

PART 3: CONVICTED NAZI WAR CRIMINAL, “BLESSED” STEPINATZ:

**A special case study of the Antichrist’s *sin* (II Thess. 2:3):
Papal Support and Beatification in 1998 of the
Convicted Nazi War Criminal, “Blessed” Cardinal Stepinatz.**

- Chapter 1 Introduction.
- a) Disclaimer to usage of Nazi atrocities by “human rights” propagandists.
 - b) Some Roman Catholic and Nazi racial and religious theoretics relevant to understanding the Ustashi’s forced “conversions” and murders of Serbs in the Croatian Inquisition.
 - c) Lack of media coverage of World War II Papist-Nazi War Crimes.
- Chapter 2 Historical Background of the three Yugoslavias in the Balkans (1921-2006): Serbia, Montenegro, (Slav) Macedonia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Slovenia.
- Chapter 3 Some Relevant Historical Matters to the Independent State of Croatia (1941-5).
- Chapter 4 The trial and sentencing of the war criminal Archbishop Stepinatz in 1946.
- Chapter 5 Would Stepinatz have been dealt with differently if Mihailovic’s royalist Chetnik’s had won, rather than Tito’s Communist Partisans?
- Chapter 6 Various Popes support Stepinatz.
- Chapter 7 Some Jewish, Eastern Orthodox, and Protestant Responses to Stepinatz’s Beatification.
- Chapter 8 Marian Medugorje Romish cult linked in popular Papist devotion to the glorification of Stepinatz and justification of Ustashi mass murders.
- Chapter 9 Connections between Stepinatz’s Cult and Irish Roman Catholic terrorism against British Protestants.
- Chapter 10 Interconnections between Nazi Ustashi War Criminal Artukovitch, Stepinatz, Irish Roman Catholicism, and Roman Catholics in the USA.
- Chapter 11 Stepinatz’s Irish-American Cult and Croatian-American Cult.
- Chapter 12 Stepinatz’s Croatian-Australian Cult.
- Chapter 13 Glorification and honour of Stepinatz exposes the Pope as Antichrist.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

(a) Disclaimer to usage of Nazi atrocities by “human rights” propagandists.

I defend the historic concept of religious freedom found in British Law from 1689 under the Protestant Christian State; and historic concepts of e.g., freedom of speech; freedom of assembly; freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention, or imprisonment; trial by jury for a capital or heinous crime (thus allowing a jury to give a so called “perverse verdict” against an unduly oppressive law), rule of law, and other such historic freedoms, which in broad terms were continued by the Stage 1 Secular State from the 19th century till about the end of World War Two in 1945 (and broadly speaking were continued about a further 20 years in Australia till 1965).

While I support democratic government, I do not consider a universal electoral franchise is a necessary component of democracy, much less a so called “right;” nor do I think it is even desirable, so that I would e.g., support the former historic positions of not extending voting privileges to Roman Catholics in Northern Ireland, nor coloured people in South Africa, nor coloured people in the American Deep South. Believing as I do in race based nationalism, I do not endorse the 1967 referendum in Australia giving Aboriginals citizenship, and think the pre-1967 situation of them being citizens of the State (or Territory) they lived in, but not citizens of Australia, to be much preferable. The fact that this 1967 referendum had such strong support in the electorate, must be qualified by the fact that if the electorate had been told plainly that the repeal of section 127 of the Australian Constitution would mean that to be an Australian one no longer had to be a Caucasian (although the policy used to allow a small amount of assimilation from other races), and that the passage of this referendum would therefore result in the repeal of the *White Australia Policy* and a flood of coloured and / or non-Christian immigrants into the country, and so the white Christian cultural identity of Australia would be attacked by “multi-culturalism,” with various non-Christian religions and coloured races, then I think this same referendum would have been resoundingly defeated. Even if, as I think highly improbable, I am wrong in this assessment of the electoral outcome had the people of Australia been properly informed as to its ramifications, I would still never support the said repeal of section 127 on the basis that it violated the principle of race based nationalism, and bearing in mind that a number of Aboriginals have remained with their heathen religious beliefs, also the historic Christian cultural identity of Australia.

Thus I entirely repudiate the post World War Two notion that one should put the historic freedoms of predominantly white, Western, Protestant countries, under the name of “human rights,” and attach to them a raft of non-discrimination values, opposing discrimination on the basis of: 1) race, 2) sex (feminism), 3) sexual practice e.g., disallowing landlords from evicting a de facto couple because he considers they are “living in sin;” or non-discrimination of homosexuals. Connected with this propagandist concept of “human rights,” there has also been a general lessening of the freedoms of white Protestants in these lands in various ways. E.g., in the workplace they are asked to endorse such pernicious values, and reprobates who do so, now use these laws to persecute godly men who do not. Such men may be removed from jobs under such names as “inefficiency,” since they do not “efficiently” enact or practice such policies, and so the element of religious and political persecution against them is cloaked, though it is very real and oppressive.

Then there is the stealing of happiness from godly men, who are constantly subjected to the barrage of coloured people in their lands; or feminist women in various positions in society; and also the taking away from them of marital happiness by feminist poisoned females and a feminist geared economy. Ejection or exclusion from traditionally recognized academic forums, such as universities is another example of this. This may be done by e.g., “marking down” the “politically incorrect” conservatives; or quotas requiring “40% female” lecturers, all of which are necessarily feminists, so this is really a political test requiring that 40% be committed to this ideology. Control of the universities by such persons, means both post-graduate work and journal articles by the cream of the genuine academic crop, have all but come to an end for more than forty years. As with the promotion of this evil “human rights” agenda in other areas, a situation has come about where the best and brightest are excluded precisely because they do perceive the damage done by the “human rights” agenda of anti-racism, anti-sexism, etc. . (This would be like excluding anyone who considered theft or murder was dangerous and immoral, i.e., what is left is either morally corrupt, or inept, or relatively stupid compared to what has been removed.) This act of discrimination by their intellectual and moral inferiors, who are blinded by and charged up with this evil philosophy, means they think nothing of their destructive actions. Thus under the name, and in the spirit of “human rights,” there is the persecution of godly, intellectually gifted men.

And so, there has been created a *fictional academic consensus* in favour of “human rights;” and the average university student, is therefore further brainwashed into this hyper-normativity, as he seeks to live up to this academic stereotype of “the intellectual.” Alas, his average university lecturer is just as brainwashed, and just as incapable of dispassionate independent analysis, so that the average “academic” is also living up to this same crazy stereotype of “the intellectual.” (Here I note a precedent was formed for the ejection of the genuine intelligentsia, with the removal of the old earth creationists under the burden of Darwinian propaganda from the late 19th century, and the preposterous theory of “natural selection” accounting for the origins of species.) Thus the type and kind of man that God once used to bless the Western World in e.g., their universities, is no longer generally found in such established or officially recognizable “intellectual” forums. They are now, by long-standing practice, ejected or suppressed from these academic positions, or from the writing of journal articles in “respected” journals, but once again, the element of religious and political persecution against them is cloaked under such acceptable sounding names as “academic standards,” by which they really mean hyper-normativity in accepting, peddling, and promoting, their wicked “human rights” agenda in the social sciences, or Darwinian macroevolution in the biological sciences.

Religious persecution of Christians or Christian values, can take different forms. One type of persecution is a *general persecution* of anyone who professes to be Christian (whether or not they really are Christians). Such were the ten general persecutions of Christians under Pagan Rome (1st to 4th centuries), or the general persecution of Christians in ancient times outside the Roman Empire in pagan Persia¹. Such are the contemporary persecutions in Communist countries such as North Korea, or (inconsistently) *some* parts of China.

A second type of persecution is a *specific persecution of those who profess some*

¹ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, pp. 1-40 (Pagan Rome), pp. 42-3 (Pagan Persia).

specific spiritual tenet or tents of religious orthodoxy (whether or not they are orthodox in all areas, and whether or not they really are Christians). This can be perpetrated by pagans, infidels, or heretics. Under pagans, such were the persecutions under Julian the Apostate (361-3 A.D.), which saw the martyrdom of the school teacher, Cassian of Imola, specifically for refusing to sacrifice to idols in 362. Under infidels, such are the contemporary persecutions in Mohammedan (Islamic) countries that “tolerate Christians” under certain conditions, including the fact that they do not seek converts, and then persecute, in some instances killing, any converts from Mohammedanism to any professed form of Christianity. Under heretics, such were the persecutions of orthodox Trinitarians by Arians (4th to 7th centuries); or persecutions by Papal Rome against the orthodox (6th century on), such as the proto-Protestant Waldensians, Huss of Bohemia (15th century), Jerome of Prague (15th century), or such later Protestants as the Marian Martyrs (16th century)². Such are the contemporary persecutions in Northern Ireland by Irish Roman Catholic terrorists against those British who profess and call themselves Protestant.

Such also are the contemporary “human rights” efforts, supported by e.g., the World Council of Churches, to inhibit or persecute Protestant evangelists and missionaries by their bid to stem the tide of liberating enslaved souls by the gospel of Christ, claiming instead that one should be happy to leave those outside the gospel in the infidel, heathen, and Satanic religions that they are now in³. This makes a mockery of the Great Commission (Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15,16). So too in 2006, the *British Church Newspaper* reported that in London, UK, “Three Police Officer surrounded a Christian woman as she stood saying the Lord’s Prayer towards parliament and they then prevented her from continuing to pray.” “The Christian woman ... said later, ‘Because the Religious Hatred Bill was being voted on in the House of Commons that day, I felt a desperate need to pray that the Lord’s will be done through our MPs in Parliament. I was shocked that I could have been made a criminal for saying the Lord’s Prayer out loud⁴.’”

A third type of persecution is a *persecution of those upholding specific Christian morals* (whether or not they are actually Christians). Such was the martyrdom of John the Baptist by Herod, “For John had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife” (Mark 6:17-25). This same Herod maintained religious tolerance to Jews like John the Baptist, and in antithesis to the first two types of religious persecution, allowed the religion of Judaism to be professed, and for Jews to assemble in public worship, and make converts. Such also was the persecution and murder in Germany of Kilien of Ireland in 689 A.D., for he had told Governor Gozbert that the Governor’s marriage to his deceased brother’s wife was incestuous, and must be ended. Before Kilien was killed, Gozbert had

² *Ibid.*, pp. 47 (Cassian under Julian the Apostate), pp. 43-4,52-4 (Orthodox Trinitarians by Arians), pp. 56-83 (Waldensians and Waldensian Albigenses by Papal Rome), pp. 152-9 (Huss by Papal Rome), pp. 159-165 (Jerome of Prague by Papal Rome), e.g., pp. 302-582 (example of Protestant Marian Martyrs by Papal Rome).

³ *British Church Newspaper*, 26 May 2006 (in John MacKenzie’s *Faith & Facts*, South Australia, June 2006, p. 4).

⁴ Reverend Roland Parsons (a part time open-air street preacher, whom I saw engaging in open-air preaching at *Speaker’s Corner* in Hyde Park on a number of Sundays when I was living in London over a number of trips there), *British Church Newspaper*, 17 February 2006 (in Editor John MacKenzie’s *Faith & Facts*, S.A, March 2006, p. 1; now under Editor Errol Stone, P.O. Box 1117, Innaloo City, W.A., 6918, Australia).

allowed religious freedom against the first two types of persecution to Kilien and his companions⁵.

Such also are the contemporary persecutions in Western countries such as e.g., the UK, Canada, USA, or Australia, by “human rights” advocating regimes, that reject the first form of persecution against Christians, but strenuously advocate and practice this third cruel form of persecution. (In some instances, there are increasing encroachments in some Western jurisdictions involving the second type of persecution, by either discouraging or inhibiting outright some or all forms of evangelistic work.) This is particularly, though not exclusively the case, in work-place persecutions of those whose godly morals are repulsed by the evil work-place laws and evil deeds of these “human rights” practitioners. Such persons are sometimes more overtly persecuted by an anti-discrimination board. But more commonly, they are driven from work-places, or deemed by work-place supervisors to be “inefficient,” i.e., they fail to efficiently advocate and embrace evil moral laws that God’s law prohibits. Such persons are removed for “inefficiency,” not for religious reasons. Thus the element of persecution is covert (a process which may include the manufacturing of further evidence of “inefficiency” to strengthen the case).

Thus the “human rights” activists who control the universities, the political agenda, media, and so on, would claim they do not believe in “discrimination,” when in fact, they have introduced some of the worst forms of discrimination against Christians known in the Western world since the medieval times of Popery. They are for the most part persons who lack any real *intellectual consciousness*, and are ill-suited for the genuine academic life. They moronically live up to the normative academic stereotype, being blinded by both their own lusts and the god of this world; and have shorn off the better minds from formal academic discourse in journals and universities or tertiary colleges. Among their many sins, they are responsible, in their pseudo-intellectualism, for sustaining the appearance of a rationalistic intellectual basis for the debasement of society and destruction of the basic family unit. Foremost in their propaganda, and almost always listed first in their raft of lusts, is elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. In more recent times, usage of the concept of ethno-religions has also been a device used to expand the legal concept of anti-racism to include some forms of anti-evangelism of e.g., Mohammedan Arabs. The fact that such persons ought never to have been brought into the country in the first place, aside, this is really an attack on the historic freedom of Protestants to evangelize, but once again the persecution of Protestant evangelists is cloaked. And in their sale of this propaganda, the brainwashers use and misuse the Allied’s opposition to Nazism during World War Two, in order to anachronistically portray the Western World as like the Allies, i.e., as opposing all forms of racial discrimination, when in fact the Allies held no such views.

Anti-racist propaganda does not give media or academic coverage to traditional types of racist views. Rather, it focuses on Nazi, neo-Nazi, skin-head, or Ku Klux Klan type groups. At the height of Ku Klux Klan (KKK) power, in e.g., the 1920s there were a number of morally decent men, deluded into joining one of the better KKK lodges in which violence was unknown. I say “deluded,” because all KKK lodges, (like all Masonic lodges,) involve the usage of spiritual images at variance with Biblical Christianity e.g., the chief executive officer is called the “Grand Wizard;” but what saith the Word of the Lord? “There shall not be found among you” “a wizard” (Deut. 18:11 cf., Lev. 19:31; 20:6,27). Ku Klux Klansmen

⁵ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, pp. 54-6 (Kilien of Ireland).

of the “better” lodges did not support the type of violence and anti-Jewish sentiment found e.g., in the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan (KKKK), a centrally organized KKK established in 1915. But even at the height of Ku Klux Klan (KKK) power, the KKK was always a tiny fraction, well below five per cent of the population in the deeply racist, racial segregationist Deep South America. Quite apart from the fact that the KKK is a series of autonomous KKK groups with no organizational interconnection or contact between each other, some of which were more violent, and some of which were not violent at all, the fact remains that they were never representative of mainline Deep South racism.

Focusing on such lunatic groups, allows the anti-racist propaganda machine to falsely claim that it has “covered the other view.” It also means racism is depicted in a way that even historically main-line racists would not agree with. Traditional racists such as myself, would not consider the case was fairly represented through reference to such groups, would not identify with such groups, and would not consider that they represented the traditional racist view of historically white Western countries. Such depictions further mean, that if by God’s common grace, a person comes to recognize race based nationalism, they may be pushed towards these lunatic groups because the anti-racist propagandists may have still managed to persuade them that to be racist they must support these kind of organizations. Thus while they would deny it, the reality is that anti-racists are to some extent responsible for the growth of these undesirable racist groups, since their propaganda machine presents them as the only pathway open to racists. The reality is, that e.g., all British governments up to 1945 supported keeping the UK as a Caucasian nation; all Australian Prime Ministers up to Bob Menzies in 1965 were racist supporters of the White Australia Policy; or all American Presidents up till the end of World War Two were racist supporters of racial segregation, and even Harry S. Truman was an opponent of miscegenation. Any attempts to depict such men as “Nazis” and so on, are thoroughly absurd.

Therefore, “human rights” commentators on matters connected with 1930s and 1940s Nazi racial theoretics, such as e.g., the World War Two Nazi Ustashi (or Ustasha, or Ustasa, and if so plural Ustase,) of Croatia, often have a covert agenda of creating anti-racist stereotypes of “racists,” in order to promote their anti-racist “human rights” agenda. This is very deceitful. To typecast all racists as Nazis, is comparable to communist propaganda that “in speaking for the people,” typecasts all capitalists, or supporters of capitalism, as cruel and abusive exploiters of innocent persons; or Nazi propaganda that “in speaking for the German people,” typecast all anti-Nazis as being “anti-German;” or feminist propaganda that “in speaking for women,” typecasts all supporters of patriarchy as “anti-woman” cruel and abusive misogynists. It should be remembered that the liberating armies of the Allies, included e.g., first and foremost the USA, during an era when Americans generally believed in racial segregation and opposed racially mixed marriages in American law and society. Australia was a trusted member of the Allied Forces, and quite overtly endorsed the *White Australia Policy* which kept Australia defined as a Caucasian country and Christian culture with race based nationalism, and under section 127 of the Australian Constitution did not allow Aborigines to be citizens of Australia (though they were citizens of the State or Territory within Australia that they lived in).

Jews were sometimes racially Caucasian Caucasoids or Aryans (Ashkenazi), sometimes Mediterranean Caucasoids of the Jewish race (Sephardic), and sometimes an admixture of these two groups. Western European nations practised racial and religious segregation of Jews with a Jewish Quarter till the post World War Two era. E.g., I inspected the old Jewish Quarter of Amsterdam in Holland (with e.g., its Portuguese Sephardic

Synagogue) in 2002, or the old Jewish Quarter of Prague in Czech in 2004. My visit to the old Jewish Quarter of London in 2003, which started in Jewry Street, included the Sephardic Synagogue (built in 1701), traditionally used by Sephardic Jews from Spain and Portugal who first moved to Holland where Dutch Protestants were more tolerant of them, and then later under Oliver Cromwell came to England in 1657. This synagogue was built so that it would not be obvious from the outside what it was, in order to comply with various regulations when it was built, seeking to maintain England as a white Protestant Christian land. (If one keeps going into the old Jewish Quarter, somewhat further than Brune Street where there is a building still bearing the inscription, “Soup Kitchen for the Jewish Poor” built in the Jewish year “5662” or our year 1902;” one also finds an Ashkenazi Jewish Synagogue in Sandy’s Row built in 1860 for Ashkenazi Jews who also came from Holland, in 1854). I was advised by the Jewish tourist guide at the Sephardic Jewish Orthodox Synagogue, that this is the longest continuous place of Jewish worship in Europe, because even though there are older synagogues in Europe, e.g., those of Prague, their usage was disrupted during World War Two.

Moreover, the British practised Roman Catholic-Protestant religious segregation in Northern Ireland. Thus the British who formed part of the Allied Forces against Nazism, were certainly not opposed to racial and/or religious segregation during the World War Two era. This was also seen in their partition of India into the northern Mohammedan land of Pakistan at the time of Indian independence in 1947. The Jews have, with just cause, been regarded as a special case in the UK since the time they first arrived under Oliver Cromwell. We of the holy Protestant faith, look with great favour on their excellent work in the preservation of the OT oracles of God with the Hebrew Masoretic Text, and preservation of works such as the Hebrew Talmud which has both OT quotations and also acts to show in a wider context how certain Hebrew words of relevance to understanding the OT may be used. When the textual scholars of the late 15th to early 17th centuries looked to find the Hebrew Text of the OT, they went to the Jews of Europe. From them and the wider body of Mediterranean Jewry, came the Masoretic Text, and for the great Protestant textual scholars of the 16th and early 17th centuries, the Bomberg Text of 1525 was the representative Masoretic Text. It is the starting point for textual analysis on the OT, like the representative Byzantine text is the starting point for textual analysis on the NT, and under the OT *Textus Receptus* rules this OT Hebrew and Aramaic text may only be departed from where there is a clear and obvious textual problem with it, in favour of a reading inside the closed class of OT sources e.g., the Talmud, Greek Septuagint, or Latin Vulgate. This priceless treasure of the Masoretic Text found in the Bomberg Text came from these Jews, and we Gentiles thus owe them an incalculably great debt. Under these circumstances, the Protestant lands of Western Europe, such as Holland and the UK, understandably gave safe harbour and protection to the Jews, both Ashkenazi (white converts from Japheth, Gen. 10:3, though some are admixed with Sephardim) and Sephardic (Semites from Shem, Gen. 10:22, who moved to Spain and Portugal, Obad. 20, though some are admixed with Ashkenazim).

This protection and safe harbour had in the case of the Sephardic Jews, the added belief that when “the fulness of the Gentile be come in” (Rom. 11:25), God will turn to save the racial descendants of “Abraham,” “Isaac,” and “Jacob” (Rom. 9:7,10,13). I.e., the Semitic Mediterranean Caucasoids now generally found among the Sephardic Jews, who are racially the Apostle Paul’s “kinsmen according to the flesh” (Rom. 9:3). This racial group is under God’s providential protection, since at the end of time a large group of them will be “saved” (Rom. 11:26). Thus in addition to their important work in connection with preserving the OT Oracles, it is important that they be where they can hear the gospel

preached, and so are not to be excluded from Protestant lands.

The violation of this safe protection by the Nazis to Ashkenazi and Sephardic Jews, the former group being much larger than the latter group, should therefore be also contextualized within the context of a Nazi attack on those involved in the preservation of the OT Oracles, which was in fact part of a yet wider attack again on the Bible and Christian values by these wicked secularists. The Allied Forces condemnation of Nazism was just. I support the traditional approach to Jews in Protestant countries i.e., creation of a Jewish Quarter, prohibition of Jews from certain key positions e.g., Head of State (to those who object, I ask, would the modern State of Israel allow a Christian President? Even if they did, I would not allow a Jewish Head of State in a country like the UK or Australia).

On the one hand Jews were told that they were in a white Christian nation that celebrated its own racial, cultural, and religious history, and accordingly there would be some level of discrimination against them. But on the other hand, they were told that they would receive broad legal protections from the government, and allowed to make a living in certain professions. Life for the Jew in e.g., the UK before 1945 was not the same as for a white Gentile Christian; they were not placed on an equality with the white Gentile Christian, and there was no apology for that. The wider interests of society mean that the people need, and must have their own racial, cultural, and religious identity; and it would have been an act of gross cruelty, resulting in many social problems such as have occurred in the post World War Two period, to take that from them by granting minority “rights” of equality to the Jews. The Jew was not placed on an equality, but nor was life for the Jew unbearably bad. He was the only non-white or non-Christian allowed to come into the land as a citizen, albeit a second-class citizen. The type of thing that happened in Nazi Germany did not happen in countries like the UK or Australia. Portraying such persons in e.g., the UK or Australia as “neo-nazi racists” etc. is grossly dishonest and highly incorrect. When those of like mind with myself had the political power to do so, they could and would have kept Jews out if they had wanted to, and certainly their immigration levels were controlled to low levels⁶.

The reality is that the Jew owes a debt of gratitude to such white Protestant Christians, whose values also protected them from the type of killings that occurred in various parts of Europe. Certainly I would join with the Allies in condemning Nazi atrocities against Jews (and Slavs). Rather than coming at white Protestant Christians like myself and complaining that we support a white Protestant Christian society in which discrimination would make Jews second class citizens; the Jews should bow down to God in prayer, and thank him that such white Protestant Christians, being most careful gardeners to care for their own vineyard, would carve out a space for the Jew that they never carve out for various coloureds, or for Mohammedans, Hindus, Buddhists, etc.; and so create an environment where within certain

⁶ On the one hand, e.g., James Maurice of Wales refers to how in the UK, “The Aliens Acts of 1913 was enacted largely to stem the entry of Jews fleeing Tsarist pogroms. The 1936 Public Order Act was passed to contain the violent demonstrations of Jewish immigrants fleeing from Nazism,” in “Nationhood,” *English Churchman* (7802), 24 Sept. & 1 Oct. 2010, p. 2. But on the other hand, “Since the re-introduction of the Jews into England, in the time of Oliver Cromwell” (4 Blackstone Commentaries 373), the Protestant Christian policy after the Restoration nevertheless gave special favour in immigration to “foreign Protestants, and Jews,” e.g., “privileges” “with respect to Jews” meant that when the Test Acts were in place, this allowed “Jews” “naturalization” “without receiving the sacrament” (1 Bl. Com. 375); a truly great privilege, given none others!

confines, Jews could prosper. They should arise from such prayer, and thank us. *We rightly expect gratitude from the Jew for what we did, not criticism seeking legal and societal equality with us.* E.g., we want our Head of State to be a white Protestant Christian, such as we find with Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of the UK and Queen of Australia. We do not want a coloured Head of State. We do not want a Papist, Jew, Mohammedan, Hindu, Buddhist, or any other kind of Head of State. We make no apology for that, and we expect those Jews living in such a society to give their sincere loyalty to that Head of State; and not e.g., to in any way encourage or assist, by word or deed, any movement seeking the disestablishment of the *Church of England*.

Up until his death, I was the friend of Reverend Dr. Broughton Knox (1916-1994), the Principal of two Evangelical Anglican Colleges, Moore Theological College, Sydney (1959-1985), and the *Church of England in South Africa's* George Whitfield College, Cape Town (1989-1992). The son of a Northern Irish Anglican Minister, he was a Chaplain of the Royal Navy Volunteer Reserve, and in 1944 participated in the Allied Forces D-Day "Operation Overlord." Knox was a well known and vocal racial segregationist⁷. His favourite segregationist Bible passage was Genesis 13 (although his base text was always Gen. 10). In this passage, there was "strife between the herdmen of Abram's cattle and the herdmen of Lot's cattle" (Gen. 13:7). The solution was that they agreed to "separate" (Gen. 13:9), and Abraham allowed Lot to choose the land he wanted to go into (Gen. 13:9-12). Typical of Knox's views are those of his 1978 Radio Broadcast on Sydney Radio 2CH, in which he said, "Genesis 10, verses 5,20,25, and 31, together with Acts 17:24-27 make clear that the separation of nations into geographical units" "is the will of God."

"The word 'race'," said Knox, is what the "Bible" calls "nation." Such "groups" have "a common centre of loyalty" that may be manifested in e.g., "language, religion, common ancestry." "And when colour of the pigment of the skin and different physiognomy of the face are added as well, there is a very strong and distinct force to keep the group conscious of itself." Thus "Australians need to ensure that our migration policies are wise enough to forestall the destruction of our homogenous society" i.e., the *White Australia Policy*. "But what is to be done when this situation has already come about, that is, when one national group, one culture, one race finds another race occupying the same geographical area?" E.g., if, as was then happening, the *White Australia Policy* was being abandoned by ungodly Australian politicians. "Unscrambling the situation by designating different geographical areas for each group to settle in," should be "carried out justly and fairly" i.e., racial segregation. "This separation or *apartheid* has a Biblical precedent. When Abraham separated his family from the family of his nephew Lot, because of the quarrels that arose between the two groups" (Gen. 13). "Christians also need to be on their guard lest they

⁷ Knox, D.B., *Not By Bread Alone*, Banner of Truth Trust, 1989, p. ix, Chapter 8, "Race," pp. 51-6; Knox's 2CH Sunday Radio Broadcasts, entitled variously, "The Protestant Faith" or "The Christian Faith," Subtitle: "The Bible Teaching About Race," No. 14 of 1971 (11 July 1971); "The Bible Teaching About Race," No. 4a of 1974; "The Bible Teaching About Race," No. 27 of 1978 (2 July 1978); "Apartheid," No. 39 of 1981 (4 Oct. 1981); Payne, T. (Editor), *D. Broughton Knox Selected Works*, Volume III, The Christian Life, St. Matthias Press, Sydney, Australia, 2006, Part 3: "The Christian in Society," Chapter 12, "Race," pp. 191-6. In my discussions with Dr. Knox, and in his writings, he preferred to use the South African term "apartheid" rather than "racial segregation," irrespective of whether the context was South Africa or somewhere else. See my letter in support of Broughton Knox and Segregation, *English Churchman*, 10 & 17 June, 2005, p. 2.

hastily conclude that things are unjust when they are not really so. For example, inequality in the vote is not in itself an injustice.⁸

Likewise, in his 1981 Radio Broadcast on Sydney Radio 2CH, he said, “there is a lot of confused thinking and talking about apartheid amongst the politicians and churchmen.” “Apartheid” “is plainly taught in the Bible (e.g., Acts 17:26), but these days politicians and many churchmen ignore the Bible’s teaching.” But in advocating “apartheid in Africa and Australia,” Knox again referred to Genesis 13, and said that it should be done on “just and generous” terms.

So too, there is a lot of confused thinking in the churches about racially mixed marriages. A 1970s Committee Appointed by the Synod of the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*, raised “objections” to “Marriage Laws, forbidding intermingling of the races” in “South Africa,” on the basis that this was “a danger which,” they thought, “seemed to be exaggerated, for experience had shown that in any civilised state inter-marriage of the races is not practised on any serious scale.”⁹ On the one hand, this Committee which reported back to its 1973 Synod, is to be commended for recognizing that “intermingling of the races” is “a danger,” and that it is against the general principles of a “civilised state.” But on the other hand, this is a woefully inadequate response, and such anti-miscegenation laws ought not to raise any “objections.” It is also too much to say “that in any civilised state inter-marriage of the races is not practised on any serious scale,” when we have before us the awful reality of mixed race southern Europe, mixed race modern day Turkey, or the mixed race Arab world that has come into existence in conjunction with Mohammedanism. It also does not sit well with the Presbyterian *Westminster Larger Catechism* at Question and Answer 138 on the seventh commandment. This refers to “keeping of chaste company” through reference to Prov. 2:16, “To deliver thee from the strange woman, even from the stranger” (AV) or “foreigner” (ASV) “which flattereth with her words.” It also refers to “conjugal love” through reference to the contrast found in Prov. 5:19,20, between *ravishing* by a man’s “wife” in a valid marriage (Prov. 5:18,19), and *ravishing* by a “stranger” (AV) or “foreigner” (ASV), meaning “a strange woman” in an invalid marriage (cf. “strange” AV, or “foreign” ASV, in Ezra 10:2,10,11,14,17,18,44; Neh. 13:27).

Better by far were the below quoted findings of the *Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa’s* General Synod of 1966, meeting at Bloemfontein (Dutch, “Fountain of Flowers”), the capital city of the Orange Free State (later renamed the Free State in 1995). On the one hand, this found that, “The unity of mankind is specifically taught” in “the Scriptural data.” “All peoples have been created by” “God” “in his image and likeness (Gen. 1:26). Of Eve it

⁸ Compare the view of the *Church of England’s* Canon of York (1882-4), Richard Blakeney, that Roman Catholics should not be able to vote in Ireland (or what would now be Northern Ireland), in Blakeney’s *Popery in its Social Aspect*, *op. cit.*, pp. 303-5.

⁹ McPherson, A. (Editor), *History of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*, *op. cit.*, p. 277. This church is generally orthodox, and in this religiously apostate Laodicean Church Age (Rev. 3:14-22), one of the better churches. I have enjoyed sweet fellowship with godly members of this church both in London, UK, and Sydney, Australia. In fairness to them, it should also be said that their 1971 Synod passed a resolution addressed to the Prime Minister and Leader of the Opposition, asking them “to establish” “firmer links with those nations which we have more affinity through ties of religion and kinship,” thus showing some commitment to their fellow white Protestant brethren of British descent (MacSween, D.R., *One Hundred Years of Witness*, *op. cit.*, p. 131).

is said, ‘She was the mother of all living’ (Gen. 3:20). Moreover the Apostle Paul writes: ‘He hath made of one blood (or of one individual, i.e., Adam) all nations of men ...’ (Acts 17:26, cf. also Gen. 10:32; ... Rom. 5:12f; I Cor. 15:21f). All men, therefore, as created in the image of God, have the same status before him. There is no respect of persons with God (Gal. 2:6; Eph. 6:9; Col. 3:25).’ Thus *Race, People, & Nation* Canon 5 says, “All people being created in the image of God are of the same status before him; with him there is no respect of persons.”

But on the other hand, the *General Synod of Bloemfontein* (1966) also found, “Ethnic diversity is in agreement with God’s will. The process of differentiation ... received particular emphasis at Babel (Gen. 11)” (*Mixed Marriages*, Canon 7) (“Gen. 10 and 11;” “Gen. 10:32;” “Deut. 32:8;” “Acts 17:26”). Having earlier determined that, “A mixed marriage” “between people of different races,” “cannot fulfill all the essential requirements laid down for marriage by Holy Scripture, and must be rejected as impermissible;” we then find echoed in the canons, “A mixed marriage cannot fulfil all the essential conditions which Scripture lays down for marriage, and must be rejected as impermissible” (*Mixed Marriages*, Canon 8) (“Gen. 10:32;” “Gen. 11;” “Gen. 24:3-4;” Gen. 28:1-2;” “Ezra 9:1-5; 12-15;” “Acts 17:26”). “In the interests of the peoples concerned and for the welfare of the whole community, the Christian state can, under given circumstances, prohibit racial mixing through legislation. This would happen especially if there was a fundamental danger of whittling down and deliberate obliteration of lines of division, and the level of civilisation and moral values and distinctive character of the people, is endangered by the number of ‘strangers.’ In the interests of self-preservation, steps may be taken to maintain the continued existence of the character and characteristics and distinctive identity of the people” (*Mixed Marriages*, Canon 10) (“Ezra 9:1-5; 12-15;” “Neh. 13:25-27;” “Acts 17:26”)¹⁰.

The usage of “strangers” at the *General Synod of Bloemfontein* (1966) is readily cross-referrable to the “strange” wives of Ezra 10:2,10,11,14,17,18,44; Neh. 13:27 (cf. I Kgs 11:1,8), or Nehemiah’s actions of ethnic cleansing when he “cleansed them from all strangers” (Neh. 13:30). The Hebrew *nekar*, or *naḳ^lriy* means “strange” (AV) or “foreign” (ASV). When the identity of a nation as a racial “family” is remembered (Gen. 10), “stranger” necessarily includes a racial component. How might a “foreign” (ASV) wife be racially “strange” (AV)? This may refer to physiognomy. Racial traits are a stereotype built up from an average of a particular group. To say e.g., that most of the Mongoloid Red Indians from the Americas are tall, and have little facial or body hair, is not disproved by e.g., producing some red-skins of shorter stature.

¹⁰ *Human Relations in South Africa, op. cit.*, pp. 1-10. The Synod’s section, “Human Relations in the Light of Scripture” is divided into two sub-section’s, “(a) Race, People and Nation in the Light of Scripture” at pp. 1-5, with this sub-section’s 12 canons / findings / recommendations at pp. 5-6; and “(b) Mixed Marriages” at pp. 6-9, with this sub-section’s 11 canons / findings / recommendations at pp. 9-10. Where Biblical references are quoted after the canon number, this means the Scripture was not referred to in the canon itself, but used earlier in the section. I do not consider this Synod to have been without error, but I endorse those of its canons and those parts of its associated sections that I quote. Article 21 of the Anglican 39 Articles, concerns “General Councils,” rather than a “Synod” like this, but I think its basic principle of preserving that which is Biblical and jettisoning that which is not from General Councils, is methodologically sound and so may also be profitably cross-applied to synods such as this one.

Nature teaches that both mentally and physically, men are better suited to be military combatants than women e.g., men are (on average) physically stronger. For military reasons, the hair length of men in combatant roles *should* be shorter than non-combatant women, lest, like the foolish Absalom, who was in the vernacular of moral conservatives, “a long-haired git,” “with long hair like a girl,” his hair become a snare to him (II Sam. 14:25,26; 18:9,10,17). (For this same reason, men ought not e.g., to wear earrings; and ought to have the same facial hair as allowed in the military of the day e.g., a close cut naval beard, but not a long lanky beard, nor a drooping moustache going below the lip.) Thus, “doth not even nature itself teach you, that if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering” (I Cor. 11:14,15). Nature also teaches that this remains true through reference to different racial hair types e.g., the wavy-hair of Caucasoids; the straight black hair of Mongoloids; the tight, woolly, and black hair of Capoids; the wavy and black hair of Dravidic Australoids (Dravidians, Dark Vedda, and Australian Aborigines), or the wavy to woolly, curly (not as tight as Negroid curls), black hair of Negritic Australoids (Negritoes and Melanesians).

The *General Synod of Bloemfontein* (1966) refers to “Isa. 18:2,7; 45:14; Jer. 13:23.” Jeremiah notes that Ethiopians have black “skin” like a leopard’s “spots” (Jer. 13:23). Isaiah refers to Ethiopians as being “tall and smooth” (Isa. 18:2,7, NKJV). The NKJV adds in italics after the “smooth” of “tall and smooth,” the words, “of skin,” which is surely correct. Negroids have relatively slight male body hair compared to Caucasoids, for which reason those of “Ethiopia” are described as “smooth of skin” (Isa. 18:1,2,7, NKJV). Ethiopians are also of tall stature, and Isaiah also refers to this racial trait of those from “Ethiopia,” saying they are “a nation” of “tall” people (Isa. 18:1,2, NKJV), or calling “Sabeans, men of stature” (Isa. 45:14, NKJV) cf. Gen. 10:7. Nature teaches Negroids have other traits such as tight curly and black hair. In the OT Septuagint and NT, the Greek word for “Ethiopia” (Acts 8:27) is *Aithiops*, meaning *burnt-face*, referring to the Ethiopian’s black skin, and possibly also their wide noses and everted lips. We cannot doubt that these racial qualities make the Ethiopian *look strange* to Caucasoids. Thus there are racial *strangers*. This helps explain why Moses’ mixed race “son,” whose mother was Mediterranean Caucasoid (Midianite) and Negroid (Ethiopian) admixed (Exod. 2:16,21; Num. 12:1), was “called,” “Gershom: for he said, I have been a stranger in a strange land” (Exod. 2:22). It also explains why, in contrast to the Cainite-Sethite admixed children (Gen. 4:16-6:3), “Noah” is said to have been “perfect in his” racial “generations,” i.e., not *imperfect* half-caste *generations*, but *perfect* Sethite racial *generations*, “And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth” (Gen. 6:9,10).

“Strange” may refer to diverse cultural practices e.g., a different dress style. Or a foreign accent (Judges 12:6), or a difference of language would make a person *sound strange*, such as the half-caste “children” who “spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews’ language, but according to the language of each people” (Neh. 13:24). Thus there are cultural *strangers*. “Strange” may refer to heathen religious practices, i.e., a “strange god” (Deut. 32:12), so that “God” might be “provoked” “to jealousy with strange gods” (Deut. 32:15,16). Thus there are religious *strangers*. Ezra’s and Nehemiah’s opposition to mixed marriages exhibit concerns for all three, namely, the purity of the “seed” (AV) or “race” (NASB) (Ezra 9:2), cultural preservation (Neh. 13:2,24), and religious purity (Ezra 9:1). The moral message of Ezra 9 & 10; Neh. 13 against mixed marriages is thus applicable to the preservation of all three, as rightly recognized by the *General Synod of Bloemfontein* (1966).

Godly Dutch practice around the time of the great *Synod of Dort* (1618), was opposed

to mixed marriages. Thus we find in the American-Dutch Law of New York in 1638, that “intercourse with heathens, blacks, and other persons” was prohibited as being “adulterous,” thus e.g., banning mixed marriages between Whites and Heathens (religiously and racially mixed marriages), or Whites and Blacks (racially mixed marriages), or Whites and other persons (other racially mixed marriages)¹¹. Like the canons wisely condemning Arminianism in the Dutch Reformed Church’s *Synod of Dort* (1618), the above quoted canons wisely condemning racially mixed marriages in the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa’s *General Synod of Bloemfontein* (1966), stand out as very fine examples of Dutch Reformed theology and practice. This fact is in no way impaired by the tragic reality that the Dutch Reformed Church, both in Holland and South Africa, has been debilitated by liberal “tares” “sowed” “among the wheat” (Matt. 13:25). Certainly as they are now constituted, no godly Protestant would look to the Dutch Reformed Church in either the Netherlands or South Africa, in order to locate an example of Biblical Christianity. Both Dutch Reformed Churches have now moved away from the standards of Biblical Christianity endorsed in the canons of Dort (1618) against Arminianism, and the canons of Bloemfontein (1966) against miscegenation. Yet this in no way detracts from the fact that these two Dutch Reformed Synods *declared* a standard, *taken out of Holy Scripture*, both in the relevant canons on protection of the holy Reformed faith against Arminianism (Dort, 1618); and in the above quoted canons on the protection of racial groups against miscegenation (Bloemfontein, 1966), that remain beacons of guidance for those of the holy Protestant faith.

Contrary to the high moral standards in the Biblically sound *Mixed Marriages* canons of the *General Synod of Bloemfontein* (1966) quoted above, some quote, God “made of (Greek, *ek*) one blood” (AV) meaning “made from (Greek, *ek*) one blood,” (NKJV) i.e., Adam’s blood, “all nations of men” (Acts 17:26), and *then add* that this means miscegenation and racial desegregation are taught here. *This is highly interpretative and adds a great deal to the text of the Scripture.* By contrast, the text itself first make a singular-plural distinction between “one (Greek, *eis*) blood,” becoming “*pan* (every) *ethnos* (nation)” i.e., “all nations” (AV); and then goes on to say God “appointed” “the bounds of” “habitation” of these plural nations (Acts 17:26) i.e., the Scripture itself goes on to give a national segregationist interpretation, in which the original “one blood” of Adam, was diversified into the many different bloodlines of the many different “nations.” Hence when we now turn to the Book of Nature, we learn e.g., that though wrongly classified in the past as Negroid, genetic research has proven Negritic Australoids to be Australoid and not Negroid, of which clear evidence is found in the fact that their Australoid blood group is unknown among Negroids. (Nevertheless, the phenotypic similarities of the Negritic Australoids to Negroids is quite astounding.¹²) Thus contextually, God “made of” (AV) or “made from” (NKJV) the “one

¹¹ O’Callaghan, E.B. (Translator), *Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland*, 1638-1674, Albany, 1868, pp. 10-12, cited in Fowler, D.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 33,402.

¹² The Negritic Australoids (typed by the Negrito Australoid pygmies) i.e., the *Negrito* of South-East Asia and Oceania (*Head Hair*: black, woolly, and fuzzy; *Body Hair*: relatively slight male facial and body hair; *Prognathism*: strong; *Head size*: broad; *Nose*: broad; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: black; *Stature*: very short); and the *Melanesians* of Oceania e.g. Papua New Guinea (*Head Hair*: called “fuzzy-wuzzy” it is black, woolly, and fuzzy or frizzy hair which is very similar to, though not identical with, Negroid hair; *Body Hair*: relatively slight male facial and body hair; *Prognathism*: strong; *Head size*: narrow; *Nose*: broad; *Eyes*: brown; *Skin*: dark brown, although in parts of Papua New Guinea some have black skin; *Stature*: medium). “Papua” is a Malay word meaning “frizzled” with reference to the Papuans hair, and “New Guinea” was named after Guinea in Negroid Africa. “Negrito” is

blood” of Adam, the many bloodlines of “every nation of men” (Acts 17:26, NKJV).

When one adds to this the recognition that a “nation” is Biblically defined as a racial family (Gen. 10), so that e.g., in quoting “all families of the earth” from Gen. 12:3, the NT translates “families” variously as “kindreds” (AV) or racial “families” (NKJV) in Acts 3:25, and “nations” in Gal. 3:8 (AV & NKJV), it follows that Acts 17:26 actually teaches racial segregation. I.e., what the Bible conceptualizes as an *empire* containing different *nations* or *nationalities* on the basis of a racial definition of a nation; people in a society using a spatial definition of a “nation” (that is, anyone in that geographical area is unBiblically said to be of that “nation,”) would conceptualize as a “*nation*” containing different *races*. Thus the Biblical concept of an *empire* of the type built up by Nimrod in Gen. 10:8-12 & Gen. 11 containing different *nations* or *nationalities*, is the “modern” concept of a “*nation*” containing different races.

This conclusion on Acts 17:26, is also consistent with the clear practice of Acts 21, where after first having a level of inter-racial fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians, the Jewish Christians then had an act of segregated worship. (Cf. Greek *genos* from which we get “gene,” translated variously as the Jewish “nation,” Gal. 1:14, AV; “stock,” Acts 13:26, AV; “kindred,” Acts 7:19, AV; or “race” Acts 7:19, NASB) Notably, in Acts 21 it was the enemies of the Apostle Paul who falsely claimed that Christianity opposed such segregation, and the holy Apostle ultimately died a martyr’s death on the false charge that he had taken a Gentile, Trophimus, over the very formal segregation line that started at the Gate Beautiful. This conclusion on Acts 17:26 is also consistent with the canons in the *Council of Jerusalem* (Acts 15:20,29; 21:25), which held that when Jewish and Gentile Christians came together in a fellowship meal, Gentile Christians were to respect Jewish cultural sensibilities by not eating “things strangled” and “blood,” even though they were not generally bound by such Jewish food rules (Mark 7:19, NASB; Col. 2:16; I Tim. 4:1-5). For the sake of weaker brethren, they were also to abstain from food offered to idols, though once again, this was not generally the case for stronger brethren (I Cor. 8). But they were also to abstain from “fornication” (AV) or “sexual immorality” (NKJV). Since both Jewish and Gentile Christians were always to practice sexual purity, it follows that this injunction, like the others, was tailored to when Jewish and Gentile Christians come together in a fellowship meal. Since the only form of “sexual immorality” that can occur when Jewish and Gentile Christians come together, but not when they are apart, is inter-racial dating and/or marriage, it follows that in harmony with the segregationist spirit of Acts 21, this is a prohibition on miscegenation between the two groups of Christians. Thus the broader context of Acts 17:26 throughout the Book of Acts, clearly supports the usage of Acts 17:26 in support of the above quoted canons of the *General Synod of Bloemfontein* (1966).

While it is true that all men are descended from Adam, it is also true that through Noah’s three sons God created different racial groups, and dispensed racial blessings and curses through Noah. E.g., it was necessary that the Messiah come through the line of Noah’s son Shem / Sem, i.e., the blessed Semites (Gen. 9: 26; Luke 3:36). Such racial blessings (Gen. 9:27; Matt. 8:5-13) and curses (Gen. 9:25,26; Matt. 15:21-28), can no more

Spanish for “little Negro” and the Negritoes were first called “Negrito” by Spaniards who thought the Negritoes of the Philippines must have been “little Negro” survivors from a shipwrecked slave-trade ship. (But since “Negro” or “Negrito” like Negroid comes from the Spanish or Portuguese word, *negro* meaning “black,” the term “Negrito” can still be used for the Australoid *Negrito* pygmies as opposed to the African Negroid *Negrillo* pygmies.)

be removed by the gospel this side of glorification, than can the racial curse of original sin derived from the racial progenitor of the human race, Adam (Rom. 5-8). Inside the wider human (primary) race, the races of man are different by God's decree. This is clear in both Scripture and Nature.

Southern Europe and Asia Minor were historically white Japhethite lands. Through race mixing over time, this feature was lost. And with it, was lost the Aryan creative genius of e.g., the ancient Greeks, or the ancient imperial Roman Empire. Popery helped perpetuate this racial disaster with an overlaying religious disaster; and it was not until the Protestant Reformation liberated a group of Japhethites in north-western Europe, that the combined Caucasian racial blessing of God (Gen. 9:27), and Protestant religious blessing of God (Gal. 3:11,14), finally allowed the broken pieces to be picked up, and some real progress to once again get going. For the racial blessing of the Japhethites had found it hard to burst through under the religious curse of Popery. Such a token of the Divine displeasure, as the loss of creative genius from the generalized miscegenation of southern Europe and Asia Minor (Turkey) is there for any with eyes to see. It stands as a powerful witness against those who think they can get down into the gutter to promote racial desegregation and miscegenation, and then pray, "God bless this mess" (Prov. 28:9; Isa. 1:15; Mal. 2:13).

