense means but whose cultural and moral reflection is still inadequate with regard to their use in achieving the appropriate ends, we are invited to not give in and to build above all a meaningful future for the generations to come. We should not be afraid to propose new ideas, even if they might destabilize pre-existing balances of power that prevail over the weakest. They are a seed thrown to the ground that will sprout and hurry towards bearing fruit. As Benedict XVI exhorts us, agents on all levels – social, political, economic, professional – are urgently needed who have the courage to serve and to promote the common good through an upright life. Only they will succeed in living and seeing beyond the appearances of things and perceiving the gap between existing reality and untried possibilities.

Paul VI emphasized the revolutionary power of “forward-looking imagination” that can perceive the possibilities inscribed in the present and guide people towards a new future. By freeing his imagination, man frees his existence. Through an effort of community imagination, it is possible to transform not only institutions but also lifestyles and encourage a better future for all peoples. Modern States became structured wholes over time and reinforced sovereignty within their own territory. But social, cultural and political conditions have gradually changed. Their interdependence has grown – so it has become natural to think of an international community that is integrated and increasingly ruled by a shared system – but a worse form of nationalism has lingered on, according to which the State feels it can achieve the good of its own citizens in a self-sufficient way.

Today all of this seems anachronistic and surreal, and all the nations, great or small, together with their governments, are called to go beyond the “state of nature” which would keep States in a never-ending struggle with one another. Globalization, despite some of its negative aspects, is unifying peoples more and prompting them to move towards a new “rule of law” on the supranational level, supported by a more intense and fruitful collaboration. With dynamics similar to those that put an end in the past to the “anarchical” struggle between rival clans and kingdoms with regard to the creation of national states, today humanity needs to be committed to the transition from a situation of archaic struggles between national entities, to a new model of a more cohesive, polyarchic international society that respects every people's identity within the multifaceted riches of a single humanity. Such a passage, which is already timidly under way, would ensure the citizens of all countries – regardless of their size or power – peace and security, development, and free, stable and transparent markets. As John Paul II warns us, “Just as the time has finally come when in individual States a system of private vendetta and reprisal has given way to the rule of law, so too a similar step forward is now urgently needed in the international community.” Time has come to conceive of institutions with universal competence, now that vital goods shared by the entire human family are at stake, goods which the individual States cannot promote and protect by themselves.

So conditions exist for definitively going beyond a 'Westphalian' international order in which the States feel the need for cooperation but do not seize the opportunity to integrate their respective sovereignties for the common good of peoples. It is the task of today's generation to recognize and consciously to accept these new world dynamics for the achievement of a universal common good. Of course, this transformation will be made at the cost of a gradual, balanced transfer of a part of each nation's powers to a world Authority and to regional Authorities, but this is necessary at a time when the dynamism of human society and the economy and the progress of technology are transcending borders, which are in fact already very eroded in a globalized world.

The birth of a new society and the building of new institutions with a universal vocation and competence are a prerogative and a duty for everyone, with no distinction. What is at stake is the common good of humanity and the future itself. In this context, for every Christian there is a special call of the Spirit to become committed decisively and generously so that the many dynamics under way will be channelled towards prospects of fraternity and the common good. An immense amount of work is to be done towards the integral development of peoples and of every person. As the Fathers said at the Second Vatican Council, this is a mission that is both social and spiritual, which "to the extent that the former can contribute to the better ordering of human society, it is of vital concern to the Kingdom of God." In a world on its way to rapid globalization, the reference to a world Authority becomes the only horizon compatible with the new realities of our time and the needs of humankind. However, it should not be forgotten that this development, given wounded human nature, will not come about without anguish and suffering. Through the account of the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11:1-9), the Bible warns us how the "diversity" of peoples can turn into a vehicle for selfishness and an instrument of division. In humanity there is a real risk that peoples will end up not understanding each other and that cultural diversities will lead to irremediable oppositions. The image of the Tower of Babel also warns us that we must avoid a "unity" that is only apparent, where selfishness and divisions endure because the foundations of the society are not stable. In both cases, Babel is the image of what peoples and individuals can become when they do not recognize their intrinsic transcendent dignity and brotherhood.

The spirit of Babel is the antithesis of the Spirit of Pentecost (Acts 2:1-12), of God's design for the whole of humanity: that is, unity in truth. Only a spirit of concord that rises above divisions and conflicts will allow humanity to be authentically one family and to conceive of a new world with the creation of a world public Authority at the service of the common good.