Racially mixed marriages are contrary to the law of God. Under Divine Inspiration, King Solomon said, "And why wilt thou, my son, be ravished with a strange (Hebrew *zar*) woman, and embrace the bosom of a stranger (Hebrew *nak^eriy*)?" (Prov. 5:20). Warning is specifically given against "the evil woman" who in Hebraic poetical parallelism is "the flattery of the tongue of a strange (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) woman" (Prov. 6:24). For "wisdom entereth into thine heart" (Prov. 2:10), "to deliver thee from the strange (Hebrew *zar*) woman, even from the stranger (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) which flattereth with her words" (Prov. 2:16). "For the lips of a strange (Hebrew *zar*) woman drop as an honeycomb, and her mouth is smoother than oil: but her end is bitter as wormwood, sharp as a two-edged sword. Her feet go down to death; her steps take hold on hell" (Prov. 5:3-5). "The mouth of a strange (Hebrew *zar*) woman is a deep pit; he that is abhorred of the Lord shall fall therein" (Prov. 22:14). So "say unto wisdom, Thou art my sister; and call understanding thy kinswoman; that they may keep thee from the strange (Hebrew *zar*) woman, from the stranger (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) which flattereth with her words" (Prov. 7:4,5). "For a whore is a deep ditch; and a strange (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) woman is a narrow pit" (Prov. 23:27).

Hebrew *zar* and *nak^eriy* mean "foreigner" or "stranger,"¹³ and so when found together

¹³ In the OT, Hebrew *zar* and *nak^eriy* literally mean strange (stranger) or foreign (foreigner). While they may refer to someone who *commits adultery*, as seen in Ezek. 16:32, where "a wife" "committeth adultery (Hebrew *na'aph*)" when she "taketh strangers" (my emphasis), it is quite another thing to claim that Hebrew *zar* and *nak^eriy* mean adultery, which is Hebrew *na'aph*. There is no warrant for such an interpretive "translation" as "adultery" in these verses. The NASB makes such an interpretive translation, but then seeks to save the anti-miscegenationist meaning of the passages by placing miscegenation in Hebraic poetical parallelism with adultery, i.e., "strange (Hebrew *zar*) woman" with "adulteress (Hebrew *nak^eriy*)" (Prov. 2:16, NASB); "an adulteress (Hebrew *zar*)" with "the bosom of a foreigner (Hebrew *nak^eriy*)" (Prov. 5:20, NASB); and "an adulteress (Hebrew *zar*)" with "the foreigner (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) who flatters with her words" (Prov. 7:5, NASB). Even worse, the NKJV uses *adultery* or *seduction* in Proverbs for *zar* and *nak^eriy*, and

in Obadiah 11, they are translated in the Authorized Version as “the strangers” (Hebrew *zar*) “and foreigners” (Hebrew *nak^eriy*). So too, in the American Standard Version, this distinction is used in Proverbs to alert the reader to the different Hebrew words. Thus we read, “For why shouldest thou, my son, be ravished with a strange (Hebrew *zar*) woman, and embrace the bosom of a foreigner (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) ?” (Prov. 5:20, ASV). “For wisdom shall enter into thine heart” (Prov. 2:10, ASV), “to deliver thee from the strange (Hebrew *zar*) woman, even from the foreigner (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) that flattereth with her words” (Prov. 2:16, ASV). So “say unto wisdom, Thou art my sister; and call understanding thy kinswoman; that they may keep thee from the strange (Hebrew *zar*) woman, from the foreigner (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) that flattereth with her words” (Prov. 7:4,5, ASV).

These words are also used in the context of racially mixed marriages, and the children of such mixed marriages. Moses had his life-span reduced from something like his father’s 205 years (Gen. 11:32), to just 120 years (Deut. 34:7) because he entered a racially mixed marriage (Gen. 6:3). His wife, the Midianite or Ethiopian, Zipporah, “bare him a son, and he called his name Gershom: for he said, I have been a stranger (Hebrew *ger*) in a strange (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) land” (Exod. 2:21). Hosea declared, “They have dealt treacherously against the Lord: for they have begotten strange (Hebrew *zar*) children” (Hosea 5:7). In Ezra 10 and Neh. 13, Hebrew *nak^eriy* is used for the “strange” (AV) or “foreign” (ASV) wives in the mixed marriages (Ezra 10:2,10,11,14,17,18,44; Neh. 13:27) e.g., “We have trespassed against our God and have taken strange (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) wives.” “Now therefore let us make a covenant with our God, to put away all the wives, and such as are born of them, according to the counsel” “of those that tremble at the commandment of our God” (Ezra 10:2,3).

Christ reintroduced the absolute ban on miscegenation in antediluvian times (Gen. 6:1-4,9,10; Matt. 24:37-39; Luke 17:26,27). For the Christian who recognizes this, Christ further says, “There is no man that hath left” “wife,” “for the kingdom of God’s sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come, life everlasting” (Luke 18:29). The Christian is not permitted to leave his wife because he is a believer, and she is not, either because he married before he converted, or because she has since apostatized; although if the unbelieving spouse of such a union deserts, then the Christian may lawfully divorce her and remarry (I Cor. 7:10-16,39 cf. passive adultery in a denial of conjugal rights, Matt. 19:9 & Judg. 19:2). But Christ here refers to a believer who himself “hath left,” literally, “he hath left (*apheken*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *aphiemi*).” Therefore this must be for an invalid union. St. Luke’s Gospel lacks the contextual example of incest (Matt. 14:4; Mark 6:18; cf. Luke 9:7-9), but does provide the contextual example of miscegenation a short space before (Luke 17:26,27); and so contextually this seems to be the issue here primarily isolated; although on application of this principle, one could certainly also apply Luke 18:29 to incest (cf. I Cor. 5:1).

“pagan” for *nak^eriy* in Ezra 10 & Neh. 13. The NKJV goes well beyond any defensible limits of legitimate translation principles, and engages in blatant perversion of Holy Writ in these absurd substitutions for strange (stranger) or foreign (foreigner). It seems unlikely that at least some of these strange women, or some of their children, did not convert to Judaism, or that some of the children could not have been brought up in Judaism. Concerns of heathen religion was only one itemized issue (Ezra 9:1). Other issues included racial purity (Ezra 9:2), cultural purity of the Hebrew language (Neh. 13:23,24), or a combination of racial, cultural, and religious purity (Neh. 13:1-3; Deut. 23:2-8). Indeed, the very usage of *nak^eriy* meaning “strange” (AV) or “foreign” (ASV), shows an anti-miscegenation concern.

A contrast is made between a “stranger” (Hebrew *naḳ^eriy*), and one’s racial “brethren” or “brother” in Deut. 17:15, which says, “thou mayest not set a stranger over thee,” but rather, “one from among thy brethren.” Hence, when we read in Ezek. 16:32, of “a wife that committeth adultery (Hebrew *na’aph*), which taketh strangers (Hebrew *zar*) instead of her husband!” it is clear that the added element of miscegenation is mentioned in order to portray a particularly obnoxious form of adultery. In my opinion, it would be unwarranted to conclude from this that Hebrew *zar* or *naḳ^eriy* can therefore mean “adultery,” which is the quite different Hebrew word *na’aph*. However, it must be said, that this added element of miscegenation in Ezek. 16:32 only makes sense on the premise that this makes it a worse form of adultery, and so by definition, miscegenation must therefore contain an element of immorality that can be itemized under the Moral Law of the Decalogue, “Thou shalt not commit adultery” (Exod. 20:14; Rom. 13:9).

This conclusion is confirmed by the words of Prov. 6:20,23-25. “My son, keep thy father’s commandment, and forsake not the law of thy mother” (Prov. 6:20). This evidently refers to the types of injunctions found in Gen. 24:2-4, where Abraham told Isaac to “take a wife” of his own “kindred;” or Gen. 28:1,2 where Isaac told Jacob, “Thou shalt not take a wife of the daughters of Canaan,” and he instead took one who was of his “flesh” and “bone” (Gen. 29:14). “For the commandment is a lamp; and the law is light; and reproofs of instruction are the way of life: to keep thee from the evil woman, from the flattery of the tongue of a strange woman. Lust not after her beauty in thine heart; neither let her take thee with her eyelids” (Prov. 6:23-25). When enticed by “the evil woman” with “the flattery of the foreigner’s tongue” (ASV), “lust not” for miscegenation (Prov. 6:24,25), clearly categorizes miscegenation under the tenth commandment as a forbidden sexual lust, and thus also categorizes it under the seventh commandment as a form of sexual immorality. (This conclusion is also consistent with the fact that the text of Scripture then goes on to discuss other forms of sexual immorality that can be categorized under the prohibition of adultery, Prov. 6:26-32).

Thus it also follows that the anti-miscegenation injunctions of Prov. 2:10,16; 5:3-5,20; 6:24; 7:4,5; 22:14; 23:27 are universal laws, that remain applicable under Christian morality. “For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou are become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty” (James 2:10-12). Since it is clear from Prov. 6:24,25, that miscegenation is properly characterized as a form of sexual immorality prohibited under the moral law of the Decalogue’s seventh and tenth precepts, it follows that the component of prohibiting race mixing in the mixed marriages of Ezra 9 & 10 and Neh. 13, is a universal law, not merely a provincial OT Jewish precept. Thus a prohibition of racially mixed marriages applicable to Christians remains present in Ezra 9 & 10 and Neh. 13.

This conclusion is also consistent with the fact that the writing style of the Book of Proverbs is known as *Wisdom Literature*. This has pithy spiritual and moral maxims of a universal quality, relevant across time, culture, and applicable under both OT and NT morals. Its teachings are applicable to all people, at all times, everywhere. Christ himself recognizes this principle, when he says that a woman, of neither the Jewish race nor religion, namely, the Gentile Queen of Sheba (I Kgs 10:1), “came from the uttermost parts of the” known or local “earth” of that time, which was around “the south” western part of Arabia, in order “to hear

the wisdom of Solomon” (Matt. 12:42; cf. Gen. 10:7,28). This means that by God’s common grace, all men are capable of hearing and responding to the type of spiritual and moral guidance found in Solomon’s Book of Proverbs.

This conclusion is also harmonious with the teaching of Rom. 1 & 2, were those who turn away from God’s common grace become “fools” and “foolish” (Rom. 1:21,22), so that by definition, if they do the converse and hearken to God’s common grace discoverable through godly reason, they become *wise*. Such wisdom includes a capacity to respond to the wisdom found in the Book of Proverbs. Hence when we read, “wisdom entereth into thine heart” (Prov. 2:10), “to deliver thee from the strange (Hebrew *zar*) woman, even from the stranger” (AV) or “foreigner” (ASV) (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) “which flattereth with her words: which forsaketh the guide of her youth, and forgetteth the covenant of her God” (Prov. 2:16,17); we are forcibly reminded that we read a universal law of God against miscegenation. A “strange woman” is one that “forsaketh the guide of her youth,” i.e., “by nature,” “the Gentiles which have not the law,” by common grace know that miscegenation is wrong, and that to marry a person of another race requires that they smash through a glass barrier put in place by God himself. Thus “the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience” “bearing witness, and their thoughts” “accusing or else excusing,” them (Rom. 2:14,15), is their “guide” (Prov. 2:17). But the “strange woman” “forsaketh the guide of her youth” (Prov. 2:16,17), since she sears her conscience and enters a mixed marriage. (Cf. “Unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled. They profess that they know God; but in works deny him, being abominable and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate,” Titus 1:15,16).

The strange woman forgets the God of Nature (Rom. 1:19-21). She also “forgetteth the covenant of her God” (Prov. 2:17). God made a “covenant” with “all flesh” through Noah (Gen. 9:17), having destroyed the antediluvians for their “violence” (Gen. 6:11,13; 9:6). They had earlier had their life-spans reduced to 120 years for the sin of miscegenation (Gen. 6:1-3), and after the Flood God made new racial families through Noah’s three sons (Gen. 10). The Noachic Covenant, evident in the rainbow, should remind people, among other things, that God created and separated the races. Those who violate the laws of nature became, among other things, “covenant breakers” (Rom. 1:31); and the “stranger” (AV) or “foreigner” (ASV) who inter-marries, “forgetteth the covenant of” none other than “God” himself” (Prov. 2:17).

In order for the anti-miscegenation values in the Book of Proverbs to meet this requirement of being discernable by reason through common grace, it follows that by godly reason men must be able to discern that God created and separated different races and groups with their own languages, and that God therefore wills the preservation of these racial groups. The conclusion that Scripture teaches that those who walk in *the light of nature* will recognize that miscegenation is wrong, means that both the natural law, and also the divine law revealed (Prov. 2:10,16; 5:3-5,20; 6:24; 7:4,5; 22:14; 23:27; Luke 11:31; Rom. 1 & 2), teach that “a whore is a deep ditch; and a strange woman is a narrow pit” (Prov. 23:27). “For why shouldest thou, my son, be ravished with a strange woman, and embrace the bosom of a foreigner?” (Prov. 5:20, ASV); since “a foreign woman is a narrow pit” (Prov. 23:27, ASV).

If so, it might be reasonably asked, how could King Solomon, who not only had the light of nature, but also under Divine inspiration wrote these verses in Proverbs, possibly not follow them? The words of Prov. 1:1, “The proverbs of Solomon the son of David, king of Israel,” may mean that he compiled this book when his father was still king, and so Solomon

was still relatively young. If so, he later forsook “the guide of” his youth” (Prov. 2:17), for of “Solomon” it is said, that he “loved many strange (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) women” (I Kgs 11:1), or “strange (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) wives” (I Kgs 11:8). On the one hand, what King Solomon wrote in the Bible, was the result of verbal inspiration. I.e., the Spirit of God chose words and terminology out of Solomon’s vocabulary, and told him what to write (Num. 22:20; Isa. 51:16; Jer. 1:7; II Tim. 3:16). Hence the prophets did not say, “I think maybe this or that,” or “In my opinion,” or “I guess that,” or even “Thus saith Isaiah,” or “Thus saith Jeremiah;” but rather, they declared, “Thus saith the Lord” (e.g., Isa. 51:22; Jer. 2:2). Thus in quoting Solomon’s Proverbs, “Envy thou not the oppressor” (Prov. 3:31), and in the Septuagint the second part of verse 31 reads, “neither do thou covet (*zeloses*, from *zeloō*) their ways” (LXX)¹⁴; followed by Prov. 3:34 (LXX), St. James says, “Do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, the spirit that dwelleth in us ‘lusteth’ [*epipothei*, from *eipipotheo*] to ‘envy’? But he giveth more grace. Wherefore he saith, ‘God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble’” (James 4:5,6). For Solomon’s Proverbs are “Scripture.”

But on the other hand, only Christ was sinless, and every Bible writer “was a man subject to like passions as we are” (James 5:17). Thus notwithstanding the fact that under inspiration Solomon condemned miscegenation in Prov. 2:10,16; 5:3-5,20; 6:24; 7:4,5; 22:14; 23:27; it must be admitted, that to his shame, Solomon himself entered some racially mixed marriages, and at least some of these were even more sinful because they were additionally religiously mixed (I Kgs. 11:1-8). For “did not Solomon king of Israel sin by these things? Yet among many nations was there no king like him, and he was beloved of his God, and God made him king over all Israel: nevertheless even him did foreign (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) women cause to sin. Shall we then ... do this great evil, to trespass against our God in marrying foreign (Hebrew *nak^eriy*) women?” (Neh. 13:26,27, ASV).

Though in the OT we read of isolated instances where racially mixed marriages and polygamy were permitted, a careful reading of Scripture indicates that they were fraught with problems that the wise person would wish to avoid. Hence when our Lord reintroduced the earlier antediluvian ban on miscegenation (Gen. 6:1-3; Matt. 24:37-39), and earlier antediluvian ban on polygamy (Gen. 4:19; 7:13; Matt. 19:9), the wise and godly no doubt heaved a great sigh of relief that such folly was once again banned outright, and that from then on, under Christian morality only homogenous and monogamous marriages would be allowed.

Racially mixed marriages have been visited with tokens of Divine displeasure, such as reducing the participants age lengths from periods in the 700s to 900s of years (Gen. 4:16-5:32), down to a maximum of just 120 years (Gen. 6:1-3). This penalty applied when age lengths were from periods around the 140s to 200s (Gen. 11:24,25,32), even to a generally righteous man, Moses, who married a Midianite / Ethiopian woman (Exod. 2:16,21; Num.12:1) from the western Hamite-Semite admixed strip on the Arabian Peninsula (Gen. 10:7,28,29), in the north-western region known as either “Cushan” or “Midian” (Hab. 3:7), and who under the Gen. 6:3 decree was not permitted to live like his father, 205 years (Gen.

¹⁴ Though the LXX here uses a dynamic equivalent, since the two parts of Prov. 3:31 are in Hebraic poetical parallelism, and the first part refers to “envy” (“Envy thou not the oppressor,” AV) to so render this second couplet (“and choose none of his ways,” AV, Hebrew *bahar* rendered “choose,” AV can also be rendered “desire”) as “covet” or “lust” is therefore accurate (even though without a Divine warrant such as here, I do not support such dynamic equivalents).

11:32), but just 120 years (Deut. 34:7).

The patriarch Isaac, was careful to marry a woman of his own race (Gen. 24:1-4), and he lived to be 180 years of age (Gen. 35:27). His son Jacob, was also careful to marry a woman of his own race (Gen. 28:1,2), for of “Rachel” it could be said, “Surely thou art my bone and my flesh” (Gen. 29:10,14; cf. II Sam. 5:1; 19:13; I Chron. 11:1); and he lived to be 147 years old (Gen. 47:28). But one of his sons, Joseph, though generally a righteous man, entered a mixed marriage with the Egyptian, Asenath (Gen. 41:45, cf. Deut. 23:7,8), and so his age was reduced to be under 120 years, and in fact he lived to be 110 years old (Gen. 50:26).

Those who enter racially mixed marriages do not “take hold of the paths of life” (Prov. 2:17), “for the lips of a strange woman drop as an honeycomb,” “but her end is bitter.” “Her feet go down to death; her steps take hold on hell” (Prov. 5:3-5). Whatever age a miscegenationist lives to, even if it is a relatively great age, like Joseph’s 110 years or Moses’ 120 years, it is less than what that person would have lived to, if that person had not been a miscegenationist. “For” God” will “add” “length of days, and long life,” only to those who “keep” his “commandments” (Prov. 3:1,2); but he gives “death” with an early grave to the one who intermarries with a “stranger” or racial “foreigner” (ASV) (Prov. 5:5,20). The God who reduced miscegenationists life-spans in Bible times, still does so today. He says he will do so in the Book of Proverbs (Prov. 2:16-19; 3:1,2; 5:3-5), and it is “impossible for God to lie” (Heb. 6:18). For “fornicators and adulterers God will judge” (Heb. 13:4, NKJV).

So too, Abraham was a generally righteous man. But when he entered a Hamite-Semite mixed marriage with Hagar, he incurred this token of Divine displeasure, that the half-caste Ishmael would “be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man’s hand against him” (Gen. 16:12). This racial curse of abnormally high violence was to be found also in his admixed race, for the Ishmaelite race “settled in defiance of all his relatives” (Gen. 25:18, NASB). And when, after more than two and a half millennia, under the religion of Mohammedanism these Arabian Peninsula Arabs intermingled their blood with the north African and west Asian Mohammedans to form the modern Arab race, this racial curse was greatly spread around, so that the world has experienced a great deal of violence from them, which it might have been spared, had Abraham not taken a wife from another race¹⁵.

The God who says he will reduce the life-span of miscegenationists (Prov. 2:16-19; 3:1,2; 5:3-5), dramatically fulfilled his word in Ruth’s first marriage, for we read that her Jewish husband “died” after about “ten years” of this union, as did his Jewish brother, who also married a Moabitess (Ruth 1:3-5). These mixed marriages thus proved to be, “the kiss of death.” And when Ruth later remarried another Jewish man, God again dramatically fulfilled his law against mixed marriages, by very clearly illustrating an operation of the anti-mixed marriage laws of Deut. 23:2-8. *When will men learn to walk humbly with God?*

¹⁵ The Semitic Abraham “cast out” (Gen. 21:10) the Hamitic Hagar the Horrible, for “what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son” (Gal. 4:30). Hence because the mixed marriage was clearly ended, Abraham did not incur the penalty of having his age reduced to no more than 120 years (Gen. 6:3). Thus Abraham lived at least 55 years longer than he would have if he had kept Hagar as a wife, since he lived to be 175 years old (Gen. 25:7). This fact also tells us that his other wife, Keturah (Gen. 25:1,4), must have been of his own Semitic race.

We cannot doubt that Ruth was a generously righteous person, who said of Israel's God, "thy God" shall be "my God" (Ruth 1:16). Yet she was a Moabitess who married a Jewish man. What saith the Word of the Lord? "A bastard" (Hebrew *mamzer*, in Zech. 9:6 translated "bastard race," ASV ftn., or "mongrel race," NASB, or "mixed race," NKJV¹⁶), "shall not enter the congregation of the Lord; even to his tenth generation," and a specific mention is given of the "Moabite" (Deut. 23:2,3). Any cultural or religious hostility would be removed a long way short of ten generations, but the issue of racial purity requires a stern discipline. This union of Ruth and Boaz was visited with this token of Divine displeasure, i.e., 10 generations of bastardy, so that in the genealogy of Matt. 1:5, there is a jump in time from the beginning of the Judges with Rahab and Ruth (Matt. 1:5), some hundreds of years to the time of Jesse and David (Matt. 1:6). It is almost as if the entire period of the Judges did not exist, for 10 generations of bastardy are here omitted.

If the justice of God's holy judgment on miscegenation is not spared, even for generally righteous people such as Abraham, Joseph, Moses, and Ruth, it certainly did not stop to save the leaders of Israel and others, who committing this sin in such large numbers in the time of Ezra (Ezra 9 & 10) and Nehemiah (Neh. 13), had their marriages which involved both race and religious mixing, declared null and void, and their children declared bastards. Nor in this depiction of generalized miscegenation was there any leniency shown to any who, like Abraham, Joseph, Moses, and Ruth, may have been in general terms, righteous. Nor could there have been, for while a race may absorb a small amount by assimilation, and remain generally pure; so that God could allow isolated instances of miscegenation in the OT, but punish them in his own way, and in his own time for their sin; this cannot be done when the intake is so large as to threaten the integrity of the general population group. In addition to religious concerns (Ezra 9:1), racial purity was at stake (Ezra 9:2), as Ezra says, "the holy seed" (AV) or "the holy race has intermingled" (NASB) (Ezra 9:2); and so in order to protect the general population group, the marriages were ended, with no exceptions. And all of them were segregated into a mixed races area. Those from Nehemiah's time (Neh. 13:23,24) appear to have fulfilled the prophecy, "a mixed race" (NKJV) or "a mongrel race will dwell in Ashdod" (Zech 9:6, NASB). Perhaps some of these who were generally godly, were used to preach the good news among their own "bastard race" (Zech. 9:6, ASV ftn).

So too, the prophet Daniel warns that from the time of its rise (in the sixth century A.D.), the Kingdom of Antichrist which in Western Europe seeks amalgamation and union through racially mixed marriages, will keep doing so till the end of time, and be destroyed for their sins by none other than Christ himself (Dan. 2:43,44). This is the same Christ who descended into hell in "triumphing" march (Col. 2:15), "and preached unto the spirits in prison" of miscegenationists and violent persons, "which sometime were disobedient" "in the days of Noah" (I Peter 3:19,20), telling them that his victory had sealed their eternal doom.

¹⁶ Since the leader of this Zech. 9:6 community represented his community, the Hebrew means both "a bastard shall dwell in Ashdod" (AV & ASV), and "a bastard race shall dwell in Ashdod" (ASV ftn), i.e., on the plural meaning "half-breeds" or "a half-breed race." But this single-plural element cannot be translated simultaneously into English, and so while the AV rendering of Zech. 9:6 is correct, it only captures one element of the greater meaning. This "bastard" (AV & ASV) and the "bastard race" he ruled (ASV ftn.), appear to have been the group of half-castes ethnically cleansed under Nehemiah (Neh. 13), for some of those "Jews ... had married wives of Ashdod, ... and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language" (Neh. 13:23,24).

Such is Christ's holy hatred of this vice. This is the same Christ, who in referring to conditions existing just before his return, itemized gluttony, drunkenness, and miscegenation as three outstanding sins that he shall visit his hot displeasure upon (Matt. 24:37-39).

A racially mixed marriage is a sin contrary to the holy law of God, as set forth in the Divine Revelation of the Holy Bible; and it is detestable in the eyes of all right-minded persons who heed the light of nature, and by godly reason read God's Book of Nature. For nature teaches that God himself created and segregated the races, and the Divine revelation tells us how this happened. It has been visited with tokens of Divine displeasure in former times, is visited with tokens of Divine displeasure in our own time, and is to be visited with Divine displeasure at the Second Advent; it has produced many evils; and from the seventeenth century, was for hundreds of years a punishable offence in the statute books of a number of predominately white, Protestant, American States of Dutch and British origins. As part of the sexually permissive society of the post World War Two Era, the US Supreme Court usurped the authority of the laws of God himself, in order to wickedly invalidate the anti-miscegenation statutes of numerous American States. In fact, with this sin on the increase, the correct response would be to more stringently enforce such anti-miscegenation statutes, and widen their orbits to all possible jurisdictions.

Thus I denounce and reject the anti-racist "human rights" values. They emanate in their modern philosophical form and political packaging, from the Thomas Paine "Rights of Man" type thinking connected with the French Revolution (and wisely opposed at the time by Edmund Burke); though they also have an overlay in their "modernist" form with the nineteenth century libertine philosophy of John Stuart Mill (rightly opposed at the time by James Fitzjames Stephens). Though in their present form finding antecedents in some of the putrid, ungodly, philosophy of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, such "human rights" philosophy has at a political level, been primarily successful in the Western World from the middle of the twentieth century on. I therefore write as one who is conscious of the great misuses made by such persons of Nazi atrocities to bolster their own "human rights" atrocities, of which feminism's "demand" for the abortion slaughter of tens of millions of unborn children is just one example.

While at the time of World War Two those of the white supremacist racist British Empire, or racial segregationist America, did not oppose *all forms of racial discrimination*, they did oppose the Nazi's aberrant racial theoretics, which deviated from mainstream Western racist ideology in a number of important particulars. Among other things, while predominantly Protestant white countries did not want race-mixing (although some permitted very small scale assimilation), such as sometimes occurred between Caucasian Ashkenazi Jews and Semitic Sephardic Jews (producing the white hooked-nose stereotypical Jew of Nazi propaganda), and so e.g., supported segregation of Jews and other groups, they did not support genocide of them as did the Nazis with e.g., the Jewish genocide. Mixed marriages were discouraged or prohibited by law, sometimes with wise criminal sanctions in the USA, but unlike under Nazism, neither those involved in them, nor those born of them, were killed. The proper solution to groups such as the Jews or admixed Serbs, lay in segregation and prohibition of mixed marriages with them, NOT in their mass murder.

Nazi racial classification was within mainline and defensible racial classification parameters in recognizing that within the human race, there are secondary races such as Caucasoids, Negroids, and Mongoloids, and that within secondary race e.g., within Caucasoids, there is a Caucasian tertiary race and Mediterranean tertiary race. However, in

their finer classification of groups beyond tertiary race, the Nazis often went badly astray, and even contradicted themselves. E.g., their claims that inside the Caucasian (tertiary) race of the Caucasoid (secondary) race, the German ethnic race was “the true Aryan,” conflicted with their claim that the Swedish type of blonde haired and blue eyed Caucasian was “the true Aryan.” This elastic and contradictory Nazi usage of “the true Aryan,” shows that under strict scrutiny, Nazi racial theoreticians were driven in their finer details by a mixture of ideological and political concerns, rather than purely intellectual analysis of racial or ethnic groups.

This same error is evident in their treatment of the Jews. While some were Caucasian (Ashkenazi) and Mediterranean (Sephardic) admixed, not all were. The pure Jewish Semitic group of Sephardic Jews were evidently greatly blessed from Shem, as seen in their ancient recognition of monotheism, and their taking of the Promised Land in which they subjugated the accursed Canaanites as a servant race. The Caucasian Jewish group of Ashkenazi Jews had the racial blessings of Japheth (Gen. 9:25-27). The Jews were generally segregated from the non-Jewish community, and they posed no serious threat to Western Europe of the type and kind claimed by Nazi propaganda. Nazi racial theoreticians about “the Jew” were thus likewise driven in their finer details by a mixture of ideological and political concerns, rather than purely intellectual analysis of religious, racial, or ethnic groups.

Among such racial classification errors, the Nazi Ustashi failed to categorize Serbs into two categories, i.e., Caucasian and Caucasian admixed, the latter of whom came mainly from the time of the Ottoman Empire (in the same way one can e.g., distinguish between a generally Caucasian north of Italy, and a Caucasian admixed south of Italy). This meant that all Serbs were classified in the latter category. The fact that all Serbs were wrongly classified as Caucasian admixed, when in fact some were pure Aryans; like the fact that all Ashkenazi Jews were wrongly classified as Caucasian admixed, when in fact some were pure Aryans (the Ashkenazi being post NT times converts from Asia Minor, and known by the name of Japheth’s sons, Ashkenaz, Gen. 10:3); meant that many of those killed in Nazi death camps were in fact as racially Aryan or Caucasian, as the Nazis who were killing them.

If during World War Two, the treatment of Serbs had involved the humane deportation of them where appropriate, (like the British deportation of Mohammedans from India to Pakistan and Bangladesh just after World War Two); *if* Serbs had then been segregated into Caucasian areas and mixed races areas; *if* these two segregated groups of Serbs had been prohibited from inter-marrying by anti-miscegenation statutes; (if the numbers of racially admixed were too great, they may have been lawfully reduced by sterilizations cf. Isa. 56:3-5; Matt. 19:12; Acts 8:27)¹⁷; *if* Serbia’s territorial interests in

¹⁷ Indeed, given that Serbs divided into both a Caucasian group and a mixed race group, I would consider it to be a noble endeavour for lawfully constituted authorities to ethnically cleanse away the mixed race group. But this would entail, a) preservation of the Caucasian Serbian group, which the virulently anti-Serb Croatian Nazi Ustashi were not interested in; b) no attempt to convert them to Popery as the Nazi Ustashi did; and c) no killings, but i) *Option 1* of segregating a mixed race group inside the country without any sterilizations is not, in my opinion, generally desirable (even though some Protestant segregationists, such as Broughton Knox, looked to this solution more than I would). It creates an ongoing problem for the main white Caucasian group, and also creates a situation where a “racial desegregation movement,” such as occurred in the USA in the 1950s and 1960s, can quickly cripple the country’s racial community identity. Re: ii) *Option 1*: only

Belgrade had been fairly recognized; *if* their had been a just and generous recognition that both Greater Croatia and Greater Serbia have legitimate territorial interests in Bosnia-Herzegovina, which should be solved by joint territorial rule (something like French-German rule in Alsace-Lorraine); *if* the segregation of Serbs (and other groups) had been on just and fair terms, such as one found with racial and religious segregation of Jews in e.g., the London Jewish Quarter at the time; *if* there had been the maintenance of religious liberty for Protestants, so that the (Lutheran) Protestants had been allowed to continue to evangelize, and converts had been allowed to freely join the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church in the same way they had before 1941; *if* there had been no forced “conversions” to Roman Catholicism; and *if* there had been no murdering of Jews, Gypsies, and Serbs on the basis of their religion and/or race; *then* neither the victorious Allied forces at the end of World Two, such as the American and British, nor segregationists such as I, would be concerned about a policy of segregation on the basis of ethnicity, race, religion, or some combination thereof. My concern is not with the principle of segregation, but with the gross injustices evident in the form of that policy under the Nazi Ustashi. My concern is with the forced “conversions,” unjust treatment, and murder that was an irreducible part of Nazism.

sterilizations of the mixed race so segregated inside the host country; or iii) *Option 2*: no such sterilizations, but removal of the mixed race group from the host country with the specific established of a mixed race mongrel nation to which they are all deported. Whether one selects *Options 1, 2* or *3*, should be determined by godly lawmakers at the time after prayer, Bible reading, meditation, and careful reflection upon the situation they have at hand e.g., *Option 3* would simply not be a practical possibility for a country like contemporary Australia. Moreover, I would only support *Option 1* for Jews, a unique indigenous racial group like Australian Aboriginals (or in North America, Red Indians), or a very small but in some way profitable group such as a small number of Chinese traders segregated in Sydney’s Chinatown or elsewhere. But if *Option 2* is then selected for the rest; I would not object to a law making it a capital crime for such mixed race persons to refuse sterilization, but it would have to be properly enacted, so that only those who had clearly refused compliance, would then be tried and executed *in accordance with law*. Such are the onerous duties of godly men with moral character and fibre, who when they are in power “clean up the mess” that wicked and irresponsible men leave behind. And for so addressing the great and terrible wrongs that have been done by bringing these coloureds and non-Christians into Western lands in the post World War Two era, much to the ongoing hurt and misery of godly men; we find that the intellectual cripples of intermediate intelligence and low moral character in e.g., the contemporary universities, whose cruelty smirks at such injustices, would add insult to injury by arrogantly and impiously criticizing us for ethnically cleansing our Western lands. As for these evildoers who create philosophical “justifications” for such wickedness, or who enact such wickedness as lawmakers, or who promote such wickedness in e.g., the media or movies; their condemnation is just. The pits of hell have been stoked to receive them for all eternity. When I “shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of” such “men,” knowing that “their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched” in hell (Isa. 66:24), I shall smile with satisfaction, and continue to do so a 1,000 years later, 10000 years later, 1 million years later, 10 million years later, and for all eternity. For if they could, they would have forever destroyed the white Protestant Christian society I believe in; and so it is just and right that when upon “the new heavens and the new earth” (Isa. 66:22), God again creates race based nations from the redeemed of all races (Isa. 66:8; Zech. 14:16-21; Rev. 5:9; 21:1,24,26; 22:2); that forever these anti-racists who have used what skills, capacities, and positions they have, to work against us, should “be an abhorring unto all flesh” in hell (Isa. 66:24).

I agree with the Allies that Nazi war aggressions in Europe constituted an unjustifiable breach of the peace, for which they were properly held accountable on an individual basis in war crimes trials. However I reject the associated claims often made by anti-Nazi “human rights” propagandists, that all wars of aggression are by definition wrong. This type of simplistic notion that any war of aggression is wrong, has to some extent been modified in more recent times with the idea of a justifiable pre-emptive first strike. But the idea is still fundamentally wrong since it has pacifistic notions about military aggression being intrinsically wrong; and includes an irremovable inability to weigh religious and moral concerns e.g., were the Australian Aboriginals, or Hottentot Bushmen of South Africa, immorally squandering the land before the white man advanced onto, and settled it? (I think they were). Was this connected to their heathen religions? (I think it was, and note that e.g., in contemporary NSW law where land taxes are foolishly used to buy land and give it to Aborigines, excellent farming land has now been locked up and its productive fertility lost, for reasons connected with NSW Aboriginals’ heathen religious views of land use. Thus on the one hand, they want government hand-outs to live on; but on the other hand, they even now refuse to use good agricultural land given to them, for productive ends.) If the notion of any military aggression being wrong is developed, it means e.g., that the OT Jewish Conquest of Canaan would stand condemned, as would the future Second Coming of Christ. This type of erroneous thinking has led to revisionist histories of counties like Australia, USA, Canada, South Africa, and New Zealand, which wrongly look with negativity on the godly white Protestants, who by the grace of God, founded these countries by relieving the backward, heathen, and abusive inhabitants of the lands used, in order to build better nations upon them.

To understand the significance of the Nazi racial classification of Serbs, which as discussed above was erroneous in failing to distinguish between Caucasian Serbs and Caucasian admixed Serbs; and which justified forced “conversions” of Serbs to Popery, some historical understanding of the Romanist forced “conversions” of American Indians in South America is helpful.

b) Some Roman Catholic and Nazi racial and religious theoretics relevant to understanding the Ustashi’s forced “conversions” and murders of Serbs in the Croatian Inquisition.

On one level, the Croatian Inquisition of 1941 to 1945 in Greater Croatia, fits within the normative type of legal arrangements made for other historical Roman Catholic Inquisitions, such as the Spanish Inquisition. But on another level, it was different in that it was simultaneously structured so as to facilitate Nazi racial theoretics under the Nazi Ustashi regime of Greater Croatia from 1941 to 1945.

The term “Inquisition” (though not the concept) was instituted by Pope Gregory IX (Pope 1227-41) against the Waldenses and Albigenses. Other than in the Papal States, the Inquisition was generally set up by a Romanist government, such as that of Spain under Ferdinand and Isabella; or by Parliament in 15th century England and Ireland, with a general blessing from Rome. The Roman Inquisition was reorganized in 1542 under Paul III (Pope 1534-49) by Cardinal Carafa, to attack Protestantism. Carafa wanted it used even more ruthlessly than it has been; so that when he was elected Pope in 1555, the “Holy” Roman Emperor, Charles V, exercised his veto powers to stop him becoming Pope. But the veto was ignored, and he became Paul IV (Pope 1555-9). He denounced the *Peace of Augsburg* (1555). (In the “Holy” Roman Empire, this allowed a territory to be either Roman Catholic

or Lutheran on the choice of the prince, and for more than 50 years stopped religious wars between these two. If a person was of one religion, he could sell his property and move peaceably to another territory that had his religion. Its ideas were further developed after the *Thirty Years War* in the *Peace of Westphalia*, 1648. This type of tolerance towards Lutheranism, probably had some bearing on later 18th century “Holy” Roman Empire attitudes to Lutherans in the area of Croatia and its environs.) The Roman Inquisition’s rigorous usage against Protestants (and to a lesser extent, Jews), under Paul IV and “Saint” Pius V (Pope 1566-72; canonized 1712), has sometimes been portrayed as the standard inquisition. In fact, it was only one type. The establishment of the Croatian Inquisition in Greater Croatia from 1941 to 1945 by the government of Anton Pavelitch, whose government received the 1941 “blessing” of Zagreb Archbishop Stepinatz, and 1943 Papal “blessing” of Pius XII, best fits within the wider normative operations of how inquisitions such as the earlier Spanish Inquisition, or English Inquisition of the 15th and early 16th centuries against the Lollards generally functioned.

The Romanist Inquisition extended beyond Spain, not finally being wound up in Rome till the loss of the Papal States in 1870. E.g., Inquisition records show that a Jewish boy, Edgar Mortara (1851-1940), was secretly baptized at Bologna in the Papal states. In 1858, Papal Police then forcibly took Edgar from his Jewish parents. The Mortara case was given wide publicity in the Western press; and despite international protests from e.g., Jews and Protestants, Pius IX refused to release this *converso* Jew; who from the age of six was indoctrinated in Popery in the Papal state of Rome itself. When Papal State Rome fell in 1870, Edgar was 19, and chose to stay with the Roman Church, becoming a Romish priest who sought to convert Jews to Popery. A controversial figure of the Inquisition, his death at a Belgium Monastery in 1940 embroils him in yet further controversy. His status as an Inquisition trophy means that his example may well have exerted a contemporary influence on the minds of those who shortly afterwards established the Greater Croatian Inquisition of 1941-5.

However, of all the Inquisitions, the Spanish Inquisition is notorious. Its victims included the English merchant, George Penn, who while residing in Spain, not being a Papist (nor a Protestant, but a Quaker,) was tortured by the Inquisition; and had all his property confiscated. His nephew, William Penn, (1644-1718), also an English Quaker, founded the American State of Pennsylvania. The Spanish Inquisition also persecuted and killed Protestants, a record of some of whom may be found in Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*¹⁸. For example, a convert from Dr. Aegidio’s Protestant missionary work in Spain, the learned Dr. Constantine, a lecturer in theology, refused to renounce Protestantism and was publicly burnt. By this time, the learned Dr. Aegidio had died of natural causes. He had been the Professor of Theology at Alcalá University in Spain. Though imprisoned under the Inquisition, he was released, after petitions by influential friends to the King of Spain. Dr. Aegidio then visited Valladolid in Spain, where he sought to promote religion, dying shortly afterwards of old age. The Inquisitors, then exhumed his body, and burnt it. Protestants thus remember Valladolid in Spain, in connection with Aegidio, whose work and fate bore

¹⁸ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, pp. 88-126 (n.b., p. 91, “A Protestant is seldom shown any mercy”). Though Quakers are not Protestants, see the reference to George Penn at pp. 671-6. Though I regard William Gardener’s evangelistic technique as seriously flawed, and contrary to Prov. 9:8; Matt. 7:6; 10:16, this did not justify the Spanish Inquisition’s “barbarity” in which he “was tormented in the most excruciating manner,” and then executed by being “burned, or rather roasted” “by slow degrees” (*Ibid.*, pp. 119-120).

some similarities to that of Wycliffe in England.

But Valladolid in Spain is important for another reason connected with the Spanish Inquisition. At the time of the 16th century Valladolid (Valladoid) Controversy in Spain (concerning whether or not American Indians had souls,) and later, Papists sometimes justified forced “conversions” on two premises. Firstly, usage was sometimes made of Luke 16:16, “the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it” (ASV). On this misuse of Scripture, it was said that one could *violently force* people to “become Christians” (although Popery is not a true form of Christianity). Secondly, that the American Indians were a racially inferior group and if normal methods of voluntary conversion were used, they lacked the intelligence to perceive how much better Popery was to their pagan religions, and to force them to adopt Popery in this life, would be better for them in the next, even though this policy may mean the killing of many of them in this life, in order to get some “converts.” Thus forced “conversions,” which they thought could be used against anyone (on the misuse of Luke 16:16), were regarded as *particularly apt* for racial groups such as the American Indians¹⁹. Among other serious defects, this type of thinking has an Arminian basis unacceptable to Reformed Protestants²⁰. This type of mix of religious and racial ideas, was also glaringly apparent in the Roman Church’s forced “conversions” of Serbs under the Nazi Ustashi. Indeed, it should not surprise us that so many Ustashi later sought refuge in Spain or parts of the former Spanish Empire in South America, since they would see such South American Papist lands as a “success story” for their type of thinking.

The Ustashi’s mix of race and religion also has a precedent in the Spanish Inquisition’s race laws for Jews. Either to get better social positions, or escape a *convert or die* ultimatum, many Spanish Jews “converted” to Popery. But some only pretended to be Papists, and secretly practised Judaism, whereas another group were sincere converts to Popery. Following the killing of their beloved inquisitor, Pedro de Arbues (1441-85), by *converso* Jews, the Spanish Inquisition moved to develop Jewish race laws from the earlier part of the 15th century, and these “purity of blood” (*limpieza de sangre*) laws remained in different forms till the 19th and 20th centuries. They were essentially religious in that they wanted to “root out” what the Roman Church called “heresy;” but were racial in that all persons of Jewish descent were prevented from holding public or church offices, or testifying in courts i.e., for fear that they were secretly adherents of Judaism. On a related basis, under the Ustashi the Romanists could give a justification for the killing of Jews, Gypsies, or persons of Serbian descent i.e., either they were not converts, or they only pretended to be “converts.” From the Papist Ustashi inquisition perspective there was thus a theological argument from the Spanish Inquisition’s “purity of blood” laws, that gave them a discretion to kill, if they so chose, persons not of Papist Croatian descent, i.e., Jews, Gypsies, and Serbs.

¹⁹ For a better Protestant understanding of this Scripture, which refers to how the “lazy” “cannot stir up themselves to take hold of an offered Christ, covenant, and salvation (Isa. 64:7), to cut off offending right hands, and pluck out offending right eyes (Matt. 5:29,30), to take the kingdom of heaven by force, and press into it (Luke 16:16);” see McMillan, J. (Ed.), *The Complete Works of the Late Reverend Thomas Boston* [1676-1732], William Tegg & Co., London, UK, 1853, reprinted by Richard Owen Roberts Publishing, Wheaton, Illinois, USA, 1986, Vol. 5, pp. 443-460 (Sermon preached in 1729 at Ettrick), at p. 454.

²⁰ A dramatized form of this debate was produced relatively recent times in “Valladoid Controversy,” FR3 - La Sept, Bakti Production, 1991, SBS TV Australia (English sub-titles).

This factor also helps to explain the Pope's *silence* on such killings in the Croatian Inquisition.

Importantly, there was an inquisition discretion with respect to non-Papists. Thus non-converso Jews might not be given the *convert or die* ultimatum, in which instance, they were simply discriminated against in more general ways with regard to societal positions. This same discretion had been used by the "Holy" Roman Empire's inquisition with respect to immigrant German Lutherans in 18th century Croatia, who were permitted to keep their religion under an inquisition discretion, providing they *kept quiet* about it i.e., with respect to their religion, a "Don't ask, Don't tell" rule. Thus when Lutheranism was officially allowed in the 19th century, Lutheran churches, as it were, "suddenly appeared from nowhere." Because of the lack of records, and the reliance for such knowledge on oral tradition history, we are not sure what percentage of these Lutherans were in an unbroken line from the time of Primoz Trubar, if so, probably intermarrying with the German group; and what percentage were 18th century German immigrants; though the overall Germanic character of the Lutheran Church clearly indicates that the vast majority of them, and possibly all of them, were from these 18th century German immigrants. On the basis of this precedent, it was possible under Papist inquisition rules to use this same discretion in the Croatian Inquisition in order to give the Nazis what they wanted i.e., the non-killing of the small community of Lutherans of Germanic descent, and likewise the sparing of Aryans in Bosnia-Herzegovina who had converted to Mohammedanism under the Turkish Ottoman Empire. *This meant that while Nazi racial theoretics wanted the elimination of all non-Aryans* (even though some Serbs were in fact Aryans); *it was possible through the exercise of inquisition "discretions," to largely achieve the same result in a Croatian Inquisition (which like the "Holy" Roman Empire's persecutions from 800 A.D., did not actually use the word "inquisition").*

Reference is made below to the fact that Monsignor Sharitch (Papist Archbishop of Bosnia who hailed the murderer Pavelitch as 'the sun of Croatia'), Anton Pavelitch (Nazi Ustashi Head of Government in Croatia), and probably "Brother" Ivanditch (Nazi Ustashi collaborating Papist monk), all fled to Franco's Spain. In 1939, the *Protestant Truth Society's* tract, "The Vatican, Fascism & Nazism," featured a picture of "The Fuehrer" (Hitler), "The Pope" (Pius XII in the Papal triple tiara), and "The Duce" (Mussolini). This tract by Horace Pearce, documents the well-known linkage between Romanism and fascism or Nazism. Reference is also made to General Franco's fascist Spain, and a telegram to Franco from Pope Pius XII (Pope 1939-1958) on 2 April 1939, concerning the Roman "Catholic victory" of Franco's Fascist-Papist state. "Lifting up our hearts to the Lord," the Pope said blasphemously, "we give sincere thanks with your Excellency for Spain's desired [Roman] Catholic victory. We express our vows that your most beloved country," "may undertake with new vigour the ancient" Papist "traditions which made her great," and "we send" "our apostolic blessing."²¹ The religious situation in Fascist-Papist Spain under Franco, during the era that the Nazi Ustashi fled to it after World War Two, has been documented by the Presbyterian writer, Loraine Boettner. E.g., the persecution of Spanish Protestants under Franco included such Fascist-Papist laws as a prohibition on establishing any Protestant Church (although a small number already existed before he came to power in 1936), together with prohibitions on: any Protestant holding public office, obtaining employment as a teacher in public (state) schools, publishing or distributing Protestant literature, being married in any form of Protestant wedding service (only civil marriage was

²¹ Pearce, W.H., *The Vatican, Fascism & Nazism*, Protestant Truth Society, London, UK, pp. 21-4.

legal for Protestants), having a Protestant funeral service in many towns, or burial of Protestants in any established cemeteries²².

In 1939, Horace Pearce documented how “The Pope is silent!” when it came to “condemnation of all the wrongs perpetrated by the leaders of Fascism and Nazism.” He notes that, “Those who have suffered at the hands of Nazism in Germany are Jews and Protestants.” While leaving much of Germany “nominally a Lutheran country,” “Hitler” sought “to reduce the Protestant Church to that of a State Church which would be Protestant no longer.” As an example of this he refers to “hundreds of” Protestant “pastors” who “have been sent to concentration camps *on account of their religion*”²³. As further discussed below, this *silence of Pius XII* continued during World War Two with his silence over Nazi mass murders of Jews and Serbs (the latter of whom were killed after refusing to convert to Roman Catholicism). This *silence of Pius XII* continued after World War Two with his *silence* about the persecution and killing of Protestants in Colombia, South America, and this was then followed with a comparable *silence by John XXIII*.

Colombia had a Roman Catholic government from 1948, which Boettner records “signed a concordat with the Vatican placing severe restrictions on Protestants,” closing about 60% of it to any Protestant work. Since Pius XII’s diplomatic support for the Papist Colombian regime was continued under John XXIII, the guilt of these Roman Pontiffs extends beyond such *silence* alone. Furthermore, both Pontiffs further participated in encouraging the anti-religious liberty policy towards Protestants, by elevating Archbishops of the capital city, Bogota, to Cardinals. Crisanto Cardinal Luque Sanchez (Roman Catholic Archbishop of Bogota, 1950-1959), was elevated to Cardinal by Pius XII in January 1953; and Luis Cardinal Concha Cordoba (Roman Catholic Archbishop of Bogota, 1959-1972), was elevated to Cardinal by John XXIII in January 1961. Loraine Boettner records in 1962, “anti-Protestant demonstrations and riots that have taken place have been incited or led by local priests.” Overall, 116 Protestants were killed, 66 Protestant Churches / Chapels burned or bombed, and over 200 Protestant Schools closed (*Report of the Evangelical Confederation of Colombia*, Bulletin No. 50, 26 June 1959). But, notes Boettner, “the course that has been followed by the Roman Church in Colombia” “seems to have the full approval of the Vatican, the Archbishop of Bogota was promoted to Cardinal by John XXIII.”²⁴ To this day, persecution of Protestants by Papists occurs in predominantly Popish South America²⁵.

Then in 2000, John-Paul II (Pope 1978-2005) beatified “Blessed” John XXIII (Pope 1958-1963). Remembered by both Papists and Protestants alike for his convening of the *Second Vatican Council* (1962-5); Pope John XXIII is also remembered by Protestants for his

²² Boettner, L., *Roman Catholicism*, Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, 1962, pp. 430-4.

²³ Pearce, W.H., *op. cit.*, pp. 8,15,18.

²⁴ Boettner, L., *op. cit.*, pp. 437-42.

²⁵ For instance, the “Gideons News from other lands” (published by the *Gideons International in Australia*), reports in their September 2010 newsletter in their “Gideon Facts” on “Peru” section in connection with a 2010 “Scripture blitz” of “Peru;” that “As members of the officially recognized State Church, Roman Catholics exercise a discriminatory influence against non-[Roman] Catholics in matters of taxes, property, and education The Evangelical Church is growing steadily – there were less than 80,000 Evangelicals in 1960 and now there are almost 2.5 million – but there is also a growing apathy among God’s people.”

continuation of Vatican support for the Colombian regime, associated *silence* over the persecution of Protestant confessors, and killing of Protestant martyrs in Colombia, together with his specific *encouragement* of this wickedness by his elevation in 1961 of the Archbishop of Bogota, to Cardinal, thus making him a “prince” of the Roman Church. But Rome is “drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus” (Rev. 17:6), and by the year 2000, Pope John-Paul II already had an established serial history of celebrating Protestant killings by the beatification or canonization of those connected with such wickedness. The beatification of the convicted Nazi war criminal, “Blessed” Cardinal Stepinatz (1898-1960) by Pope John-Paul II in 1998, followed hard on the heels of the canonization of a mass murderer of Protestants, “Saint” Sarkander (1576-1620) of Moravia by Pope John-Paul II in 1995. Both the Franciscan, “Blessed” Stepinatz, and the Jesuit, “Saint” Sarkander, were involved in campaigns of forced “conversions” to Roman Catholicism. In Sarkander’s case this was associated with forced “conversions” of Protestants to Roman Catholicism, whereas in Stepinatz’s case this chiefly was associated with forced “conversions” of Serbian Orthodox to Roman Catholicism, although it included the persecution and murder of a small group of Protestants of Serbian descent who refused to “convert” to Popery (and who numbered less than one per cent of the total Serbs persecuted).

In this special case study, we will consider in more detail an instance of the Pope’s “sin” and “iniquity” (II Thess. 2:3,7) condoning murder, by studying the case of “Blessed” Cardinal Stepinatz, and associated with this *Stepinatz’ steps into Nazism*. Archbishop (later Cardinal) Aloysius (Alojzije) Stepinatz (Stepinec / Stepinac²⁶) was convicted in 1946 of war crimes as a collaborator of the murderous World War Two Nazi Ustashi government of Anton (Ante) Pavelitch (Pavelic) in the *Independent State of Croatia*. We will consider some arguments for and against Aloysius Cardinal Stepinatz²⁷; but deal mainly with the

²⁶ Though Stepinatz’s name is spelt with a “c” rather than a “tz” in both Serbian and Croatian, the Slavic languages pronounce this as “tz.” Hence in English it is spelt as “Stepinatz” or “Stepinac,” but even when spelt “Stepinac” it may be pronounced “Stepinatz,” especially by those familiar with the Slavic languages. (Discussions between myself and Presbyter Srboljub Miletich, presbyter of St. Stephen’s Serbian Orthodox Church, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia, September, 2004). English writers who, like myself, have used “Stepinatz” rather than “Stepinac,” include, e.g., Arnaldo Cortesi in his articles, “Vatican Indignant and Sorrowful at Prison Sentence for Stepinatz” (*New York Times*, 12 Oct. 1946, p. 7), and “Officials in Stepinatz Case Excommunicated by Vatican” (*New York Times*, 15 Oct. 1946, pp. 1,16); or Cyrus Sulzberger in his 1951 *Pulitzer Prize* winning article, “Stepinatz in Cell Interview Says His Fate Is Up to Pope” (*New York Times*, 13 Sept. 1950, pp. 1,13).

²⁷ There are numerous works on this issue, but some of the sources consulted for the relevant information on Stepinatz include: *Anti-Stepinatz sources*: Eddy, S., “Stepinac’s Red Hat is Blood-Red” *The Christian Century*, Undenominational, Volume 70, Chicago (Illinois, USA), 14 Jan 1953, no. 2, pp. 42-3, and associated correspondence by Eddy (anti-Stepinatz); and others (pro-Stepinatz) in Vol. 70, no. 7, 18 Feb. 1953, pp. 195-6 and no. 8, 25 Feb. 1953, pp. 226-7; Wallace, B., *The Trial of Dr. Aloysius Stepinac*, British Yugoslav Association, London 1947; Paraphrase of “The Slaughter of the Serbs” in Dave Hunt’s *A Woman Rides the Beast* (www.Amazon.com); *Pro-Stepinatz sources*: www.hr/datko/etf/Stepinac.html; Allen, J.L., “Mourning bells to chime for Pope’s visit (Greece),” *National [Roman] Catholic Reporter*, May 11, 2001 (www.findarticles.com/cf_0/...15/ pl/articles.jhtml?term= stepinac); Falconi, C., *The Silence of Pius XII*, 1965, English translation by B. Wall, Faber and Faber, London, UK, 1970; Ramet, S.P., *Balkan Babel*, Politics, Culture, & Religion in Yugoslavia, Western Press, Boulder, Colorado, USA, 1992, pp. 123-9,200-1.

evidence against him and his cult.

c) *Lack of media coverage of World War II Papist-Nazi War Crimes.*

In discussing the “hideous” “massacres” of “Serbs by Roman Catholic Croats” under the “Ustashi,” Loraine Boettner says, “Most astonishing was the manner in which those crimes were ignored or hushed up,” “by the news services even in the United States, although similar massacres of Jews in Germany were given the widest publicity.” He attributes this to the Roman Church’s “influence over the press and radio.” He notes that during World War Two, “Stepinac” “visited Pope Pius XII, in Rome.” “He reported that 244,000 Serbs had accepted (forced) conversion to Roman Catholicism. So the Pope too, was well informed as to what was going on in Serbia and Croatia.” “The Pope,” “rewarded” “Stepinac” for “his services by naming him a Cardinal.” “So reads another chapter of church-state intrigue as dark as any played out during the Middle Ages. Let it be noted that both Hitler and Mussolini were Roman Catholics. But that despite their crimes,” “neither was ever excommunicated, nor even severely censored, by the Roman Church.²⁸”

It must be remembered, that men are tempted to evil by their own lusts, and also by the Devil through his minion fallen angels, who are able to suggest evil ideas in the minds of men. Sometimes called, “whispering in the ear,” the manner in which devils can so suggest ideas to the human mind is not presently known to us mortals, and certainly no-one is suggesting that there is an audible “whispering” that could be detected by sound devices. One cannot generally know if such a suggestion is from one’s own sinful nature, or a devil, a fact making those who do not recognize this fact e.g., atheists, easy prey for the devils. But one can and should resist it in basically the same manner, seeking the power of God through Jesus Christ, to turn away from evil and follow the God of the Bible.

Thus e.g., working through his devils, he tempts woman to have abortions. But if and when a person decides to “repent,” the same Devil is standing there in the Satan-possessed Pope of Rome, saying, “abortion is wrong,” and as they turn to Rome with minion devils “whispering in their ear” something like, “The Pope’s always opposed abortion, you should listen to him;” the Devil then retains them, for it is a case of “out of the Devil’s frying pan and into the Devil’s pot.” Few ever see through the master deceiver’s tactics. Consider e.g., the USA abortion case of *Roe versus Wade* (USA Supreme Court, 1973). The woman known as “Jane Roe,” subsequently renounced her vile involvement in this bloodthirsty case, in which violation of the sixth commandment, “Thou shalt not kill” (Exod. 20:13), was “legally” set aside to allow easy mass abortion by the US Supreme Court²⁹. From 1995 she has joined the anti-abortion and pro-life movement. Yet her repentance cannot stop the flow of blood from millions upon millions of abortions that were “legally” started in the USA by her earlier wicked lusts in 1973, and whose bad example has also echoed and redounded

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 534-7; referring to e.g., Herve Lauriere’s (pseudonym of Brank Miljus), *Assassins au nom de Dieu (Assassins in the Name of God)*, Preface by Jean Perrigault, Editions La Vigie, Paris, France, 1951; also in *L’Age d’Homme (The Age of Man)*, reprint, Lausanne, Switzerland, 1991.

²⁹ Self-defence is a basic legal defence to the charge of murder if this is the least force reasonably necessary to save one’s life. Thus in harmony with this wider defence, if an abortion is necessary to save the mother’s life, then it is not murder. But this is the only exception to permit an abortion that Biblically based morals will allow.

throughout the Western world in even more abortions, though she now may regret this, and we Christians do not hold sins against anyone who truly repents (Matt. 18:23-35). But as she turned away from abortion, though at first doing so in 1995 in a Baptist context, in 1998 she became a Papist. *This is a classic technique of the Devil i.e., first tempt someone to commit a sin like abortion and hog-tie them for hell by irreligion; and then, if they look like repenting, hold out the Roman Church, so as to hog-tie them for hell via a false gospel of works' righteousness.* Thus by her bad example as a Papist, she is now *instigating another problem* of promoting the Devilish errors of Popery, with e.g., its idolatry (Exod. 20:3-6) of Mariolatry and adoration of the Communion bread related to "transubstantiation" (I John 4:2,3; 5:21); and denial of justification by faith (Gal. 3:11) for the false gospel of Romish justification by a combination of faith and works (Gal. 1:6-9; 2:16). Thus this Jane Roe has been a painful problem from go to woe!³⁰

A small number, representing less than one per cent of Papists, may be overt Roman Catholics by day, and covert Devil-worshippers at night in a Black Mass. Such persons may know the same fact that Protestant historicists know i.e., that the Pope is the Antichrist and possessed by the Devil; but unlike the Protestant historicists who oppose Popery, these Devil worshippers follow Satan secretly. They know that to be in their master's service requires their overt support for the Church of Antichrist, and their covert worship of the Devil. *Such are Satan's special human minions.* But such persons are rare. Given that the Nazis in their higher echelons sought to reintroduce pagan forms of worship e.g., Woden, some of them may have also known the secret of who the Pope really was. But more commonly, most Papists i.e., over 99 per cent of them, are deceived as to the true nature of the Church of Rome. After all, if e.g., a person comes to believe abortion is wrong, and then turns to the false gospel of justification by works in Romanism, they will still be damned to hell, and so the Devil has still gotten them.

Thus we should not be surprised that e.g., the same debased Hollywood movie industry that produces great filth and wickedness, will nevertheless allow an occasional

³⁰ Her real name is Norma McCorvey of Texas, USA (b. 1947). Her upbringing was in the Jehovah's Witness cult. She became an atheist. She then lived a wild and wicked life which in her 1994 autobiography, "I am Roe," refers to what was then her Lesbian Sodomite partner, saying, "We're Lesbians together." She then "converted," first becoming a Baptist in 1995, being baptized in a backyard swimming pool at Dallas, Texas, on USA wide Television by a Baptist Minister called Flip Benham. (We Evangelical Anglican Protestants prefer a more "dignified" baptismal service, as indeed would Evangelical Baptist Protestants known to me, who would conduct something like this in their church. But while a backyard swimming pool baptism is irregular, providing it is done in accordance with broad Biblical guidelines, and "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," Matt. 28:19, then it is certainly a valid baptism.) But she was evidently not genuinely converted, for the antecedent sin of idolatry that resulted in her being given over as a judgment by God to Lesbian Sodomy (Rom. 1:20-26) came back in some form, and she also started hankering for the works righteousness of her Jehovah's Witnesses' background. Thus to fulfill both her idolatrous lusts and her works righteousness hankerings, in 1998 she became a Papist, "according to the true proverb, The dog is turned again to his own vomit" (II Peter 2:22); and "they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us" (I John 2:19). "Norma McCorvey," *Wikipedia* (1 Feb. 2010) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Norma_McCorvey).

“cleaner” film, so long as it still promotes some sin, especially the sin of Roman Catholicism e.g., *Sound of Music* (1965), or likewise allow “a Christian” film such as the highly inaccurate and unBiblical Roman Catholic *Passion of Christ* (2004). The devils aiding and abetting the sinful whims and lusts of Hollywood movie producers, are forever going back and forth in transit to and from Rome, in order to report to, and get their orders from, the Devil who possesses the Pope (Rev. 17:9; 18:2); and they like to please their master by promoting the Church of Rome from time to time. On the one hand, the Devil and his minions do not mind some negative exposure of individual Romanists such as Romanist clergy who sexually abuse children, since they can be written off as “a rotten apple in the barrel.” But on the other hand, *the fact that in World War Two, a Nazi-Papist Pact was entered, establishing a Romanist Inquisition, and making the Nazi’s third largest concentration camp, Jasenovac, the place where hundreds of thousands of people were killed for refusing to accept forced conversion to Popery*, has evidently been judged as too potentially damaging to be allowed wide coverage. Thus as Boettner notes, while much coverage is given to the Nazi’s Jewish genocide of World War Two, no such coverage is given to Jasenovac (Yasenovatz) or the other places of forced conversion killings under the Nazi Ustashi.

CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE THREE YUGOSLAVIAS IN THE BALKANS (1921-2006): Serbia, Montenegro, (Slav) Macedonia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Slovenia.

The creation of Yugoslavia in 1921 was a fruit of the Allied’s victory in World War One (1914-1918). In June 1914 the Austrian heir to the Hapsburg throne, Archduke Francis Ferdinand, was assassinated in Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia-Herzegovina, by Gavrilo Princip. Of Serb descent, Princip is an example of a citizen of Bosnia-Herzegovina considered to be part of Greater Serbia. Austria, considering that Serbia had been involved in the plot, declared war on Serbia, thus starting World War One. Under the *Triple Entente* (1907), Russia, France, and the United Kingdom, entered the war on Serbia’s side against Austria-Hungary, Germany, and the Ottoman Empire. At the Paris Peace Conference, the victorious Allies established Yugoslavia.

In referring to “Yugoslavia” (“Jugoslavia”) (which means, “Land of the Southern Slavs,”) one must understand the distinction between the first, second, and third Yugoslavia. All three Yugoslavias have been inside the Balkans (the easternmost of Europe’s three great southern peninsulars). *The first* Yugoslavia (1921-1941, called “The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, & Slovenes,” 1918-1929, & “Kingdom of Yugoslavia, 1929-1941) was a six state royal federation under the Serbian Karageorgevic Dynasty consisting of: Serbia, Montenegro, (Slav) Macedonia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Slovenia, and Croatia. This was dismantled during World War Two under the Nazis. After World War Two *the second* Yugoslavia (1946-1991/2, reconstituted as, “The Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia”) was reconstituted as a republican federation of these same six states under the Communist Tito (who was of both Slovenian and Croatian descent). The first and second Yugoslavian federations put in abeyance the claims of Greater Serbia to Slav Macedonia (which is distinct from, and borders, Greek Macedonia), Montenegro, and Bosnia-Herzegovina; and likewise

put in abeyance the claims of Greater Croatia to Belgrade and Bosnia-Herzegovina, since both Croats and Serbs could regard Greater Serbia and Greater Croatia to be part of the Yugoslav federation because they were in it. It also meant that both Serbs in Greater Serbia, and Croats in Greater Croatia, could *if they wished*, and only some did so wish, unite in a common cause of Yugoslav federation in order to satisfy their desires to be part of Greater Serbia and Greater Croatia respectively. Since Serbia and Croatia were the two most powerful states of the first and second Yugoslavia, and since both claimed Belgrade, it followed that the Serbian capital of Belgrade was the logical federal capital for the first and second Yugoslavia. From 1946 Montenegro's capital, Podgorica, was renamed after Tito as "Titograd," till after the collapse of communism when it reverted back to Podgorica in 1992.

A number of Slav Macedonian Embassies (e.g., in the Republic of Ireland, or Commonwealth of Australia), refer to themselves on their official internet home-page, as the "Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" ("FYROM"). Slav Macedonia (about two-thirds of whose population is Slavic Macedonian seemingly derived from 6th and 7th century A.D. migrations from the area of Bulgaria into Macedonia, about one-fifth are Albanians mainly located in the north-west, and the remainder are Serbs and other relatively small minorities), left the Yugoslavian federation peacefully in 1991. About one quarter of Serbs in the area of the first and second Yugoslavias are in Greater Serbia, and most of these are in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Slovenia and Croatia (which has a large Serb minority) left the Yugoslav federation in 1991³¹. Warfare resulted. Bosnia-Herzegovina (Hercegovina / Hertzegovina³²) (about two-fifths of whose population is Bosnian Mohammedan, about one-third is Serb, and out one fifth is Croat,) left the Yugoslav federation in 1992. Warfare resulted.

The third Yugoslavia (1992-2006, called "Federal Republic of Yugoslavia" 1992-2003 & "Serbia- Montenegro" 2003-2006) was formed in 1992 comprising two federal states, Serbia and Montenegro³³. The name "Montenegro" is divided into "Monte" meaning "Mountain," and "negro" meaning "black." This "Black Mountain" giving its name to Montenegro, is the historical centre of Mount Lovcen near the Adriatic Sea. At least a third of Montenegro's 650,000 citizens are Serbs of Greater Serbia. Excluding the northern

³¹ I refer to the northern Macedonia as "Slav Macedonia," although its official name is simply "Macedonia," since it was formerly part of Yugoslavia, meaning, "Land of the Southern Slavs." Thus "Slav Macedonia" is a name of historical continuity, since it continues the "Slav" from Yugoslav i.e., before 1991 it was Yugoslav Macedonia, and after 1991 it is Slav Macedonia. Furthermore, the southern Macedonia, whose official name is also simply "Macedonia," is sometimes called "Greek Macedonia," and so "Slav Macedonia" is a comparable ethnic term to distinguish the two; in the same way that before 1991 one distinguished between Greek Macedonia and Yugoslav Macedonia. There has been diplomatic tensions between Greece and Slav Macedonia over the official names of both Slav Macedonia and Greek Macedonia being the same i.e., simply "Macedonia." In 1995 the Greek government said it implied territorial claims by Slav Macedonia over the adjacent Greek province of Greek Macedonia, since the official names of both are just "Macedonia."

³² Though sometimes spelt with a "c" as "Hercegovina," the "c" of "Hercegovina," in both the Serbian and Croatian Slavic languages is pronounced as "tz" (as in Stepinac/Stepinatz). Hence the variant spellings of "Herzegovina" and "Hertzegovina."

³³ Gruenwald, O., "The Third Yugoslavia, Illyrian League of Autonomous Republics? A Kafkaesque Civil War," *Southern Slav Journal*, Vol. 18, 3-4 (69-70), 1997, pp. 2-24.

Serbian region of Voivodina which is ethnically about 50% Serb, the rest of Serbia (excluding Kosovo) is about 80% Serb, and Kosovo is mainly Albanian ethnically. While official insignia of State such as government uniform crests referred to this two state federation as “Yugoslavia” (Yugoslavia), more generally the federation was referred to variously as “Yugoslavia,” “Serbia-Montenegro,” or “Yugoslavia (Serbia-Montenegro).”

In 2003, the “Federal Republic of Yugoslavia” formally changed its name to become the State Union of “Serbia and Montenegro.” While this was the official end of the usage of the term “Yugoslavia” for the third Yugoslavia, in practice the term continued to be used by a number of “Yugoslavs.” E.g., when I went to Belgrade in April 2004, the passport inspector border guard’s uniform insignia still read, “Yugoslavia,” and the monetary currency was stamped “Yugoslavia,” rather than “Serbia and Montenegro,” which had been the new official name since February of the previous year. Moreover, people I spoke to there in English referred to the country as either “Yugoslavia” or “Serbia-Montenegro.” As usage of “Yugoslavia” had lacked official endorsement by the Belgrade government since 2003, this type of continued usage of the designation “Yugoslavia,” e.g., on old uniforms worn by passport inspector border guards, was intended to be temporary and transitional. But old habits die hard, and just as I was leaving Belgrade in 2004, an English speaking citizen of Serbia-Montenegro said to me in a heavily Slavic accent, “Diz (This) iz (is) YugoZlavia (Yugoslavia).” As in the earlier six state federation of Yugoslavia before 1992, in the two state federation of (the third) Yugoslavia from 1992-2006, Serbia’s capital of Belgrade was Yugoslavia’s federal capital³⁴.

In May 2006, just over 55 per cent of the Montenegrin electorate, voted to secede from Yugoslavia. On 3 June 2006, Montenegro’s Parliament declared independence from the two-state union of Serbia-Montenegro. The Declaration of Independence was signed by the Speaker of the Montenegrin Parliament³⁵. Two days later, on 5 June 2006, the National Assembly of Serbia declared Serbia to be the successor state to the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro i.e., Serbia is the successor state to the third Yugoslavia. This effectively ended both the third Yugoslavia (1992-2006), and the longer 85 year history of the three Yugoslavian federations (1921-2006). In the Balkans’ region of the former three Yugoslavian federations, there are now six independent republics i.e., Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, (Slav) Macedonia, Montenegro, and Serbia. There is also the

³⁴ Belgrade had been a town of the Byzantine (or Eastern Roman) Empire until it came under Serbian rule in 1284, and then in 1402 Stephen Lazarevic made it the capital of Serbia. Under the “Holy” Roman Empire (800-1806), the Hapsburgs had become the virtual hereditary rulers of this empire from the fifteenth century on. The Mohammedan Ottoman Empire had besieged Belgrade in 1440 and after 1521 it was in their hands except for three periods when the Austrians occupied it from 1688-90, 1717-39, and 1789-91. After a Serbian uprising Belgrade became the capital of Serbia from 1807-13, but the Ottomans then recaptured it. Serbs were given autonomy under the Ottomans in 1830, control of Belgrade from 1867, with independence in 1878. Then in 1921 Belgrade became the capital of the first Yugoslavia. It was made part of the Nazi Ustashi’s Greater Croatia from 1941-5.

³⁵ Montenegro votes to split from Serbia,” *Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 May, 2006, p. 8; and *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 May, 2006, p. 11. Jurist - Paper Chase (4/6/06), “Deklaracija Nezavisne Republike Crne Gore” of “03/06/2006,” by “Predsjednik Ranko Krivokapic” (Speaker of the Parliament), (www.juris.law.pitt.edu/paperchase/2006/06/montenegro-Parliament-declares-phi). “Montenegro Lawmakers Declare Independence,” ABC News International, 10/6/06 (abcnews.go.com/international/wireStory?id=2037054).

unresolved issue of Kosovo.

The northern region of Serbia above Belgrade contains the area of Voivodina. The southern region of Serbia is historically known as Kosovo (or before 1971 Kosovo-Metohia). In April 1999, Caritas, a Roman Catholic “charity” based in the Vatican at Rome, and whose Croatian branch was established by Stepinatz in 1934, was caught at Anconca by the Italian authorities smuggling weapons destined for the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA). Before stopped, thirty tons of war material, such as machine guns, anti-tank and anti-aircraft missiles, and rocket launchers, were heading for a KLA camp in northern Albania’s Scutari. The shipment’s official consignee was “Father Luciano Augustino,” the Roman Catholic priest at Scutari³⁶. But under the *Rambouillet Peace Agreement*, and subsequent military action from the air by NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) air force bombings, and on the ground by KLA forces composed of Albanian Kosovars, and then Russian diplomacy to bring about a peace, Kosovo was placed under NATO military forces in 1999. The third Yugoslavia (or 2003-2006, Serbia-Montenegro), and since 2006, Serbia, considers NATO’s military presence is a violation of its sovereignty, and both the (third) Yugoslavian government, and since 2006, the Serbian government, and most persons of Serbian descent in Kosovo, consider Kosovo is part of Serbia. By contrast, most persons of Albanian descent in Kosovo want Kosovo to become an independent nation.

As at 2010, the partially recognized *Republic of Kosovo*, a self-declared independent state, has *de facto* control over most of the Kosovo territory, although only a limited control in north Kosovo’s three most northern municipalities (of Leposavic, Zuecan, and Zubin Potok). Kosovo’s population varies in estimates between about 1.9 million to 2.4 million; and while estimates I have seen vary and so figures are somewhat “rubbery” and unclear, from the imprecise data I have been able to presently obtain, the country has a small Protestant community who have reported persecution from the Mohammedans, and which in 2004 was less than 600, and *c.* 0.03% of the population e.g., the *Kosovo Protestant Evangelical Church* is a member of the *European Evangelical Alliance*. It also has about 65,000 Roman Catholics who are *c.* 3% of the population, and about 100,000-120,000 Serbian Orthodox who are *c.* 5.2% of the population (although some estimates put them at *c.* 7.8% of the population, these numbers might be complicated by the movement of Serbs coming and going from, but in recent times mainly going from, Kosovo); but the vast majority of its population is Mohammedan who are *c.* 89% of the population. There are also some very small numbers of Jews, Gypsies, Pentecostals, and cults (e.g., Jehovah’s Witnesses).

Kosovo declared its “independence” in Feb. 2008, and notwithstanding protests by Russia (who considered this declaration to be illegal) and others in the United Nations, this “independence” was diplomatically recognized by e.g., the USA, Croatia, Albania, and Turkey. Serbia gives no recognition to the unilateral succession of Kosovo, and in its 2006 *Constitution of Serbia* (replacing its 1990s third Yugoslavia constitution for Serbia and Montenegro), it considers it is a United Nations governed area within Serbia’s sovereign territory, called the *Autonomous Province of Kosovo & Metohija*. Its 2006 Constitution says Kosovo is an “integral part of Serbia with substantial autonomy.” Thus some eleven years

³⁶ MacKenzie, J.S. (Editor), “Rome at Work,” *Faith & Freedom*, Dec. 2004, p. 11; *The Vatican’s Caritas Charity Involved in Arms Trafficking* (www.slobodanmilosevic.org/news/smorg); *Freenations* (www.freenations.freeuk.com/news); “Rome Accused of Sending Arms to Kosovans,” *English Churchman*, 6 & 13 Jan. 2006, p. 1.

on from 1999, with 69 UN states recognizing Kosovo “independence” and others such as Serbia not, as at 2010 this matter is presently unresolved.

Broadly speaking, the Nazi’s *Independent State of Croatia* (1941-5) approximated the area of Croatia-Slovenia under the Austro-Hungarian Empire (1867-1918), which was under the Austrian House of Hapsburg monarchs. The *Independent State of Croatia* manifested the Croat concept of *Greater Croatia* i.e., the contemporary states of Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and a small area of Serbia east of Osijek in Croatia up to and including Belgrade³⁷. By the time of the Nazi Ustashi in World War Two, what today is Croatia was predominantly Roman Catholic, but with significant areas of Serbian Orthodox in most of the country other than Zagreb in the region north and north-west of Zagreb to what is today Slovenia. There were significant populations of Protestants north of Zagreb on the Croatian side of the Slovenian border; and significant populations of Protestants in the region around Osijek. There were significant populations of Roman Catholics in most of what today is Bosnia-Herzegovina, other than in a strip approximating about a quarter of Bosnia-Herzegovina in the eastern region. There were also significant populations of Eastern Orthodox and Mohammedans (or Muslims) throughout most of Bosnia-Herzegovina. There was a significant population of Protestants on the north-central section of Bosnia-Herzegovina bordering Croatia, near Jasenovac; and a significant population of Protestants in the far north-east of Bosnia-Herzegovina in the region bordering what today is Serbia. In the strip extending from what today is Osijek in Croatia to what today is Belgrade in Serbia (including the Srem), there were significant populations of Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, and Protestants³⁸.

Croatia is historically a predominantly Roman Catholic country. But the glorious light of Protestantism shone into some of the dark recesses of the Papal controlled Slovene provinces of Croatia and Slovenia. Soldiers, merchants, and miners from Germany, together with Croats and Slovenes returning from universities in Germany where they learnt of the Protestant faith, brought Lutheran Protestantism to Croatia and Slovenia. The light of the Reformation came to these Slovene provinces as early as 1528, and by the second half of that century large numbers of both the aristocracy and general citizenry had accepted its truth. The great Protestant leader, Primož Trubar (1508-1586) established a Slovene Protestant Church where services were held in the vernacular in accordance with Protestant teaching, and Trubar’s Slovene translation of the Bible was published in 1584. The work of Protestants laid the groundwork for the Slovene literary language. Though the successes in Croatia were less than in Slovenia, they were nevertheless real. For example, the Croat Protestant theologian, Matthias Illyricus (1520-1575) wrote an important work, *Centuriae Magdeburgenses*, giving a history of Christianity from the Protestant perspective.

But after the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation, the Jesuits moved in like sharks

³⁷ Kumovic, M., *Croatia: Jasenovac - Exhibition Jasenovac: The System of Ustasha Death Camps*, Memorial Day for the Victims of Genocide, 22 April, 1997, Published by Milan Bulajic & Zivejin Vlahovic, Museum of the Victims of Genocide, Belgrade, Serbia, Yugoslavia, 1997, p. 19 map (orange section), (bilingual: Serbian and English in parallel columns). This map shows that a relatively small section of west-coast Croatia from just north of Zadar down to the Split was not part of the *Independent State of Croatia*.

³⁸ Brown, A., *The Treason of Mihailovitch*, Yugoslav Embassy Information Office, London, UK, 1945 (British Library copy), Maps of Religions, three pages in folder facing p. 61.

to encircle the Protestants in these Hapsburg controlled Slovene provinces. The anti-Protestantism of the Hapsburgs is, e.g., seen in the usage of force by “the Holy Roman Emperor,” (Archduke) Ferdinand II (1619-1637) to remove Protestantism. From 1596, he spearheaded what at first was an expulsion, but then a martyring, of numerous Protestants in what approximates the contemporary areas of eastern Austria, Slovenia, and north-western Croatia (the areas then known as Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola)³⁹.

Among other things, Archduke Ferdinand II e.g., banished Protestant preachers in 1598, and issued a decree in 1599 ordering Protestant commoners to return to Popery. Protestant churches were demolished, Protestant books were burned, and Protestant graves were desecrated. The Jesuits took over control of the schools. The brilliant mathematician, and Lutheran Protestant, John Kepler (1571-1630), was teaching mathematics in these regions at Graz (Austria) in the 1590s. (About 75 per cent of the Graz population was Protestant). Ferdinand II’s persecution included closing down Kepler’s school. Fortunately, Kepler was invited to Bohemia (Czech), where he worked from 1600 at Benatek Observatory outside of Prague. In that same year, Ferdinand II drove all remaining Protestants out of Graz. The great Protestant Reformer of Slovenia, Primoz Trubar (1508-1585), was also forced out.

Then in 1628, Ferdinand II ordered all Protestant noblemen in his empire to either convert to Popery or to get out of his empire. Over 750 Protestant noblemen left the evil empire, “choosing” like the godly Protestant commoners twenty-nine years before, “rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season.” “Of whom the world was not worthy,” the Protestant nobility “wandered” in exile (Heb. 11:25,38). Other than a small number of areas for Jews, until the 1700s, Papistry was the only officially permitted religion in these dark Slovene lands. But the Austrians of the “Holy” Roman Empire came under increasing Germanic influence, and from around the mid eighteenth century an increased number of Germans moved into the regions of (modern day) Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia’s Voivodina in northern Serbia. These Germans were both Roman Catholics and Protestants⁴⁰. Thus by the mid twentieth century, God had still “reserved” to himself “a remnant according to the election of grace” (Rom. 11:5,6) of Lutheran Protestants in (what today is called) Slovenia⁴¹, Croatia, and the northern region of Voivodina in Serbia.

But the Protestant population in these regions (which in most instances was Lutheran,) was decimated by two events in the twentieth century, namely, Nazism and Communism. Neither of these events are well documented in written historical sources, although the former has better written documentation than the latter. At the beginning of

³⁹ Dowley’s *Atlas of the Bible and the History of Christianity*, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

⁴⁰ Dedijer, V., Bozic, I., Cirkovic, S., & Ekmecic, M., *History of Yugoslavia*, Belgrade, Serbia, Yugoslavia, 1972, English translation 1974, McGraw-Hill, New York, USA, pp. 162-8; and discussions between myself and Presbyter Srboljub Miletich, presbyter of St. Stephen’s Serbian Orthodox Church, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia, September, 2004.

⁴¹ When the Nazis dismantled (the first) Yugoslavia, Slovenia was partitioned. Hungary was given Prekmurje in the north-east, Germany put the north directly under its Nazi Reich, and Italy took the southwest including the capital, Liubliana. When (the second) Yugoslavia was reconstituted at the end of World War Two, Slovenia was reconstituted as one of its six states, and it became an independent nation when it left (the second) Yugoslavia in 1991.

World War Two, there were about 70,000 Lutherans in the region of the Nazi Ustashi's *Independent State of Croatia*, of which about 68,500 were of Germanic descent, and about 1,500 converts from other ethnicities, for example, Serbian descent or Jewish descent. The first great persecution came under the Nazi Ustashi from 1941 to 1945. This targeted the 1,500 Lutherans not of Germanic descent, all of whom were persecuted, some of whom were killed, for either racial reasons in the case of Protestants of Jewish descent, or religious reasons in the case of Caucasian Protestants of Serbian descent who refused to convert to Roman Catholicism.

Tito's communist Partisans, with (American, British, and other) Allied support, defeated the Nazi Ustashi in 1945. But Tito soon broke the promises he had made to the Allies on issues such as granting religious freedom. The fact that the Ustashi did not persecute or kill the Lutherans of Germanic descent (for fear of upsetting their German Nazi masters), now had the unfortunate side-effect of feeding Tito's Nazi-phobia in which he considered any person of Germanic descent was secretly either a Nazi or a Nazi sympathizer. The overall number of Lutherans of Germanic descent was reduced under the communist regime from about 70,000 in 1945 at the beginning of the second Yugoslavia, to less than 20,000 in 1991 by the end of the second Yugoslavia.

The destruction of Lutheran Church records by Tito's communists makes getting detailed facts and figures for this period difficult. But general facts are known through oral history. For example, when I was in Croatia in April 2004, the Zagreb Lutheran Minister, Pastor Rajkovic, advised me that under Tito's communist regime Lutheran meetings were secret until 1951, after which time some religious freedom was allowed though most Lutherans of German descent had been removed from (the second) Yugoslavia (1946-1991/2) by Tito. The central offices attached to the Zagreb Lutheran Church were taken over by the communists, and the records there presumably used to help locate the Lutherans of German descent that Tito removed from (the second) Yugoslavia. By the time the communists fell, the number of Lutherans had been reduced to about 20,000 in Croatia; although Pastor Rajkovic said that a small number of Baptists operating from house churches had come into the country after 1951. The Lutheran Church now enjoys religious freedom, but many of its records from this era are missing, *presumably* destroyed by the communists, although possibly preserved in a yet undiscovered archive collection⁴².

I have visited the Slatina Lutheran Evangelical Church from which came the Protestant martyrs of Serbian descent who had refused to convert to Roman Catholicism under the Nazi Ustashi in 1941. Local oral history among these Slatina Protestants has preserved the knowledge that the Lutheran Church at Slatina was closed in 1945 under Tito's communist regime, and not re-opened till 1999, at which time the church buildings, though in need of cleaning, had been preserved, but regrettably all local church records were also missing⁴³.

In regions where written records have been frequently destroyed, oral history is also important for understanding what happened to those of German descent under Tito. According to oral history, some of them were deported to Germany, and some of them were

⁴² Discussions between myself and Pastor Moran Rajkovic, Lutheran Evangelical Church, Zagreb, Croatia, April, 2004.

⁴³ Discussions between myself and Kata Talj, Lutheran Evangelical Church, Slatina, Croatia, April, 2004.

killed. While I have not been able to definitively verify or disprove his claims, Serbian Orthodox Presbyter Miletich of Sydney, advised me that for two or three years from 1945, Tito had two concentration camps in the northern region of Serbia known as Voivodina, one of which was at Sremska Mitovica in the Srem (the same region in which both Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Serbs were killed under the Ustashi in 1941-2). Here he said, Tito's communists killed about 150,000 persons of German descent as a manifestation of his Nazi-phobia. Only a small number ever left these camps, for example, Presbyter Miletich knew a Lutheran who had been released after two years because he was "useful" to the communist state. To be "useful" meant the person was a specialist in some needed field of expertise, for example, engineering⁴⁴. If this oral history is correct, the 150,000 persons of Germanic descent killed included both Protestants and Roman Catholics, since Tito's alleged mass murders of Germanic genocide were directed against Yugoslavs of Germanic descent, rather than religiously directed. But while the numbers of such Yugoslavs of Germanic descent who were deported as opposed to killed has yet to be definitively verified, so that these claims of oral history for mass German genocide remain unsubstantiated, it is certainly verifiable that they are no longer in the regions of northern Serbia and Croatia where they had a much larger small minority community before Tito's rule than after Tito's rule. Clearly then, something happened to remove them.

Numerically, the post World War Two communist persecution against Yugoslavs of Germanic descent, therefore did far more damage to the size of the Protestant community, than the World War Two Nazi persecution of Protestants not of Germanic descent. With Protestants of Jewish or Serbian descent first persecuted, deported, or killed by the Ustashi; and Protestants (and others) of Germanic descent then either deported or killed by Tito's communists, the overall witness of the Protestant gospel in this part of the world has been considerably reduced. For "the dragon," "that old serpent, called the Devil," "was wroth with the woman" who is Christ's bride, the church (Eph. 5:25,32,32), and acting first through the Nazis and then the Communists in these regions, "went to make war with" the church, "which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus" (Rev. 12:9,17). That is, the Protestants who have "the Spirit of prophecy" (Rev. 19:10) found in the completed Word of God, the Bible, since the gift of prophecy only existed in Bible times (Dan. 9:24; Rev. 11:3).

The history of the "Holy" Roman Empire mentioned above is additionally significant because it relates to the Ustashi's commonly used false Nazi propaganda depiction of Serbian Orthodox "conversions" from 1941-5 as being a "return to the faith of their" Roman Catholic "fathers after 250 years" in Eastern Orthodoxy. To examine this piece of important Ustashi propaganda, first requires a general overview of some relevant Serbian Orthodox history. In 1219, the Serbian Orthodox had become independent from the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, with an autocephalous Archbishop of Serbia, Sava I, and autocephalous Patriarch, Joannicius II, from 1338. The Serbian Orthodox Presbyter Dr. Radomir Popovic (Popovich), Professor of Church History at the Theological Faculty of the Serbian Orthodox Church in Belgrade, Serbia, makes reference to an event known in Serbian history as "the Great Migration of 1690." This was an outgrowth of the Austro-Ottoman war of 1674-1690. The Mohammedan Ottoman Empire tried to storm Vienna in 1683, and though the Austrians finally repulsed this Mohammedan siege, a counter-offensive by the Ottoman Turks into Kosovo led to the Great Migration of about 40,000 Serbs. Under the

⁴⁴ Discussions between myself and Presbyter Srboljub Miletich, presbyter of St. Stephen's Serbian Orthodox Church, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia, October, 2004.

Serbian Orthodox Archbishop, Arshenius III, the Serbian Orthodox moved north of the Sava and Danube Rivers into the jurisdiction of the Austrian Emperor Leopold I (“Holy” Roman Emperor 1658-1705). Originally known as the Metropolitanate of Krusedol (1708-1713), Arshenius III established the Serbian Orthodox Metropolitanate of Karlovac (about 50 km or 30 miles south-west of Zagreb). Initially the Metropolitanate was under the Serbian Orthodox Patriarch of Pec, but it was made autocephalous by Kalinik I (Serbian Orthodox Patriarch of Pec, 1691-1710), a fact which meant it remained Serbian Orthodox after the abolition of the Patriarchate of Pec in 1766 (at which time the Serbian Orthodox Church in Serbia, Kosovo, and Bosnia-Herzegovina came under the jurisdiction of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople).

These Serbs were in a military alliance with Leopold I, who had given guarantees of religious freedom to the Serbian Orthodox. But upon arrival in the Roman Catholic “Holy” Roman Empire, these freedoms immediately began to be eroded, and attempts were made to convert them to Romanism. The Serbian Orthodox were told that in towns or regions where they were a minority of the population, they must use Roman Catholic priests and bishops, and attend the Roman Mass, rather than use Serbian Orthodox clergy and attend the Serbian Orthodox Eucharist. The Serbian Orthodox agreed to this for a period of about 20 to 30 years. *The Serbian Orthodox did not consider that they were thereby “converting” to Romanism.* Rather, because they believed in the validity of Roman Catholic religious orders and the Roman Mass, and because they were not sure if they might be moving location again within a fairly short time, they agreed to this on the basis that they considered Roman Catholics to be their “fellow Christians.” But within 20-30 years a number of Serbian Orthodox had become higher ranking officials in the Austrian part of the “Holy” Roman Empire, and having shown themselves to be good fighters for the Empire, they then sought the benefits of religious liberty promised to them at the time of the Great Migration of 1690 from Kosovo. From about the 1720s and 1730s, these Serbian Orthodox requests were agreed to, subject to the qualification that the outward architecture of Serbian Orthodox Churches had to be Western or baroque.

At the time of the *Great Schism* in 1054, the Patriarch of Constantinople led what became known as the Eastern Orthodox Church, out of the Roman Catholic Church. In time, autocephalous Eastern Orthodox churches were formed, which were no longer under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and which had their own ethnicity rather than the Greek ethnicity of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople. For example, Rumanian Orthodox in 1864, Bulgarian Orthodox in 1870, or Albanian Orthodox in 1937, all became autocephalous. Even Greece became autocephalous in 1833, so that the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople’s direct power is now limited to the Archdiocese of Constantinople, four suburban dioceses of: Chalcedon; Terkos; Buyukada; and the islands of Imroz Adasi and Bozca Ada. However in a power sharing arrangement with the autocephalous Greek Orthodox Archbishop of Athens, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople retains some minimal and largely ceremonial jurisdiction over the Greek Orthodox monastic state of Mount Athos, the Greek Orthodox monastery of St. John on the Island of Patmos (where the Book of Revelation was written), four bishoprics in the Dodecanese, several dioceses in northern Greece, and over the autonomous Greek Orthodox Church of Crete. The fact that the Russian Orthodox Church ceased to be a Metropolitanate of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, and became autocephalous under the Patriarch of Moscow in 1593, is significant for the Serbian Orthodox under their autocephalous Metropolitanate of Karlovac inside the “Holy” Roman Empire. That is because after 1766 when the Serbian Orthodox Patriarchate of Pec was abolished, these

Serbian Orthodox in the “Holy” Roman Empire built strong voluntary contacts with the Russian Orthodox Church, which as an autonomous Eastern Orthodox Church was prepared to assist them by supplying church service books and teachers.

In (the area known in contemporary times as) Montenegro, the Serbian Orthodox Church was neither under the “Holy” Roman Empire nor the Ottoman Empire, but being a Metropolitanate of Pec, was deprived of its Patriarch after 1766. However Serbian Orthodox there elected various bishops, and had them consecrated by other Eastern Orthodox bishops, sometimes by Russian Orthodox, and sometimes by Serbian Orthodox from Karlovac.

But other Serbian Orthodox came under the Ottoman Empire. Under the Mohammedan (or Islamic) Ottoman Empire, national Eastern Orthodox Church independence was lost in (the areas known in contemporary times as) Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo, (Slav) Macedonia, and Sandzak (the regions of Kosovo, Slav Macedonia, and Sandzak - a section between Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Serbia, are also called “old Serbia”), which all came under the centralized control of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople. After the Eastern Orthodox Serbian Patriarch, Arshenius IV (Patriarch of Pec in Kosovo, 1726-1737) fled into Austria, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople started appointing mainly Greek Orthodox Patriarchs of Pec beginning with Joannucius III (Patriarch of Pec, 1739-1746), so that of eight patriarchs appointed between 1752 and 1765, five of them were Greeks. The last Serb, Basil, was appointed patriarch from 1763-1765, but he was banished to Cyprus as an enemy of the Ottoman Empire. The Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople then appointed another Greek, Kalinik II (Patriarch of Pec, 1765-1766), who petitioned the Patriarch of Constantinople to abolish the Patriarchate of Pec. This was done in 1766, and thereafter these Eastern Orthodox Serbian Dioceses were placed under the direct jurisdiction of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople. All Serbian Bishops were then removed, and Greek Orthodox Bishops were appointed, most of whom could not speak Serbian, and they were known as Phanariots (after the region of Constantinople called Phanar / Fener, where most Greek Orthodox, including the Patriarch of Constantinople, reside).

Serbian revolts in 1804 and 1815, contributed to the Ottoman Empire granting Serbia the status of an autonomous principality within the Ottoman Empire. Connected with this, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople decided to recognize a degree of Serbian national autonomy, and he removed all Greek Orthodox bishops who had come into direct conflict with the Serbian leaders of the two revolts. The first Eastern Orthodox Serb appointed as Metropolitan of Serbia was Melentie Pavlovitch (Metropolitan 1831-1833). A succession of Serbian Metropolitans were appointed by the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, they again became autocephalous in 1879, and by the beginning of the twentieth century this position was known as the Metropolitanate of Belgrade.

Serbian Orthodox Presbyter, Dr. Radomir Popovic, says that after World War One, the Serbian Orthodox Church “turned to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, as to its mother church,” to consult the Patriarchate over this matter. The Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople is by virtue of his historic importance to Eastern Orthodoxy as the Patriarch who broke with Rome in 1054, also known as the *Ecumenical Patriarch* of Eastern Orthodoxy, being deemed among the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs as *the first among equals* (a ceremonial honour given to him by autocephalous Eastern Orthodox churches which brings with it no accompanying jurisdictional power in their churches). He consented to the re-establishment of an autocephalous Serbian Orthodox Patriarch of Pec in 1920. The

Serbian Orthodox in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, Kosovo, and Slav Macedonia⁴⁵, were now placed under the newly reconstituted autocephalous Serbian Orthodox Patriarch of Pec, together with Serbian Orthodox under the autocephalous Metropolitanate of Karlovac both inside the old Austro-Hungarian Empire, and outside of it in Dalmatia (which had come under the Metropolitanate of Karlovac in 1828), and the Metropolitanate of Montenegro (which had leaned heavily on Russian Orthodox support for survival). Thus the Serbian Orthodox Church was reconstituted from its constituent parts in 1920, just one year before the formation of (the first) Yugoslavia in 1921⁴⁶.