[End of Vatican Paper]

APPENDIX B

[Official document of the Roman Catholic Church]

Formulary for the Renunciation of Protestantism - Hungary, 1823 –

Start of confession:

1. We believe and confess that we have been brought from heretical ways and faith to the true and saving faith of Roman Catholics, by the singular care of our high spiritual and temporal magistracy, solely and wholly in consequence of the active diligence and help of Messieurs the Jesuit Fathers, and that we do of our own free will, and without any compulsion embrace the same, and we desire both with our mouths and tongues to make this known publicly to the whole world.
2. We confess that the Pope of Rome is the Head of the Church, and incapable of error.
3. We confess and believe, that the Pope of Rome is the Viceregent of Christ, and has full power according to his pleasure, to forgive and retain the sins of men, to cast into hell, and to excommunicate.
4. We confess, that all that the Pope has lately established, whether from the Scriptures or not, also whatsoever he has enjoined, is true, godly, and saving; and that every man ought to hold it in higher veneration than the law of the living God.
5. We confess, that the most holy Pope ought to be honoured with goodly honour, and indeed with the deepest reverence, such as belongs to the Lord Christ himself.
6. We confess and affirm, that the Pope ought to be obeyed by all, in all places, as their most holy Father; wherefore every heretic who lives in opposition to his institutions, ought, without any exception, without any mercy, to be cast not only far out of sight by fire, but body and soul into hell.
7. We confess, that the reading of Holy Scripture is the origin of all factions and sects, as also a fountain of blasphemy.
8. We confess, that to invoke departed saints, to venerate their holy images, to bow the knee before them, to appoint processions to them, to adorn them, to burn lamps before them, is godly, holy, useful, and wholesome.

9. We confess, that each priest is much greater than Mary the Mother of God herself as she brought forth the Lord Christ once only and brings him forth no more: but a Roman priest not only offers and creates the Lord Christ, when he will, but also always, even after he has created him, he swallows him entirely, at his pleasure.
10. We confess, that to read masses for the dead, to distribute and ask alms is useful and wholesome.
11. We confess, that the Pope of Rome has power to alter the Scriptures, and at his pleasure to add or take from them.
12. We confess, that the souls after death are cleansed by the fire of Purgatory – and that the mass offering of the Priests is their only hope of delivery from it.
13. We confess, that the use of the Eucharist under one kind is good and safe, but under both kinds is heretical and damnable.
14. We confess and believe, that whosoever receives the Eucharist under one kind receives the whole Christ, both body and blood, with his Divinity and bones – but whosoever receives it under both kinds eats only so much bread.
15. We believe, that there are seven true and genuine sacraments.
16. We confess, that God takes pleasure in images, and is known by men through the intervention of them.
17. We confess, that the Holy Virgin Mary, should be considered both by angels and men as higher than Christ the Son of God himself.
18. We confess that the Holy Virgin Mary is the Queen of Heaven, and reigns together with the Son – and that after her pleasure the Son must do all things.
19. We confess that the bones of the saints possess great virtue, on account of which they should be revered by men, and chapels built to them.
20. We confess, that the Roman Catholic faith is infallible, divine, saving, ancient and true: but that the Protestant faith (which we from our hearts renounce), is false, erroneous, blasphemous, execrable, heretical, pernicious, seditious, impious; whilst on the other hand the Roman religion is complete and perfect in all interpretations, under one only form, good and wholesome; we execrate therefore all other religions which these disputatious and impious heretics profess under a double form [*Lutheran and Calvinist - editor*]. We execrate our parents who have brought us up in this heretical faith; we execrate also every one that ever made the Roman Catholic faith doubtful or suspected by us. Likewise also the Communion that offered to us the execrable cup. Yea, we execrate ourselves, and declare ourselves execrable, inasmuch as we have been partakers of that execrable heretical cup, of which we ought not to have tasted.

21. We confess, that the Holy Scripture is an imperfect and a dead letter, so far as it is not interpreted by the Pope of Rome, and which it is permitted to be read by every layman.
22. We confess, that one mass said by a Roman priest is much more beneficial to the soul, than a hundred sermons of Protestants; and, therefore, we execrate all their books in which these heretical and blasphemous doctrines are contained. We execrate all the good works performed by us while we lived in that heretical faith, inasmuch as they will profit us nothing before God in the last judgment. All this we do out of a sincere and steady mind, declaring by a pubic recantation of this heretical faith, in the presence of _____ that the Church of Rome in the above-mentioned, and all other articles, is true; moreover we also swear, that so long as we have blood in our bodies, we will persecute this execrable Protestant faith, in private and in public, by violence, and by fraud, by words and by deeds, and even with the sword. Lastly, we swear before God, and the angels, that neither through fear nor favour will we ever renounce this our change, nor ever again turn from the saving Roman Catholic and holy Church, to the execrable Protestant heretical doctrines.

End of confession

Source: The Christian Examiner and Church of Ireland Magazine, No. XXXVI, June 1828, Volume VI, from the section entitled 'Foreign Religious Intelligence', pps.454-456. Translated from the German. Available online as a digitised Google Book.

Link to source (scroll down to p.454):

http://books.google.ie/books?id=UBoEAAAQAAJ&pg=PP15&dq=Christian+Examiner+and+Church+of+Ireland+Magazine,+Volume+VI+1828+foreign+intelligence&hl=en&ei=ep-2To6VEsSGhQe53pWwBA&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CCoQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false

For further information about the proposed One World Government and One World Religion, as well as the dangers posed to true Biblical Christianity by organized apostate and subversive groups, visit

www.zephaniah.eu