Significantly then, at no time did the Serbian Orthodox as a group covert to Roman Catholicism (even if some lone individuals may have). Thus the common 1940s claim of the Nazi Ustashi, that their programme of attempted forced “conversions” of Serbian Orthodox (and some Serbian Protestants), was “a return to the faith of their fathers after 250 years,” is quite wrong. The Serbs were historically in most instances Eastern Orthodox, and while for a twenty or thirty year period from about 1690 they were required to use, and did use, Roman Catholic Churches and priests, this was understood by them to be a temporary stop-gap measure. They did not consider that by this action they were converting to Roman Catholicism. When this twenty or thirty year period ended, and they were permitted to build Serbian Orthodox Churches, they did so, and thereafter clearly continued in an Eastern Orthodox history.

CHAPTER 3

SOME RELEVANT HISTORICAL MATTERS TO THE INDEPENDENT STATE OF CROATIA (1941-5)

On 25 April 1941, the Ustashi decreed that the term “Serbian Orthodox” was prohibited, and that the Serbian Orthodox be known as “Greek-Easterners” or “Greco-Orientalists”⁴⁷. The four most ancient Sees of Eastern Orthodoxy are held by the Greek Orthodox, namely, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, and Jerusalem. Connected with this, in Western countries Eastern Orthodoxy is referred to by some writers as “the Greek Church” or generically as “Greek Orthodox,” a designation which also highlights its historic origins from the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople in the *Great Schism* of 1054. This type of thinking also lies behind Article 19 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* which refers to “the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch” (which was also written before some, though not all, Eastern Orthodox Churches became autocephalous). But Western writers who use such terminology for Eastern Orthodoxy when referring to it *generically as a church*, do not thereby deny the reality of its national diversity. They do not, for example,

⁴⁵ In the mid 1960s, the Slav Macedonians left the Serbian Orthodox Church to become the Macedonian Orthodox Church under the autocephalous Patriarch of Skopie. But the Serbian Orthodox Church has not recognized the Patriarch of Skopie.

⁴⁶ Popovic, R., *Serbian Orthodox Church in History*, Gratiprof, Belgrade, Serbia, Yugoslavia, 2002, pp. 53-7,62-81,109-111; and discussions between myself and Presbyter Srboljub Miletich, presbyter of St. Stephen’s Serbian Orthodox Church, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia, September and October, 2004.

⁴⁷ Alexander, S., *The Triple Myth*, East European Monographs, Distributed by Columbia University Press, New York, USA, 1987, p.68; quoting *Srpska Pravoslavna Crka 1920-1970*, Serbian Orthodox Church (official history), Belgrade, Serbia, Yugoslavia, 1971, 21 June 1941.

refuse to refer to the “Russian Orthodox Church” or the “Serbian Orthodox Church.” Therefore, this is not to be confused with the Ustashi’s prohibition of the term “Serbian Orthodox” and associated requirement that they be referred to as “Greco-Orientals.” *The usage of the term “Greco-Oriental” seems to have had Ustashi policy overtones either back to the situation before 1219 when the Eastern Orthodox Serbs were under the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, and / or back to the time of the Mohammedan Ottoman Empire when some Eastern Orthodox Serbs lost their autocephalous Serbian Orthodox Patriarch and were placed under the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople. The reason for this is not specifically stated, although my reconstruction of the Nazi-Ustashi’s probable reasoning is that it seems to have been connected with a desire to strip Serbian Orthodox of a Serbian ethnic identity; as well as trying to use Eastern Orthodox Serbs under the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople in the past, as some kind of precedent to replace the Serbian Orthodox Patriarch of Pec in the Independent State of Croatia under the Nazi Ustashi, with “the Patriarch of the West,” the Roman Catholic Pope.*

But any such analogy is quite false. That is because even when the Eastern Orthodox Serbs were under the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople before 1219, they were nevertheless Eastern Orthodox, not Roman Catholic, and so their former relationship with the Patriarch of Constantinople could not be used as a precedent for placing them under the so called Patriarch of the West, the Roman Catholic Pope. The usage of this term “Greco-Oriental” from 1941 to 1945 could only be applied to Serbian Orthodoxy in the southern part of the Ustashi’s Greater Croatia of the *Independent State of Croatia* (in what approximates contemporary Bosnia-Herzegovina), who under the Ottoman Empire had again been under the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople after 1766, by denying the events of the previous 60-70 years since these Serbian Orthodox had again become autocephalous in 1879, and also denying the previous 20 to 25 years since the re-establishment of the autocephalous Serbian Orthodox Patriarch of Pec in 1920. Moreover, the usage of this term “Greco-Oriental” from 1941 to 1945 could only be applied to Serbian Orthodoxy in the northern part of the Ustashi’s *Independent State of Croatia* (in what approximates contemporary Croatia), by denying the events of the previous 720 to 730 years dating from the autocephalous Serbian Orthodox Archbishop Sava in 1219, and the previous 600 to 610 years since the autocephalous Serbian Orthodox Patriarch Joannicius II in 1338.

In describing the “conversions” of Serbian Orthodox to Roman Catholicism, Butler records that Ustashi newspapers of World War Two “usually” used “such headlines as ‘Return to the faith of their fathers after 250 years’.”⁴⁸ *But the historical facts also clearly show that contrary to the common Nazi Ustashi propaganda depiction of Serbian Orthodox “conversions” from 1941 to 1945 as being a “return to the faith of their” Roman Catholic “fathers after 250 years” in Eastern Orthodoxy, the Serbian Orthodox of 1941 to 1945, had been Eastern Orthodox and not Roman Catholic for a long time before 1690, during 1690, and after 1690.* It is surely notable that this common Nazi Ustashi propaganda necessarily first endorsed the Romanist religious intolerance of the “Holy” Roman Empire, and then applied an even more rigorous Romanist religious intolerance to Serbs in the *Independent State of Croatia*. This common Nazi Ustashi propaganda depiction of Serbian Orthodox

⁴⁸ Butler’s *Grandmother and Wolfe Tone*, Lilliput Press, Dublin, Republic of Ireland, 1999, pp. 184,186. Butler refers to the oblique nature of these claims which he found baffling, in part because of the lack of any genuine underpinning historical veracity to the claims, and in part because he did not know Serbian Orthodox Church history well enough to understand how the Nazis were misusing the events of the 20 or 30 years following 1690.

“conversions” from 1941-5 as being a “return to the faith of their” Roman Catholic “fathers after 250 years” in Eastern Orthodoxy is thus quite false. The usage of Romanist priests, bishops, and churches in the “Holy” Roman Empire by the Serbian Orthodox for 20 or 30 years from the Great Migration of 1690 did not constitute a “conversion” of Serbian Orthodox to Roman Catholicism, but rather was considered by them as a temporary stop-gap measure. Notably, the *Vatican II Council (1962-5)*, “Declaration on the Position of the [Roman] Catholic Church on the Celebration of the Eucharist in Common by Christians of Different Confessions” (3 & 6) in the “Decree on Ecumenism,” shows a similar, though not identical thinking. It says, “Eastern Christians not in full communion with” “Rome,” may “be admitted to the” Roman Catholic “Eucharist” “in specific circumstances,” such as “danger of death or in urgent need (during persecution, in prisons)” if the Eastern Orthodox person “has no access to a minister of his own communion, and spontaneously asks for a [Roman] Catholic priest.⁴⁹”

The period 1690 to about 1720 would be an example of such “persecution,” although the fact that the Serbian Orthodox of this time had “no access to a” Serbian Orthodox “minister” was the result of Austrian “Holy” Roman Empire rules, and it would be too much to say the Serbian Orthodox “spontaneously” asked for a Romish priest. Nevertheless, in general terms, it was *a similar type of thinking* that lay behind the usage of Romish priests by Serbian Orthodox in the “Holy” Roman Empire for about 20 or 30 years after 1690. Moreover, at the point of implementation, a Romish Bishop could, *if he so wished*, use his discretionary powers to allow an Eastern Orthodox person to use this provision in identical circumstances as 1690-1720. That is because, as seen by the forced “conversions” to Romanism under the Ustashi, the Church of Rome’s hierarchy is prepared to turn a blind eye to such issues *when it suits them*. For example, on 13 January 1942, the Croatian newspaper *Nova Hrvatska* described mass “conversions” in Stepinatz’s Roman Catholic diocese at Kamensko, near Karlovac. It states “Four hundred people” “of the Greco-Oriental ritual from Popovic” were part of “this conversion ceremony.” This “conversion” was criticized in Allied countries. Responding to this criticism and broadcasting in English to reach the people of the United Kingdom and the United States, *Radio-Vatican* said, “It is true that the majority of the population in the village of Popovic,” “has swung over to [Roman] Catholicism, but this conversion was entirely spontaneous. And in spite of what people say, it was undertaken without any pressure from the civil or ecclesiastical authorities.⁵⁰” The usage here by *Vatican-Radio* to describe these forced “conversions” of Serbian Orthodox to Romanism as “spontaneous,” shows the absurd interpretation they are prepared, *in practice*, to give to such words, *when it suits their Romish purposes to do so*. Though it has not so suited their purposes to do so, it would, on the precedent of claiming forced Ustashi “conversions” to Romanism were “spontaneous” in January 1942, certainly be possible for Romanists to say that between 1690 and 1720 the Serbian Orthodox usage of Romish clergy was “spontaneous,” although to do so would then undermine the Ustashi propaganda claim of Serbian Orthodox “conversions” from 1941 to 1945 being a “return to the faith of their” Roman Catholic “fathers after 250 years” in Eastern Orthodoxy.

The *Vatican-Radio*’s reference to “what people say” against the proposition that these

⁴⁹ *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, pp. 503,505.

⁵⁰ Paris, E., *Genocide in Satellite Croatia 1941-1945, A Record of Racial and Religious Persecutions and Massacres*, Translated from the French by Lois Perkins, King’s The Printer, Ballarat, Victoria, Australia, 1981, p. 152 (unless otherwise stated, references to this book are to this edition).

“conversions” were genuine, included, less than two months later, a letter by a group of Serbian Orthodox priests on 1 March 1942 to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Belgrade, Bishop Ujic. In this letter, which Edmond Paris says “was destined to find its way to the” “See” of Rome, these Serbian Orthodox priests state that in “the Independent State of Croatia all the [Serbian Orthodox] bishops and [Serbian] Orthodox priests have either been killed or imprisoned or sent to concentration camps. Their churches and monasteries have been destroyed and their goods confiscated.” “The impartial observer is obliged to admit that the conversion of the Serbian Orthodox to [Roman] Catholicism took place under tremendous political pressure. It is certain that the number of [Serbian] Orthodox in Croatia who became converted by inner conviction to [Roman] Catholicism could be counted on one’s fingers,” and hence these were forced “conversions.” “The forced conversion of Serbian masses, the tortures inflicted on their priests, the destruction of their churches,” “was done, so it is said, in the interests of the [Roman] Catholic Church.” *Then in a manner reminiscent of Jewish concerns about the silence of Pope Pius XII on the genocide of Jews*, these Serbian Orthodox priests said, “*The Serbs could not understand the reasons which motivated the silence of the*” “See” of Rome. They petitioned that the “See” of Rome “publicly condemns the bloody persecution of the [Eastern Orthodox] Serbs and their church;” “forbids all conversions to [Roman] Catholicism under the existing reign of terror;” although allow “certain persons” “to be converted to [Roman] Catholicism” if they “examine each case” and it is genuine; and advise “the Croatian” Roman Catholic “bishops” to give “Serbian Orthodox” “their protection⁵¹.” *But the response of the Roman Pontiff to the mass killings of Serbs and forced “conversions” of Serbs to Romanism, was the same as his response to the mass killings of Jews. Silence.*

Concerning the “bishops” “killed” referred to in this letter, it should be noted that different writers refer to either three or four Serbian Orthodox bishops being killed by the Ustashi. For example, Edmond Paris lists three (Planton, Sava, and Simonic), whereas Joachim Wertz lists four (adding Dositei). Bishop Dositei of Zagreb (Croatia), died after having been beaten and tortured. But because he was not killed on the spot by the Ustashi, but died subsequently of his wounds, he is not included by those who count only three Serbian Orthodox bishops killed. Bishop Trlaic Sava of Karlovac, southwest of Zagreb, in May 1941 was taken from his home to Ogulin together with thirteen other Serbian Orthodox. After being locked in a barn where they were beaten and tortured, they were first taken to Gospic, and then in August 1941 together with 2,000 other Serbs, they were sent to the Adriatic island of Pag on Croatia’s west coast, where they were killed. Bishop Jovanovic Platon of Banja Luka (Bosnia-Herzegovina), together with the Serbian Orthodox priest, Dusan Subotic, was taken 6 kilometres (or 4 miles) away to Vrbania, where they were killed in May 1941. When their dead bodies were dragged from the Vrbania River, they showed that they had been tortured, with bodily parts removed, and fires finally lit on their chests. Archbishop Peter Simonic (Zimonic), the Archbishop of Sarajevo (Bosnia-Herzegovina), an octogenarian who in May 1941 was first taken to Zagreb, then sent to Jasenovac concentration camp where he was killed⁵².

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 163-5; quoting *Tajni dokumenti o odnosima Vatikan I ustake nevaisne drzave Hrvatske*, Zagreb, Croatia, Yugoslavia, 1952, pp. 98-9; and referring to Novak, V., *Magnum Crimen*, Zagreb, Croatia, Yugoslavia, 1948, pp. 785-7.

⁵² Wertz, J., “On the Serbian Orthodox New Martyrs of the Second World War,” *Orthodox Life*, Brotherhood of Saint Job of Pochaev at Holy Trinity Monastery, Jordanville, New York, USA, Volume 33, Number 1, 1983, pp. 15-26 at pp. 19-20, 23-6; referring to Paris, E., *Genocide in Satellite Croatia 1941-1945*, American Institute for Balkan Affairs,

The Roman Church is a whore who goes to bed with the highest political bidder. She sits as a great whore with spiritual power over hundreds of millions of people, and as a political power in Rome. The rulers of the earth commit fornication with her by making her offers, for example, money to help fund her schools and hospitals. If she accepts the bid, she goes to bed with these rulers by encouraging those in her spiritual power to support the regime in question. Because she sits as a great whore, the Church of Rome has been able to adapt to political democracies who are prepared to *play the game* and *make a bid for her services*. But while some later more established communist regimes such as Tito in Yugoslavia were ultimately prepared to *play the game* in a limited way, generally speaking the communist promotion of atheism meant they *did not want to play the game and bid for the whore's favours*. This led to a situation of virulent anti-communism by the Vatican, *for a woman scorned is a sour thing*. By contrast, the fascists or Nazis *were prepared to play the game and make a bid for the Roman whore*. This led to a situation where by the time of World War Two, the Roman Catholic Church had consistently denounced Communism, but not fascism / Nazism. Many instances exist of Roman Catholics supporting Fascist or Nazi regimes in this period, in part because they were anti-communist, and in part because the Vatican had not condemned fascism or Nazism since they *were prepared to play the game and make the Roman whore a bid* (Rev. 17).

The “Holy” Roman Empire (800-1806) was set up as a Papist persecuting empire; although centring largely in Germany, it was weakened by the Protestant Reformation, and after the Thirty Years War (1618-1648), the emperor’s power became largely nominal. The German Empire of 1871-1918 was called “the second reich,” i.e., the “Holy Roman Empire” was regarded as the “first reich” or rule. Hitler called Nazi Germany “the third reich” This indicated a clear allegiance to Rome, and he was certainly prepared to “play the game” with the old Roman whore. Stereotypically, the Fascists or Nazis sought the support of the Roman Church and to secure this gave the Roman whore “an offer to good to refuse.” In Italy, the murderous fascist dictator, Benito Mussolini gave the Roman whore her heart’s desire with the Vatican State established as a temporal power in 1929, thus ending the period of 59 years from 1870 when the Pope lost the Papal states (Dan. 7:25,26), and so lacked temporal power as a Head of State (Rev. 13:3). In France, the Vichy Government of Petaine was set up by the German Nazis after they invaded France, and Petene’s regime endorsed Roman Catholicism. In Spain, the Roman Church likewise gained favours from Hitler’s friend, General Franco. The *Inquisition* was not officially wound up in the Papal states and Rome itself, till the fall of the last of the Papal states in 1870. It continued to operate in Rome until this time. E.g., in 1848-9, under the Republic at Rome a government deputation released Archbishop Cashiur, who having been imprisoned in a Roman dungeon for twenty years could hardly walk, together with a number of other prisoners, including two nuns. Though the Inquisition’s dungeons at Rome included a hall of torture, the *Inquisition’s* most famous regional manifestation is the *Spanish Inquisition* which was wound up in 1809⁵³.

In the Independent State of Croatia, the deal with the Nazis would be a system of concentration camps, other killing fields, and deportations, that re-introduced something akin to the Spanish Inquisition for Serbs (most of whom were Serbian Orthodox, but a small percentage of whom were Protestants), who refused to convert to Roman Catholicism. This

Chicago, Illinois, USA, 1961.

⁵³ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, pp. 675-8; Blakeney’s *Popery in its Social Aspects*, *op. cit.* .

affected about 2.2 million Serbs, and by the time the Ustashi regime was destroyed four years later in 1945, at least about 750,000 to 800,000 had been killed, between 180,000 and 300,000 had been deported to Serbia, and about 240,000 had been “converted” to Roman Catholicism⁵⁴. This means that for every three Serbs killed, one Serb was deported, and one Serb “converted” to Romanism. This division sometimes cut inside families, for example, the Yugoslav lawyer, Grace Beaton, had three brothers killed for refusing to convert to Romanism, but one sister who “converted” to Romanism and lived⁵⁵. On this basis, had the Nazis not been defeated in 1945, if the ratios of 60% to 65% killed, 15% to 22% deported, and 18% to 20% “converted” to Popery had remained the same, then this would have resulted in at least a further 515,000 Serbs being killed, at least a further 129,000 Serbs being deported, and at least a further 155,000 Serbs being “converted” to Romanism. We cannot doubt that if the Allied Forces had not intervened, this “prize” of an extra 155,000 “converts” would have spurred these *Inquisitors* onto the necessary further 515,000 mass murders. (And having thus eventually Romanized what remained of the Serbian population, I think it reasonable to ask if the Ustashi would then have used these techniques to Romanize the Moslem population of Bosnia-Herzegovina?)

In 1935 the King of Yugoslavia was assassinated in France, and Anton Pavelitch and Slavko Kvaternik were both found to have been directly responsible via the Ustashi (a Croatian fascist organization founded in the 1920s), and sentenced to death by a French court⁵⁶. But Pavelitch fled and was given protection in Italy by the murderous Fascist dictator, Mussolini. (The first) Yugoslavia was then governed by a Nazi collaborating regime which signed the *Tripartite Pact* on 25 March 1941 with the Fascist-Nazi Axis powers. This resulted in an anti-Nazi revolution in (the first) Yugoslavia on 27 March 1941 which denounced this pact. The Fascist-Nazi Axis powers responded by invading Yugoslavia on 6 April 1941 and the Yugoslav army capitulated in 17 April 1941. Between these two dates, on 10 April 1941, a leader of the Ustashi terrorists, Slavko Kvaternik proclaimed the “Free Independent State of Croatia,” while awaiting the arrival of Anton Pavelitch from Italy.

The well published Protestant writer, (George) Sherwood Eddy (1871-1963) gives an important general overview. “When, in 1941, Hitler invaded Yugoslavia,” the “war was waged with frightful cruelty in Yugoslavia. Aside from the operations of the German army, it was largely a guerilla war, with the Ustashis, often led by Roman Catholic priests, battling the Partisans under Tito. As part of this conflict, a thousand [Serbian] Orthodox and Protestant churches were destroyed, fifteen hundred church leaders, [Serbian] Orthodox and Protestant, were killed, three [Serbian] Orthodox bishops were murdered (one after long torture), hundreds of Serbian Orthodox priests and monks were massacred, and when the Ustashi power was at its peak, 200,000 Serbs under forcible mass conversion accepted

⁵⁴ Falconi, C., *op. cit.*, p. 274; Butler, H., *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, Penguin Press, London, UK in association with Lilliput Press, Dublin, Republic of Ireland, 1990, pp. 282,284; Butler, H., *In the Land of Nod*, Lilliput Press, Dublin, Republic of Ireland, 1996, p. 96; Kumovic, M., *Croatia: Jasenovac - Exhibition Jasenovac: The System of Ustasha Death Camps*, *op. cit.*, p. 6; Paris, E., *op. cit.*, p. 211.

⁵⁵ Butler’s *In the Land of Nod*, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

⁵⁶ *Encyclopedia Britannic*, 23rd edition, 1952, p. 922 says, “It was proved that the assassination had been inaugurated by a Croat revolutionary organization under Dr. Ante Pavelitch, the head of the terrorist Ustashi, and his fellow worker Slavko Kvaternik. A French Court sentenced them to death in absentia for murder” (quoted in Eddy, S., *op. cit.*, p. 42).

Roman Catholicism as the only hope of saving their lives.⁵⁷”

The largest Nazi concentration camp was Auschwitz in Poland, where about 1.6 million people were killed, including about 16,000 Soviet Prisoners of War, about 2,000 Gypsies, and several hundred Polish political prisoners. But the vast majority of those killed at Auschwitz were Jews (or persons of Jewish descent), numbering about 1.5 million. The Nazi’s second largest concentration camp was Treblinka, also in Poland, where about 870,000 people were killed, comprising of about 2,000 Gypsies and the rest were Jews (or persons of Jewish descent). The Nazi’s fourth largest concentration camp, Belzec, in Poland, killed about 600,000 people, of which a few thousand were Gypsies and the rest were Jews (or persons of Jewish descent). Dachau was the Nazi’s favoured camp for political prisoners. For example, in sharp contrast with the Roman Catholic Primate of Yugoslavia, Archbishop Stepinatz, the Serbian Orthodox Patriarch, Gabriel Dozic (Patriarch Gabriel V, 1938-1950), rejected any idea of Yugoslavia entering a pact with Hitler, and declared, “If we are to live, let us live in liberty; and if we are to die, let us die for liberty!” In the first days of Nazi occupation, both Patriarch Gabriel V and Serbian Orthodox Bishop Nicholas Velimirovic were taken to Dachau concentration camp from the Serbian Orthodox monastery of Ostrog in Montenegro, where they were interned till 1945. After the war, Bishop Velimirovic was a strong critic of the Nazis. For example, he said in 1954, “The Duke of Alva, that sinister representative of the Spanish King (Philip II), to the Low Countries” of the Netherlands, “tortured and killed some 18,000 Protestants within six years” from 1567. “In France, the massacre” on the Day “of St. Bartholomew,” “1572,” “justifiably stigmatized by the historians,” had “100,000 victims.” “The head inquisitor,” of the “Spanish Inquisition,” “named by the Pope, was the Dominican monk, Thomas de Torquemada,” (Grand Inquisitor of Spain, 1483-1498,) whose “sinister bitterness” is seen in the fact that he was responsible for having “10,220 persons” “burned at the stake, while 114,401 (according to the historian Motley) perished from hunger and torture in their prisons, which meant 125,000 people” died. “This record” of the “Spanish Inquisition” “is frightful enough, but the inquisition of the Serbian Orthodox” under the Nazi Ustashi “was much more terrible, for 750,000 Serbs were killed in just four years.⁵⁸”

The Nazi’s third largest concentration camp, Jasenovac in Croatia, was very different to other Nazi concentration camps. (In the Slavic, “Jasenovac” is pronounced “Yasenovatz,” and comes from “Jasen” meaning an “Ashtree.”) Jasenovac killed between 600,000 and 700,000 people⁵⁹, of which a relatively small number were anti-Nazi political dissidents,

⁵⁷ *The Christian Century*, Undenominational, Vol. 70, Chicago, Illinois, USA, 14 Jan 1953, number 2, p. 42. The World War Two German (and later German-Italian) occupation of Yugoslavia was militarily opposed by two rival resistance military forces, the Partisans and Chetniks. The Partisans were the communist republican forces under Tito, the Chetniks were the anti-communist royalist forces under Mihailovic (Mikhailovitch), loyal to the Yugoslav government-in-exile under King Peter. The Allies originally supported the Chetniks, but for military reasons switched support to the Partisans whom they regarded to be a better military force. A complicating factor occurred near the end of the war when numerous Chetniks joined forces with the Nazis, regarding them to be a lesser evil than Tito’s communists. In 1946 the Tito regime executed Mihailovic against Allied protests.

⁵⁸ Paris, E., *op. cit.*, pp. 4,43,49.

⁵⁹ The Croat National Commission reported to the International Military Court in Nuremberg on 15 Nov 1945 that the number of Jasenovac victims was between 500,000 and 600,000. But the figure most often stated is 700,000, and on 16 March 1944 the Nazi SS

about 20,000 were Jews (or persons of Jewish descent), about 30,000 were Gypsies, but most of whom were Serbs *who had refused to convert to Roman Catholicism*. This included about 11,900 children of Serbian descent, about 5,500 Gypsy children, about 2,000 children of Jewish descent, about 130 children of Croatian descent, and about 20 Mohammedan children⁶⁰. This meant Jasenovac, and other such killing places under the Nazi Ustashi, were a mixture, containing an element of the normal Nazi concentration camps concern to kill Gypsies, Jews, and anti-Nazi political dissidents, but *predominantly* they operated more like the Spanish Inquisition, killing those Serbs who had refused to convert to Romanism. Like Jews who were required to wear identifying arm-bands, Serbian Orthodox were required to wear arm-bands showing their religious affiliation, that is, the letter “P” for *Pravoslavac* meaning “Orthodox”⁶¹. The *Independent State of Croatia* started with about 2.2 million persons of Serbian descent in 1941. By 1945, in addition to between 180,000 and 300,000 deportations, and about 240,000 “conversions” from Serbian Orthodoxy to Roman Catholicism, about 750,000-800,000 Serbs had been killed⁶². This means that in the Ustashi’s Croatia, about 67% of all Jews killed, (depending on the figures used) between about 75% to 85% of all Serbs killed, and 100% of all Gypsies killed, died at Jasenovac.

Unlike the Jewish, Gypsy, and anti-Nazi political dissident elements killed at Jasenovac, or those killed at Nazi concentration camps outside of the *Independent State of Croatia*, those 600,000-650,000 Serbs killed at Jasenovac, could have saved their lives if they had *earlier* been prepared to convert to Roman Catholicism; although under Spanish Inquisition type “purity of blood” (*limpieza de sangre*) laws relevant to a *converso* convert, they might still have been killed in the Croatian Inquisition on the basis that their conversions were (understandably) not genuine. Jasenovac was not just a place of killing, but also a place of cruel torture. The method of killing at Jasenovac was different to Nazi concentration camps outside of the Ustashi’s Croatia. Mladenko Kumovic recorded that at Jasenovac victims were killed in a variety of ways, including, having their throats cut with a specially designed knife; being killed with hammers, mallets, or axes; being hung, shot, or burnt alive in furnaces; being boiled in cauldrons; or being drowned in the Sava River⁶³. The term “cut-throat” has moved from its plenary meaning and now refers to any murderer. But

Major-General Ernest Fik reported to Berlin that the Ustashi had killed between 600,000 and 700,000 people at Jasenovac. The discrepancy between these two figures (which both use the figure of 600,000 victims) arises from the destruction of Ustashi records (Bulajic, M., *et al*, *Ustashi Genocide in the Independent State of Croatia (NDH) from 1941 -1945*, Ministry of Information of the Republic of Serbia, Belgrade, Serbia, Yugoslavia, 1991, p. 30; Bulajic, M., *Tudjman’s “Jasenovac Myth,” Genocide Against Serbs, Jews, & Gypsies*, (translated by M. Jankovic & A. Pesic), Strucna Knjiga, Belgrade, Serbia, Yugoslavia, 1996, p. 161; reproducing “Croatian-run death site remains dark secret,” *Washington Times*, 5 July, 1994, p. A 10.) I was advised of Milan Bulajic’s retirement from the post of Director of the *Genocide Victims Museum* in Belgrade, Serbia, (the third) Yugoslavia, when I visited the museum in 2004.

⁶⁰ Mirkovic, J., & Lukic, D., *They Were Only Children*, Jasenovac’s cemetery of 19,432 boys and girls, Museum of the Victims of Genocide, Belgrade, Serbia, Yugoslavia, [c. 2004] (bilingual: Serbian and English in parallel columns), p. 8.

⁶¹ Wertz, J., *op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁶² Butler’s *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, pp. 282,284; Butler’s *In the Land of Nod*, *op. cit.*, p. 96; Paris, E., *op. cit.*, p. 211.

⁶³ Kumovic, M., *Croatia: Jasenovac - Exhibition Jasenovac: The System of Ustasha Death Camps*, *op. cit.*, pp. 4,10-11.

the special knife used so frequently by the Ustashi, meant they were quite literally “cut-throats” in the plenary sense of the word, and certainly the largest group of “cut-throats” in the plenary sense of the word, known in modern history. In 2004 I visited the *Jasenovac Memorial Park* which is located at Camp 1, also known as Camp Spomenik, in the Jasenovac Concentration Camp (in fact Jasenovac was a spider-web of twenty-four sub-camps⁶⁴). In addition to some concentration camp memorabilia I saw in the *Memorial Museum*⁶⁵, in the main grounds stands a train with carriages used to bring victims on their nightmare journey to the camp. I also saw the huge *Stone Flower* unveiled in 1966 as a memorial to the Serbs, Jews, Gypsies, and anti-Nazi political dissidents killed at Jasenovac by the Nazi Ustashi. The *Stone Flower* is located on the spot of Jasenovac Concentration Camp’s Crematory, although unlike other concentration camps, dead bodies were not always disposed of through the crematory, for example, many bodies were simply thrown into the Sava River. Not far from the entrance to *Jasenovac Memorial Park*, that is, the old Camp 1 of the *Jasenovac Concentration Camp*, I saw an architecturally picturesque white Roman Catholic Church, old enough to have been there when the Jasenovac concentration camp was operating. Thinking about this white church and how some 600,000-650,000 Serbs killed at Jasenovac could have lived had they converted to Romanism, the words of Jesus seem apt, “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye are like whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men’s bones, and all uncleanness” (Matt. 23:27). Jasenovac is southeast of Zagreb on the Sava River near the border with Bosnia-Herzegovina. The Jewish-American Nazi hunter, Simon Wiesenthal has said, “The crimes must be known of the fascist Ustashi over the Serbs in the notorious camp at Jasenovac, crimes that are the worst ones ever along with those committed in the Holocaust of the Jews.”⁶⁶

In understanding Jasenovac and Roman Catholic involvement in killing those Serbs who refused to convert to Roman Catholicism, it is helpful to understand the history of the Franciscans. Named after Francis of Assisi who died in 1226, and who was canonized less than two years later by Pope Gregory IX (Pope 1227-1241), Assisi in southern Italy has become a major pilgrimage site for Papists. His quick canonization by the Pope relates to

⁶⁴ At Jasenovac Memorial Park, I saw a metallic map naming and showing the relative locations of the 24 sub-camps forming the Jasenovac complex, together with a scale-model of their locations made from mounds of earth surrounding this metallic map.

⁶⁵ The train, museum and its exhibition was greatly damaged by the Croatian army in 1991, which also destroyed the last remaining historical building, the “Kozhara” of Camp 4 (Bulajic, M., *Croatia: Jasenovac, op. cit.*, pp. 107-9). While the train and museum buildings had been repaired by the time of my visit in 2004, the memorial museum was bare except for some large logs hung on the wall which I was told had been cut from trees in the area by Jasenovac concentration camp prisoners for camp-fires such as kitchens and the crematorium. There has been debate in Croatia as to what should be featured in the memorial museum, and at the time I made enquiries in 2004 it was thought that an exhibition would again be set up focusing on Jewish, Gypsy, and political dissident victims at Jasenovac, *with a special emphasis on Croatian anti-Nazi political dissidents* such as the Romish priest Stepinatz sought to assist when sent to Jasenovac. If this suggestion eventuates, then the exhibition will have little to nothing to say about the Serbs killed here, and so will depict Jasenovac as more similar to the normative Nazi concentration camp than what it actually was. However when I made enquiries the matter was still unresolved, and we can only wait to see what the exhibition will in fact be about, if and when an exhibition is again set up in the memorial museum. (As at the time of this 2nd edition in 2010 I have no further information on this.)

⁶⁶ Bulajic, M., *Tudjman’s “Jasenovac Myth,” op. cit.*, p. 120.

the fact that Francis of Assisi's life showed the working of Satan in it as manifested by the fact that he was a stigmatic (II Thess. 2:9). The influential Romish "Saint" Bonaventure (1257-74) is sometimes called the Franciscans "Second Founder." The Franciscans First Order has three independent branches, Friars Minor, Friars Minor Conventuals, and Friars Minor Capuchin; its Second Order is the Nuns of St. Clare; and its Third Order is secular, consisting of both religious and lay people who live in the world rather than as monks and nuns. It is the Roman Church's largest religious order, with ninety-eight Franciscans having been canonized and six made Popes. A prominent Franciscan of the Third Order was also beatified in 1998, namely, "Blessed" Aloysius Cardinal Stepinatz. The Franciscans, together with the Jesuits, were important instruments of the Counter-Reformation and both have historically been important Romanist instruments for making converts to Popery. As seen in the Romanist missionary work in South America, the Jesuits were sometimes the spearhead of Romish conversions, the Franciscans were sometimes the spearhead of Romish conversions, sometimes these two orders worked together (and as seen by tensions between them in China, they were sometimes rivals). Of course, some Roman Catholic missionary work was also done by others, e.g., the Dominican Republic in the West Indies was so named because of the Popish missionary work there of the Dominican monks.

The ugly history of the Franciscans is well illustrated in the martyrdom of the young French Protestant, Chevalier Del la Vay. In 1766 this godly young man was in a village of northern France when a group of Capuchin Franciscan monks came past in a religious procession. These cruel and arrogant Franciscans considered this Protestant should doff his hat and so give these religious apostates a religious "greeting" (NASB) which thing is forbidden by the Apostle John (II John 10,11). Not being prepared to do so, Chevalier Del la Vay was arrested, convicted of "blasphemy," and sentenced. His hands were chopped off, his tongue was ripped out with pincers, and then he was burnt alive⁶⁷. Thus for those who know the persecuting and murderous background history of the Franciscans, it comes as no surprise to learn of their involvement with the Nazi Ustashi. In the Nazi Ustashi saga, both during and after World War Two, the Franciscans have taken the lead role, with the Jesuits acting in a background support role.

This pattern of Franciscans taking the lead role and Jesuits the background support role is discussed below with respect to Artukovitch and Stepinatz after World War Two. But to illustrate this point during World War Two, Marquette names over 700 Roman Catholic priests and monks involved in the Ustashi's reign of terror. None of these were ever excommunicated or disciplined by the Roman Church for their involvement with the Ustashi. By contrast, in September 1947, Rome excommunicated all Yugoslavs involved in attacking two Romish priests in the Gulf of Venice. The excommunication applied to "all those who physically or morally participated in committing the crimes or who were a necessary part."⁶⁸ *The hypocritical duplicity of this is obvious.* If on the one hand, a Popish priest in (the region of the second) Yugoslavia was involved in mass killings, which included the killing of more than 300 Serbian Orthodox priests⁶⁹, then the Church of Rome took no action. But if on the other hand, a Roman Catholic citizen of (the second) Yugoslavia killed a Popish priest, then the Church of Rome excommunicated that person. Where does the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill" (Exod. 20:13), allow for these type of ridiculous

⁶⁷ *Saints & Sinners: History of the Popes*, An Opus Television Production.

⁶⁸ "[Roman] Church Bans Yugoslavs Who Slew Trieste Priest," *New York Times*, 12 Sept. 1947, p. 9.

⁶⁹ Falconi, *op. cit.*, pp. 293.

distinctions?

The list of Popish priests involved with the Nazi Ustashi includes a number of Jesuits, for example, Ivan Jager, a priest and teacher of religion in Daruavar; or Karlo Leopold, chief of the Jesuit Monastery in Sljeme, near Zagreb. Notably, just over 20% or about one in five of them, were Franciscans. This list of Franciscans includes, for example, Miroslav Buzuk, who participated in Serbian massacre and was decorated by Pavelitch. Andrija Jelic, an Ustashi Army Chaplain who organized the Ustashi Militia to enter villages and kill Serbian Orthodox. Dionize Andrasc, a close associate of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Aksamovic, who pillaged Serbian Orthodox Churches and used terror to convert Serbs to Roman Catholicism, being decorated by both Pavelitch and the Ustashi. Didac Coric of Tomislaugrad, who organized the massacre of Serbs in Nevesinje and Berkovivi, twice decorated by Pavelitch. Dr. Vitomir Jelcic, Dean and Professor of Roman Catholic Theology at Sarajevo University, decorated by Pavelitch. Dionizije Juriceu who headed the *Croatian [Roman] Catholic Office for Conversions*. In 1941 he promised Pavelitch that within one year he would get one million Serbs converted to Roman Catholicism, and within that time there would be left no more Serbs living in Croatia (i.e., modern day Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and a small section of Serbia up to Belgrade). (Such a promise required that the remaining Serbs be killed or deported from the Independent State of Croatia.) He was decorated by Pavelitch. Ante Klaric, who killed a number of Serbs, and was responsible for the death of about 3,000 Serbs in Donja, Gornja Slatine, Brcko, and the surrounding villages. *Borivje Mache, a close friend of Archbishop Stepinatz.*

Ambrozije Miletic from Osijek Monastery, who terrorized and tortured Serbs to try and make them convert to Romanism. Antun Mladenovic, who used terror and torture to force Serbs to convert, and participated in killing Serbs who had refused to convert to Romanism. Stjepan Naletilic, an Ustashi Army Chaplain who participated in the slaughter of Serbs in Duuno Field. Mirko Rados, who was the main organizer for the slaughter of Serb men, women, and children in the village of Malouan in August 1942. Mate Mogus, the first Ustashi commandant in the Udbina district. He initiated the massacre of about 1,000 Serbs of the Udbina district. Emmanuel Rajic, who as the priest in Bugojno, refused to take confessions from Ustashi who did not first kill a certain number of Serbs. He would tell them, "Son, go, you didn't finish your job yet." He organized the first unit of murderers in the Gornji, and he accompanied them in the killing of Serbs. Sidonije Scholz, who first tortured, and then murdered the Serbian Orthodox priest, Djordje Bogic of Nasice. He cut off Bogic's nose and tongue, then cut him open the full length of his stomach and wrapped his intestines around his neck. He was decorated by Pavelitch. Viktor Sliskovic from the Monastery of Scit, priest at Brajkovac, he participated in the slaughter of Serbs, and was decorated by Pavelitch. Mirko Topic, the Guardian of the Monastery of Sinj. He ordered the slaughter of 1,800 Serbs in Kamenica in March 1943. Franj Udovic, the priest at Koricani who participated in killing Serbs, and was known to then brag about it for days⁷⁰.

The Roman Catholic religious nature of Jasenovac is, for example, reflected in the fact that the Franciscan friar, Filipovitch (Filipovitch-Majstorvitch / Filipovic), from the Roman monastery near Banja Luka, in Bosnia-Herzegovina, was camp commandant for four months in 1942, and during that time over 40,000 Serbs, Gypsies, and Jews were tortured and killed. Moreover, Sandy Marquette records that the second "most bloodthirsty killer in Camp

⁷⁰ Marquette, S., *Stepinac: Portrait of a War Criminal*, 1994, pp. 133-85 (British Library copy, London, UK).

Jasenovac after Max Luburic,” was a Jesuit priest from Traunik, Lluo Majic, who killed thousands of Serbs. The Roman Catholic priest “on duty” at Jasenovac was Zvonko Lipovac, a member of the “Brotherhood of St. Francis” who personally murdered thousands of Serbs and was decorated by Pavelitch⁷¹.

On the one hand, its size as the Nazi’s third largest concentration camp makes Jasenovac especially notable, (and it was the only place Gypsies were killed in the Ustashi State of Croatia). Hence when in 2004, I visited the *Genocide Victims Museum* Headquarters (the main exhibition is mobile) in Belgrade, Serbia, in (the third) Yugoslavia, one of the museum curators, Jovan Mirkovic, gave me a book he co-authored on Jasenovac⁷², and much of what I saw there related to Jasenovac Concentration Camp. But on the other hand, as the *Genocide Victims Museum* curators themselves recognize, Ustashi persecutions and/or killings of Serbs and Jews occurred in various places throughout the Ustashi’s *Independent State of Croatia*. For example, in Zagreb, Protestants of Jewish descent were persecuted. In Osijek in 1941, Protestants of Serbian descent were persecuted. In Slatina in 1941, Protestants of Serbian descent were taken to certain death at a concentration camp. The following year in 1942, the Nazi Ustashi came again into Osijek and Slatina, not this time seeking Protestants of Serbian descent who had refused to convert to Roman Catholicism, but rather persons of Jewish descent. They took about 3,000 such Jews, 1,000 of whom they sent to certain death at Auschwitz, and the rest they sent to certain death at Gornja Rijeka and Jasenovac concentration camps⁷³. When I visited Slatina, Croatia, in 2004, less than five minutes up the same road (Vladimira Nazora) that the Lutheran Evangelical Church (Evangelicka Luteranska Crkva) is on, that is, the church that the 1941 Protestants martyrs were members of, I was shown a two-storey shop (Trgocentar = Tarago Centre), and told that this was formerly the Jewish Synagogue but that there were no longer any Jews in Slatina. The Ustashi were effective killers.

Besides Jasenovac, some of the larger Ustashi concentration camps were Danica in Koprivnica, Kerestinec, Lobograd, Sstara Gradiska, Sisak, Lepoglava (where Stepinatz was later imprisoned for Nazi collaboration), and Jastrebarsko. The Ustashi concentration camp at Jastrebarsko was southwest of nearby Zagreb. This *Little Kids Concentration Camp*, sometimes called “A Camp in Nappies,” was run by the Roman Catholic nuns of St. Vincent de Paul (who continue to exist to this day at Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia-Herzegovina). The nuns of St. Vincent de Paul, established this ostensibly as a boarding school for “the re-education and upbringing of children.” By the time the righteous rage of the *Fourth Kordun Brigade* advanced into, and liberated the *Little Kids Concentration Camp* on 26 August 1942, some 768 children had died there. The liberation army took with them about the same number, 727 children, whom they freed from the evil clutches of these child-abusing Roman Catholic nuns⁷⁴.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 147,160,162.

⁷² Mirkovic, J., & Lukic, D., *op. cit.* .

⁷³ O’Brien, A.H.C., *Archbishop Stepinac: The man and his case*, Newman Bookshop, London, UK, 1947, p. 12; Falconi, C., *op. cit.*, pp. 286-7; Simic, S., *The Change of Religion among the Serbs during World War Two*, Titograd [Podgorica], Montenegro, Yugoslavia, 1958, p. 96; Bulajic, M., *Never Again*, Ustashi Genocide in the Independent State of Croatia (NDH) 1941-1945, The Ministry of Information in the Republic of Serbia, Belgrade, Serbia, Yugoslavia, 1991, pp. 28-9.

⁷⁴ Kumovic, M., *Croatia: Jasenovac - Exhibition Jasenovac: The System of Ustasha Death Camps*, *op. cit.*, p. 7; Bulajic, M., *Never Again*, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

Furthermore, not all the Ustashi killings occurred in concentration camps. For example, we have an archival photo of Serbs hanging from Nazi Ustashi gallows erected at Bosanski Brod in July 1942, just in front of the clearly visible Serbian Orthodox Church. Likewise, another archival photo shows the dead bodies of some 463 Serbs murdered at Kordun in July 1942 inside the local Serbian Orthodox Church. Records also exist of many other Ustashi mass murders, at many different locations, that were not concentration camps⁷⁵.

CHAPTER 4 THE TRIAL AND SENTENCING OF THE WAR CRIMINAL ARCHBISHOP STEPINATZ IN 1946

Any conversions to Roman Catholicism, let alone the mass “conversions” of some 240,000 Serbs to Roman Catholicism under the Nazi Ustashi, cannot occur without the Roman Church approving this through a great deal of paper-work. At the end of World War Two, the Allies did not put a large number of Nazi war criminals on trial, but tended to try the worst of the higher ranking officials. In 1946, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Zagreb, Aloysius Stepinatz, was charged, tried, and found guilty of collaboration with the Nazi Ustashi regime. Those who question this verdict, would do well to consider the words of the Roman Catholic Newspaper, *Katoliki List (The Catholic News)*, published in Zagreb, and thus inside Stepinatz’s own Archdiocese. *Katoliki List* (No. 26, 1941), reported Stepinatz’s sermon in June 1941, in which he addressed Pavelitch and said, that “as legitimate representatives of the Church of God in the *Independent State of Croatia*, of which you are the Head, we utter our deference with our whole hearts, and promise our sincere and loyal collaboration for the brightest of futures for our fatherland.” Stepinatz thus publicly pledged “loyal collaboration” to Pavelitch in June 1941. Earlier that year, *Katoliki List* (No. 16, 1941) also reported, that Stepinatz’s “move established a close collaboration between the Ustashi and the supreme representative of the Roman Catholic Church in the State of Croatia.” This Romish newspaper thus admitted Stepinatz’s “close collaboration” at the time⁷⁶.

Issues 1,2, and 3 deal with the first three counts of the indictment against Stepinatz at his war crimes trial. During the war and enemy occupation, Stepinatz engaged in political collaboration with the enemy, collaborating throughout this period with the Ustashi under Anton Pavelitch (Count 1). Stepinatz’s collaborative support included the forcible conversion of Serbs in Eastern Orthodoxy to Roman Catholicism, these forced “conversions” giving rise to the murder of hundreds of thousands of Serbs who refused to convert (Count 2). Stepinatz accepted Vatican nomination as Chaplain-General of the Ustashi and general militia (Count 3).

Issue 1: The establishment of the Ustashi regime in April 1941: On 12 and 16 April, 1941, Stepinatz made official visits to Kvaternik. On 28 April he publicly endorsed the regime, saying, “Venerable brethren,” we act as heralds of Christ’s gospels.” “Knowing the men who today govern” “the Croat people, we are deeply convinced that our work will be met with complete understanding and assistance from them.”

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 19 (Bosanski Brod photo), p. 62 (Kordun photo).

⁷⁶ Paris, E., *op. cit.*, pp. 55,88,296.

Analysis of Issue 1: When the Nazi Ustashi entered Zagreb in 1941, Roman Catholic Church bells rang out, and Archbishop Stepinatz proclaimed religious celebrations with the singing of the *Te Deum*⁷⁷. Possible arguments for Stepinatz's innocence are that he was an anti-communist who was simply following the same Vatican policy of supporting fascism or Nazism in Croatia that the Roman Church had also followed in e.g., France and Italy. He certainly was anxious to curry favour with the new Nazi regime, making official visits to them before the Yugoslav army had capitulated. But *Two wrongs don't make a right*. Vatican policy of supporting fascism or Nazism elsewhere was immoral both there and in the Ustashi's Croatia. Pavelitch and Kvaternik were convicted murderers who had been responsible for the King of Yugoslavia's death. Stepinatz knew this. Yet he helped facilitate Pavelitch and the Nazi Ustashi come to power. **THUS IN APRIL 1941 STEPINATZ WAS CLEARLY A NAZI COLLABORATOR WITH THE NEW USTASHI REGIME OF CROATIA.**

Issue 2: The persecution, murder, and forced conversions of non-Roman Catholic Serbs between May and December 1941. Between May and December 1941 the Nazi Ustashi regime pursued a policy of Romanizing Croatia by persecuting non-Roman Catholic Serbs who refused to convert to Roman Catholicism, as well as persecuting for racial reasons, some mixed race Serbs (partly Caucasian), Jews, and Gypsies, and for political reasons anti-Nazi political dissidents. Numerically the Serbian Orthodox were the largest persecuted group. Over 750,000-800,000 Serbian Orthodox were killed, most of whom had refused to submit to forced conversions to Roman Catholicism in which Popish clergy worked with the Ustashi⁷⁸. Other Serbs did accept the *convert or die* ultimatum, and the Roman Church took ownership of Serbian Orthodox churches, lands, and monies. Some Serbs who accepted the Croatian Inquisition ultimatum were still killed, but this was within inquisition guidelines by reference to *converso* Jews of the Spanish Inquisition, and associated "purity of blood" laws i.e., the Croatian Inquisitors drew the conclusion that these were not genuine conversions (and they were probably right to draw that conclusion, although this does not then justify murdering them). It was also within Nazi racial theoretic guidelines. Which racial views were being followed, Nazi or Inquisition, is not always clear; though it seems the killers used either interchangeably to justify the killings.

In broad terms the Ustashi did not seek to exterminate the Protestant community as it was regarded as a small enclave representing a German-like culture which had no influence on the dominant Croatian Roman Catholic culture. However, the small Protestant community of about 70,000 also suffered at the hands of the Nazis and Fascists. In the first place, as noted above, Sherwood Eddy records that "Protestant" "church leaders" "were killed," and "Protestant Churches were destroyed" in general war-time military operations.

But more than this, some Protestants also came under specific Ustashi persecution for their faith because they refused to convert to Roman Catholicism. Like Titus who evangelized in this general area of Dalmatia in NT times (II Tim. 4:10), the small Protestant community had an evangelistic programme, and the Nazi Ustashi did not want conversions from Serbian Orthodoxy to Protestantism. Thus what in comparison to the Ustashi's overall number of murders is a relatively small number of Protestant killings, nevertheless transpired. Specifically, Protestant converts from Serbian Orthodoxy were first reclassified as Serbian

⁷⁷ Butler's *In the Land of Nod*, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

⁷⁸ Manhattan, A., *Terror Over Yugoslavia*, Watts & Co, London, UK, 1953, pp. 81-91.

Orthodox by the Ustashi, and then persecuted by the Ustashi because they would not convert to Roman Catholicism. *These Protestant confessors and martyrs have frequently been overlooked by writers*, many of whom prefer to focus on the relatively larger numbers of 2.2 million Serbian Orthodox persecuted, 750,000-800,000 Serbian Orthodox killed, 30,000 Jews killed, and 30,000 Gypsies killed, by the Ustashi. For instance, the *Independent State of Croatia* Protestant confessors and martyrs of Serbian descent in Slatina (Croatia, 1941) or Srem (Serbia, 1941-2).

But one writer who recognizes this group of Protestants is Edmond Paris. In *Genocide in Satellite Croatia 1941-1945*, Paris says “any Serb who joined” “the Protestant-Evangelical Church, which had 70,000 members among the local Germans in Croatia,” “and Jews were forbidden” “to do that” from 1941, “were later killed by the officials of the state, without intervention by the Croat [Roman] Catholic Church. Moreover, the same [Roman] Church obtained a decree from the State, forbidding other religions to accept Serbs as members,” only “exempting the [Roman] Catholic Church. This caused the” Zagreb bishop “of the Protestant-Evangelical Church of Croatia, Dr. Filip Popa (Popp), to protest most energetically ‘against the law which forbade the Serbs of Orthodox religion to convert voluntarily to Protestantism’.” This was followed by a protest from Dr. Jacob Elikier, who was of Germanic descent and the Governor of the Vukovar District in Srem. Vukovar is on the border of Serbia and Croatia, south of Osijek. But these protests were rejected and there followed a mass killing of Serbs, both Protestants and Eastern Orthodox, together with Jews, in the southern part of Voivodina known as the Srem region of Serbia, between November 1941 and September 1942, numbering about 22,000. Paris records that these killings were court sanctioned against “those who refused to be converted” to Romanism. The first such trials and killings occurred north-west of Belgrade on 10 August, 1941 in Ruma, where 109 people were prosecuted in three hours, of which 8 were sent to a prison camp “where,” Paris says, “death was even worse,” and 101 sentenced to death. The circuit court started its work in Ruma, Stara Pazova, Vukovar, Mitrovica, and Irig, and thereafter moved throughout the rest of Srem⁷⁹. The fact that the overwhelming majority of Protestants were of Germanic descent and so not killed, and the fact that numerically the Protestant martyrs make up less than one per cent of the Serbs killed by the Ustashi during World War Two for refusing to convert to Roman Catholicism, does not diminish the horror of this event in Protestant hagiology. These Protestant confessors and martyrs are declared by Christ to be “blessed” with their “reward in heaven” (Matt. 5:11,12). Jesus prophesied of a time when “whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service” (John 16:2), and one fulfilment of this is found among the Ustashi Papists who martyred these Protestants of Serbian descent who had refused to join the Roman Church, for “precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints” (Ps. 116:15).

On 30 July 1941, the Ustashi Command in conjunction with the Ministry of Justice and Religion, together with other Ustashi Departments, issued a circular giving certain “directives.” One of these was, “should Greco-Orientals” (meaning Serbian Orthodox,) “or

⁷⁹ 21,597 were sent to their death by the Croat-Nazi Emergency Court in Srem. Among the bones dug up in the Srem common graves, which were dug by the victims themselves before being killed, were found the remains of 22,000 skeletons, of which 20,000 skeletons were identifiable as being from 15,700 men (1,200 of which were old men), 3,200 women, and 1,100 children (mostly 2-3 years old). Paris, E., *op. cit.*, pp. 186-191; quoting no. 1640 [1740] of 1941 [in Simic, S., *The Change of Religion among the Serbs during World War Two*, *op. cit.*, pp. 94-6].

others” such as Roman Catholic Croats, Gypsies, or Jews, “go over to Protestantism” “while not belonging by blood to the German minority, they shall not be allowed the rights enjoyed by minorities of German nationality.” This directive immediately made confessors of about 1,500 Protestants e.g., an Osijek school teacher who was told to convert to Popery or lose her job. In April 2004 I visited the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Osijek in east Croatia where this school teacher suffered as a Confessor; and I also visited the Lutheran Church in Slatina where the Protestant martyrs who refused to convert to Roman Catholicism came from. Of these 1,500 Protestants not of Germanic descent, a lesser number were of Serbian descent. But from 1941 the Ustashi refused to recognize any further conversions from Serbian Orthodoxy to Protestantism. The destruction of records means we do not know how many of these persons whose conversions were not recognized by the Ustashi were persecuted or killed under the erroneous Ustashi classification of Serbian Orthodox (which refused to acknowledge converts to Protestantism), when in fact they were Protestants.

The number of such Protestants classified by the Ustashi as Serbian Orthodox who were killed would certainly have been relatively small, since in 1941 there were only about 1,500 Protestants not of Germanic descent, although a relatively small number in addition to this 1941 figure of 1,500 was compiled may have later converted during 1941-5, though how many more is not known, since in what Ustashi records there are, their conversions were not recognized and they simply appear in the overall number of Serbian Orthodox. We do not know the fate of most of the other 1,500 (Lutheran) Protestants not of Germanic descent, but we do know they were persecuted and so *certainly* confessors. Even if many or most of them were ultimately killed (and possibly they were not), these 1,500 Protestants, together with the Protestants of Serbian descent known to have been killed, represent well below one per cent of the Serbs persecuted or killed. The certain figures of *1,500 Protestant confessors* of which an unknown number were killed as *Protestant martyrs*, represents a very small percentage of the overall number of Serbs persecuted and killed by the Nazi Ustashi, and they are not mentioned by most historians dealing with this era. But in God’s sight, and for we Protestants, they are a precious and important “cloud of witnesses” (Heb. 12:1) to the true faith of Jesus Christ.

Later in that year, while the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Zagreb, Stepinatz was collaborating with the Ustashi, the Ustashi got a different response from the Lutheran Bishop of Zagreb, Philip Popp (1893-1945). On 19 November 1941, this Protestant leader wrote to Pavelitch, the Ustashi government, and Ustashi Supreme Command. Among other things, he said, “almost every day,” “from almost every part of” “Croatia,” he received “protests” “against the behaviour of the State authorities,” “as well” as “against the Ustashi henchmen who despise and insult the Evangelical Church.” He said that Serbian “Orthodox” who “wish to embrace the Evangelical Church” have “their conversion hindered by State organizations which withhold the certificate of good conduct without which conversion from one faith to another is impossible” under Nazi Ustashi law. “But if these same [Serbian] Orthodox express a desire to join the [Roman] Catholic Church, then they obtain the necessary documents.” Hence those “received into the Evangelical Church” from the Serbian “Orthodox” Church, “are persecuted as if they had not been converted, whereas those who have gone over to [Roman] Catholicism are not. The authorities are spreading the idea,” “that the conversion of the [Serbian] Orthodox to the Evangelical faith is no defence, and hence it is suggested that they should go over to the Roman Church.” “This behaviour of State and Ustashi authorities confirms that Protestantism is despised in our State.”

Philip Popp said “our” Croatian “State Protestants number only some 70,000” and

estimated that “perhaps 1,500 in the whole State” had converted, “not” “in mass but only individually,” from “the [Serbian] Orthodox” to “the Evangelical Church.” Popp said (in words underlined by the Nazi S.S.), that “at this very moment” in November 1941, “we have learnt that some [Serbian] Orthodox” from the area of “Slatina,” who had “asked to join the Evangelical Church, have been transferred to a concentration camp” and Popp also refers to other similar cases⁸⁰. Commenting on this statement by Bishop Popp, Lazo Kostich is surely correct in saying, “Being transferred to a concentration camp was equivalent to a death sentence⁸¹.” Since in November 1941 being sent to “a concentration camp” was a death sentence, while these Protestants from Slatina may have appeared on official records as “Serbian Orthodox” killed, they are in fact Protestant martyrs.

It should also be noted that since conversions from Serbian Orthodoxy to Protestantism did not prevent these Protestants from being persecuted as confessors or killed as martyrs for refusing to convert to Roman Catholicism, it is reasonable to conclude that their conversions to Protestantism were genuine, and part of the ongoing evangelistic work of the area, albeit a work made harder by the formation of the religiously intolerant, and pro-Roman Catholic, Nazi Ustashi regime. For example, in the above mentioned letter of November 1941, the Lutheran Bishop Philip Popp further said:

we received information that some time ago an [Eastern] Orthodox [Serb] family in Osijek converted to the Evangelical faith, a school teacher among them. The teacher has now been informed that she can remain in public service employment only if she abandons the Evangelical faith and converts to Roman Catholicism. This office gets reports of cases like this almost every day, and this office could submit several Protocols on the truthfulness of these occurrences. There are, actually, some State officials who maintain that the Evangelical [Lutheran] Church is not recognized in our State and that *the [Serbian] Orthodox can be left in peace only when and if they become Roman Catholics.* (Underlined by [Nazi] S.S.).

Bishop Popp concluded by saying, “that we do not live in the Middle Ages, but in the twentieth century,” and urged State tolerance to “everyone” for their “religious conviction.” He expressed “the opinion that this treatment of Protestantism” “can only be harmful to the reputation of the Croatian nation and the Croatian State.” Bishop Popp referred to “the alarm among the Protestants in the province” which he said “is growing.” He closed his letter by saying that “the publication of the requested declaration or circular is urgently necessary and we therefore once again ask that an instrument to that effect be issued by all the Croatian Ministers or Ministries as well as by the Ustashi Headquarters⁸².”

Having thus dealt with the small number of Serbian Protestants in 1941-2, in the following year, 1942, Pavelitch decided to grant some generalized religious liberty to the Protestants. Jesus treatment of the Samaritans gives the example of how Bishop Popp should

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* (Eddy); Falconi C., *op. cit.*, pp. 274,283,285,286-7; quoting from Simic, S., *The Change of Religion among the Serbs during World War Two*, *op. cit.* .

⁸¹ Kostich, L., *The Holocaust in the “Independent State of Croatia,”* Liberty, Chicago, Illinois, USA, 1981, p. 226.

⁸² Simic, S., *Prekrstavanje Srba za vreme drugog svetskog rata [The Change of Religion among the Serbs during World War Two]*, Graficki zavod, Titograd [Podgorica], Montenegro, Yugoslavia, 1958, p. 96 [British Library copy] (English translation of Croatian and Serbian). I visited Osijek Lutheran Church in 2004, which is nearby a school.

now have responded. On the one hand, Jesus did not seek to cloak the Samaritan's sin. Contrary to God's laws against racially mixed marriages (Gen. 6:1-4; Deut. 23:2-8; Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39) or religiously mixed marriages (Deut. 7:1-4; II Cor. 6:14), or both (Ezra 9 & 10; Neh. 13), they had intermarried with Gentiles and were both racially mixed and religiously apostate. Thus Jesus said plainly to the Samaritan woman, "salvation is of the Jews" (John 4:22), since it was through the more or less racially pure Jewish line that the Messiah had now come, and they were the true keepers of the Old Testament oracles of God. But on the other hand, Jesus also taught that Samaritans could still have genuine faith in him (Luke 17:11-16), that "Love thy neighbour" included Samaritans, and that there was a duty of care in this commandment to help a "neighbour" in need (Luke 10:25-37). Following this example, Bishop Philip Popp should have used the religious liberty he gained in 1942 to state that on the one hand, "salvation is of the Protestants" since they alone have the true and Biblical doctrine of salvation in justification by faith; but on the other hand, on the "love thy neighbour principle" the mass killings of Serbian Orthodox, and genocide of Jews and Gypsies was murderous immorality.

But in what must be a sad chapter in the annals of Protestant history, Bishop Philip Popp became a turncoat, and collaborated with the Nazi Ustashi from 1942-5. For example, Butler records that "Bishop Popp, supported" "Pavelitch and received from him an 'Order with Star for sincere collaboration as head of the Evangelical Church'."⁸³ Moreover, when I was in Croatia in 2004, the Lutheran Minister of Zagreb, Pastor Rajkovic, also advised me of Philip Popp's collaboration with the Ustashi. But he also told me that Philip Popp's son who was also a Lutheran Bishop, Edgar Popp, "put a distance" between himself and his father after the war. I think Bishop Edgar Popp was right to do so. Significantly, no Protestants inside or outside of Croatia are seeking to uphold or justify Philip Popp's 1942-5 example as worthy of emulation, by, for example, setting up the "Bishop Philip Popp Evangelical School" or "Bishop Philip Popp Chapel" inside a Protestant Church. Rather, there is a recognition by Protestants, his son Bishop Edgar Popp included, that Philip Popp's collaboration from 1942 to 1945 was wrong. Therefore this is quite different to Stepinatz's case where there are attempts to white-wash, excuse, justify, or deny his collaboration with the Ustashi, and then to glorify him. Furthermore, Philip Popp's immoral actions from 1942-5 do not invalidate his records and earlier stance in 1941-2 with respect to the Protestant confessors and martyrs of Serbian descent. Philip Popp died in 1945, though his death remains an unsolved mystery⁸⁴.

⁸³ Butler's *In the Land of Nod*, *op. cit.*, p. 106-7,125; cf. Butler's *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

⁸⁴ Bishop Philip Popp certainly died of unnatural causes in 1945. But there are three quite different accounts of his death. *The Anti-Nazi Version*. This version claims of "Bishop Philip Popp (1893-1945)," the "Evangelical Bishop of Zagreb," that "the bishop died" on the Allies side fighting "for the communists" under Tito "in 1945." [Translation of: "biskuplju Phillip Popp (1893-1945)" "evangelicka biskupa u Zagrebu" (www.matica.hr/hrroijsa/revija032nsf/allwebdocs/beus); "El obispo Popp fue muerto por los comunistas en 1945" (Rastko Vidic's *Situacion del la Ingles a en Yugoslavia*, Por Ivo Bogdan, Buenos Aires, Argentina, www.studiacraotica.com/revistas/020/0202803.htm).] If this is correct, and he repented of his collaboration and died fighting the Nazi Ustashis, then Tito's Partisan propaganda omitted reference to this, presumably as part of Tito's anti-German Nazi phobia campaign against persons of German descent. *The Anti-Communist Version*. This version claims Bishop Popp was killed by communists who hung him in 1945. *The Unknown Murderer Version*. This version claims Bishop Popp was killed by a person or

Writing in 28 March 1941, we have in his own handwriting these words by Stepinatz. “The schism” (referring to Eastern Orthodoxy through reference to the *Great Schism* with the Patriarch of Constantinople in 1054), “is the greatest curse in Europe, almost greater than Protestantism. Here there is no moral, no principles, no truth, no justice, no honesty.⁸⁵” This is a revealing insight into Stepinatz’s thinking in 1941. Then in this atmosphere where there was, in Stepinatz’s words, “no principles, no truth, no justice,” and “no honesty,” in September 1941 Stepinatz issued a circular in which he urged Romish “conversions to be speeded up and carried out without obstacles” (No 15964/31, 26 Sept. 1941). In October and November 1941, Stepinatz held a Roman Catholic Episcopal Conference at the Archbishop’s Palace in the Croatian capital of Zagreb. It discussed: conversions (of Serbs) to Roman Catholicism, the slaughters in Bosnia and Herzegovina, persecution of the Jews, and the Ustashi attitude to political prisoners (a general cover all which would therefore include, for example, the Protestant converts from Serbian Orthodoxy).

Analysis of Issue 2: The persecution, murder, and forced conversions of non-Roman Catholic Serbs between May and December 1941. The leader of the Nazi Ustashi, Pavelitch, awarded Stepinatz the *Grand Cross of the Order of King Zvonimer* “for exposing both at home and abroad the rebels from the territory of the Independent State of Croatia.⁸⁶” At his trial in 1946, “Archbishop Aloysius Stepinatz” was presented with “evidence of collaboration and forcible conversion of Serbs to Roman Catholicism.” Stepinatz “admitted in questioning that ‘I had no reason to oppose’ the work of a committee of three dealing with conversions matters.” The “prosecutor, referring to a large number of conversion, said to Msgr. [Monsignor] Stepinatz: ‘Were you not surprised that several hundred thousand Serbs swung to [Roman] Catholicism with an overnight discovery of an all-abiding and supreme faith?’ The prelate answered: ‘Conditions were unusual’.⁸⁷”

Possible arguments for Stepinatz’s innocence are that the Nazi Ustashi were acting on their own in their programme of forced conversions to Roman Catholicism and associated Romanization of Croatia. In letters to the Ustashi Minister of the Interior, Andrija Artukovitch, dated 22 and 30 May 1941, Stepinatz objected to new laws affecting Roman Catholics of Jewish descent. For example, on 30 May 1941 he said, “I wrote to you, Mr. Minister, on May 22nd this year, asking that you do something to protect the Jews converted to [Roman] Catholicism from the Jewish religion.” And in December 1941 he said membership of the group *Catholic Action* was incompatible with the Ustashi. However, Stepinatz’s concern for Roman Catholics of Jewish descent *must surely condemn him since it lacks concern for adherents of Judaism of Jewish descent*, or converts to Protestantism who were not of Germanic descent, and so exhibits a Spanish Inquisition like desire to force people to convert to Roman Catholicism, though it clearly lacked the Nazi concern against persons of Jewish descent irrespective of their religion, a factor that possibly also explains his

persons unknown in the garden of the Zagreb Lutheran Church in 1945. (These latter two versions were made known to me by the Lutheran Minister of Zagreb, Pastor Rajkovic, when I visited Zagreb, Croatia, in 2004. He was unaware of the anti-Nazi version.)

⁸⁵ Dedijer, V., *The Yugoslav Auschwitz and the Vatican*, Ahriman-Verlag, Freiburg, Germany, 1988; English translation, Prometheus Books, New York, USA, 1992, p. 142 (showing a photograph of these words in Stepinatz’s handwriting).

⁸⁶ Butler’s *In the Land of Nod*, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

⁸⁷ “Stepinatz Refuses to Defend Himself: Admits Not Opposing Forcible Conversions but Insists Conscience is Clear,” *New York Times*, 2 Oct. 1946, p. 13.

concern for an incompatibility between the Ustashi and [Roman] Catholic Action groups i.e., Spanish Inquisition type “purity of blood” (*limpieza de sangre*) laws for a *converso* convert to Popery may be waved, and Stepinatz evidently thought they should be. Stepinatz’s episcopal conference shows he was aware of what was going on in broad terms.

The Roman Catholic Bishop of Mostar, Bishop Mishitch (Misic), a Franciscan, wrote to Archbishop Stepinatz as President of the Episcopal Conference, stating if “the competent authorities” were “to carry out conversions to [Roman] Catholicism with more tact,” then “in this propitious period the number of [Roman] Catholics would have increased by at least 500,000 or 600,000, and” “in Bosnia and Herzegovina we would have moved from the present number of 700,000 to 1,300,000.” The pro-Stepinatz writer, Falconi, claims that this letter simply acts to “show that not all the bishops had the same severe criteria as the Primate Stepinac for guaranteeing the integrity” “of aspiring ‘converts’.”⁸⁸ But I think this letter helps to condemn Stepinatz who as Primate did nothing tangible to stop a process of forced conversions that he knew about. The Roman Church is hierarchical, i.e., (unlike e.g., a Primate in the Anglican Church of Australia,) a Roman Catholic Primate is not titular, and a Roman Catholic Primate is able, if he wishes, to take some forms of actions against this type of thing occurring under him.

In a series of articles in the *Anglican Church of Ireland Gazette* (1950-1), Butler published some important correspondence showing Stepinatz was knowledgeable about the Nazi Ustashi policy of mass killings of Serbs who had refused to convert to Popery. In November 1941, Stepinatz wrote a letter to Pavelitch in which he was clearly aware of the forced conversions. In it he says, “we speak only of the mistakes which have impeded the conversion of the [Serbian] Orthodox so that it has not proceeded as successfully as it ought. *For these mistakes we do not blame the [Ustashi] Government of the NDH [Independent State of Croatia]; we do not wish to present them as deliberate, but as the acts of irresponsible persons.*” Stepinatz refers to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Banja Luka, in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and then quotes a “letter from that old ‘Croatian warrior’.” In it, Bishop Jozo says “The movement for conversion” to Roman Catholicism “is abating in those places where the Chetniks and Communists are in command.” Stepinatz also quotes the Roman Catholic Bishop of Mostar in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bishop Moisie Mishitch. He said “Bishop” “Mishitch” wrote “on the 18th of August this year” of 1941, ““There was never such a good occasion as now for us to help Croatia to save the countless souls [of] people” ““who live side by side with [Roman] Catholics; they know the [Roman] Catholics and the [Roman] Catholics know them. Conversion would be appropriate and easy” and ““in present circumstances we are letting slip excellent opportunities and advantages which we could use for the good of Croatia and the” Roman “Catholic cause. From a minority we might become a majority in Bosnia and Herzegovina’.” “The same Bishop writes on 7th November this year.” (“The Sub-Prefect” or “The Vice-Governor in Mostar, Mr. Bajic,” “publicly declared, (as a State employee he ought to have held his tongue), that in Ljubina alone 700 [Serbian Orthodox] schismatics have been thrown into one pit’.”

Stepinatz continues, “The Archbishop of Upper Bosnia” in Bosnia-Herzegovina, “Ivan Saric, writes on the 15th of November 1941.’ ““The civil government has taken the standpoint that as many as possible of the Greek Orthodox” (meaning Serbian Orthodox, a term prohibited by the Ustashi, who preferred to call them “Greco-Orientals,”) ““should be converted. But unfortunately it has in many cases acted very incorrectly. We have received

⁸⁸ Falconi, *op. cit.*, pp. 294,295.

complaints from many quarters that the civil authorities, where Moslems are in control, are rejecting the petitions of [Serbian] Orthodox, who wish to be received into the [Roman] Catholic Faith’.” “Furthermore,” says Stepinatz, “the Archbishop speaks about the propaganda of the [Lutheran] Evangelical Confession. Its representatives have said that it is unnecessary for the [Serbian] Orthodox to become converted to the [Roman] Catholic Faith, and that their [Serbian Orthodox] priests will return to them, but that if they are to be converted at all, it will be better for them to become Protestants.”

Next Stepinatz refers to the Roman Catholic “Bishop of Kotor” in Montenegro, and “Apostolic Administrator of the Diocese of Dubrovnik” in Croatia, Pavao Butorac. On “the 4th of November, 1941,” Bishop Butorac said, “I well understand the importance of the subject to be discussed. From the recent instructions of the Ministry of Internal Affairs it can be seen that in the highest circles a better understanding of the conversions to the [Roman] Catholic Faith begins to prevail’.” In his favour, this Bishop did not support forced conversions. But I think this Bishop’s overall intellectual grip on the situation under the Nazi Ustashi must be questioned, given his following ridiculous proposition, “‘We must reckon with every eventuality and even the possibility that the Serbs, out of defiance, may decide to be converted in masses to Islam [Mohammedanism]’.” (Butorac was later appointed Bishop of Dubrovnik, Croatia, in 1950, when Croatia was part of the second Yugoslavia.)

Addressing Pavelitch, Stepinatz then says, “Leader! From this report from the Croatian” (meaning those inside the Ustashi *Independent State of Croatia*) “Bishops and” “Ordinaries at the conference, it is clear that many great mistakes have been made in the conversions. The source of these mistakes lies in the fact that the work of conversion was not entrusted to that forum to which it alone should have been entrusted,” “that is, the Croatian [Roman] Catholic Episcopate.” “Another fundamental mistake in the conversions is that the local authorities and the Ustashi functionaries, “in spite of the circular of the Government” “of 30th July, 1941, often forbade any conversions of the [Serbian] Orthodox to [Roman] Catholicism of the Greek [meaning Eastern] rite.”

On the one hand, in fairness to Stepinatz, in this letter he says “that terrible crimes and cruelties have taken place,” and maintains that the Roman “Church must condemn all crimes and outrages of irresponsible elements of immature youths, and it must demand the complete respect for the human personality” of “all people.” But on the other hand, Stepinatz does not hold the Nazi Ustashi regime responsible but some unnamed “immature youths.” Thus he considers Pavelitch’s Ustashi regime is basically sound, since he says, “You yourself, Leader, have publicly condemned the violence.” “We believe, Leader, that you share this opinion with us, and that you will do what is in your power to restrain the violence of individuals, so that only the responsible authorities may rule and govern in the land. In the contrary case all work for the conversion of the schismatics is illusory.⁸⁹”

Stepinatz’s letter to Pavelitch includes a quote from the Roman Catholic Bishop of Mostar, Bishop Mishitch, who wrote to Stepinatz, among other things saying that “in the parish of Klepca seven hundred schismatics from the neighbouring villages were slaughtered,” and the “sub-prefect of Mostar, Mr. Bajic,” “publicly declared” “that in Liubina alone seven hundred schismatics have been thrown into one pit.” This clearly shows Stepinatz was aware of the mass murders. Bishop’s Mishitch’s comment on this, namely,

⁸⁹ Butler, H., *Church of Ireland Gazette* (No. 3523, Vol. 45), 29 Dec. 1950, pp. 4-6.

that because he was “a state employee” of the Ustashi, “the sub-prefect” “should have held his tongue” and not “publicly declared” what happened, is remarkably like Stepinatz’s view in his 1942 Report to Rome, “that one cannot and must not allow anyone to attack the” Independent Croatian State. These chilling words gave rise to the title of first an essay, and then a book by Herbert Butler, entitled, *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*⁹⁰.

In broad terms I would agree with Hubert Butler’s view of the “Archbishop’s letter,” namely, the “resolution which was passed by the [Romanist] Bishops” “in November, 1941, was an attempt to bring the conversion campaign under the control of the [Roman] Church,” or I would say, to *more fully* bring it under the Roman Church’s control. As Butler says, “It is particularly to be noted that the second of the Council of three appointed to regulate the conversions, by the [Roman] Bishops’ resolution, was Mgr. [Monsignor] Shimrak, who had expressed himself forcibly in favour of the conversion campaign in his diocesan magazine.⁹¹” When Butler interviewed Stepinatz in Lepoglava Jail, he asked him “Why,” “had he chosen as one of his two collaborators Mgr. [Monsignor] Shimrak, Apostolic Administrator of the Eastern-rite Roman “Catholic (Uniate) Church. Mgr. [Monsignor] Shimrak’s enthusiasm for the disgraceful conversion campaign had been well known and publicly expressed” “in his diocesan magazine of *Krizhevtsi*.” “The Archbishop” said he “had never” specifically “*urged* forcible conversion of a single soul,” and “gave the stock reply he had so often given at his trial,” namely, “Our conscience is untroubled.⁹²”

On the one hand I think this letter goes a long way to exonerate Stepinatz from any claims that his involvement went beyond collaboration. In late 1941, he and some of his fellow Roman Catholic bishops clearly criticized the “violence” connected with forced conversions; and *I for one do not claim that Stepinatz’s involvement with the Nazi Ustashi can be reasonably shown to have gone beyond collaboration*. Stepinatz broadly seems to have wanted a Croatian Inquisition in which all Inquisition discretions were exercised by the Roman Church, and would often have often been exercised with less violence than they actually were under the Ustashi; whereas what he got was something which could be conceptualized as either a Roman Catholic Croatian Inquisition or an application of secular Nazi Ustashi racial theoretics, in which Pavelitch ensured Inquisition discretions were used to achieve the basic result sought for by Nazi racial theoretics. The relationship between Stepinatz and Pavelitch was thus sometimes an uneasy one, although Stepinatz never stopped his collaboration with the Nazi Ustashi because of this.

Thus on the other hand, I think this letter also shows that Stepinatz was prepared to collaborate with the Ustashi. He makes it clear that he does not wish to criticize Pavelitch and the Ustashi *per se*. Rather, he says “we speak only of the mistakes which have impeded the conversion of the [Serbian] Orthodox so that it has not proceeded as successfully as it ought. *For these mistakes we do not blame the [Ustashi] Government of the NDH [Independent State of Croatia]; we do not wish to present them as deliberate, but as the acts of irresponsible persons.*” For a regime that had killed hundreds of thousands of Serbs in 1941, of which Stepinatz in this letter clearly knew about some, this tone of excusing the

⁹⁰ Butler, H., *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, Penguin Books, London, UK, 1990, p. 275; quoted in Cornwell, J., *Hitler’s Pope*, The secret history of Pius XII, Penguin Books, London, England, UK, 1999, p. 255.

⁹¹ Butler, H., *Church of Ireland Gazette* (No. 3521, Vol. 45), 15 Dec. 1950, pp. 10-11.

⁹² Butler’s *In the Land of Nod*, *op. cit.*, pp. 136,137 (emphasis mine).

Ustashi whom “we do not blame,” is far too accommodating for any but a collaborator.

Likewise, the claim that the “violence” can be put down to some *rotten apples at the bottom of the barrel* i.e., some unnamed “immature youths,” beggars belief. It seems hard to put any construction on this type of comment other than that Stepinatz was bending over backwards as a collaborator to appease Pavelitch. It is also contradicted by his later unqualified quotation from Bishop Mishitch, that “as a State employee,” “the Vice-Governor ought to have held his tongue” at the killing of “700 schismatics.” This quotation seems contextually intended to stroke Pavelitch’s ego and reassure him of the Roman Church’s general sympathy; and their hope that Romanists might “From a minority,” go to “a majority in Bosnia and Herzegovina;” albeit with *far less physical force* than had been used in 1941. But if, as Stepinatz claims, the “violence” was not the result of Ustashi actions but some “irresponsible persons” in the form “immature youths,” then why say that, “as a State employee”, “the Vice-Governor ought to have held his tongue.” If, as Stepinatz claims, Pavelitch really had “condemned the violence,” then surely we might read of Stepinatz saying how much he disagreed with Mishitch, and that *as a State employee, the Vice-Governor ought NOT to have held his tongue at the killing of 700 Serbs by irresponsible persons.* Thus once again, under strict scrutiny, this letter goes to show Stepinatz’s collaboration.

Whatever criticisms Stepinatz was prepared to make of “irresponsible persons” in November 1941, it is therefore clear that he did not thereby mean to “blame the” Nazi Ustashi “Government” for their actions. Indeed, he considers that his “Leader,” Pavelitch, has “publicly condemned the violence” Stepinatz disagrees with. Thus it is clear that Stepinatz and his fellow bishops wanted the Ustashi to increase the power directly given to the Roman Church for the mass conversions of Serbs. *The fact that Stepinatz is prepared to condemn the so called “propaganda of” “Evangelical” Christians who “have said that it is unnecessary for the [Serbian] Orthodox to become converted to the [Roman] Catholic Faith” is disturbing, and once again helps to prove the case for his collaboration.*

On the one hand, Stepinatz quotes Bishop Mishitch to create the impression that “conversion” of the Serbs “would be appropriate and easy’.” But on the other hand, Stepinatz quotes Bishop Butorac to create the impression that Serbs are extremely unreasonable people who may require *some force* to be converted to Romanism, since “We must reckon with every eventuality and even the possibility that the Serbs, out of defiance, may decide to be converted in masses to Islam [Mohammedanism]’.” The incongruity of these statements means that under strict scrutiny Stepinatz wanted to help create an expectation of “easy” conversions, and when this inevitably did not come, and the Nazi Ustashi were frustrated by this, then they should be aware “that the Serbs” sometimes exhibited “defiance.” The net effect of these statements must be that they condone mental processes that would easily continue the use of violence in the forced conversions, and so they contextually imply sympathy for the forced conversions, and also therefore contextually imply Stepinatz’s collaboration. This remains so even though it is clear that by applying Nazi racial theoretics to Roman Catholic Inquisition discretions, Pavelitch had often produced a much harsher and more violent and ruthless form of Croatian Inquisition than Stepinatz actually wanted e.g., Stepinatz would have stopped with a Jew converting, and possibly used an Inquisition discretion to allow some Jews to live notwithstanding their conversion; although Pavelitch also produced a much softer Inquisition than Stepinatz would have been likely to have had with respect to the usage of an Inquisition discretion to leave alone the 68,500 out of 70,000 Lutheran Protestants of German descent.

Writing in favour of Stepinatz, a former editor of a Zagreb newspaper claimed that Stepinatz's collaborative support for "conversions" to Roman Catholicism "were the only means of saving the lives of those doomed by the Ustashi." But if this was truly Stepinatz's motive then he might reasonably have been expected to have given his support to the 1941 protest by the Evangelical Lutheran Church's bishop, Philip Popp, and to have called for the end of the Ustashi law that converts from Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy, Mohammedanism, or Judaism "to Protestantism" who were "not" "by blood" "German," "not be allowed the rights enjoyed by" the "German" "minorities." Stepinatz could have called for an end to Ustashi refusal to recognize Serbian Orthodox conversions to Protestantism and associated legal classification of these Protestants as "Greco-Orientals" (meaning Serbian Orthodox), and thus called for an end to the persecution or martyrdom of these Protestants for refusing to convert to Roman Catholicism. Instead, in his 1941 letter to Pavelitch, he simply dismissed as "propaganda" those of "the Evangelical Confession" who hoped that by voluntary means some Serbs would "be converted" "to become Protestants." The fact that Stepinatz did not so support Lutheran Bishop Popp's 1941 protest, and indeed was collaborating with the Ustashi at the same time the Protestant leader Popp was protesting against the Ustashi in 1941-2, must surely act to condemn Stepinatz.

Also writing in Stepinatz's defence, the Director of the Bureau of Information, National [Roman] Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C., USA, Thomas McCarthy argued, "On May 14," 1941 "Stepinac wrote a letter to Pavelitch in which he denounced the execution without trial of 260 [Eastern] Orthodox Serbs at Glina. On May 15, he admonished the persecuted [Serbian] Orthodox and Jews that conversions to [Roman] Catholicism must be sincere. On May 22, 1941, Stepinac wrote to the Minister of the Interior in the Pavelitch government denouncing the treatment of [Serbian] Orthodox Serbs, Jews, and Gypsies." "In July, preaching in his cathedral at Zagreb, Stepinac said: 'We call to God to witness that we have always been opposed to any compulsory attachment to the [Roman] Catholic Church.'" "On July 16, Canon Loncar, on instructions from Stepinac, called on the Minister of Cults in the Pavelitch government," and said, "'The [Roman] Church cannot and does not wish to receive the [Serbian] Orthodox *en masse*, but can only receive individual persons of whom it has been established that they have not been subjected to constraint,'" "'the [Roman] Church cannot and will not receive the ownership of any ecclesiastical or parish building of the [Serbian] Orthodox.'" "'What a policy is now yours of forcing people to pass from Judaism and [Serbian] Orthodoxy to [Roman] Catholicism, in order then to assassinate them or intern them in a concentration camp'."

There is some substance to McCarthy's claims and I think that they once again show that Stepinatz's war crimes did not go beyond collaboration. But it must also be said that at the same time he was collaborating with the Nazi Ustashi regime, and he did not seek to have these comments aired more publicly and widely throughout the Ustashi's Croatia by, for example, disseminating these comments in a Roman Catholic newspaper, or if need be by circular to Romanist clergy. It is also clear that his comments on the policy of forced conversions of Jews and Serbian Orthodoxy being followed by their killing "in a concentration camp," highlights his dislike for the way Pavelitch was using a Spanish Inquisition type "purity of blood" (*limpieza de sangre*) laws discretion on the *convverso* here i.e., not regarding them as genuine converts and so killing them even if they converted; and thus Stepinatz was in some conflict with Pavelitch who was using such Croatian Inquisition discretions to simultaneously stay within secularist Nazi racial theoretic guidelines. But because Stepinatz liked so much of what was happening, he continued to collaborate with the Nazi Ustashi regime under what in effect was its "grand inquisitor," who was clearly

Pavelitch, not Stepinatz.

The testimony of the Roman Catholic priest and Croatian military Chaplain (for the area of Bjelovar, Varazdin, Gradiska, Knin, Ogulin, Gospich, and Karlovac - all Serbian areas in the *Independent State of Croatia*), Josip Vukelich, given some years after the war, illustrates this point. He said, "It was known to me that the Ustashi were doing various criminal acts and burning many villages in Banija, and it was known to me that they were killing, and that their allies were Domobrans (the regular Croatian Armed Forces). I remember that on February 23, 1945, in the village of Banija, 400 Domobrans burned many houses and killed many people I did not raise my voice against these crimes, because others didn't either, not even Cardinal Stepinac⁹³." Thus it is clear that *by not clearly and publicly condemning the mass murder of Serbs, Gypsies, and Jews*, at least to some extent, the Archbishop of Zagreb, *Stepinatz, led Roman Catholic clergy by bad example.*

His *actions speak louder than his words in letters to Ustashi officials.* It is clear that while Stepinatz was anxious to meet the technical legal requirements of Roman Catholic canon law and not accept any forced converts, he then went on to give a very liberal interpretation to what was meant by voluntary conversion which in effect sanctioned forced conversions. On this same logic, the Roman Church did in reality accept former Serbian Orthodox churches, lands, and monies. For example, in violation of the tenth commandment, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house," "nor anything that is thy neighbour's" (Exod. 20:17) and the eighth commandment, "Thou shalt not steal" (Exod. 20:15), Stepinatz was reminded at his trial in 1946 that he specifically requested Pavelitch give the Serbian Orthodox monastery at Orahovica to the Roman Catholic Trappist monks. Even the pro-Stepinatz writer, Falconi, admits that "at his trial" "Stepinac did not convincingly exculpate himself from this" "accusation." And as Sherwood Eddy himself noted in reply, "it seems indisputable that 1,000 [Serbian] Orthodox and Protestant churches were destroyed, that 1,500 church leaders were killed, that three [Serbian] Orthodox bishops were murdered, one after long torture, that 240,000 Serbian Orthodox" "were suddenly 'converted,' many accepting forcible conversion as the only hope of saving their lives, that [Roman] Catholic leaders, both priests and laymen, organized Ustashi terrorist gangs and 'Crusaders' who were guilty of widespread atrocities," and that hundreds of thousands of Serbian "Orthodox" "were put to death" or "escaped from Croatia." "How did it happen if, when they were free, we have hardly a record of a single voluntary conversion [to Roman Catholicism] in nine centuries, that suddenly when the [Roman] Catholic Church and Hitler's quisling Pavelitch gained power in Croatia for a year there were 240,000 conversions reported by Stepinac to the Pope?"⁹⁴

The Ustashi Minister for Interior, Artukovitch, became the highest ranking Nazi war criminal to seek refuge in the USA till he was finally extradited from America and convicted as a Nazi war criminal in (the second) Yugoslavia in 1986. He was sentenced to death but died of natural causes in a prison hospital in 1988. Artukovitch studied at the Roman

⁹³ Marquette, S., *Stepinac: Portrait of a War Criminal, op. cit.*, p. 188.

⁹⁴ Correspondence on "Stepinac" by an unnamed Roman Catholic of Colorado, USA, who formerly edited a paper in Zagreb, Croatia (pro-Stepinatz) and Thomas J. McCarthy of Washington D.C., USA (pro-Stepinatz), and Sherwood Eddy of Jacksonville, Illinois, USA (anti-Stepinatz), *The Christian Century*, Undenominational, Vol. 70, Chicago, February 18, 1953, no. 7, p. 195; February 25, 1953, no. 8, pp. 226-7; Falconi (pro-Stepinatz), *op. cit.*, pp. 293,295.

Catholic Franciscan monastery at Siroki Brijeg in Herzegovina, before joining the Ustashi. As Minister for the Interior he approved virtually all the Ustashi atrocities, and in May 1941 personally ordered the murder of about 4,000 Serbs in his native town of Siroki Brijeg. In September 1941 he approved the construction of the concentration camp system, including the Nazi's third largest concentration camp, Jasenovac (which killed 600,000-700,000 people, mainly Serbs). When the Nazi Ustashi regime collapsed, (as further discussed below,) Artukovitch managed to escape with the aid of two trusted friends of Archbishop Stepinatz, Dragonovitch and Jureditch, both of whom has been appointed in 1941 to Stepinatz's *Commission of Five For the Conversion of the [Serbian] Orthodox*⁹⁵. At his war crimes trial, Artukovitch testified, "I discussed the conversions with Stepinac. I was not an expert on the matter, and since I knew the Archbishop personally, I let him take over that duty, because he was the Archbishop and a saintly man. He agreed to gladly, and as a saintly man advised me." "He told me, 'Leave it to me! As a representative of the [Roman] Catholic Church, I shall obey my conscience to do whatever is best.' I engaged Stepinac as a saintly man, to be the only one to settle those matters in the best and most conscientious way."⁹⁶

It is notable that Artukovitch thrice referred to Stepinatz as a "saintly man," some six years after the process for beatifying Stepinatz was started by the Roman Church in 1980, and some twelve years before the Roman Church beatified him in 1998. Artukovitch clearly testified to having taken his advise on forced "conversion" from "Stepinac," who "gladly" "agreed" to "take over that duty." Given Artukovitch's Franciscan monastery background, the fact that he wanted to convert people to Romanism, and the degree to which the Roman Church helped him to escape, and the help they gave him to fight extradition from the USA to Yugoslavia for war crimes (further discussed below), it would be fatuous to suggest the man was hostile to the Roman Church or that the Roman Church was hostile to him. Yet in his 1986 deposition he claimed "Stepinac" "advised me" on "the matter," of forced "conversions." This goes well beyond the evidence used in 1946 to convict Stepinatz of collaboration with the Ustashi and thus a Nazi war criminal, and claims that Stepinatz had a more robust role in the Nazi Ustashi forced conversions than simply collaboration. But given that the evidence indicates that the Croatian Inquisition was designed to simultaneously operate on Roman Catholic Inquisition theoretics and secular Nazi racial theoretics in which Pavelitch used inquisition discretions to achieve Nazi racial theoretics results, and Stepinatz clearly did not want this added layer of secular Nazi racial theoretics operating as the determining factor for how Roman Catholic Inquisition discretions would be used; was Artukovitch committing perjury?

Others have made similar claims, Kruno Saric, a Franciscan priest, who used terror and torture to convert Serbian Orthodox to Roman Catholicism, claims to have sent a telegram after each mass conversion to Archbishop Stepinatz informing him of the details of the conversions. Petar Galves, a Franciscan priest in Hrcaci, decorated by Pavelitch and an active Ustashi, alleged that Archbishop Stepinatz ordered him to support the Ustashi program. Or France Rakic, a Franciscan priest at Vigorci, publicly alleged that Stepinatz

⁹⁵ Butler, H., *Escape from the Anthill*, Lilliput Press, Mullingar, Republic of Ireland, 1986, pp. 283-305; *Pavelitch [Pavelitch] Papers* (www.pavelicpapers.com/documents/artukovic).

⁹⁶ Deposition made during the main hearing before the District Criminal Court in Zagreb, Minutes, 16 April, 1986; quoted in Bulajic, M., *Tudjman's "Jasenovac Myth," op. cit.*, p. 103; and also quoted in Bulajic, M., *The Role of the Vatican in the break-up of the Yugoslav State*, Ministry of Information of the Republic of Serbia, Yugoslavia, 1993, p. 88.

ordered him to terrorize Serbs in order to force them to convert to Romanism⁹⁷. In discussing “The Croatian Holocaust” under the “Ustashi” with its “murderous reign of terror” “against” “Jews,” “Gypsies,” and “the large Serbian minority,” together with the associated Nazi policy that saw “Serbs” “forcibly converted en masse to Romanism,” the (Strict Baptist) Protestant writer, Ian Sadler, evidently accepts such claims about Stepinatz’s involvement going beyond collaboration. Sadler’s view is that the “policy of genocide against the Serbs was supported at the highest level by Archbishop Stepinac.” He considers that “the Ustashi terrorists led by Pavelic,” “had the full and public support of Stepinac the Jesuit Archbishop of Zagreb.”⁹⁸

But with all due respect to Sadler and others taking this view, *I think it is an overstatement of the facts to claim that Stepinatz’s involvement went beyond collaboration, and that the Ustashi “had” Stepinatz’s “full and public support.” Stepinatz would have liked a Roman Catholic Inquisition which did not simultaneously justify itself in terms of secular Nazi racial theoretics, and so used inquisition discretions to achieve this end. Stepinatz collaborated with the Nazi Ustashi in some areas of mutual agreement, but clearly he was not “the power behind the throne,” and clearly he did not give his “full” “support” to the Nazi Ustashi regime of Pavelitch. He did not e.g., want the automatic killings of Jews and some (though not all) Serbs who had “converted” under the “convert or die” ultimatum, and he would no doubt have been uneasy about allowing more than 90% of the Protestant population (68,500 out of 70,000) to receive the benefits of an Inquisition discretion that left them alone from 1942 onwards i.e., after e.g., the martyrdom of the Lutheran Protestants confessors and martyrs of e.g., Serbian descent from Slatina (Croatia, 1941) or the Srem (Serbia, 1941-2).*

On the one hand, the 1958 statements of Stepinatz’s Secretary, “Father” Lachovitsch, given while Stepinatz was still alive, that “Cardinal Stepinac” “had consulted” Artukovitch “on the moral aspect of every action he took,”⁹⁹ do appear to give some corroboration to Artukovitch’s claims. But on the other hand, Lachovitsch was not cross-examined in a court of law on these statements. Indeed it is not now possible to either more rigorously investigate these claims, or cross-examine Artukovitch, Saric, Galves, and Rakic, on their claims that Stepinatz’s involvement went well beyond collaboration, and so in the first instance I do not think it is safe to argue for anything beyond the conviction of Stepinatz in 1946 for collaboration. Furthermore, I note that such claims are easy to make, and harder to defend. Moreover, these allegations are both uncorroborated, and contrary to the evidence that we have on Stepinatz’s conduct. Significantly, Artukovitch, Saric, Galves, and Rakic were clearly gruesome killers and of a far worse moral order of criminal than Stepinatz. I think the most probable explanation for the claims of Artukovitch, Saric, Galves, and Rakic, is that these murky individuals were dishonestly using Stepinatz’s name in a bid to try and make themselves look better; and in a similar vein Lachovitsch was fabricating evidence in order to help his friend Artukovitch, and taking a calculated risk that the ageing and ill Stepinatz under town-arrest in Krasic, would be unaware of the statements he was making in far away USA. *The case against Stepinatz on the grounds of collaboration is rock solid. That case is not helped by giving credence to the extravagant claims of seedy characters such*

⁹⁷ Marquette, S., *Stepinac: Portrait of a War Criminal, op. cit.*, pp. 150,174,176.

⁹⁸ Sadler, I.A., *op. cit.*, pp. 222-3.

⁹⁹ *The Mirror News*, Los Angeles, California, 24 Jan 1958, quoted in Butler, H., *Escape from the Anthill, op. cit.*, pp. 283-305.

as Artukovitch, Saric, Galves, and Rakic, to the effect that Stepinatz was in fact involved beyond the level of collaboration. In the interests of justice, Stepinatz deserves to be condemned as a collaborator and thus a Nazi war criminal. But in the same interests of justice, he also needs to be defended against these type of exaggerations and manufacturing of evidence.

Stepinatz's circular urging "conversions to be speeded up" shows he was intimately involved as a collaborator with the programme of Romanizing Croatia. Furthermore, Stepinatz was made Chaplain-General of the Ustashi and regular militia. With priests accompanying the Ustashi, it is absurd to suggest he did not know what was going on. He clearly did, and he clearly collaborated by urging "conversions to be speeded up." Though in his 1986 deposition Artukovitch overstated the case, the fact remains that Stepinatz collaborated as an advisor to "conversions" to Artukovitch, who regarded him as a "saintly man." Stepinatz also must have known that the Roman Church was being enriched from ill-gotten gain as she became the new owner of former Serbian Orthodox churches, lands, and monies. BETWEEN MAY AND DECEMBER 1941 STEPINATZ WAS CLEARLY A NAZI USTASHI COLLABORATOR WHO WAS COLLABORATING WITH THE USTASHI WHEN HE WAS AWARE OF THEIR POLICY OF FORCED CONVERSIONS TO ROMAN CATHOLICISM, AND PERSECUTION OF NON-ROMAN CATHOLICS SERBS SUCH AS SERBIAN ORTHODOX, AS WELL AS JEWS, GYPSIES AND OTHER ANTI-NAZI DISSIDENTS.

Issue 3: Stepinatz's continuing specific and general collaborative support with the Nazi Ustashi regime in 1942 (and later) after the horrors of May to December 1941.

Butler documents how during the Ustashi era, Croatian "newspapers give full details of these conversions" from Serbian Orthodoxy to Roman Catholicism, "usually under some such" inaccurate "headline as 'Return to the faith of their [Papist] fathers after 250 years'." This included detailed knowledge of how several villages would have their Serb population "converted" at the same time. For example, "at a village near Karlovac three clergy performed the ceremony assisted by a company of 400 Ustashi, and Father Niksich, the preacher, told the new parishioners that [Roman] Catholics would receive them with open arms." "'Alert for the Fatherland' roared the 400. Mass was then celebrated. The band played the Ustashi hymn and the converts raised their hands in the Ustashi salute," then "went back home bearing the Ustashi flag." Or "in *Nova Hrvatska* of 9 April 1942, we read how the then Mgr. [Monsignor] Stepinac received a telegram of 'devoted greetings to the head of the [Roman] Church' from 2300 new converts from six different villages, assembled in the village of Drenovac¹⁰⁰."

At his trial in Zagreb, the Chief Justice presented numerous newspaper and magazine articles from the Ustashi era in which Stepinatz was depicted as a supporter of the Nazi Ustashi, for example, photographs were presented of Stepinatz at Ustashi functions with Anton Pavelitch. "Archbishop Aloysius Stepinatz" replied, "It is my holy duty to ask God to help the enemy too'." "Most of the spectators hissed when the court read an article describing the Archbishop's blessing of the Ustashi 'crusaders'. 'I give my blessings to all who ask,' he said.¹⁰¹"

¹⁰⁰ Butler's *Grandmother and Wolfe Tone*, op. cit., pp. 184-5.

¹⁰¹ "Stepinatz Denies Guilt at his Trial," *New York Times*, 10 Oct 1946, p. 15.

Concerning Stepinatz's *specific acts* of collaborative support for the Nazi Ustashi. After the atrocities of 1941, and after Croatia had declared war on the USA and UK on 13 December 1941, Stepinatz continued his collaborative support for the Ustashi regime by clear specific acts. This was seen in, for example, his official presence at many public occasions. On 1 January 1942, the *Croatian Sentinel* published an article in which Archbishop Stepinatz said, "Hitler is a God-sent leader; the" Fascist-Nazi "Axis powers" "are fighting" "against the English and Jewish capitalist plutocracy." Pro-Stepinatz writers have tried to negate this type of anti-Jewish comment on the basis that Stepinatz did not support the Nazi's anti-Jewish racial views, and helped Jews by, for instance, founding the Relief Action for Refuge of Jews in 1938. But the fact that Stepinatz sometimes assisted Jews does not, as pro-Stepinatz writers seem to think, somehow disprove the fact that he at times collaborated with the Ustashi in working against the Jews, that is, he acted inconsistently. Moreover, while I accept that Stepinatz's anti-Jewish statements were Papist religiously motivated rather than Nazi racially motivated, this could *in practice* still overlap with Spanish Inquisition type racial laws as exemplified by those against *converso* Jews i.e., "purity of blood" (*limpieza de sangre*) laws in which the Spanish Inquisition still persecuted Jews who converted to Popery, on the premise that they may have only been pretending to convert for fear of the *convert or die* ultimatum. *If an Ustashi officer killed a Jew, Gypsy, or Serb who had was not a convert to Popery, he could justify it on the basis of either Papist religious inquisition theoretics in what he thought of as a Croatian Inquisition, or on the basis of secular Nazi racial theoretics in what he thought of as a Nazi political action; and if he killed a Jew, Gypsy, or Serb who had been converted to Romanism, he could always justify it either under these converso Jew Papist inquisition racial theoretics in what he thought of as a Croatian Inquisition, or on the basis of Nazi racial theoretics in what he thought of as a Nazi political action.* The two being in practice, imperceptibly blended, as part of the political pact between the Nazis and the Roman Church in Croatia. Thus Croatian Inquisition thinking constituted a Romish religious reason, whereas Nazi racial theoretics constituted a secular political reason. Which if these two reasons, or combination thereof an Ustashi officer chose, was basically left up to him. Just so long as the Roman Church got *some* "converts" out of the deal, they were essentially happy.

Hubert Butler noted that under the Ustashi, "Many prominent Croats were collaborationists, for example, Stepinac, the Primate of Croatia, and Sharitch, the Archbishop of Bosnia (who published a poem to the murderer Pavelitch, hailing him as 'the sun of Croatia')." But Butler also records that Archbishop Sharitch was permitted to publish his *Ode to Pavelitch* in Roman Catholic newspapers both in his own diocese *and that of Zagreb*, and observes that in this *Ode* "Archbishop Sharitch praises" "Pavelitch" "for his measures against Serbs and Jews." Relevant poetical lines include, "God himself was at thy side, thou good and strong one," "against the Jews, who had all the money, who wanted to sell our souls, who built a prison round our name, the miserable traitors."¹⁰² I think the fact that Stepinatz allowed this Jewish conspiracy theory rhetoric to be published without challenge in a Zagreb Romanist paper, surely shows he had an unacceptable anti-Jewish sentiment, and it further shows he was prepared to collaboratively support similar sounding anti-Jewish Nazi propaganda.

Stepinatz's anti-Jewish and Nazi Ustashi collaborating sentiment also emerged in his

¹⁰² Butler's *Grandmother and Wolfe Tone*, *op. cit.*, p. 163; Butler's *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, pp. 278,285; Butler's *In the Land of Nod*, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

visit to the Vatican in May and June 1943. A Croatian record of this states that the “Archbishop of Zagreb” “made a very positive report about Croatia.” “He mentioned” “laws” in “Croatia” “against abortion, a point very well received in the Vatican. Basing his arguments on these laws, the Archbishop justified in part the methods used against the Jews, who in our country are the greatest defenders of crimes of this kind and the most frequent perpetrators of them.¹⁰³” While abortion constitutes murder (other than where it is necessary to save the mother’s life, based on the same principle of self-defence which allows a man to kill someone trying to murder him if this is the only reasonable way he can save his own life,) one cannot justify killing Croatian Jews generically on this basis, many of whom would no doubt be opposed to abortion. If Stepinatz wished the Government to imprison or even execute, specific Jews and Gentiles who had been convicted in accordance with law of having procured an abortion or performed an abortion (other than where necessary to save the mother’s life), then this would be reasonable and fair. But when “the Archbishop justified in part the methods used against” *all* “the Jews” on the basis that *some* Jews were “defenders” and “perpetrators” of “abortion,” he abandoned any defensible position, and showed himself to be unjustifiably anti-Jewish, and clearly giving collaborative support to the murderous anti-Jewish policies of the Nazi Ustashi.

On 22 June 1941, Pavelitch’s Minister for Education, Budah, predicted that one-third of Serbs would be deported, one-third of Serbs converted to Romanism, and one-third of Serbs killed¹⁰⁴. Though these figures proved to be incorrect (by 1945, the ratios were 15% deported, 20% “converted,” and 65% killed), they mean that the Ustashi had made it clear, and reported this in the newspaper *Hrvatski Narod*, that Serbs were to be mass “converted” to Romanism, and it was expected that about a third of them would resist this to the point of death. Significantly then, having accepted membership of the Nazi Ustashi’s legislature, the Croatian Diet, Stepinatz made a speech at its opening on 23 February 1942, in which he addressed the murderous Pavelitch who had committed regicide and killed the King of Yugoslavia seven years before, and about a quarter of a million Jews, Gypsies, and Serbs in the *Independent State of Croatia* during the seven months from May to December 1941. Archbishop Stepinatz said (my emphasis), “My Head of State! At this time when the Croatian Diet, this symbol of Croatian political independence, sends its wishes to you, the Chief of the Independent State of Croatia, *I cannot but call the blessings of God the Creator on you, and your work, speaking myself as the representative of God’s Church.*” Given the recent mass murders, for example, of over 200,000 Serbian Orthodox who refused to convert to Roman Catholicism, and the fact that his letter of November 1941 to Pavelitch shows Stepinatz was aware of mass murders, these words in early 1942 constitute clear-cut evidence of collaboration.

Then to celebrate Pavelitch’s birthday in June 1942, Stepinatz sent a circular to Popish clergy in which he said, “On June 15th, 1942, the glorious Chief of the Independent State of Croatia, the Head of State / Government (literally ‘Poglavnik’ or ‘Head’), Dr. Anton Pavelitch, celebrates his birthday. On this occasion I appeal to the whole clergy to say on the following Sunday,” “preferably after the High Mass, a *Te Deum* with the proper prayers.” Those who know history will remember that when the Romanists killed the Protestants in the

¹⁰³ Falconi, *op. cit.*, pp. 316-7, quoting Lobkowicz’s Report.

¹⁰⁴ Alexander, S., *op. cit.*, p. 71; quoting *Srpska Pravoslavna Crka 1920-1970*, Serbian Orthodox Church, Belgrade, 1971, (official history), p. 124; *Hrvatski Narod* 26 June 1941; Miljus, B., *La Revolution Yugoslave*; *Hrvatski Narod* 25 July 1941; & *Katolicki Tjednik Sarajevo* 17 August 1941.

Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacre of 1572 in France, the Church of Rome also celebrated by blasphemously uttering a *Te Deum*. It seems that in the Ustashi's Croatia, the Protestant confessors who were of non-Germanic descent, and the Protestants killed who were of Serbian or Jewish descent, were celebrated over in a strikingly similar way. For just as Herod's birthday was a time of celebration for those wanting John the Baptist killed (Mark 6:14-29), so Pavelitch's birthday was a time of celebration for those wanting the Protestants of Jewish or Serbian descent killed. Given the general ongoing killing of Jews, Gypsies, and Serbs in the *Independent State of Croatia*, most of whom were not Protestants, Stepinatz's circular for Pavelitch's birthday constitutes clear collaborative support.

Other specific acts of collaborative support by Stepinatz throughout the period to 1945 also include the fact that after the atrocities of 1941, he continued to wear Ustashi insignia throughout 1942. Furthermore, he was the Chaplain-General of the Ustashi bands and also the regular Croat militia (known as the Domobran). Moreover, he accepted the highest Ustashi decoration, the *Order of Merit - High Order with Star*, which was announced in the Nazi Ustashi's Official Gazette on 8 March 1944. In June 1944 at *Mary's Basilica*, Stepinatz "declared that the Ustashi state would be saved by the intercession of the Holy Virgin." Then in a sermon on 7 July, 1944, he said, "The Croatian people are shedding their blood for the state and they will preserve the state," "we should each contribute to an ever-increasing strength in building and defending the state," that is, from the Allied Forces. The official Nazi Ustashi newspaper, published at Zagreb in Stepinatz's own Archdiocese, *Hrvatski Narod* (23 July, 1944), gave front page coverage to this statement, together with a picture of Stepinatz standing next to Pavelitch. Stepinatz was honoured by the Nazis who bestowed upon him the title, "First Lord of the Kingdom"¹⁰⁵. If becoming "First Lord of the Kingdom" does not make Stepinatz a collaborator, then it is hard to imagine what would make anyone a collaborator.

To this must be added a number of *general actions* of collaborative support. As Chaplain-General, Stepinatz in no way sought to discipline those Romanist priests who had accompanied the Ustashi soldiers, and were in clear fraternity with them. He also appointed a number of the lesser Ustashi chaplains to their military posts, and this included Miroslav Filipovitch, a Franciscan, who was made chaplain of Pavelitch's personal bodyguard. Filipovitch commanded an Ustashi detachment which on 7 February 1942 slaughtered 1,300 men, women, and children in Motika, Sargovac, and Drakulici. Filipovitch also later became camp commandant of the Jasenovac concentration camp, in which Filipovitch later admitted to having killed about 40,000 people. Stepinatz clearly had general knowledge about what was going on, yet failed to restrain men like Filipovitch. This is clear from his above mentioned letter to Pavelitch of November 1941, published by Butler in the *Church of Ireland Gazette* (1950-1). In this letter, Stepinatz says to Pavelitch, "Leader! it is clear that many great mistakes have been made in the conversions. The source of these mistakes lies in the fact that the work of conversion was not entrusted to that forum to which it alone should have been entrusted," "that is, the Croatian [Roman] Catholic Episcopate"¹⁰⁶. But though Stepinatz had gained greater control by "the Croatian [Roman] Catholic Episcopate," since he was made Ustashi Chaplain-General, he did not seriously use his power as Archbishop or Chaplain-General to realistically try and stop, restrain, or subsequently discipline, Filipovitch, or other Romanist clergy involved in the mass murders and forced "conversions" of Serbs throughout 1942 to 1945. Thus by acquiescence he gave his

¹⁰⁵ Paris, E., *op. cit.*, pp. 202-3.

¹⁰⁶ Butler, H., *Church of Ireland Gazette* (No 3523, Vol. 45), 29 Dec. 1950, p. 6.

collaborative support to the Nazi Ustashi; who had used Croatian Inquisition discretions to simultaneously meet secular Nazi racial theoretic objectives, something that Stepinatz would not have done if he could have had a Roman Catholic Croatian Inquisition with discretions unfettered by such secularist Nazi concerns.

Moreover, there was some friction between the Nazi German army and Fascist Italian army in Croatia. Of specific interest, the Italian General, Mario Roatta, Commander of the Second Army, records that the “Italian forces” under him “could not watch” the Ustashi “extermination of the Serbian Orthodox” and “Jews” “unmoved.” Hence “in September 1941,” “they proceeded to occupy the rest of the territory assigned to them.” “Thus the [Italian] Army saved the lives and possessions of numbers of Serbian Orthodox (their authorities put the number at 600,000),” and “also took under its protection some thousands of Jews who had fled from Zagreb and the parts of Croatia under German occupation, as well as some hundreds of Poles” “for whom the Germans were looking.” General Roatta says that the Ustashi “made two vain attempts in ’42 at armed penetration into areas held by our forces with the intention of committing more excesses against the population” but the “Italian Command blocked their way.” Stepinatz’s response to this situation in 1942 must surely indict him. In a letter to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Mostar, Stepinatz complained, “The Italians have returned and assumed civil and military authority. The schismatic churches have immediately come to life again, and the [Serbian] Orthodox priests, in hiding up till now, have reappeared in freedom. The Italians seem to be favourably disposed towards the Serbs and severe towards the [Roman] Catholics.” *These are hardly the words of a man who was purportedly allowing forced conversions to Romanism in order to help save Serbian lives!*

But worse still, Stepinatz wrote to the Minister for Italian Affairs at Zagreb, Rafael Castertano, further complaining “that in the Croatian territory annexed to Italy a constant declining in religious life is to be observed, and a certain discernable shift from [Roman] Catholicism to [Eastern Orthodox] schism. If that most [Roman] Catholic part of Croatia should cease in the future to be so, the blame and responsibility before God” “will lie with” “Italy. This religious aspect of the problem I am discussing” “since I am responsible for the religious well-being of Croatia.¹⁰⁷” *These are hardly the words of a man who was purportedly allowing forced conversions to Romanism in order to help save Serbian lives!* This clearly shows that Stepinatz wanted to see the Romanization of this region, and especially the associated suppression of “schism,” a term which, together with “schismatics,” is contextually used with specific reference to Eastern Orthodox whose Church broke with the Roman Church in 1054 A.D., in what is known as *The Great Schism* under the Patriarch of Constantinople. Stepinatz clearly wanted to see a return to the Ustashi policy of Romanization, and invoked religious beliefs such as “responsibility before God” to bring this about. These comments must surely indict Stepinatz as a man giving collaborative support to the Nazi Ustashi, and as a man with a Spanish Inquisition type view of Romanizing this region of Croatia.

Stepinatz’s general collaboration is also evident in the fact that Roman Catholic newspapers supported the Ustashi regime throughout 1941 to 1945. Even if Stepinatz did not want to denounce the Nazi Ustashi, the Roman Church could have refrained from political comment and simply kept its papers to religious matters. Instead, these papers supported the Ustashi regime. In defending Stepinatz against this charge, Ramet argues,

¹⁰⁷ Falconi, *op. cit.*, pp. 318-20.

“The prosecution made use of a string of citations from [Roman] Catholic” “press to try and incriminate the Archbishop. But most of the [Roman] Catholic periodicals cited by the prosecution in substantiation of its charges were published in dioceses lying outside Stepinac’s jurisdiction.¹⁰⁸” I regard this as a very incriminating defence. After all, if “most of the [Roman] Catholic periodicals” “were published in diocese lying outside Stepinac’s jurisdiction,” this is really an admission by a pro-Stepinatz writer that *some* of these periodicals were published *inside* Stepinatz’s jurisdiction; and therefore Stepinatz is responsible for *some* general support of the Ustashi, and *thus this admission actually corroborates the War Crimes prosecution’s case that Stepinatz was a Nazi Ustashi collaborator!* Furthermore, it highlights the fact that Stepinatz had access to newspapers which could have been used to vigorously denounce the Ustashi’s murderous campaign of genocide against Jews and Gypsies, and *Spanish Inquisition* type murderous campaign against persons of Serbian descent who were not Roman Catholics.

Stepinatz made a visit and report to Rome in 1942. Among other things, we learn from Rusinovic’s record of this visit, “the Archbishop” on “Croatia” “considers that the situation on the country is favourable, and he praises the work and effort of the government. In particular he is eloquent in his praise of the attempts made by the Poglavnik [or “Head”],” Pavelitch, “to restore order, and in the description of his religious attitude and his relationship with the Church. He also states that” “both leader and people” in “the State of Croatia,” “have shown their determination to restore the ancient traditions of life.” “He considers” “that one cannot and must not allow anyone to attack the” *Independent State of Croatia*. “Stepinac was received by the Holy Father, after he had presented him with his report, and had an audience with him for an hour.” The pro-Stepinatz writer, Carlo Falconi, admits that the statements in Stepinatz’s report are “undoubtedly perplexing,” but then seeks to explain them away on the basis that, “obviously,” “Stepinac must have suddenly been given firm hopes of changes in” the Ustashi regime. I find Falconi’s defence unsatisfactory. Even if, for which there is absolutely no evidence, Stepinatz had “been given firm hopes of changes,” he need not have white-washed the Ustashi’s past as he did, nor claimed “one cannot and must not” “attack” the Ustashi’s Croatia. I think *the more natural construction to place on Stepinatz’s report to the Pope was that Stepinatz was a collaborator with the Nazi Ustashi, and Pope Pius XII also acquiesced to this Nazi regime.*

Writing in Stepinatz’s defence, Thomas McCarthy further notes, “Three times the” Roman “See was petitioned by the Nazi and Ustashi regimes to remove Archbishop Stepinac from his See because he had incurred the wrath of Pavelic and Hitler.” Also writing in Stepinatz’s defence, an anonymous writer described as “a Roman Catholic” who “formerly edited a paper in Zagreb,” Croatia, said that “on October 31, 1943, “Stepinac publicly declared: ‘The [Roman] Catholic Church cannot admit that a race or a nation, because it is more numerous or better armed, can do violence to a nation smaller in size. We cannot admit the killing of innocents because someone has killed a soldier, even if that soldier belonged to a race considered more noble. The system of shooting hundred of hostages for a crime for which the culprit cannot be found is barbarous.’” Writing on February 24, 1943, to Pavelitch,” “in protest against the murder of [Roman] Catholic priests in the concentration camp at Jasenovac, Stepinac said: ‘This is a disgraceful blot and a crime crying to heaven for revenge, just as the whole camp of Jasenovac is a shameful blot on the independent Croat state’.¹⁰⁹” The first thing I would note about these claims based on Stepinatz’s statements, is

¹⁰⁸ Ramet, S.P., *Balkan Babel*, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

¹⁰⁹ Falconi, *op. cit.*, pp. 314-5; Correspondence on “Stepinac” by Thomas J.

that they are made by a former editor of a Zagreb newspaper. He now sought the right to disagree with an anti-Stepinatz writer, but why were editors of Zagreb newspapers not prepared to extend the same privilege to those who disagreed with Stepinatz during 1941 to 1945? Indeed, why did Zagreb newspapers not publish these statements at the time as part of an anti-Ustashi viewpoint? This former Zagreb newspaper editor asked his name be “withheld to protect members of his family still in Yugoslavia,” but why was his newspaper not prepared to publish anti-Ustashi letters from someone whose name was “withheld to protect” him under Pavelitch?

On the one hand, I consider that these statements by Stepinatz once again go to show that his war crimes do not go beyond collaboration. They are not the kind of thing that a more sinister Nazi war criminal like Artukovitch would have said. But on the other hand, these statements also once again go to show that he was aware of Nazi Ustashi atrocities such as the mass murders at Jasenovac, and though condemning them in a 1943 non-public letter to Pavelitch, he was still prepared to collaborate with this same Ustashi regime which perpetrated them. He did not, for example, make his letter of 1943 “An Open Letter to the Poglavnik (or Head)” published in his Roman Catholic newspaper, and then disseminated throughout the *Independent State of Croatia* as a letter of protest condemning the mass murder of Jews, Gypsies, and Serbs at Jasenovac and elsewhere.

Furthermore, there is nothing in Stepinatz’s statement of October 31, 1943 to necessarily link it to a general anti-Ustashi viewpoint. Stepinatz’s statement that the Roman “Church cannot admit that a race or a nation, because it is more numerous or better armed, can do violence to a nation smaller in size,” could just as easily be interpreted to be a criticism of the Allies, who the Ustashi did not want attacking the “race” or “nation” of Croatia which was “a nation smaller in size.” Likewise, his criticism of reprisal shooting “of innocents” or “hostages,” lacks any specific application to the Ustashi, and so a listener could, for example, think Stepinatz was referring to Stalin’s communists and so giving a reason why Croats should support the Ustashi.

Concerning Stepinatz’s February 1943 statement, it is notable that his motivation is the killing of Roman Catholic priests, which he describes as a “crime,” and makes no specific mention of the Jews, Gypsies, and Serbs being killed at Jasenovac. Though he says “the whole camp of Jasenovac is a shameful blot,” he waited until long after hundreds of thousands of Serbs were killed there to make this statement, and then focuses it on the relatively small number of Romish priests killed there. But it must also be said, that this letter does show some conflict between Stepinatz’s desire to collaborate with the Nazi Ustashi in the creation of a Romanized Croatia, and the Ustashi Nazi’s desire to kill some Roman Catholic priests who presumably did what Stepinatz did not, and actively opposed them. This factor of Stepinatz’s occasional criticisms, explains why, as the pro-Stepinatz writer McCarthy notes, “Three times the” Roman “See was petitioned by the Nazi and Ustashi regimes to remove Archbishop Stepinac.” That is to say, the Ustashi preferred to work with a Roman Catholic Archbishop like Dr. Ivan Sardic (Saric), Roman Catholic Archbishop of Sarajevo, who had been the Roman bishop of Sarajevo since 1922 and had

McCarthy of Washington D.C., USA (pro-Stepinatz); and an unnamed Roman Catholic of Colorado, USA, who formerly edited a paper in Zagreb, Croatia (pro-Stepinatz), and Sherwood Eddy of Jacksonville, Illinois, USA (anti-Stepinatz), *The Christian Century*, Undenominational, Vol. 70, Chicago, Jan. 21, 1953, no. 3, p. 81 and February 18, 1953, no. 7, pp. 195-6.

joined the Ustashi in 1934. Sardic wrote odes in honour of Croatia's "beloved leader," Pavelitch, and exalted Ustashi methods in the Roman Catholic weekly of his diocese "in the service of" what he absurdly and blasphemously called "truth, justice, and honour."

Thus on the one hand, because the totalitarian Nazi Ustashi disliked any dissent or anything other than complete, total, and blind obedience to their fascist wishes, they were to some extent uncomfortable with Stepinatz, whose support for them did not go beyond collaboration. Thus they petitioned the Roman Pontiff for his removal. But on the other hand, the Ustashi still found Stepinatz to be sufficiently accommodating for them to work with him *as a collaborator*, and so he did not, for example, meet the same fate as the Serbian Orthodox bishop, Archbishop Peter Simonovic of Sarajevo, who had his throat slit by the Ustashi at Jasenovac. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Zagreb clearly fared a good deal better than the Serbian Orthodox Metropolitan of Zagreb; Bishop Dositei, who subsequently died from torture inflicted by the Ustashi; or the Serbian Orthodox Bishop Platon of Banja Luka, whose eyes were gauged out, ears and nose cut off, feet were cruelly shod as though he were a horse, and was then forced to walk in public gaze till he fell, at which point his beard was torn out, his chest was set on fire, and his dead body finally thrown into the Vrbania River.

Collaborators may sometimes disagree about some of the policy specifics. Thus Stepinatz's statements do not disprove that overall Stepinatz was a Nazi Ustashi collaborator. I think this statement further condemns Stepinatz. After all, when did Stepinatz ever say, "I think it is a disgraceful blot and crime that many Roman Catholic priests have engaged in killing hundreds of thousands of people who refused to convert to the Roman Church"? Why did he not make comparable statements about, for example, the Serbian Orthodox priests who were killed because they refused to convert to Roman Catholicism? What of the Serbian Orthodox bishops killed, for example, Bishop Trlaic Sava (1884-1941) of Karlovac (Croatia), or Bishop Jovanovic Platon (1874-1941) of Banja Luka (Bosnia-Herzegovina)? What of others persecuted and killed such as the Protestant confessors and martyrs not of Germanic descent who had converted from some other religion to the glorious truth of Protestantism?

I think the only manner of legal defence way to argue in favour of Stepinatz's specific and general collaborative support for the Ustashi regime during 1942 to 1945, would be to either plead some form of temporary (or permanent) insanity, in which Stepinatz simply was not in control of his senses and really did not understand what he was saying or doing, or to argue that his actions and comments were made under Ustashi duress. But at this point, I introduce the evidence of those Romanists who argue in favour of Stepinatz. In the first place, they make much of two statements he made, one in 1942 and the other in 1943. In 1942, in a *private address*, Stepinatz said at a Romish Mass, "All nations and races are from God and they all have a right to live." "That is why the Croatian" Roman "Church has always condemned injustice and violence committed in the name of class, racist, or ethnic theories." Notably, this did not include a condemnation of Roman Catholic *Inquisition* like *religious theories*. I.e., on the precedent of the Spanish Inquisition's "purity of blood" (*limpieza de sangre*) laws against Jews, Stepinatz could still consider that those not of Croat race and Romanist religion, were rightly made the subject of the Croatian Inquisition on the basis that it was no an "injustice" to persecute, possibly even unto death, those who only pretended to convert to Popery, like the *converso* Jews of Spain. Then in May 1943 Stepinatz *publicly* criticized the Nazis, with the result that the Fascist Italian and Nazi German regime's demanded his removal from office by Pope Pius XII, who refused to do so, instead warning

Stepinatz that his life was in danger; and in July 1943 the British Broadcasting Commission (BBC) commented on Stepinatz's criticisms of the Ustashi regime.

These type of facts once again make the point that Pavelitch set up a system that could be conceptualized under either Roman Catholic Inquisition theoretics, or under secular Nazi racial theoretics. Pavelitch then used inquisition discretions to achieve Nazi racial theoretics ends. Stepinatz was clearly regarded as "problematical" in that he was happy with the idea of a Croatian Inquisition under Roman Catholic theoretics, but he did not want the Nazi racial theoretics. Specifically, this meant conflict developed as to how various Inquisition discretions should be exercised. Thus this type of conflict between Stepinatz and Pavelitch's Nazi Ustashi regime surfaced from time to time. Nevertheless, it remains clear that Stepinatz was a collaborator with this Nazi Ustashi regime.

A more moderate pro-Stepinatz writer, Falconi, refers to "oscillations" in Stepinatz's comments about the Ustashi, and is even prepared to concede that Stepinatz's was "contradictory in his relations" with the Ustashi regime¹¹⁰. It seems to me that one of two constructions can be placed on Stepinatz's criticisms of the Nazi Ustashi in 1942 and 1943, and for that matter, his general reference in February 1943 mentioned above to "Jasenovac" as "a shameful blot." Either his conscience was troubled by what was happening, and he had genuine doubts about it; or he was a brazen political opportunist who wanted to create some "protection" for himself in case the Allies won the war, so he made these statements in private with the intent of referring to them in the future if required. But the first point to note is that these statements totally demolish any case for Stepinatz's general endorsement of the Ustashi regime during 1942 to 1945 being either the result of some form of temporary insanity or duress. The fact that Stepinatz made these statements shows that he realized that the Ustashi regime was acting in an immoral manner, and that he had enough freedom to criticize it if he so wished. The second point to note is that for whatever reasons he made these comments, he then ignored his own words and THROUGHOUT 1942 to 1945 CLEARLY COLLABORATED WITH THE USTASHI REGIME OF HIS BELOVED HEAD OF STATE, THE MURDEROUS ANTON PAVELITCH, BOTH IN SPECIFIC AND GENERAL WAYS AS OUTLINED ABOVE.

In the final analysis, it is not necessary for an investigator to reach inside a man's mind and divulge his motive, something that no man can ever do with certainty anyway. But even if we give Stepinatz the benefit of the doubt and allow that these statements of 1942 and 1943 were sincere twinges of his conscience, it is clear that he then ignored them and seared his conscience, by then going on in collaborative support of the Ustashi regime. He seems to have been genuinely unhappy about the way secular Nazi racial theoretics were being used to implement Roman Catholic inquisition discretions, and while this means he would have been less ruthless to a number of Serbs and Jews who "converted" than were the Ustashi who killed them anyway, and would probably have allowed some more of the non-converted group of Serbs and Jews to live than did the Ustashi; the other side of the coin is he would have been far more ruthless to the 68,500 out of 70,000 Lutherans of German descent than was Pavelitch, who dared not strike against these Protestants precisely because he was using Nazi racial theoretics to determine inquisition discretions. In the end, Tito did to most of these German Protestants what the Ustashi did not, and so in the end the Protestant witness in the Balkans was greatly reduced anyway.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 311,314,316,317.

But with respect to Stepinatz's at times, admittedly uneasy collaboration; it is no defence for a man who is an accomplice to a murder, whose partner in crime slowly and systematically murdered their victim over an hour, to argue that during the hour it took to kill him, on two or three occasions he paused for a minute, sincerely wondered if what he was doing was right, openly expressed remorse and regret to their victim, even said to his partner in crime he thought he should stop killing their victim as he now thought it was immoral, if he then proceeded to once again aid and abet his murderous partner in crime to kill their victim over that hour. Indeed, the fact that on two or three occasions the accomplice said these things acts to heighten his guilt, since it shows that he clearly knew what they were doing was wrong, and he clearly had the freedom to desist from them if he so wished, but failed to take clear and decisive measures to stop it, or to at least try and stop it. SO LIKEWISE, STEPINATZ WAS CLEARLY A COLLABORATOR OF THE MURDEROUS NAZI USTASHI REGIME BETWEEN 1941 AND 1945, EVEN IF ON TWO OR THREE OCCASIONS HE HAD TWINGES OF CONSCIENCE ABOUT WHAT THEY WERE DOING, AND EVEN CRITICIZED THE USTASHI, SINCE IN THE END HE WENT ON GIVING COLLABORATIVE SUPPORT TO THE NAZI USTASHI REGIME IN BOTH SPECIFIC AND GENERAL WAYS AS OUTLINED ABOVE.

Another argument used in Stepinatz's defence, is that his prosecution for war crimes was politically motivated by Tito's communist Yugoslavia because he was an outspoken critic of the injustices of communism. This claim may appear to have some *prima facie* plausibility, since this type of thing would be consistent with Tito's megalomaniac personality and Nazi phobia. For example, the finding of a U.S. Commission of Inquiry, that the head of the Royal resistance forces, the Chetniks, Dragoliub Mihailovic (1893-1946), and those under his immediate command, were not guilty of Nazi collaboration, was ignored by Tito who had him executed as a Nazi collaborator in 1946. Tito's dictatorial actions and Nazi phobia also resulted in the vast majority of Lutheran Protestants of German descent, together with Roman Catholics of Germanic descent, being either killed or deported from Yugoslavia after World War Two. This was the era of *Tito suspecting that every person of Germanic descent in Yugoslavia was secretly a Nazi*. At a time when alarmist Americans and other alarmist Westerners were overly worried about "a Red" or "communist under every bed," the alarmist Tito was overly worried about "a Nazi under every bed."

This type of claim was present from the time of Stepinatz's trial in 1946. When "Archbishop Aloysius Stepinatz" "said, 'I have honourably carried out my duties,' there was a roar of laughter and some of the audience shouted, 'Yes, your duty to the Ustashi.'" Later "the crowd booed" "Stepinatz." "Bitterly the Archbishop upbraided the Government of Marshal Tito for terrorizing the [Roman] Church, declaring 'not a [Roman] Catholic Bishop or priest is safe for his life'." "As he left the stand, Bishop Joseph P. Hurley, Papal Nuncio to Yugoslavia," "rose and bowed to" "Stepinatz."¹¹¹

But Stepinatz received a more sympathetic ear from the Romanist Archbishop of Boston, USA, Richard Cushing, who said, "'Archbishop Stepinatz is guilty of one crime; it is the crime of being Archbishop of the [Roman] Catholic Church'," and he rejected the trial as "'political propaganda'" by the "'Communist dictatorship'."¹¹² Hence the *New York Times* correspondent, Cortesi, reported at the time of Stepinatz's conviction in 1946, that "the Vatican newspaper, *L'Osservatore Romano*," "brands the sentence as 'shameful,'" and

¹¹¹ "Stepinatz Replies Tito is Terrorist," *New York Times*, 4 Oct. 1946, p. 7.

¹¹² "Bishop Cushing Assails Trial," *New York Times*, 5 Oct. 1946, p. 3

claims “Archbishop Stepinatz’ trial was ‘essentially political’.” “The Zagreb trial was aimed not only at Archbishop Stepinatz but also at the [Roman] Catholic Church, says *L’Osservatore*. It declares that at the same time as he was denounced [in his court case] as an accomplice of the enemy and of the Ustashi, he was described as at the orders of Rome ‘because if his crimes were crimes they should not be his alone but also of the [Roman] Church’.” “This was fortunate in *L’Osservatore’s* opinion, since it said all reasonable and upright men must conclude that ‘Monsignor Stepinatz is a criminal only as far as the [Roman] Catholic Church’” “‘is criminal’.”¹¹³

In support of the proposition that Stepinatz’s charges of collaboration were the result of Tito’s indisputable Nazi phobia and associated abuses of power, (clearly evident in his killing or deportation of most Protestant and Roman Catholic Yugoslavs of Germanic descent,) pro-Stepinatz writers make reference to the fact that the prosecutor at Stepinatz’s 1946 trial, Jalov Blazevic, said in 1985, the “trial of Stepinac was forced on us. If Stepinac had only been more flexible, there would have been no need of a trial.” In the first place, I note that any claim that a person was the victim of Tito’s Nazi phobia must be considered on its merits. That is because it must be remembered that there were some actual Nazi war criminals in this period; and in the case of Stepinatz, the evidence that he was a Nazi Ustashi collaborator is compelling. Thus, for example, the Allies did not protest Stepinatz’s conviction as a Nazi war criminal the way they did protest Mihailovic’s conviction as a collaborator. Furthermore, I note that this claim by pro-Stepinatz writers, that Stepinatz was prosecuted because he was openly anti-communist, unintentionally acts to further indict Stepinatz. After all, if Stepinatz was really a man of unflinching moral conviction and stamina, who was prepared to stand up to, and speak out against, an unjust regime, and take the consequences no matter what, whether that meant political persecution, imprisonment, or death; then why were these same purported qualities not evident in a comparably robust, outspoken, criticism of the injustices of the Nazi Ustashi? Why did he not, like the Serbian Orthodox Patriarch of Belgrade, Gavriilo, who died in prison, defy the Ustashi, resulting in his imprisonment?

In the second place, I note that Blazevic stopped short of saying Stepinatz was innocent, but did say he would not have been prosecuted if he had been more pliable in the hands of Tito’s communists. This indicates a certain strength of character in Stepinatz inconsistent with claims that he was somewhat pliable in the hands of the Ustashi, but he really did not give collaborative support to the Ustashi. It is certainly the case that Tito’s regime sought to diminish the potential danger that a popular anti-communist figure like Stepinatz posed to them, and if he was not prepared to desist from his anti-communism, Tito would have preferred to have simply gotten Stepinatz out of the country. To this end, Tito did seek to avoid putting Stepinatz on trial by asking the Vatican to remove him. But it is quite another thing to say that this means that Tito thought Stepinatz was innocent of Nazi Ustashi collaboration, or that he actually was innocent of such collaboration. The Bishop of Rome had a general policy of not withdrawing World War Two fascist Roman Catholic bishops upon the request of a subsequent non-fascist post World War Two government. For instance, in France, President De Gaulle wanted thirty Petainist bishops from Petain’s Vichy French Nazi era to be retired, but the Papal nuncio, Roncalli, succeeded in reducing this number to just three. Roncalli later became the next Pope, John XXIII (Pope 1958-65). Thus in refusing to remove a fascist collaborating bishop in Croatia, the Vatican was acting

¹¹³ Cortesi, A., “Vatican Indignant and Sorrowful at Prison Sentence for Stepinatz,” *New York Times*, 12 Oct. 1946, p. 7.

consistently with its general policy elsewhere, and in the case of (the second) Yugoslavia, the Pope would be even less likely to accede to such a request given his strong anti-communist stance.

Moreover, Blazevic here portrays himself as a weak-willed and unprincipled man, unable to stand up under pressure to the communists, and prepared to commit perjury for them in order to prosecute Stepinatz. Blazevic is thus a man who admits his moral qualities include cowardice, dishonesty, and perjury. This is a grave admission. In his list of those outside the city gates of Paradise, St. John includes “the fearful” (AV) or “cowardly” (NKJV) (Rev. 21:8), and thrice mentions “liars” (Rev. 21:8,27; 22:15). If Blazevic’s 1986 statements are to be believed, this means that in 1946 he believed Stepinatz should not have been tried. If so, I consider Blazevic *was sincerely wrong* in this belief, but he was also clearly prepared to go against his conscience and prosecute Stepinatz. But given that the man is an admitted coward and perjurer, necessarily raises the question of whether in fact he is lying in 1986, as a cowardly consequence of pressure, probably from Croatian Roman Catholics involved in the process of Stepinatz’s beatification, and /or pressure from the Vatican, to try and present Stepinatz in a more favourable light? Evidence for such pressure is found in the fact that after Stepinatz was convicted as a Nazi war criminal in 1946, the Vatican immediately pronounced a decree of excommunication against all those involved in Stepinatz’s trial. The “Declaration” of the “Sacred Congregation of the Council” in Rome said, “Msgr. [Monsignor] Aloysius Stepinatz, Archbishop of Zagreb, was arbitrarily arrested and unjustly sentenced.” “The [Roman] Church provides for the defense of sacred persons.” “Therefore the Sacred Congregation” “declares that all those who have contributed, physically or morally, toward the consummation of” these “crimes” against “Msgr. [Monsignor] Aloysius Stepinatz,” “or were necessary cooperators in them,” “have incurred” “excommunications, to which they will remain subject until they have obtained absolution from the Apostolic See.” Signed “F. Cardinal MARMAGGI, Prefect. F. Roberti, Secretary.”¹¹⁴

This means that for Blazevic to be free from this excommunication, he would, among other things, need to renounce his involvement in the Stepinatz trial. Thus it must be reasonably asked if his 1986 recantation was the result of this duress by the Roman Church, against a Papist who did not want to die excommunicated from his Church? Whether Blazevic was lying and showing cowardice in 1946, or whether Blazevic was lying and showing cowardice in 1986, the fact remains, that this man’s testimony in no way effects the legal case against Stepinatz, which is based on solid evidence. *Even if one concludes that this cowardly liar is telling the truth in 1986, the case in support of Stepinatz as a collaborator is so strong, it would only go to prove that in 1946 Blazevic was not only deceitful and cowardly, but also inept and sincerely wrong in his view that Stepinatz ought not to be tried.*

Furthermore, it should be remembered that Stepinatz’s trial in 1946 was conducted publicly in front of the world’s press, the Papal nuncio, Bishop Hurley, the British consul, and the American consul. This was not a communist show trial, as seen, for example, by the lack of any such contemporary claims by the British or American consuls. By contrast, the American protests at the finding that the Chetnik leader, Mihailovic, was guilty of

¹¹⁴ Cortesi, A., “Officials in Stepinatz Case Excommunicated by Vatican,” *New York Times*, 15 Oct. 1946, pp. 1,16. The Vatican announced this decree of excommunication on 14 Oct. 1946 (“[Roman] Church Bans Yugoslavs Who Slew Trieste Priest,” *New York Times*, 12 Sept. 1947, p. 9).

collaboration, shows that they were certainly prepared to make such protests when this was considered warranted. *But most fundamentally of all, the case against Stepinatz in 1946, 1986, and any other date, rests on the evidence against him of Nazi Ustashi collaboration during World War Two, and not on variable political considerations as to whether or not the subsequent regime could best deal with him by removal from the country or trial. Even if Tito had gotten his wish and Stepinatz had been withdrawn from Yugoslavia, so that there had been no specific war crimes trial of Stepinatz, the evidence would still show that Stepinatz was a Nazi Ustashi collaborator who would have been convicted as a Nazi collaborator had he (as in fact he was,) been put on trial*¹¹⁵.

For my purposes, the salient point involves examining enough of Stepinatz's trial to show that he was a Nazi collaborator. For my limited purposes I shall not deal with Count 4 of the indictment¹¹⁶, nor all of Count 5. The fourth issue I shall consider deals with one element in the last count of the indictment against him at his war crimes trial. After the fall of the Ustashi regime, Stepinatz sought to help the Ustashi set up a new regime (Count 5).

Issue 4: After the Nazi Ustashi regime collapsed, Stepinatz sought to help the Ustashi set up a new regime.

When he was arrested, it was said that "Archbishop Aloysius Stepinatz, Roman Catholic Primate of Yugoslavia," "was" "the center of terrorist opposition to the Government." "Witnesses charged that Ustashi activities since the war had been directed from the 'main center in the Zagreb Archbishopric, which was in the hands of Archbishop Stepinatz'."¹¹⁷ In July 1944, Stepinatz declared, "All must apply themselves with even greater effort to the defence and building up of the State." "The people of Croatia who shed their blood for their State will preserve and save it." Stepinatz then appears to have been grieved by the collapse of the Nazi Ustashi regime. After it collapsed, he received in the Archbishop's Palace, Ustashi leaders who had illegally returned to the country, who were seeking to start up Ustashi terrorist groups to work against the government. For instance, the Ustashi Chief of Police under Pavelitch, Colonel Eric Lisak, illegally returned to Croatia in November 1945. He secretly went to the Archbishop's Palace and was personally received by Stepinatz, who did not advise the authorities of this.

Furthermore, it is clear that the Vatican helped the Ustashi stash ill-gotten gain in Rome, and after the war the *College of San Girolamo degli Illirici* in Rome, was used as the underground Ustashi headquarters facilitating an escape route for Nazi Ustashi war criminals, who were given false passports and identities in order to help evade the Allies. Thus it is significant that at the same time he secretly saw Lisak, Stepinatz was also in contact with a female Italian spy, Lela Sepijanec, who transported his messages to and from the Ustashi in Trieste. Moreover, part of the gold stolen from Ustashi victims was hidden in a nearby Franciscan monastery. It was concealed below a Popish confessional, and then cemented over by the Franciscans friars. This gold included such gruesome objects as victims' weddings rings, false teeth, and other personal belongings. The stashing of this Ustashi State

¹¹⁵ Ramet, *op. cit.*, p. 129; quoting *Polet* 8 & 15 Feb 1985; Falconi, *op. cit.*, pp. 286,317-8,413.

¹¹⁶ During 1944-5 when the Nazi's were collapsing, Stepinatz entered liaison with Ustashi leaders with a view to inviting armed intervention from abroad in order to "save" the "independent State of Croatia" (Count 4).

¹¹⁷ "Yugoslav Primate Seized as Traitor," *New York Times*, 19 Sept. 1946, pp. 1,2.

Treasure implies that it was put there in the hope of an Ustashi return which would drive out Tito's Partisans. Foreign Office records of 6 May 1945 show that Stepinatz had personally signed a receipt for these incriminating ill-gotten gains, which was then handed to the Ustashi Foreign Minister, Alabegovic. What saith the Word of God? "Cursed be he that taketh reward to slay an innocent person. And all the people shall say, Amen" (Deut. 27:25)¹¹⁸.

I think the only possible defence that could be made for this, was that Pavelitch was "a good anti-communist" who wanted "the red menace out of Croatia." But *two wrongs don't make a right*, and given the Allies' World War Two position that the Nazis constituted a more serious menace to Europe than the communists, I think that if this was his motive, then Stepinatz should have funnelled his anti-communist sentiment through a more acceptable channel, for example, in public statements supporting the bravery of the Chetniks as World War Two resistance fighters against the Nazi Ustashi. On his visit in May and June 1943 to the Vatican, Stepinatz said to the Pope, "Holy Father," "Let us not mention the horrible fate that would befall [Roman] Catholics in Croatia should the Bolshevik beast win through and" "occupy" "Croatia." "Holy Father!" "The" "State of Croatia" "shows at every turn that it longs to remain faithful to its splendid [Roman] Catholic traditions and to win for the [Roman] Catholic Church" "a better and brighter hope for the future. On the other hand, by its loss or even fatal reduction," "not only would the 240,000 converts from Serbian Orthodoxy be annihilated, but also the whole [Roman] Catholic population of these territories, and with them all their churches and convents."¹¹⁹ Stepinatz's dire predictions did not prove to be the case when the admittedly ugly "Bolshevik beast" did "win through." There is clearly a very big contrast here between Stepinatz's concern for the fate of "the 240,000 converts from Serbian Orthodoxy" to Roman Catholicism whom he fears will "be annihilated" by "the Bolshevik beast," and his lack of comparable concern for a much larger number of Serbian Orthodox who were annihilated by the Nazi Ustashi beast for refusing to convert to Roman Catholicism, together with the Gypsies, Jews, and Protestants of Serbian descent annihilated by the Ustashi beast. Stepinatz may, for example, have spoken in favour of Mihailovic and supported the Chetniks during World War Two if this was his passionate concern. Instead he supported the murderous Ustashi who wanted the Romanization of Croatia, and so once again Stepinatz showed himself to be a Ustashi collaborator and thus a Nazi war criminal.

In summary of the case against Stepinatz, the evidence for his collaboration with the Nazi Ustashi is seen in specific acts by Stepinatz, namely, he publicly endorsed the Ustashi in April 1941. Between May and December 1941 when over 200,000 Serbian Orthodox were killed who refused to convert to Roman Catholicism, in actions involving some Roman Catholic clergy working with the Ustashi, during which time about thousands of Jews were also killed, together with Gypsies and a relatively small number of Protestants of Serbian descent who refused to convert to Roman Catholicism, Stepinatz issued a circular urging that Romish "conversions be speeded up and carried out without obstacles," though he showed concern for Roman Catholics of Jewish descent. He requested that the Church of Rome benefit from the Ustashi's programme by giving the historically important Orahovica Serbian Orthodox Monastery to his Roman Catholic Trappist monks. Commenting on Stepinatz's actions in 1941, the Zagreb Roman Catholic newspaper, *Katoliki List*, reported that Stepinatz had "established a close collaboration between the Ustashi and the supreme representative of

¹¹⁸ Falconi, *op. cit.*, p. 314; Cornwell, J., *op. cit.*, p. 266; Butler's *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, p. 284; Butler's *In the Land of Nod*, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 311-2.

the Roman Catholic Church in the State of Croatia,” that is, himself. Later in June of that year, this same newspaper reported a sermon of Stepinatz in which he addressed Pavelitch and pledged to him a “promise” of “sincere and loyal collaboration.”

Between 1942 and 1945 Stepinatz continued his official presence at public occasions with the Ustashi. In January 1942 he was reported in the *Croatian Senital* as saying “Hitler is a God-sent leader; the” Fascist-Nazi “Axis powers” “are fighting” “against the English and Jewish capitalist plutocracy.” As a member of the Ustashi’s legislature, Stepinatz made a speech at its opening in February 1942 addressing the known regicidal murderer Pavelitch in very favourable terms. To celebrate Pavelitch’s birthday in June 1942, Stepinatz sent a circular to Roman Catholic clergy asking for a High Mass for “the glorious Chief,” “Anton Pavelitch.” In 1942 he made a visit to Rome and in the record of Stepinatz’s report to the Pope he said “the situation in” “Croatia” “is favourable,” “he praises the work and effort of the government,” is “eloquent in his praise of” Pavelitch, and said “one cannot and must not allow anyone to attack” the Ustashi Croatia. Stepinatz wore Ustashi insignia, and in 1944 he accepted the highest Ustashi decoration. His general acts of support for the Ustashi included: his position as Chaplain-General of the Ustashi and general militia; his appointment of Ustashi chaplains; his failure to discipline these or any Roman Catholic clergy for their part in atrocities such as forced conversions to Roman Catholicism; his written complaints to the Romish bishop of Mostar and Minister for Italian Affairs in Zagreb, that when the Italian Second Army moved into part of the *Independent State of Croatia* and stopped the Ustashi’s activities, that the Serbian Orthodox “Churches have immediately come to life again,” so that “a constant decline in religious life is to be observed” with a “discernable shift from [Roman] Catholicism to schism,” thus clearly indicating that Stepinatz wanted Romanization of this region in collaboration with Ustashi policy. Stepinatz also gave general support in Roman Catholic newspapers under his jurisdiction to the Nazi Ustashi throughout 1941 to 1945. He also accepted the political leadership of the Ustashi State in a handover of power to him from the Nazis, when Pavelitch fled just before Tito’s Partisan army arrived, and he further sought to assist the Ustashi set up a new Nazi regime after Tito had established his communist regime.

It is clear that the actions of the Nazi Ustashi as established under Pavelitch’s Ustashi were designed so that one could conceptualize various actions against Serbs, Jews, and Gypsies, either as the outworking of secular non-religious Nazi racial theoretics, or as the outworking of Roman Catholic Inquisition rules under a Croatian Inquisition. This required interpreting certain Inquisition discretions in a particular way e.g., Jews were not spared but killed under the “purity of blood” (*limpieza de sangre*) *converso* laws; Protestants of German descent were spared under an Inquisition discretion, whereas in the earlier days of the Ustashi regime the relatively small number of Protestants of Jewish or Serbian descent were not so spared. At heart, I think Stepinatz was a Romish religious Inquisitor type of man, rather than a secularist Nazi racial theoretic type of man. This fact appears to have sometimes caused some conflict between Stepinatz and the Pavelitch regime, since Stepinatz would sometimes have liked to have exercised these Inquisition theoretics in a different way i.e., as though Croatian Inquisition theoretics were the ONLY way to be conceptualizing the process. Nevertheless, such conflicts aside, as a broad package deal he clearly collaborated with the Nazi Ustashi regime of Pavelitch, often, if not always, getting what he wanted out of the deal; albeit sometimes grumbling and complaining about the way that this or that Croatian Inquisition discretion was being exercised by Pavelitch *et al*, and causing varying levels of friction with them in the process. On the one hand, this means that Stepinatz was not the controlling power in the Nazi Ustashi regime’s policies; but on the other hand, this means

Stepinatz was guilty of the lesser crime of being a Nazi Ustashi collaborator and therefore a Nazi war criminal.

CHAPTER 5

WOULD STEPINATZ HAVE BEEN DEALT WITH DIFFERENTLY IF MIHAILOVIC'S ROYALIST CHETNIK'S HAD WON, RATHER THAN TITO'S COMMUNIST PARTISANS?

Pro-Stepinatz Roman Catholic propaganda commonly claims that after Stepinatz “spoke out against the persecution of the [Roman] Church by the communists,” he was then “tried” “on trumped-up charges¹²⁰.” We cannot doubt that Tito failed to give religious freedom in (the second) Yugoslavia, and this denial of religious liberty was worse in the earlier years of his communist regime. Among Protestants, Lutherans met secretly under Tito’s repressive regime until 1951, when some limited religious freedom was finally granted to them. Moreover, Bishop William Manning had been a champion in favour of Mihailovic’s Chetniks during World War Two. Writing in 1947, the then Retired Anglican Bishop of New York, Bishop Manning, noted that the Serbian Orthodox “Bishops Nicholai [Velimirovic] of Ticha and Ochrida, and Iriney [Georgevitch] of Dalmatia,” both “endured the horrors of concentration camps” under the Nazis, the former “at Dachau and the” later “at Bari.” But under Tito’s communists both “Bishop Nicholai and Bishop Iriney,” were “in New York as refugees” from the communist regime of “Tito.” Bishop Manning observed that “Winston Churchill has acknowledged that the withdrawal of support from Mikhailovitch was a tragic mistake, and that Britain and the United States were completely deceived by Tito and his friends.¹²¹” Thus at the time of Stepinatz’s arrest and trial, Tito was clearly denying religious freedom to Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Eastern Orthodox. But this does not in itself prove that the trial of Stepinatz was a manifestation of Tito’s religious persecutions, and indeed the evidence does not support this claim, which the Papists have used as a smoke-screen to try and conceal Stepinatz’s guilt.

Furthermore, pro-Stepinatz writers often point to Stepinatz’s good deeds, and somehow think that these invalidate the reality of his bad deeds. For example, in “1938, he founded the Relief Action for Refugee Jews under his protection.¹²²” But even if one gives full credence to all the statements used by pro-Stepinatz supporters, these do not change the reality of his guilt as a collaborator. We cannot enter into the mind of Stepinatz to account for the many good things he did. Different constructions are possible upon these. For example, was he erratic and mentally unstable, and hence simply inconsistent? Or was he trying to create an alibi to cover himself if things went wrong and the Allies won? Or did he

¹²⁰ *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (2003), Vol. 13, p. 527 (“STEPINAC, ALOJZIJE VIKTOR, BL”).

¹²¹ “Religion in Yugoslavia,” “Lack of Freedom Under Tito Regime Pointed Out by Bishop Manning,” Bishop William Manning’s Letter to the Editor, *New York Times*, 11 Sept. 1947, p. 26; “Religion in Yugoslavia,” Bishop Manning’s Letter to the Editor, *New York Times*, 3 Oct. 1947, p. 24 (both of Manning’s letters referring to David Martin’s *Ally Betrayed - The Uncensored Story of Tito and Mikhailovitch*); and “Religion in Yugoslavia,” William Melish’s Letter to the Editor, *New York Times*, 22 Sept. 1947, p. 22.

¹²² *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (2003), Vol. 13, p. 527 (“STEPINAC, ALOJZIJE VIKTOR, BL”).

from time to time have serious misgivings, genuine doubts, and sincere criticisms of the Nazi Ustashi regime? But contrary to the claims of pro-Stepinatz writers, whatever Stepinatz's reasons for his many good acts, they do not somehow invalidate the overwhelming evidence that he was a Nazi Ustashi collaborator. At best, they show he had twinges of conscience over his collaboration, but that he then ignored these, as with an ever more seared and seared conscience, he continued his collaboration with the Ustashi. Therefore, the pro-Stepinatz supporters' evidence is irrelevant to the main points at his trial with respect to the issue of his guilt in collaborating with the Ustashi from 1941 to 1945.

I have no reason to doubt the broad accuracy of the claims made by pro-Stepinatz writers with respect to Stepinatz's random acts of kindness, and much of the evidence of good character traits. For example, he showed some resistance to some of the Ustashi laws against political dissidents and persons of Jewish descent. For instance, some of the political dissidents sent to Jasenovac concentration camp included a Roman Catholic priest, "Father" Rihar, whom Artukovitch said "was sentenced to" "the concentration camp at Jasenovac" in 1942, "because as pastor of Gornja Stubica he did not celebrate a solemn high mass on the anniversary of the founding of the Independent State of Croatia," "nor did he consent to sing the" "*Te Deum*." Stepinatz unsuccessfully appealed to Artukovitch against this sentence, but since Rihar had already spent three months at Jasenovac, he had under the rules operating at Jasenovac already been killed. But as Butler rightly notes, Stepinatz was "hopelessly compromised by his official connection with the" Nazi Ustashi "state." "How" "could Stepinac defend Father Rihar with any authority, since he himself had done what Rihar refused to do?" That is, on Paveltich's birthday in 1942, Stepinatz sent a letter "exhorting his clergy to hold a *Te Deum* after High Mass the following Sunday," "because of 'Our Glorious Leader'," that is, Paveltich¹²³.

Likewise, Stepinatz established the *Relief Action for Refugee Jews* in 1938 and gave assistance to *some* persecuted persons of Jewish descent. Most of those whom he assisted of Jewish descent were adherents of Judaism, but some of them were adherents of either Roman Catholicism or Protestantism. For example, his relief fund paid for half of the weekly assistance to some Protestants refugees of Jewish descent, and the other half was paid by the *Protestant Relief Fund* in England¹²⁴. But it is also the case, that on 30 May 1941, Stepinatz urged Artukovitch "to separate the [Roman] Catholic Aryans from non-Christian non-Aryans in relation to their social position and in the manner of treating them."¹²⁵ That is, he wanted Roman Catholics who were of Jewish descent treated better by the Ustashi regime than adherents of Judaism who were of Jewish descent; whilst making no comment about Protestants of Jewish descent. This 1941 petition clearly shows that Stepinatz was sympathetic to the Ustashi's program of Romanizing Serbs, since he endorsed this basic principle when he urged better treatment for Romanists than non-Romanists of Jewish descent, and contextually this meant that he wanted the same kind of *Inquisition* distinction made between persons of Jewish descent that the Nazi regime was already making for persons of Serbian descent. Thus Stepinatz did not support Nazi racial theoretics used against persons of Jewish descent. But *in practice* it made little difference to most Jews whether the legal theory for their persecution was religious (Stepinatz's *Croatian Inquisition* approach,) or racial (the Nazi's genocidal secular political approach), since the vast majority

¹²³ Butler, H., *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, pp. 285-6.

¹²⁴ O'Brien, A.H.C., *Archbishop Stepinac*, *op. cit.*, p. 12. *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (2003), Vol. 13, p. 527 ("STEPINAC, ALOJZIJE VIKTOR, BL").

¹²⁵ Butler, H., *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, p. 286.

of persons of Jewish descent were also adherents of Judaism. And where they were not, the Spanish Inquisition racial distinction between *converso* Jews and Papists, meant that the government running the Croatian Inquisition i.e., the Ustashi and its officials, could still choose to conclude that the *converso* Jews were not true “converts” and so persecute or kill them anyway.

In the final analysis, usage of this type of evidence by pro-Stepinatz writers about how, for example, Stepinatz tried to give assistance to *some* political dissidents and *some* persons of Jewish descent, is irrelevant to the fact of his being generally in a Nazi Ustashi collaboration. I do not doubt that Stepinatz’s desire to have a Roman Catholic Croatian Inquisition which had its discretions unfettered by secular Nazi racial theoretics, would have resulted in a number of Jews and Serbs being spared who were in fact killed, and also a number of Lutheran Protestants of German descent probably being killed that in fact were spared under Pavelitch’s usage of these same discretions. But if, for example, a man was found guilty of murder, it would be irrelevant to show evidence that, for example, the man had been a staunch campaigner in favour of capital punishment for murder, that he had stood with other protestors outside abortion clinics, and that he had delivered a series of public addresses on the dangers posed to society by tolerance towards murder as seen in the effects on societies that historically allowed cannibalism or human sacrifice to pagan idols. Such evidence may go to show that the man acted *inconsistently* at times. But this evidence would constitute red herrings. So too, the many good works pro-Stepinatz writers point to are red herrings, and irrelevant to the issue of this man’s guilt as a Nazi collaborator.

But this type of evidence is relevant at the point of sentencing. It shows that Stepinatz was not in the same evil league as the men tried and sentenced in Nuremberg at the end of World War Two. The difference between these men and Stepinatz is like the difference between a group of crazed serial murderers and thieves (those sentenced at Nuremberg); and a shady part-time criminal who runs a legitimate small business during the day, is a respected member of the local business community, and is known to sometimes give generous gifts to charity, but who secretly enhances the profits of his business by laundering ill-gotten gain into it from his occasional night-time activities, which entail taking money from organized crime bosses as a reward for helping them to hide murderers and thieves in a secret cellar under his house, in the hope that the police won’t catch them. He *sometimes* daydreams about how, “I’d like to be a big-time gangster and murder people who got in my way;” but these desires are never anything more than his daydreams (Stepinatz). Both types of men violate the sixth, eighth, and ninth commandments, “Thou shalt not kill,” “Thou shalt not steal,” and “Thou shalt not bear false witness,” but the former are guilty of far more egregious breaches of these moral precepts than the latter.

I do not wish to “white-wash” Stepinatz whose gruesome enthusiasm for a Roman Catholic Croatian Inquisition with discretions unfettered by secular Nazi racial theoretics, as opposed to a secular guided Nazi racial theoretics policy of genocide using Inquisition discretions to achieve its ends, *in its own way would have been sufficiently ugly to warrant the death penalty for murder if Stepinatz had gotten his way and that is what had been set up. But Stepinatz did not get his own way* on the decisions of who would die and who would live. At the end of the day Stepinatz was on trial for a specific issue, to wit, Nazi war crimes. In this context, it is clear that he was not the one making the decisions as to who would die and who would live in Greater Croatia, and that if he were, some of the Serbs and Jews who died would have been spared, and most of the Protestants of German descent who were spared probably would not have been spared. The parameters of Nazi war crimes for which

Stepinatz was on trial were in some ways too narrow to deal properly with the issues at stake in the Nazi Ustashi's Greater Croatia, i.e., the issue of how these were simultaneously conceptualized from the paradigm of Roman Catholic Inquisition theoretics was not specifically dealt with. Nevertheless, these narrow parameters, which in some ways anachronistically tried to conceptualize Greater Croatia's Nazi racial theoretics and *modus operandi* in the same terms as the Nazi's *modus operandi* outside of Greater Croatia, were the parameters relevant at Stepinatz's trial. And inside these narrow parameters the reality is that Stepinatz was clearly a collaborator with the Nazi Ustashi, rather than a Nazi Ustashi controlling organizer such as Pavelitch or Artukovitch. Stepinatz's collaboration greatly helped the Nazi Ustashi in their programme of mass murder, but it was their call, and not Stepinatz's, as to who would live and who would die. Thus while from the Protestant paradigm of Divine Law, in moral and spiritual terms he is guilty under God's law of violating the Sixth Commandment in the Holy Decalogue, "Thou shalt not kill" (Exod. 20:13; Luke 10:25-37; 18:20); nevertheless, in terms of how secular courts determine such matters, his involvement is properly characterized as collaboration.

Furthermore, looking at the matter in terms of purely secular law, which is the legal theory on which he was tried, and indeed all Nazi war criminals were tried by the Allies here on earth; on the basis of the evidence that Stepinatz did a number of good things, including assistance to some persecuted Protestants of Jewish descent, I think it can be reasonably argued that Stepinatz should have received a lighter sentence than some collaborators for whom such good things cannot be said. Specifically, I think it can be reasonably argued that he should not have been executed, and indeed he was not. *Thus Stepinatz was fortunate that he did not get his own way and have a Croatian Inquisition that exercised inquisition discretions purely on the basis of Roman Catholic religious considerations, since if he had, he would then have been given powers he did not have under the Ustashi, and in turn, he would have become guilty of far more serious crimes of mass murder. For while under God's law by which a man's soul is judged (Exod. 20:1-17; Eccl. 12:7,13,14), a man's sexual "lust" is enough for him to violate the 7th commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and (if he is not in Christ) to warrant his sentence to "hell" (Matt. 5:27-29); or a man's desire to violate the 6th commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," is a sufficient breach of the Decalogue to warrant (if he is not in Christ) his sentence to "hell" (Matt. 5:21,22); nevertheless, under the secular law a man who simply wished he could kill someone, is not regarded for legal purposes as a murderer.*

Given that under M. Wimpulsek, the President of the Court which tried and sentenced him, Stepinatz received a relatively light sentence of 16 years with hard labour; and given the fact that the "hard labour" element was never enforced; followed by his release with confinement to Krasic, where he was given the freedom of the town and allowed to function as the local Popish priest after serving about six years; I think it fair to say that this Nazi war criminal was *generously treated* by the legal processes, and so these type of considerations must have been fully taken into account. *But while Stepinatz was thus by no means the worst type of Nazi war criminal to emerge from World War Two, he was, nevertheless, a high profile figure who was properly convicted as a Nazi war criminal. Moreover, it must be frankly said the only reason he was not guilty of more serious crimes is that the Nazi Ustashi state were not prepared to set up the type of Roman Catholic Croatian Inquisition that Stepinatz wanted, but rather a Croatian Inquisition whose usage of inquisition discretions was OUT OF HIS HANDS and at every step guided by secular state policies emanating from Nazi racial theoretics.*

Therefore I consider the communist regime of Tito showed proper restraint, fairness, and dispassion, in trying and imprisoning Stepinatz. Pro-Stepinatz advocates have consistently claimed that Stepinatz's trial was politically motivated by Tito's communist Yugoslavia because Stepinatz was an outspoken anti-communist. For example, at the request of the Irish-American Roman Catholic Archbishop of Omaha, Nebraska (1945-7, Romish Bishop of Omaha from 1935), Archbishop James Ryan, a petition was presented to Matthew Connelly, Presidential Secretary to U.S. President Harry S. Truman (USA President 1945-53). This petition was "in protest against 'both the trial and sentence' of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinatz." "The petition described the trial of Archbishop Stepinatz as a joke" "and his prison sentence as a political one."¹²⁶

Likewise the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster and Primate of England and Wales (1943-56), Bernard Cardinal Griffin, said that under Tito's communist regime 186 Romish priests had been murdered, 32 sentenced to death by a court, 85 sentenced to life imprisonment, and 409 "forced into exile." He said, "200 priests, three vicars general and Archbishop Stepinatz are" "in prison." On the basis of these figures, he then made the staggering claim, "*The number of these priests was greater than that of any victims of any massacre known in Balkan history for centuries*"¹²⁷." Quite apart from the fact that Cardinal Griffin omits reference to any Nazi Ustashi crimes by any of these Romish priests, even on his numbers of some 200 Romish priests awaiting trial, and 218 Romish priests killed (some with trial some without trial), the claim that this constitutes a "greater" "massacre" than any "known in Balkan history for centuries" constitutes a denial of the *far greater massacre under the Nazi Ustashi*. The massacre of 750,000 to 800,000 Serbs thoroughly dwarfs Griffin's 218 Romish priests killed (32 of whom he says were in fact executed after a court trial). That Cardinal Griffin was prepared to make this outrageous claim about what he calls a "greater" "massacre" than any "known in Balkan history for centuries," and use as an example of this general issue the fact that "Archbishop Stepinatz" is "in prison," when Stepinatz was in prison as a collaborator with the Nazi Ustashi whose massacre of 30,000 Gypsies or 30,000 Jews alone dwarfs Griffin's so called greatest Balkan's "massacre" "for centuries" of 218 Popish priests, acts to show how those in the Roman Church, such as this "prince" of the Roman Church, Cardinal Griffin, have sought to promulgate a revisionist history in which Stepinatz is depicted as an innocent man victimized by a cruel communist regime. While I do not wish to deny that Tito was the dictator of a cruel communist regime, it is simultaneously clear that the Roman Church has misused this fact to try and white-wash Stepinatz and the involvement of other Romanist clergy in the Nazi Ustashi mass murders and mass conversions.

But as Hubert Butler rightly noted, given the publication of such Serbian Orthodox books as *The Martyrdom of the Serbs* (1943), had Mihailovic's anti-communist Chetnik's won, rather than Tito's communist Partisans, and Yugoslavia reconstituted under the Serbian Orthodox monarchy, it seems inconceivable that the trial of Stepinatz could have been avoided¹²⁸. Published in the middle of World War Two, *The Martyrdom of the Serbs* is both

¹²⁶ "Stepinatz Protest Filed," *New York Times*, 12 Jan. 1947, p. 24; "Prominent Ryans," Ryan, M., "The Ryan Family in the United States: From Colonial Times to the Present," Excerpt from the Bulletin of The Eire Society of Boston, USA, Vol. 52, No. 3, 1993 (www.ryans.org/ProminentRyans.htm).

¹²⁷ "English Primate Asks U.N. Yugoslav Inquiry," *New York Times*, 14 July 1947, p. 19 (emphasis mine).

¹²⁸ Butler's *In the Land of Nod*, *op. cit.*, p. 138; Butler's *The Sub-Prefect Should*

anti-communist and pro-Mihailovic. It has a *Foreword* by, and associated photograph of, the Anglican Bishop of New York, Bishop William Manning, a well known supporter of Mihailovic's Chetniks and opponent of Tito's communists¹²⁹. For example, when just after World War Two, Manning criticized the lack of religious freedom in (the second) Yugoslavia under Tito's communists, Manning's critic, William Melish, who sought to absurdly claim that Tito's communists were upholding religious freedom in 1947, referred negatively to "Bishop Manning," whom he says "was a champion of the Serbian Chetniks under Draja Mikhailovitch."¹³⁰ Amidst documentation of the mass murder of Serbs, the Ustashi policy of forced conversions to Romanism, and the involvement of Romanist clergy, we read *in 1943 by those opposed to Tito's communist Partisans who were hoping that Mihailovic's Chetniks would defeat the Nazi Ustashi*, "Archbishop Stepinec of Zagreb and the other [Romanist] bishops of Croatia signified their approval of this unchristian and wild orgy of blood, for at no time did they raise their voices of objection to such conduct of their clergy, nor did they by any act or move attempt to exhibit their displeasure, at least, of these crimes. Their ominous silence is but proof of their condonation."¹³¹

The Martyrdom of the Serbs also reproduces a letter to Stepinatz said to have been signed by "Prislav Grizogono, Former Minister of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia" on "February 8, 1942."¹³² This is a well-known letter, copies of which have also been translated by the Yugoslav historian and former Director of the *Genocide Victims Museum* in Belgrade, Milan Bulajic; as well the renowned Nazi hunter, Simon Wiesenthal, who founded the associated anti-Nazi *Simon Wiesenthal Center*, Los Angeles, California, USA, in 1977. Bulajic and the late Wiesenthal were favourably known to each other before the latter's death, on one occasion meeting in Vienna, Austria, to discuss Croatian President Tudjman's revisionist history of the Nazi Ustashi era¹³³. E.g., in 1994 Croatia introduced the "kuna" as their currency. This is the same currency as used by the Nazi Ustashi during 1941-5, and the *10 Kuna* note features a picture of Stepinatz in Cardinal's dress. Bulajic refers to disputation as to the authorship of this letter to Stepinatz¹³⁴. In my opinion, the issue of authorship is a secondary matter that I will not now consider. The primary point is that this letter was clearly given wide circulation from at least 1943. Bulajic has shown that the British Foreign Office received a copy of this letter in June 1943; and the publication of the letter in *The Martyrdom of the Serbs* in 1943 means that it stands out as a well publicised *Open Letter to Stepinatz* in 1943, irrespective of the identity of its author. (Stepinatz was also known to be

Have Held His Tongue, op. cit., pp. 273-4.

¹²⁹ *The Martyrdom of the Serbs, Persecution of the Serbian Orthodox Church and Massacre of the Serbian People, Prepared and Issued by the Serbian Eastern Orthodox Diocese for the United States and Canada, Chicago, Illinois, USA, 1943, pp. 1-3,19,198.*

¹³⁰ "Religion in Yugoslavia," "Lack of Freedom Under Tito Regime Pointed Out by Bishop Manning," Bishop William Manning's Letter to the Editor, *New York Times*, 11 Sept. 1947, p. 26; "Religion in Yugoslavia," Bishop Manning's Letter to the Editor, *New York Times*, 3 Oct. 1947, p. 24; and "Religion in Yugoslavia," William Melish's Letter to the Editor, *New York Times*, 22 Sept. 1947, p. 22.

¹³¹ *The Martyrdom of the Serbs, op. cit.*, p. 177.

¹³² *Ibid.*, pp. 289-94.

¹³³ Bulajic, M., *Tudjman's "Jasenovac Myth," op. cit.*, p. 91, and prefatory page showing a picture of Bulajic and Wiesenthal together in Vienna to discuss Tudjman's *Wastelands*; and Wiesenthal, S., *Jasenovac in Second World War* (www.balkan-archive.org/yo/kostal/jasenovac-1941).

¹³⁴ Bulajic, M., *Tudjman's "Jasenovac Myth," op. cit.*, pp. 94-7.

in contact with the American Archbishop of New York, Spellman, around this time¹³⁵; and the Roman Church should have specifically brought this American published *Open Letter* to Stepinatz's attention, although there is no direct evidence that they did so.)

This letter dated February 1942 states, "For fully ten months now," "the Serbs in Croatia are being exterminated in a most beastly manner, with" "their property subject to destruction." "Since the first day of the Independent Croatian State the Serbs have been massacred (Gospich, Gudovac, Bos. Krajina, etc.) and this massacring has continued to this day. These atrocities do not amount to simple killings alone. They aim at the extermination of every Serb, men, women, and children, and with terribly wild tortures of the victims." For example, "Serbs were struck on poles alive and fires built on their bare chests. Literally they were roasted alive, being burned to death in their homes and in their churches. In many cases boiling water was poured on living victims before their mutilation," "and their eyes gouged out while they were still living." "The beards and moustaches of the [Serbian Orthodox] priests" "were ripped off," and some "were tied to trucks and dragged" along the ground. (I here omit details of other bodily mutation and desecration of dead human bodies, as from my religiously conservative Protestant Christian paradigm they are unfit for publication, being things among "the depths of Satan" of which "it is a shame even to speak," Eph. 5:12; Rev. 2:24.).

"Many were thrown into the deep cisterns and caves," "children were thrown into fire or scalding water, and then fed to the fired lime furnaces" (I here omit some details of these assaults and murders as unfit for publication, being things among "the depths of Satan" of which "it is a shame even to speak," Eph. 5:12; Rev. 2:24). "Thousands upon thousands of Serbian bodies floated down the Sava, Drava, and Danube rivers and their tributaries." "In one boat on the Sava there was a pile of children's head with a woman's head (presumably that of the mother of the children)" (I here omit details of the desecration of dead human bodies and associated attacks on the sanctity of human life as unfit for publication, being things among "the depths of Satan" of which "it is a shame even to speak," Eph. 5:12; Rev. 2:24). "Countless women and girls were raped," and around "3,000 Serbs were murdered in the Serbian Orthodox Church at Glina" and there was a "massacre of Serbs" in the Serbian Orthodox Church "at Kladusha" (I here omit details of rapes, child sexual abuse, and murders, as unfit for publication, being things among "the depths of Satan" of which "it is a shame even to speak," Eph. 5:12; Rev. 2:24). These atrocities "were so terrible as to have shocked even the [Nazi] Germans and the [Fascist] Italians. Many pictures were taken of these massacres and" acts of "torture" (I here omit details of some photographs showing desecration of dead human bodies which thus attack the sanctity of human life, as unfit for publication, being things among "the depths of Satan" of which "it is a shame even to speak," Eph. 5:12; Rev. 2:24). "The horror in the camps where thousands of Serbs were murdered or left to die from hunger, cold and mistreatment, is indescribable. The [Nazi] Germans tell about one camp in Lika in which the [Nazi Ustashi] Croats confined thousands of Serbs. Yet when they came there, they found the camp empty, flooded with blood, and clothing strewn everywhere. Today, in the camp of Jasenovac, thousands of Serbs are being tortured and murdered."

"Why do I write this to you," Archbishop Stepinatz, "since you are not a political character and not responsible for this? Here is why: In all these unprecedented crimes, worse than pagan, OUR [ROMAN] CATHOLIC CHURCH HAS ALSO PARTICIPATED

¹³⁵ Falconi, C., *op. cit.*, pp. 371-3, quoting Lobkowicz's Report.

IN TWO WAYS. First, a large number of [Roman Catholic] priests, clerics, friars, and organized [Roman] Catholic youth actively participated in these crimes, but more terrible, even [Roman] Catholic priests became camp and group commanders and, as such, ordered or tolerated the horrible tortures, murders and massacres.” For example, “ONE [ROMAN] CATHOLIC PRIEST SLIT THE THROAT OF AN ORTHODOX SERBIAN PRIEST. None of this could have been done without the permission of their Bishops and if it was done, they should have been brought to the Ecclesiastical Court and defrocked [that is, removed from religious orders]. Since this did not happen, then ostensibly the [Roman Catholic] Bishops gave their consent by acquiescence at least.”

“The [Roman] Catholic Church has used all means to [Roman] Catholicize forcefully the remaining Serbs. And, while the land streamed with the innocent blood of martyrs,” “the friars and the nuns carried Ustashi knives in one hand and a Cross and [Popish] prayer-book in the other. The province of Srem is covered with the leaflets of Bishop Akshamovich [/ Akshamovitch], which were printed in his own print shop at Djakovo. He calls upon the Serbs, through these leaflets, to save their lives and property, recommending the [Roman] Catholic faith to them.” And “at the same time, many Serbian Churches were destroyed, while others were converted into [Roman] Catholic [Churches]; all Serbian [Orthodox] monasteries were confiscated, all properties seized and carted away; many historical monuments were destroyed with even the [Serbian Orthodox] Patriarchal Cathedral at Sremski Karlovci not untouched.”

“Again, it is the duty of the [Roman] Church to raise its voice, because” “it is powerful.” “For” “both divine and human punishment shall fall upon the heads of the [Roman] Catholic Church and also upon the people if they do not repent in time for these grave and terrible sins.” Hence “I write” “to you” “about these terrible crimes.”¹³⁶

The Martyrdom of the Serbs also reproduces comments by the United States Justice Robert Jackson of the U.S. Supreme Court, who in commenting on the murder of twenty-four Slovenians in the Slovenian capital of Ljubliana (a state of the first and second Yugoslavias), quotes some general comments of relevance by U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt (President 1933-1945). For example, Roosevelt refers to the “wholesale slayings of innocent people by the Nazis” in their “occupied countries.” “But” he says, “this Nazi terrorism against innocent civilians will be avenged.” “The Government of the United States has been aware for some time of these crimes. Our Government is constantly receiving additional information from dependable sources, and it welcomes reports from any trustworthy source which would assist in keeping our Government fund of information and evidence up to date and reliable.” “It seems only fair,” concludes the US President, “that the Nazi criminals should have this warning that the time will come when they shall have to stand in courts of law in the very countries they are now oppressing and answer for their acts.”¹³⁷

¹³⁶ *The Martyrdom of the Serbs, op. cit.*, pp. 289-94. For an eyewitness account of some aspects of the killings at Glina, see Damir Mirkovic’s “Memoirs: Recollection of a forced conversion to [Roman] Catholicism and of Ustasha Genocide,” *The South Slav Journal*, Vol. 17, No 1-2 (63-4), 1996, pp. 75-85. Though only a boy at the time, Mirkovic recalls how his Serbian Orthodox father first lost his job as the Presiding Judge of the District Court, and then was killed by the Nazis. Damir Mirkovic then underwent a forced “conversion” to Romanism.

¹³⁷ *The Martyrdom of the Serbs, op. cit.*, pp. 295-6.

Therefore, in the middle of World War Two, during 1943 in *The Martyrdom of the Serbs*, Stepinatz was in the first instance, said to have “signified” his “approval” of the mass killings of Serbs because he “at no time did” “raise” any “objection to such conduct” by Romish “clergy,” “nor did” Stepinatz “by any act or move attempt to exhibit” “displeasure” “of these crimes,” so that his “ominous silence is but proof of” his “condonation.” In the second instance, what in effect was, irrespective of its true author, an *Open Letter* to him, was publicly put in the domain of general knowledge in 1943 by its publication in *The Martyrdom of the Serbs*, in which Stepinatz was addressed and told about how “the Serbs in Croatia are being exterminated in a most beastly manner, with” “their property subject to destruction.” He was clearly told about how the “[Roman] Catholic Church has used all means to [Roman] Catholicize forcefully the remaining Serbs,” with the involvement in this process of “a large number of [Roman Catholic] priests, clerics, friars.” He was specifically told about “the leaflets of [Roman Catholic] Bishop Akshamovich” in the “province of Srem” (where some 22,000 mass killings of Jews and both Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Serbs occurred in 1941-2). And Stepinatz was specifically petitioned in this *Open Letter of 1943* to “raise” his “voice” “about these terrible crimes.” Finally, in *The Martyrdom of the Serbs (1943)*, Stepinatz and others working with the Nazis were reminded of U.S. President Roosevelt’s words “that the Nazi criminals should have this warning that the time will come when they shall have to stand in courts of law in the very countries they are now oppressing and answer for their acts.” The combination of these three facts thus clearly shows that more than two years before the end of World War Two, anti-communist Chetnik supporters were urging Stepinatz to stop collaborating with the Nazis, and they were clearly gearing up to put Archbishop Stepinatz on trial for his ongoing collaboration with the Nazi Ustashi regime. Therefore, had the Chetniks defeated the Nazis rather than Tito’s communist Partisans, Stepinatz would not have been spared a Nazi war crimes trial. These facts thus demolish the Romish Church’s propagandist claim that Stepinatz was “tried” “on trumped-up charges” after he “spoke out against the persecution of the [Roman] Church by the communists¹³⁸.”

Furthermore, if Stepinatz’s trial had so proceeded under a Chetnik government, I think it likely that Stepinatz would have been executed (as, I think, would also have been a large number of those in Roman Catholic religious orders involved in these forced “conversions”). That is to say, I consider Stepinatz (and a number of other Roman Catholics in Romish religious orders,) got a lot better treatment under Tito’s communists than he would have gotten under Mihailovic’s Chetnik supporters of the Serbian Orthodox monarchy. (Although in terms of general religious liberty, they would have been better off under Mihailovic than under Tito.) That is because, Tito’s Nazi phobia notwithstanding, *at least on this occasion*, Tito’s communists showed they were more capable of dispassionate analysis for Stepinatz’s involvement with the Nazi Ustashi, *which they rightly limited to the lesser charge of collaboration, and rightly did not apply the death sentence for*, than I think many of the Serbian Orthodox have, who in my opinion have *wrongly tried to extend Stepinatz’s involvement to something greater than collaboration, and wrongly argued that the death penalty should have applied in his case*. As Sulzberger noted in his 1951 Pulitzer Prize winning *New York Times* article of 1950, “Stepinatz in Cell Interview Says His Fate Is Up to Pope,” when he went to Yugoslavia, “Orthodox Serbs of all political shades came up to me and growled: ‘Stepinatz should have been hanged.’” And his chauffeur from Montenegro, “who is of the [Serbian] Orthodox faith, muttered, ‘They should have killed the

¹³⁸ *New Catholic Encyclopedia (2003)*, Vol. 13, p. 527 (“STEPINAC, ALOJZIJE VIKTOR, BL”).

pig¹³⁹.”

Moreover, in January 1951, Tito said, “In connection with an earlier interview and its interpretation that Stepinatz would be released and even allowed to go abroad, there has been considerable dissatisfaction on the part of the Orthodox Serb population because they consider him a war criminal and that cannot be changed. We have to take into account their feelings.” “Here is a question of a war criminal who was responsible for” “crimes, because it should be borne in mind that many [Roman] Catholic priests were in the Ustashi units and took part in bloodshed and forced conversion of the [Serbian] Orthodox.¹⁴⁰” Later in July 1951, the government radio station in Belgrade said that “the Vatican was trying to make a martyr” of Stepinatz¹⁴¹. Stepinatz was in fact given early release in 1952, indicating that Tito finally put aside the Serbian Orthodox objections to doing this, a decision that a Chetnik government under a Serbian Orthodox monarchy would have been unlikely to have followed.

So too, we find that Bishop Iriney Georgevitch, the Serbian Orthodox Bishop of Dalmatia, Yugoslavia, writing in 1948 from exile in New York, USA, refers to some relevant facts under the Ustashi. “The Roman Catholic Bishop of Djakovo, Akshamovitch, had leaflets distributed in his diocese, in which he gave ‘the inhabitants of the Greek-Eastern faith the friendly advise’ to turn Roman Catholic in order to be allowed to remain in their homes.” Or “many [Serbian] Orthodox Churches were” “destroyed” “by the Roman Catholics under the leadership of Franciscan monks who occupied all the [Serbian] Orthodox monasteries in [the] Roman Catholic [Independent State of] Croatia.” “These facts clearly show that the spirit of the” “Inquisition is still alive in Rome and that Rome does not shy away from mass murder” “to further its” “aims.” Bishop Georgevitch also refers to the trial conducted against Stepinatz by “the Communist regime in Yugoslavia for which I have no sympathies whatsoever.” His conclusion is clear. “The verdict was surprisingly mild.” “It was his good luck that he was not tried at Nuremberg where German generals were sentenced to death for crimes of which many of them knew much less than Stepinac knew of the unspeakable atrocities which his bishops, his priests, and his monks committed against the [Serbian] Orthodox in Yugoslavia.¹⁴²”

In 1980, the official patriarchal monthly journal of the Serbian Orthodox Church, *Glasnik* (“Messenger”), published an article repeating the official position of the Serbian Orthodox Church that Stepinatz, with the Vatican behind him, supported the Ustashi’s forced “conversions” of the Serbian Orthodox to Romanism¹⁴³. Some might think we should now write-off the whole Stepinatz scandal by saying Stepinatz was “a rotten apple at the bottom of the barrel.” But the Roman Church herself will not let the matter rest. Shortly after the Serbian Orthodox *Glasnik* article of 1980 appeared and was reported in the Croatian Roman Catholic press *AKSA*, and at a time when Croatia and Serbia were two of the six states in the second Yugoslavia (1946-1991/2), Croat Roman Catholics were evidently unaffected by

¹³⁹ Sulzberger, C.I., “Stepinatz in Cell Interview Says His Fate Is Up to Pope,” 13 Nov. 1950, pp. 1,13.

¹⁴⁰ *New York Times*, 8 Jan. 1951, p. 4, section entitled “Serbs Against Stepinatz.”

¹⁴¹ *New York Times*, 7 July 1951, p. 4, “Martyr role seen for Stepinac.”

¹⁴² Butler’s *In the Land of Nod*, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-7.

¹⁴³ *AKSA (Aktualnost Krscanska Sadasnojost)*, the weekly news service of the Croatian Roman Catholic Church located in Zagreb, reproduced without comment, excerpts from both secular and religious papers. It reported this *Glasnik* article (*AKSA* 1/8/1980); quoted in Alexander, S., *op. cit.*, pp. 213-4,238.

these Serbian Orthodox concerns, since later in this same year, the process for beatifying Aloysius Cardinal Stepinatz was started by the Roman Church on 5 December 1980.

CHAPTER 6

VARIOUS POPES SUPPORT STEPINATZ

Various Roman Popes, demonstrating that they are “the man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3) by setting aside the sixth commandment, “Thou shalt not kill” (Deut. 5:17), have sought to support and glorify Stepinatz. Let us now consider this Papal support in three time periods: during the Nazi Ustashi years of 1941-5; after World War Two while Stepinatz was still alive (1945-60); and after Stepinatz’s death.

During World War Two, Pope Pius XII (Pope 1939-58) clearly lent his support to Stepinatz. Stepinatz twice visited the Roman Pontiff and supplied him with the figures for the forcible “conversions.” In an official document dated 8 May 1944, Archbishop Stepinatz advised the Roman Pontiff that “240,000 Orthodox Serbs had been converted to the Church of God.¹⁴⁴” Pope Pius XII also communicated directly with the murderous Pavelitch, for example, on 12 March 1942 he sent Pavelitch “our thanks and our wishes for Christian prosperity;” and at New Year 1943, Pius XII telegraphed Pavelitch, “For all that you have expressed to us both in your own name and in that of the Croatian [Roman] Catholics, we thank you and joyfully send the apostolic benediction [/ blessing] to you and to the Croatian people,” thus giving a Papal blessing to Pavelitch and his Ustashi regime. Or in 1944 the Pope telegraphed Pavelitch, “The wishes that you and the Croatian people have expressed to us, upon the occasion of the fifth anniversary of our Pontificate, are very dear to us, and we pray that God may bless you with his most gracious gifts.¹⁴⁵”

It is clear that the Roman Pope failed to discipline either the Ustashi collaborator Archbishop Stepinatz or other Roman Catholic clergy involved with the Nazi Ustashi. A list of over seven hundred such Romanists in religious orders is given in Sandy Marquette’s *Stepinac: Portrait of a War Criminal* (1994). This list includes Dr. Ivan Sardic, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Sarajevo, who had joined the Ustashi in 1934 and was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Serbian Orthodox, decorated by Pavelitch; Dr. Anton Aksamou, Roman Catholic Bishop of Djakoo, decorated by Pavelitch, who employed forced conversions and took over Serbian Orthodox churches in his jurisdiction, converting them to Roman Churches; Dr. Kuirin Bonafacic, Roman Catholic Bishop of Makarska and Split, active in the Ustashi and decorated by Pavelitch; Dr. Josip Carevic, Pavle Butorac, Roman Catholic Bishop of Kotor and Duravonik, active in the Ustashi and decorated by Pavelitch; Dr. Josip Lach, General Vicar-Bishop who liaised with the Vatican over any concerns with forced conversions of Serbian Orthodox to Roman Catholicism, he worked closely with both Stepinatz and the Ustashi, and gave instructions in his circular of 26 September 1941 that “the soul-saving [Romish] clergy perform the religious conversions as fast as possible and without delay;” Dr. Karlo Ferencic, Director of the Sarajevo Theological University, Roman

¹⁴⁴ Manhattan, A., *The Vatican’s Holocaust*, Ozark Books, Springfield, Mo, USA, 1986, p. 104.

¹⁴⁵ Edmond Paris, *The Vatican Against Europe*, 1959, translated by A. Robson, English edition, Macmillan, London, UK, 1961, p. 221, quoting *Hrvatski Narod*, 21 March 1942, 17 March 1943, 21 March 1944; *Katoliki List* (Roman Catholic Newspaper), no. 3, 1943.

Catholic priest and active in the Ustashi; Monsignor Ignacije Deberaj, House priest of the Pope in Zagreb, active in the Ustashi and decorated by Pavelitch; Stjepan Bogutovac, an Ustashi chaplain decorated by Pavelitch; Ivan Mahalić, a Roman Catholic priest at Jasenovac concentration camp who killed over one thousand Serbs; Miroslav Matjević, a Roman Catholic priest who led a group that killed 950 Serbs in Kulen Vakuf and then became a priest at Jasenovac concentration camp; and Ivica Maković, a Roman Catholic priest at Jasenovac concentration camp who sometimes held Romish services in bloody clothes because he liked to kill his victims with a knife.

Such figures were clearly well known. For example, when the Ustashi regime collapsed, Ustashi supporting bishops, Archbishop Sardić of Sarajevo and Bishop Parić of Banja Luka fled, and Bishop Simrak of Krizevci was arrested and condemned to death. Furthermore, after being made aware of the resolutions of Stepinac's Episcopal Conference of October and November 1941 (see Issue 1, above), which discussed conversions to Roman Catholicism, the slaughters in Bosnia-Herzegovina, persecution of the Jews, and the Ustashi attitude to political prisoners, Cardinal Maglione reported in February 1942 that "Having read the report, the Holy Father was pleased to express great satisfaction for the Croatian Bishops' demonstration of pastoral zeal. As proof of his satisfaction and of the paternal feelings with which he received the expression of filial devotion offered him in the same of his fellow bishops by Monseigneur [/ Monsignor] Stepinac, His Holiness bestows his apostolic blessing on them and on their faithful." Thus it is clear that the Roman Church was benefiting from the Ustashi's policy of Romanizing Croatia, and that Pope, Croatian bishops and clergy alike, did not want to clearly and unequivocally denounce the Ustashi regime and dissociate themselves from it¹⁴⁶.

Depending on context, the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," abbreviates either the last six of the Ten Commandments (i.e., when the first four are abbreviated as "love" of "God," per Matt. 22:37-40), or summarizes all of the Ten Commandments (i.e., if one love's one neighbour one will want him to know about the true God, not commit idolatry, not blaspheme etc., and it is e.g., offensive to Christian people to hear someone blaspheming the name of God, e.g., Rom. 13:9). Either way, we cannot doubt that "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," includes the sixth precept, "Thou shalt not kill" (e.g., Matt. 19:18; Rom. 13:9; Jas. 2:11). In commenting on this, Jesus taught that there is a positive duty to help a "wounded" person and not allow him to die (Luke 10:25-37). Thus to the extent that the Pope of Rome, "passed by" (Luke 10:31,32) and failed to help the Ustashi's victims by restraining and disciplining his Romish clergy, for example, the Archbishop of Sarajevo, he passively violated the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill" (Exod. 20:13). The Apostle John taught that "no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him" (I John 3:15), and if one "gives" "a" religious "greeting" (NASB) or "biddeth" "God speed" (AV) to one who "transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ," then "he" "is" made in God's eyes a "partaker of his evil deeds" (II John 9,11). Thus to the extent that Pope Pius XII gave his "Apostolic blessing" to "Stepinac" and "his fellow" "Croatian Bishops," for their "pastoral zeal" in the period of the greatest Ustashi killings in 1941; or the Pope "wished for" Pavelitch "Christian prosperity" in March 1942, or claimed to give an "apostolic benediction" or blessing to Pavelitch and his Ustashi regime in 1943; the Pope actively violated the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill" (Deut. 5:17). Thus *from Jasenovac alone*, the voice of the blood of about 20,000 Jews, 30,000 Gypsies, and 600,000 Serbian Orthodox, cries out against Pope Pius XII, who seems simply to reply, "Am I my

¹⁴⁶ Falconi, *op. cit.*, pp. 294,295,307; Cornwell, *op. cit.*, p. 255.

brother's keeper?" (Gen. 4:9,10). And the voice of Protestant martyrs, namely, those Protestants of Serbian descent who were killed, cries out, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (Rev. 6:10).

But blood-guilty Papal "sin" and "iniquity" (II Thess. 2:3,7) did not stop there. The Pope then gave further support to Stepinatz. Archbishop Stepinatz was given early release in 1952 and in that year the Pope decided to reward Stepinatz by making him a Cardinal. Pope Pius XII's brother was a lawyer who helped fashion the Concordat with the murderous fascist dictator, Benito Mussolini; and throughout World War Two Pius XII kept silent rather than speak out against Nazi atrocities such as the killing of about six million Jews in concentration camps, or the Ustashi murders of Jews, Gypsies, Serbian Orthodox, and Protestants in the Ustashi's Croatia. Papal defenders of this policy claim that to speak out would have needlessly aggravated the fascists and achieved nothing. Consistent with this approach, Pius XII left Roman Catholic bishops in the *Independent State of Croatia* free to follow and support the Nazi Ustashi. But *in sharp contrast to the claims of those supporting this Papal policy*, Pope Pius XII was outspoken in his opposition to communism, and in 1946 enacted severe measures against Communist collaborators, something he was never prepared to do with Nazi collaborators like Stepinatz.

A similar duplicity is seen in the fact that, on the one hand, though more than 700 Roman Catholic priests, monks, and nuns were involved in the Ustashi's reign of terror, Pope Pius XII never excommunicated any of them. This included, for example, Mate Mogus, the first Ustashi commandant in the Udbina district who initiated the massacre of about 1,000 Serbs in that district; the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Bosnia, Monsignor Sharitch, whose *Ode to Pavelitch* was published in Romish newspapers both in his own Diocese and also Monsignor Stepinatz's Diocese, and which applauded Pavelitch's actions "against the Jews."¹⁴⁷ It also included the Franciscan friar, Filipovitch, who among other things was camp commandant of the Jasenovac concentration camp for one-third of 1942, during which time over 40,000 Serbs, Gypsies, and Jews were tortured and killed. But on the other hand, with the approval of Pope Pius XII, the "Sacred Congregation of the Council" excommunicated all Roman Catholics who had any in part in either the arrest or trial of Stepinatz, the Primate of about 6.5 to 7 million Yugoslav Romanists¹⁴⁸.

Once again, the duplicity of Pope Pius XII is seen in the fact that he was not prepared to excommunicate the wicked Nazi Ustashi leader, Pavelitch; but he did excommunicate the communist leader Tito. Tito said, "during the war, the then Pope excommunicated me from the [Roman] Catholic Church." But at the time he said this in 1978, Tito (1892-1980) was an old man in his mid-eighties, and it would appear that his recollection was a little bit faulty.

¹⁴⁷ Butler records, "Mgr. [Monsignor] Sharitch applauded Pavelitch's appalling measures against the Jews. As far as I know he got no official reprimand for his behaviour from his superiors. He is in exile [in Madrid, Spain from at least 1947] and is referred to in the religious press as a victim of Yugoslav and Communist slander and intolerance" (Butler's *In the Land of Nod*, pp. 109-10; Butler's *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, p. 281).

¹⁴⁸ "Cardinal Stepinac Dead at 61; Was Imprisoned by Yugoslavia," *New York Times*, 11 Feb. 1960, pp. 1,14; Sulzberger, C.L., "A Dead Cardinal and a Live Cause," *New York Times*, 15 Feb. 1960, p. 26; Bulajic, M., *The Role of the Vatican in the break-up of the Yugoslav State*, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-8, quoting the Papal excommunication declaration *Acta Apostolica Sedia, Commentarium Officiale*, notebook 38, 23 Nov. 1946, p. 401.

What he seems to have meant was that the 1946 excommunication connected with those fighting against the wartime Nazi criminal Stepinatz, meant that the then Pope, Pius XII, (via the “Sacred Congregation of the Council”) excommunicated him, in connection with wartime matters¹⁴⁹. When the Vatican excommunicated “all those who have contributed, physically or morally, toward the” “crimes” of convicting “Msgr. [Monsignor] Aloysius Stepinatz, Archbishop of Zagreb,” the Vatican was specifically asked about the relationship of this declaration to Tito. At the time, the *New York Times* correspondent, Arnaldo Cortesi, reported that “whether the excommunication applies to Marshal Tito depends on whether he is a [Roman] Catholic because excommunications can be pronounced only against persons who were baptized in the [Roman] Catholic faith. The Vatican said that it lacked positive information as to whether Marshal Tito was a [Roman] Catholic, but it presumed he was.”¹⁵⁰

Thus Pope Pius XII appears to have been very similar in his thinking to Cardinal Stepinatz, that is, rightly being intolerant of communism at the expense of wrongly being tolerant of fascism. *But nothing can get around the fact that the claim of Papal defenders that to speak out against the Nazi Ustashi would have needlessly aggravated the fascists and achieved nothing, is at strident variance with the way the Roman Church and Pope were prepared to speak out and aggravate Tito’s communists, by, for example, elevating Stepinatz to a Cardinal.* In this context, Pius XII’s failure to stop the establishment in 1948 of the *Archbishop Stepinac High School* in New York, which acted as a Roman Church sanctioned vehicle to glorify Stepinatz; together with Pius XII’s elevation of Stepinatz to the Cardinalate, may both have been related to his anti-Communist stance against Tito and others. Certainly the decision to make Stepinatz a Cardinal resulted in Tito breaking diplomatic relations between Yugoslavia and the Vatican.

On the broad spectrum of pro-Stepinatz writers, the Italian writer Carlo Falconi is at the more moderate end. Certainly I am repulsed by Falconi’s pro-Stepinatz views, e.g., he considers Stepinatz had a “dignity” that “makes him” “worthy of our respect and” “qualified admiration.” Yet even this pro-Stepinatz writer was prepared to concede that “Stepinac’s election to the Cardinalate” was a “needless provocation” on the part of Pope Pius XII. Decent men were outraged by this news of Stepinatz being elevated and honoured by the Church of Rome as a Cardinal. For example, the editorial in *The Christian Century* said, “It must be remembered that Stepinatz was found guilty of having worked hand-in-hand during the war with Pavelitch’s Ustashi. These were the terrorists who, under the encouragement of the Hitler occupation, subjected Yugoslavia to some of the most terrible atrocities of that blood-drenched period.” “To be sure, the old rivalry between Croatia and Serbia was involved in the frightful civil war which Tito finally won. Some defenders of Stepinatz therefore insist that he should be regarded as only a Croat patriot whose revolt lost. But that would not lessen the provocative character of the Pope’s act in making this man, on parole from his 16 year prison sentence but not permitted to resume his functions as Archbishop of Zagreb, a ‘prince of the church’.”

The honour of becoming a Cardinal in the Roman Church is symbolized by wearing a red hat; and in the following month another edition of *The Christian Century*, had an article

¹⁴⁹ Bulajic, M., *The Role of the Vatican in the break-up of the Yugoslav State*, op. cit., pp. 167-8, quoting Tito in “Vjesnik,” Zagreb, Croatia, Yugoslavia, 4 March, 1978.

¹⁵⁰ Cortesi, A., , “Officials in Stepinatz Case Excommunicated by Vatican,” *New York Times*, 15 Oct. 1946, pp. 1,16.

by Sherwood Eddy, entitled, “Stepinac’s Red Hat is Blood-Red” (1953)¹⁵¹. Eddy asked, for example, “Why” in the United States of America, “does Cardinal Spellman dedicate American Roman Catholic “schools to Stepinac?” and “Why was he imprisoned?” In seeking an answer, Eddy, then in his early 80s, visited the now freed Nazi war criminal Stepinatz in the state of Croatia, in (the second) Yugoslavia. Eddy says he found Stepinatz “saying” the Roman “mass daily without interference in the village church” at “Krasic.” He concluded that Stepinatz was certainly guilty as found in his 1946 Nazi War Crimes trial, and after interviewing him, said “Stepinac gives the impression of being a transparently sincere but bigoted fanatic and ascetic, who would have made an ideal Grand Inquisitor.”

“When,” Eddy says, “I asked him what hope of salvation there is for us Protestants, he said it was a problem for which he did not see the solution.” Of course, in 1952 the *Second Vatican Council* (1963-5) had not yet clearly changed the Church of Rome’s teaching found in the Papal Bull of Pope Boniface VIII, *Unam Sanctam*, endorsed by the *Fifth Lateran Council* (1512-17), which says “it is essential to the salvation of every human being that he be subject to the Roman Pontiff.” (Though *Unam Sanctam* had been endorsed by Pope Pius IX in 1854, a controversy existed in the Roman Church on this issue, and the majority of Romish theologians disagreed with *Unam Sanctam* and modified its scope through such ideas as “tolerance” and “invincible ignorance.” But Stepinatz’s comments seem to indicate that his position was more akin to the exclusive Roman salvation view of the minority, than the “separated brethren” view expressed by Vatican II). Because Stepinatz did not understand the Biblical gospel of justification by faith, he could “Not see the solution” to the “problem” of “Protestants.” As Sherwood Eddy poignantly notes, “Stepinac” “was” “apparently” “willing to leave” the “fate” of “Protestants” (or more precisely, the vast majority of about 68,500 Protestants who were of Germanic descent,) “to God. But not that of thousands of [Serbian] Orthodox” (which under the Ustashi’s legal definitions also included a relatively small number of converts from Serbian Orthodoxy to Protestantism,) “who in his days of power, were given the choice between conversion and death.” “After examining scores of witnesses and reading great numbers of documents,” “I am left with no shadow of doubt of the guilt of Archbishop, now to be Cardinal, Stepinac.” “The red hat of this new Cardinal will be blood-red.”

To the extent that the Pope made this convicted Nazi war criminal a Cardinal, the Pope further identified himself with the gruesome murders and atrocities of the Ustashtis that Cardinal Stepinatz collaborated with. Indeed, it is worth noting that the Nazi Ustashtis of Croatia were so bloodthirsty, that even the Nazi Germans were appalled, and said so in their reports to Berlin, although they did not seek to restrain them. Pope Pius XII went so far as to say, “this Croatian Cardinal is the most important priest of the [Roman] Catholic Church.” Not surprisingly then, when Cardinal Stepinatz died in 1960, he was given the further honour of being buried behind the main altar in the Romish Cathedral at Zagreb¹⁵².

Pope Pius XII was simply the first in a successive line of Popes to glorify Stepinatz. Pope John XXIII (Pope 1958-1963) said, “Cardinal Stepinac” “gave twenty-six years of episcopate to his illustrious archdiocese” (this thus includes a general reference to the Ustashtis

¹⁵¹ Falconi, *op. cit.*, p. 317; *The Christian Century*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 69, 31 Dec. 1952, no. 53, pp. 1516-7 (editorial under Editor Paul Hutchinson); Vol. 70, 14 Jan. 1953, no. 2, pp. 42-3.

¹⁵² Lindsay, F., *Beacons in the Night*, Stanford University, California, USA, 1993, pp. 21-2; www.hr/datko/etf/stepac.html.

years), and was “first in tireless and zealous work of apostolic activity and then in the last long years of painful segregation, was a truly faithful reproduction of the Divine Shepherd. By his latter years of segregation he accumulated such a great wealth of merits” (thus indicating he considered him “saintly” in the Romish sense), “that the heavenly Father has certainly converted” these merits “to grace and blessing for all the families and faithful of fervent and pious Croatia.” At Stepinatz’s death, Pope John XXIII said he had decided “to hold” a “memorial service in the Basilica of St. Peter” in the Vatican State, “for the repose of the soul of Cardinal Aloysius Stepinac, even though it is not customary to do so for a Cardinal who is not a member of the Roman Curia.” In doing so, he described Stepinatz as a “truly faithful and inspirational image,” “who had served his” “Archdiocese” of Zagreb “as Bishop for twenty-six years,” and expressed his “hope, that” Stepinatz “will unfurl his protection over the entire College of Cardinals and over the entire” Roman “church.¹⁵³” This once again attributed Romish “Saint” mediator powers to Stepinatz, and so implied the inevitability of his eventual beatification, and possibly a future canonization.

Then in 1965, Pope Paul VI (Pope 1963-1978), said in an audience to the Bishops of (the second) Yugoslavia during the *Vatican II Council*, that Stepinatz showed “heroism” and was “an example to the entire” Roman “Church. When I was in New York,” “I was shown a school built by Cardinal Spellman,” “named ‘Stepinac High School,’ He is known” “because he was faithful to a heroic degree. You have the good fortune to pay homage to his grave. I ask that you remember my intentions when you find yourselves at that grave.¹⁵⁴” This “homage” of Stepinatz’ “grave,” as one who “was faithful to a heroic degree,” once again implied the inevitability of Stepinatz eventual beatification, and possibly canonization.

But blood-guilty Papal “sin” and “iniquity” (II Thess. 2:3,7) did not end there. With the collapse of eastern European communism and the Soviet Union in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the second Yugoslavia (1946-1991/2), disintegrated into the independent nations of (the predominantly Eastern Orthodox) Montenegro and Serbia in Eastern Europe (from 1992 to 2006 these were the two federal states of the third Yugoslavia, before Montenegro voted to leave the Yugoslav federation in 2006), Bosnia-Herzegovina (with a large Mohammedan population) in Eastern or Central Europe, (predominantly Roman Catholic) Croatia in Western Europe, and (predominantly Roman Catholic) Slovenia in Western Europe. Papists in Croatia seemed to have started looking for a clearly anti-Yugoslavian federationist, anti-Serbian, and pro-Croatian independent nationalist, anti-communist, and pro-Roman Catholic identity, to promote as a national religious figure. They found the very qualities they were looking for in the convicted Nazi war criminal, Cardinal Stepinatz.

Thus the Pope of Rome made another step of support for, and glorification of Cardinal Stepinatz, after his death. In 1998 Pope John Paul II (Pope 1978-2005) made a Papal visit to Croatia, a country where about 85 per cent of its 4.4 million people are Roman Catholic, about 11 per cent are Eastern Orthodox, 1.2 per cent Mohammedan, and less than 0.5 per cent are Protestant. On 3 October 1998, Pope John Paul II stood in front of a crowd

¹⁵³ Prcela, J., *Archbishop Stepinac in His Country’s Church-State Relations*, Associated Book Publishers, Scottsdale, Arizona, USA, 1990, p. 75; *Stepinac: The Man For His Time*, published by the Franciscans at Drexel Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, USA, 1998; pp. 202-5, quoting Discorsi mesagi, colloqui del Santo Padre Giovanni XXIII, Tipographia poliglotta Vaticana, 1961, Vol. 2, pp. 202-5.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 87; quoting; Villim Ceceleja, “Ostavio je snazan do jam namene,” *Glasnik Srca Isvsova, Marinjina*, 19, 1967; Benigar, pp. 874-5.

numbering hundreds of thousands at Croatia's main shrine of Mariolatry, *Mary's Basilica* (Marija Bistrica) (near Zagreb), and at this Marian shrine beatified Cardinal Stepinatz. In the Roman Church, beatification gives the dead recipient a status one step above a person declared "Venerable" and one step below a canonized Roman Catholic "Saint." Once beatified, the dead Papist is said to have had *a reputation for holiness*. His Romish "cult" consists of a Mass with its own Office (an occasional service, usually annual), made in his honour. The process of formal beatification allegedly requires that the person had *heroic virtue* or suffered martyrdom, and *worked miracles when invoked in prayer*. He is also given the honorific titular prefix "Blessed" before his name. Thus in the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (2003), we find an entry for "Stepinac," with the initials "BI" after his name, for "Blessed." According to this article, "Stepinac's faith was nurtured by," for instance, "daily meditation on the rosary," and his "spirituality is marked by," for instance, his "zeal for the Eucharist, and filial devotion to the Blessed Mother¹⁵⁵," that is, as a *son of Mary*.

A Romanist must first be beatified before he can be canonized and made a "Saint," so the fact that "Blessed Cardinal Stepinatz" has been beatified, means that he is a candidate for *possible* canonization at some point in the future. Whether or not the Church of Rome ever will canonize "Blessed Stepinatz" and make him "Saint Stepinatz," is presently not known. If it does, it will bring even more condemnation down upon itself. But even if it does not, the fact that Stepinatz is now to be referred to as "Blessed," means the Pope has violated the human dignity of the Jews, Gypsies, and Serbian Orthodox persecuted and killed by the Ustashi. More than this, the Pope has opened his mouth in blasphemy against the Protestant confessors and martyrs in heaven (Rev. 13:6), who were persecuted and/or killed by the Nazi Ustashi. The Protestant "souls" in heaven, "that were slain for the Word of God, and for the testimony which they held" in refusing to convert to Popery under the Nazi Ustashi, cry out, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (Rev. 6:9,10).

At his 1998 beatification in Mary's Basilica (30 miles or 50 kilometres north of Zagreb), Pope John Paul II (Pope 1978-2005), also spoke of Stepinatz. Stepinatz required no miracles before beatification because under Roman Catholic canon law a Papist classified as a "martyr" can, after being declared "venerable" (the first step bringing with it the title "Venerable"), then be "Beatified" (the second step bringing with it the title "Blessed"), or "canonized" (the third step bringing with it the title "Saint"). But in his "Homily" "at *Mary's Basilica* for the Beatification of the Venerable Servant of God, Cardinal Aloysius Stepinac," Pope John Paul II made this frank admission, "Stepinac did not shed his blood in the strict sense of the word," but rather, the Pope said, he "endured" "suffering."¹⁵⁶ The ramifications of this staggeringly candid admission are striking! The basic difference between a *confessor* and a *martyr* is that a confessor endures suffering for his faith, but not to the point of death, whereas a martyr is killed for his faith.

From the Protestant perspective, Stepinatz was certainly not a confessor, and much less a martyr. But even from a Romanist paradigm, while they might like to claim he was some kind of "*confessor*" "against communism," it is surely ridiculous mental gymnastics to suggest, as Pope John-Paul II has, that a man who was not killed for his religious belief, such as Stepinatz, be called a "*martyr*." He was sentenced to "hard labour," but that element of his

¹⁵⁵ *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Catholic University of America, Thomson Gale, USA, 2nd edition, 2003, Vol. 13, p. 527 ("Stepinac"), Vol. 2, p. 177 ("Beatification").

¹⁵⁶ *Stepinac: The Man For His Time*, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

sentence was never carried out. In 1949 the Romish Bishop Santin of Trieste, said of the imprisoned Stepinatz, "There is no indication that he is ill-treated." When he was visited in prison by Cyrus Sulzberger, in his 1951 *Pulitzer Prize* winning interview with him, Sulzberger reported that of about 1,000 prisoners at Lepoglava Jail, there was "only one 'special prisoner' -Archbishop Stepinatz. The others live in dormitory rooms," "and work eight hours a day six days a week in" "fields and workshops. The Archbishop has exceptional quarters and treatment." Stepinatz informed him, "he received plentiful food and his cell was heated every day." Sulzberger says "Stepinatz" "pointed to another wood door opening on to the wall of his cell and said: 'There is my chapel. You may go in.' I opened the door and saw another cell, slightly smaller, dominated by one table covered with a white cloth and serving as an altar. Archbishop Stepinatz explained that there were two other Roman Catholic priests imprisoned in Lepoglava who were permitted to pray with him daily.¹⁵⁷" These were clearly quite good prison conditions relative to what other prisoners at Lepoglava Jail had.

When Stepinatz was made a Cardinal in 1952, *he refused to go to the Vatican to receive his Cardinal's hat because he feared the communist government might not allow him to return to Yugoslavia. This is hardly the reaction of a man greatly suffering under a regime that he was trying to get away from!* After serving only six years of his sixteen year sentence, Stepinatz was generously given early release in 1951 under house imprisonment at his hometown of Krasic. The terms of his house-arrest included the freedom of the town to function as the local Popish priest, and he died in 1960 some two years before the expiry of his sentence. While town arrest in Krasic would not have been as enjoyable as the freedom afforded him had he lived to the end of his sixteen year sentence, nevertheless, he died in the relative cushy comfort of his bed. There is no sense in which this man was killed for his faith. What an outrage to call such a generously treated convicted Nazi war criminal a "martyr"!

The decision of Pope John-Paul II to beatify Stepinatz occurred while the German Cardinal, Joseph Ratzinger, was Prefect of the *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*, formerly known as *The Inquisition*. This, and the position of Vatican *Secretary of State*, are the most powerful positions in the Vatican, after the Papacy. As a boy, in 1941 Cardinal Ratzinger was conscripted to join the Hitler Youth. In 1943, he was placed in a Nazi anti-aircraft unit dedicated to destroying Allied Bombers, in order to protect a BMW factory that was part of the Nazi's war effort. This unit came under Allied aircraft bombardment, and was engaged in military action against Allied aircraft, while Ratzinger was a member of it. In September 1944 he was reassigned to digging anti-tank trenches in order to help halt the Allied's advance. Conscripted into the Nazi German army (or *Wehrmacht*) in November 1944, army life involved obvious difficulties and dangers, and with the war evidently lost, in April-May 1945 the young Nazi soldier, Joseph Ratzinger, deserted his post. On the run, he was captured by United States Allied Forces, and held as a Prisoner of War. In discussing his war memories, he has recounted the time he was stationed near Hungary, and watched Hungarian Jews being sent to Nazi death camps. As Dean of the College of Cardinals, and from 1981 Prefect of the body formerly called *The Inquisition*, he was in a key position to stop Stepinatz being Beatified in 1998 for his role in the Croatian Inquisition, yet he deserted his moral obligations to do so. This one-time labourer for the World War II Nazi cause, who used to dig anti-tank trenches to help halt liberator Allied tanks, was nick-named after the

¹⁵⁷ Butler's *In the Land of Nod*, p. 130 (Bishop Santin); Sulzberger, C.L., "Stepinatz in Cell Interview Says His Fate Is Up to Pope," *New York Times*, 13 Nov 1950, pp. 1,13.

Nazi German Panzer tanks, as “the Panzer Cardinal.” Having himself once dressed in the Nazi uniforms of the Hitler Youth and *Wehrmacht*, Cardinal Ratzinger evidently felt he could not condemn Cardinal Stepinatz’s Nazi collaboration. Following the death of Pope John-Paul II in 2005, the Australian newspaper, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, reported that the front-page headline of the British newspaper, *The Sun*, read, “From Hitler Youth to ... Papa Ratz.” Cardinal Ratzinger had become the new Pope, Pope Benedict XVI¹⁵⁸.

Thus we find that the Pope of Rome fulfils his Biblical description as “the man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3). His “sin” (AV & NKJV) and “iniquity” (AV) or “lawlessness” (NKJV) (II Thess. 2:3,7) is evident with respect to the sixth commandment, “Thou shalt not kill,” in his support for Stepinatz, a convicted collaborator of the murderous Nazi Ustashi regime of World War Two. Zechariah prophesied about the Antichrist (Zech. 11:15-17) as a contrast to the Christ (Zech. 11:12,13), describing him as “the idol shepherd.” For as a bishop the Pope claims to be a “shepherd,” and he is an “idol” who is worshipped, “shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4). Well did the prophet Zechariah say of him, “his right eye shall be utterly darkened” (AV), or “his right eye shall be totally blinded” (NKJV) (Zech. 11:17), for he turns a blind eye to a great deal of Scriptural truth, and we cannot doubt that in beatifying “Blessed Cardinal Stepinatz,” he has turned a blind eye to the ugly side of a convicted Nazi war criminal’s collaboration with the murderous Nazi Ustashi regime.

CHAPTER 7

SOME JEWISH, EASTERN ORTHODOX, AND PROTESTANT RESPONSES TO STEPINATZ’S BEATIFICATION

In their bid to give Stepinatz’s beatification “ecumenical” and “inter-faith” support, the Church of Rome sought for, and obtained at his beatification, support from some deluded Jews, a foolish Serbian Orthodox deacon, and some apostate Protestants. But in the wider picture, it is clear that various protests were made against the Pope’s beatification of Stepinatz by Jews, Eastern Orthodox, and Protestants.

At the time of Stepinatz’s beatification in October 1998, the *New York Times* article, “Pope Beatifies Croat Prelate, Fanning Ire Among Serbs,” reported that the “leader of the Jews in Croatia,” Slavko Goldstein, said, “‘There is no question he saved hundreds of Jews and others.’” But he also said Stepinatz’s World War Two war-time record was mixed. “‘He tried to correct some of the worst aspects, but he never condemned the regime as such.’” Slavko Goldstein also “expressed regret that the beatification - linked entirely to the Cardinal’s resistance to communism - was unlikely to prompt Croats to examine a wartime past clouded in myth. ‘This will not clarify the period of World War II,’ Mr. Goldstein added. ‘Croatian society has yet to deal with something that Germans have dealt with successfully’.”¹⁵⁹ Furthermore, the *Religion and Ethics Newsweekly* reported in October 1998, that “several Jewish groups had criticized the beatification” of the “controversial

¹⁵⁸ “From Nazi Germany to the balcony of St. Peter’s,” *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 April, 2005, pp. 1,8; *Newshour*, With Jim Lehrer (USA TV News), 19 April, 2005; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 April, 2005, pp. 8,9; 23-23 April, 2005, pp. 13,26.

¹⁵⁹ Stanley, A., “Pope Beatifies Croat Prelate, Fanning Ire Among Serbs,” *New York Times*, 4 Oct. 1998, p. 13.

Croatian Cardinal,” on the basis “that the Cardinal collaborated with Croatia’s World War II pro-Nazi regime.¹⁶⁰”

More Serbian Orthodox were persecuted and killed by the Ustashi than any other group, and so understandably the Roman Church was unable to get any Eastern Orthodox bishop or high-ranking church dignitary to attend Stepinatz’s beatification. Then in 2001 when the Pope visited Greece, the Eastern Orthodox made their protest clearly known. The Greek Orthodox *Clerical Union* denounced the Pope, “as an arch-heretic and the two-horned grotesque monster of Rome” (Rev. 13:11). At a Greek Orthodox Monastery on Mount Athos, the Greek Orthodox monks hung a banner on the monastery walls, stating, “The Pope is Antichrist.” A Greek Orthodox bishop in America explained, saying, “The trepidation that we Greek Orthodox have as regards the Latin Papacy, stems from that institution’s serious deviations from the apostolic faith, and its historic role in attempting to force these deviations onto the [Eastern] Orthodox.” “That is, Croatian Cardinal Stepinac, and his Nazi Ustasha forcibly converting thousands of Orthodox Serbians to [Roman] Catholicism, and massacring the thousands who refused. Cardinal Stepinac has recently been Beatified by John Paul II.¹⁶¹”

These Greek Orthodox concerns that Stepinatz’ glorification acts to promote a role model “to force” Roman Catholic “deviations onto the [Eastern] Orthodox,” has some support from the Protestant writer, Ian Sadler. After discussing the “Croatian Holocaust” in which “Romanist clergy and monks” under the spiritual jurisdiction of “Stepinac the Jesuit Archbishop of Zagreb,” “were foremost in encouraging and even participating in these atrocities,” Sadler says that “the onslaught” then “moved” from “Croatia “on to Russia in 1941 with Hitler’s massive invasion.” Sadler refers to Papist “reference to the Fatima prophecies” at this time, and concludes that if the Nazis had been successful this would have resulted in “the forcible conversion of Russia to Romanism.¹⁶²” While I think Sadler’s certainty that this would have happened is an overstatement of this possibility on the available evidence, I would nevertheless accept that it is *possible* that the Nazis *might* have installed a Nazi regime that followed the Croatian Ustashi example “effecting the forcible conversion of Russia to Romanism.” In this context, it is surely noteworthy that both Stepinatz and the Roman Church have expressed a desire for mass “conversions” from Russian Orthodoxy to Romanism. In 1917 at the major Romish pilgrimage site of Fatima in Portugal, three Papists claimed to have had a vision of Mary predicting the “conversion” of the Russian Orthodox to Popery. Moreover, Butler refers to 1940s Irish Roman Catholic articles in the *Dublin Review* such as that of Mr. Tomberg stating, “‘Russia has become a vast field for missionary activity and will no doubt prove to be a fertile field as soon as the Iron Curtain [of communism] is lifted’.¹⁶³” And on the page dedicated to “BL.” “STEPINAC,” the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (2003), states, “Stepinac” “predicted that ‘Russia will be

¹⁶⁰ Bob Abernethy on Stepinatz, *Religion and Ethics Newsweekly* 9 Oct, 1998 (www.pbs.org/wnet/religionandethics/transcripts/206.html).

¹⁶¹ Quoted by Blunt, D., “The Pope is the Antichrist,” 2003 (cassette) (available from the United Protestant Council, London, via Rev. John Shearer, The Rectory, Nuffield, Henley-on-Thames, Oxon, RG9 5SN, England, UK).

¹⁶² Sadler, I., *op. cit.*, pp. 223-4.

¹⁶³ Butler’s *In the Land of Nod*, *op. cit.*, pp. 119,121.

converted, and the statue of the Mother of God will be put in the Kremlin'¹⁶⁴.” The fact that this Romish encyclopedia has linked “Blessed Stepinatz” to the same cause as the Romish “Our Lady of Fatima,” must surely hint at Roman Catholic sympathy for the prospect of an Ustashi like regime in Russia.

Also referring to the Papal visit to Greece in 2001, the Roman Catholic *National Catholic Reporter*, said Greek Orthodox protestors “chanted against the Pope. Banners in Greek and Italian said: ‘Get the Antichrist Pope out of Orthodox Greece’.” The highest ranking Greek Orthodox prelate in Greece, Archbishop Christodoulos of Athens, refused to join in prayer with the Pope, citing “doctrinal differences.” Protestors also “blasted” Pope John Paul II for beatifying “‘the arch-criminal Cardinal Aloysius Stepinac,’ whom they blame for the murder of” the “Orthodox Serbs” by the Ustashi between 1941 and 1945. This Roman Catholic newspaper then informs its readers that, “Stepinac” “was the primate of Croatia at the time,” and “is sometimes criticized for having been uncritical” of the Nazi Ustashi¹⁶⁵.

Likewise, Protestants were heard to raise their voice in horror. For example, in 2003, the Reverend David Blunt, Minister of the *Free Church of Scotland (Continuing)* in Aberdeen, Scotland, gave the address at the *Annual Public Meeting* of the *United Protestant Council*, held at London in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Blunt’s address was entitled, “The Pope is the Antichrist,” and he referred to both the Beatification of Cardinal Stepinatz, and the associated Nazi Ustashi atrocities of World War Two. Having earlier referred to the fact that “‘Cardinal Stepinac has recently been Beatified by John Paul II’,” Blunt said, “We all know something of that event that took place during the Second World War. Largely unnoticed at the time. It happened in Yugoslavia. A new State was born out of that territory, called Croatia. And a Roman Catholic Head of State [Pavelitch], in league with a Roman Catholic Archbishop [Stepinatz], pursued a convert or die policy.” “You didn’t have to die.” “You could instead become a Roman Catholic, and then you would be spared. Two hundred thousand did convert, but at least seven hundred thousand chose to die; and they were put to death in the most savage and brutal way. Is this the Church of Jesus Christ, wielding a sword of steel rather than the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God? I think not¹⁶⁶.”

Another Protestant, Clive Gillis, in his 2003 book, *Contemporary Rome Viewed Through History*, with a Foreword by Ian Paisley (since 2010, Baron Bannside), A Member of Westminster Parliament (and Moderator of the *Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster* till 2008), has commented on this matter. Gillis describes as “provocative,” the fact that on “3rd October [1998] the Pope beatified Cardinal Alojzije Stepinac, who had co-operated with Hitler though the fascist Ustashi regime in Croatia¹⁶⁷.”

¹⁶⁴ *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (2003), Vol. 13, p. 527.

¹⁶⁵ John Allen Junior’s, “Mourning Bells to Chime for Pope’s Visit. (Greece),” *National Catholic Reporter*, 11 May, 2001, pp. 1-3 (spelling “Antichrist” as “anti-Christ” in the original article) (www.findarticles.com term=stepinac).

¹⁶⁶ Blunt, D., “The Pope is the Antichrist,” *op. cit.* (this meeting and address of 1 March 2003 was reported in *English Churchman*, 21 & 28 March, 2003, p. 1).

¹⁶⁷ Gillis, C., *Contemporary Rome Viewed Through History*, Foreword by Ian Paisley, MP, Ambassador Publications, Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK, 2003, pp. 56 & 57.

Moreover, in December 1998 the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland's* publication, the *Free Presbyterian Magazine*, quoted and commented on an article in the Anglican newspaper, *English Churchman*, a church newspaper largely catering to the *Church of England's* Evangelical Anglicans, together with Anglicans outside the Anglican Communion in either the *Free Church of England* or *Church of England (Continuing)*. The *Free Presbyterian Magazine* quotation said, for example, after “Stepinac” “welcomed the creation of the Nazi puppet state”, he “sat in the Ustashi parliament which approved the policy of extermination of” Serbian “Orthodox”, “Jews”, “Gypsies”, and others. “Stepinac wrote in the *Croatian Sentinel* on the 1st of January 1942, <Hitler is an envoy of God>.” “It is not possible to repeat here all the horrors of the forced conversions, the slow tortures and the ugly deaths of the resisting Serbs. Throughout 1942 Stepinac wore Ustashi decorations, attended all their important meetings and made speeches’.” “It is with typical brazen effrontery that Rome projects this notorious satanic monster’,” seen, comments the *Free Presbyterian Magazine*, when the “Pope went to Croatia” “to beatify” “Stepinac.”¹⁶⁸

CHAPTER 8

MARIAN MEDUGORJE ROMISH CULT LINKED IN POPULAR PAPIST DEVOTION TO THE GLORIFICATION OF STEPINATZ AND JUSTIFICATION OF USTASHI MASS MURDERS

The Roman Catholic Marian shrine and pilgrimage site of Medjugorje (or Medugorje), is situated in the south of contemporary Bosnia-Herzegovina. Here six Papists, all youths in 1981, all born in Bosnia-Herzegovina when it was part of (the second) Yugoslavia, have claimed to have seen visions of Mary from 1981 onwards. They are Vicka Ivankovic, born at Medjugorje in 1964 (she now lives near Medugorje); Marija (/ Maria) Pavlovic, born at Medjugorje in 1965 (since marrying an Italian, she is living at Monza near Milan, Italy); Ivan Dragicevic, born at Mostar in 1965 (since marrying the 1994 Miss Massachusetts, he lives part of the time in Boston, Massachusetts, USA); Mirjana Dragicevic, born at Sarajevo in 1965 who claims to hear Mary’s voice (she now lives at Medjugorje); Ivanka Ivankovic, born at Medjugorje in 1966 (she now lives at Medugorje); and Jakov Colo, born at Medjugorje in 1971 (he now lives at Medugorje)¹⁶⁹.

Homily 2, Book 2, Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, entitled, “Against Peril of Idolatry,” refers to “infinite thousands” of “miracles” attributed to Romish Saints such as “our Lady” Mary, “St. Christopher,” or “St. Leonard,” which are nothing more than “shameless lies,” “feigned lies and crafty jugglings of men;” although “some miraculous acts” have “by illusion of the Devil” been “done where images” of such saints “be” found¹⁷⁰. There is strong evidence that, at least to date, the apparitions of Mary at Medugorje fall into the first category of “lies and crafty jugglings of men.” Two successive Roman Catholic Bishops of Mostar-Duvno have denounced the apparitions as frauds; and monkery by local

¹⁶⁸ Macleod, K.D. (Editor), *The Free Presbyterian Magazine*, Dec. 1998, “Protestant View.”

¹⁶⁹ “An Updated Statement from Bishop Ratko Peric” (www.mdaviesonmedj.com/page_lateststatement.htm.)

¹⁷⁰ Griffiths’ *Two Books of Homilies*, *op. cit.*, pp. 234-5.

Franciscan monks desirous of increasing their influence appears to be the force behind this sham. Of course, this does not mean that at some future point in time there may be real devilish miracles at Medugorje, but at least to date, this does not appear to have been so. Evidence of these apparitions being fraudulent includes the fact that the six Papists involved have altered the way they claim to get visions in response to criticisms as to why they were fake.

Among other things, one claims that when she sees Mary in a vision, “Her eyes are blue. Her cheeks are pink.” But only Caucasian Caucasoids have white skin with pink cheeks, and eye colours other than brown, such as blue and green (although Mongoloid Japanese Ainu occasionally have greenish eyes). By contrast, as a Semite Mediterranean Caucasoid, Mary would have black wavy hair, olive coloured skin, a hooked nose, and brown eyes. Thus this depiction of a Caucasian Mary is as indefensible as, and possibly related to, the Nazi depiction of an “Aryan Christ¹⁷¹.” Of course, such errors could still occur in real visions given by devils. (A complicating factor is that the Semitic race Christ appears in his post resurrection body as white, not light brown, in Song of Solomon 5:10 & Rev. 1:14. But while a similar thing might be claimed for Mary, in the first place this assumes her bodily “Assumption,” for which we have no Biblical evidence, and so we more naturally conclude that she presently exists as a disembodied spirit / soul in heaven; and in the second place, the addition of “blue eyes,” acts in the context of a group glorifying Stepinatz, to sound very much like an “Aryan Mary” to match an “Aryan Christ.”)

Significantly, the local Roman Catholic Bishop of Mostar-Duvno (1980-1993) in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Roman Catholic Bishop Emeritus of Mostar-Duvno (1993 till his death in 2000), commented on these “visions” when they first occurred and denounced them as frauds. Bishop Pavao Zanic, observed these fake “visionaries,” and said in 1982, “They were embarrassed, not knowing what to say. ‘What’ll we say? You talk.’ ‘No, you.’ ‘Ask <Mary, how long will you be with us?>’” And then, pretending to look up into heaven, one says, “‘Mary, how long will you be with us?’” “Really!” exclaimed Bishop Zanic, “Now they don’t speak aloud. *They’ve learnt how to behave during the apparition, with the journalists, [or with] the bishop. It’s all changed. But I’ve followed it from the start. They’re obviously being manipulated.* All these pilgrims become for the others,” “a proof of the apparitions. And I think that this was the intention of this group of Medjugorje Franciscans.” Also commenting on the role of the Franciscan monks, historian, Joachim Boufflet found that, “As soon as the Franciscans stepped in, the whole apparition phenomenon was manipulated.” “She whom they claim is the Virgin, declares the Bishop” who denounced the Franciscans, allegedly claims “that they are persecuted” by the Bishop Zanic “and he’s a bad bishop.” They say of Mary, that “she blames the bishop for her tears, he makes her cry, etc.¹⁷²”

¹⁷¹ The so called, “Aryan Christ” or “Aryan Jesus,” was justified by Nazis through the religiously liberal theology such as the “Documentary Hypothesis,” which among other things, claims the Pentateuch evolved over time, and its “final redaction” was in the late 8th century B.C. or even later. See e.g., Ken Collins, “The Torah in modern scholarship (<http://www.kencollins.com/>) in “Religious Tolerance. Org”, “The Documentary Hypothesis on then identity of the Pentateuch’s authors,” at “Who wrote the five books of Moses?” (www.religioustolerance.org/chr_tora.htm).

¹⁷² “When the Virgin Appears,” Arte France, Lith & Chamaerops Productions, A Film by Patrick Benquet, Produced in association with SBS TV Australia, English Version, 2002 (emphasis mine).

Bishop Zanic also issued a Declaration in 1987 which said, “I do forbid the priests who organize pilgrimages or come here ascribing a supernatural character to these events, to celebrate Mass in the territory of my Diocese.” Then in 1991, the Yugoslavian Roman Catholic Bishops’ Conference at Zadar, in Croatia, issued a statement that “*nothing supernatural*” had occurred at the Medjugorje shrine. Then Bishop Ratko Peric, who had formerly been Roman Catholic Coadjutor Bishop of Mostar-Duvno (1992-3), and who was now Roman Catholic Bishop of Mostar-Duvno (since 1993), issued a statement in 1997, denouncing these “visions” as exhibiting “scandalous disobedience,” and “lies that are at times put into the mouth of the ‘Madonna’.”¹⁷³

But some Papists are uncertain as to whether or not the supernatural element is involved at Medjugorje. For example, the Roman Catholic Bishop (since 1988) of Le Puy-en-Velay in France, Bishop Henry Brincard, said, “as for the actual facts, I have many questions. For instance, the number of messages. The extreme banality of many of them. I also find the attitude of some visionaries very disconcerting. I find that, probably,” “they’re putting on a show¹⁷⁴.” However, some Papists either fraudulently claim, or sincerely believe, that the “apparitions” at Medjugorje are real. Notably, Pope John-Paul II clearly favoured his Franciscans monks of Bosnia-Herzegovina over his Bishops of Bosnia-Herzegovina, both by deed, in allowing *private* pilgrimages to Medjugorje in which the “pilgrims” may have the pastoral guidance of a Romish priest, and by word, in saying, “If I weren’t the Pope, I’d have been [to Medjugorje] myself.”¹⁷⁵

As at 2010 (the time of the second edition of this work), it is claimed by those at Medjugorje that 40,000 Romish priests and 160 Roman Catholic Bishops have visited this shrine e.g., from Australia, Bishops Bunbury, Kennedy, Myles, McKeon, and Patrick (Ancillary Bishop); from Canada, Bishop Jean Luis Jobicton of Quebec; from Croatia, Archbishop Frane; from Ireland, Bishop Seamus Hegarty; and from the USA, Cardinal Timothy Manning of Los Angeles, California. As at 2010, the so called “Messages from Mary” are still continuing to Mirjana Dragicevic¹⁷⁶. E.g., her “Monthly Message” of 2 Oct. 2010, claims that in “our Lady’s apparitions to Mirjana,” Mary said, “Dear children, Today I call you to ... humble devotion My children, my apostles, help me to open the paths to my Son ... “ This shows the heretical Romish idea of Marian “children” who go through Mary to get to Christ. An associated picture of this last “apparition,” shows Mirjana looking up in prayer, presumably either at a statue of Mary, or in a “vision” looking to Mary¹⁷⁷.

¹⁷³ “Medjugorje Deception - Part II: Declaration of Bishop Pavao Zanic - Part IV” (www.chrisusrex.org/www1/apparitions/http:pr00045.htm).

¹⁷⁴ “When the Virgin Appears,” *op. cit.* .

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.* (Referred to as a comment by Pope John Paul II to some Romish Bishops by “Father” Rene Laurentin). Cf. “If I wasn’t the Pope, I’d be in Medjugorje already” (Reported by Jesuit Bishop Hnilica, Auxiliary Bishop of Rome, 21 April, 1989, www.medjugorje.org/Pope.htm).

¹⁷⁶ “Bishops who visited Medjugorje” (www.medjugorje.com/church/bishops-who-visited-medjugorje/); & Medugorje Website, “Apparitions of the Virgin Mary in Medjugorje, “Messages” from Mary, “Message to Mirjana” on various dates e.g., 25 July 2010 or 2 Aug. 2101 (www.medugorje.org/).

¹⁷⁷ “Medugorje Website – Our Lady of Medugorje Messages and Apparitions”

At this stage, the full extent of the deceit and fraud that will be perpetrated by the six con-artists' of Marian "apparitions" is not known. Will one of them, or possibly one of the Franciscan monks who aids and abets them, apply the skills of a ventriloquist and project their voice onto a statue of Mary so as to fake a "speaking Madonna"? Will they fake a "weeping Madonna"? Will they simply stay with some fake "visions of Mary" under the tutelage of crafty Franciscan monkery? In the future will, or has it already happened, that the Devil exploits the situation to his advantage by getting one of his minion devils to give Mirjana some real "visions"? Or in the future will the Devil decide to give some verifiable miracles performed by the power of Satan to help the Medjugorje Marian cult along, for example, a supernatural *Weeping Madonna*? Whatever the final saga with these six murky "visionaries" is, Medjugorje is important in popular Papist devotions both because of its links to Stepinatz and its usage to condone the acts of the Nazi Ustashi.

Medjugorje is clearly linked to Stepinatz and the Ustashi. On 10 February, 2003, the Popish Franciscans who are so strongly connected with the fake Marian shrine, held a special Mass at Medjugorje on the "Feast of Blessed Cardinal Stepinac," to remember the "Anniversary of the Martyrdom of the Franciscans." "Father" Branko Rados said in his Homily, that the "Croatian Church today remembers" "the Blessed Cardinal Aloysius Stepinatz;" and in what was also a link to the Nazi Ustashi, then further said they were remembering as "martyrs," some "66 Franciscans" who were "murdered" by "Partisan authorities" "between 1942 and 1945" in "Herzegovina." The Homily ends with an injunction 'to "pray that we may be inspired by the example of the Blessed Aloysius [Stepinatz]" and "the example of the Franciscan martyrs."¹⁷⁸

During World War Two, fear that Yugoslavian resistance might result in the Allies invading the Balkan Peninsula, led the Nazi Germans and Fascist Italian Axis Powers to step up military operations against Partisans and Chetniks. The crucial turning point came in 1943 when Partisans escaped encirclement in Herzegovina by pushing through the Sutjeeka Gorge, since after the Battle of Sutjeeka the Allies switched their support from the Chetniks to the Partisans. By the end of 1943 the Partisans had about 300,000 troops holding down about 40 Axis Divisions, and this kept a large number of Axis forces from other Allied fronts¹⁷⁹. Given the heavy involvement of Franciscans with the Nazi Ustashi, and the fact that what Rados calls "Franciscan martyrs" were killed by the communist Partisans *when the Partisans were part of the Allied Armies' fight against Nazism*, this "Feast of Blessed Cardinal Stepinatz" clearly shows a thinly disguised sympathy for the Nazi Ustashi.

The manipulative link that the Franciscans have made between Stepinatz and the fake "visions" of Medjugorje has been present from the very outset. The process for beatifying Stepinatz was started by the Roman Church on 5 December 1980. Then just six months later, the first fraudulent "visions" of Mary were claimed at Medjugorje in June 1981. John Prcela, a Roman Catholic born in Croatia, Yugoslavia in 1922, who says he "escaped" from Yugoslavia in 1945, studied at the International College of St. Anthony in Rome, and

(<http://www.medjugorje.ws/>).

¹⁷⁸ "Father" Branko Rados, *Homily Given in Medjugorje on 10 February, 2003*, "Feasts of Blessed Cardinal Stepinac - Anniversary of the Martyrdom of the Franciscans and of the People" (www.medjugorje.hr/Eng%20StepRados.htm).

¹⁷⁹ *Encyclopedia Britannica CD 99, op. cit.*, "Partisan."

Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, and became an American citizen in 1955. Prcela authored the pro-Stepinac work, *Archbishop Stepinac in His Country's Church-State Relations* (1990), in which he promotes Stepinac's cult, describing him some eight years before his beatification as "saintly." He finds significance in the fact that "in Stepinac's Croatia exactly on the anniversary of his episcopal consecration" in 1934, on "June 24, 1981, the Blessed Virgin Mary began appearing to six Croatian youths in the Herzegovinian village of Medjugorje under the title of Queen of Peace," and "she continues appearing to them"¹⁸⁰.

Written in 1990 while Croatia was still one of the six states of (the second) Yugoslavia, Prcela refers to "Stepinac's Croatia," and provides a map on the cover of his book, and a more detailed map inside his book, of "Croatia in her ethnic and historical boundaries." This map shows the states of Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, together with a section of north-west Serbia, all under the name of "Croatia;" and the map then labels as "Serbia" a smaller area than the state of Serbia is now, or was in the second or third Yugoslavia¹⁸¹. That is, Prcela largely follows the Nazi Ustashi boundaries of Greater Croatia in the *Independent State of Croatia* in his definition of "Croatia." This also makes his usage of Medjugorje significant, since he uses it to reinforce his claim that Bosnia-Herzegovina is part of "Croatia." The fact that the first Medjugorje "visions" are here linked to the forty-seventh "anniversary of" Stepinac's "episcopal consecration" by a writer promoting Stepinac, clearly shows a long history of associating Stepinac with the Medjugorje shrine from the very outset.

Both Croats looking to a "Larger Croatia," and Serbs looking to a "Larger Serbia," have made territorial claims on Bosnia-Herzegovina, which in fact is a mix including Roman Catholic Croats, Eastern Orthodox Serbs, Bosnia-Herzegovinian Mohammedans, and some Protestants. So long as the six state federation of the first Yugoslavia (1921-1941) or second Yugoslavia (1946-1991/2) existed, both Croats and Serbs could partially satisfy their rival claims on the basis that they were all part of Yugoslavia. But since the break-up of the second Yugoslavia, both Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina are independent republics, and so neither Croatia in the name of Greater Croatia, nor (the third) Yugoslavia (1992-2006) or Serbia (since 2006) in the name of Greater Serbia, can claim political union with Bosnia-Herzegovina. However, Roman Catholic Croat and Serbian Orthodox tensions remain inside Bosnia-Herzegovina. The link between Medjugorje and the Nazi Ustashi, evident in the 2003 celebration of the "Franciscan martyrs" of Herzegovina who sided with the Ustashi against the Allied backed Partisans, has also been present from the outset. This Marian shrine is geographically close to a number of burial pits where the Ustashi mass murdered and buried Serbs who had refused to convert to Popery. Serbian Orthodox Presbyter, Srboljub Miletich, reported that Roman Catholics connected with popular Papist devotions at Medjugorje, consider the close geographical proximity of Medjugorje to these mass burial pits of murdered Serbs, constitutes a supernatural message from Mary justifying these killings¹⁸².

In this general region of southern Bosnia-Herzegovina, near, but south of Mostar,

¹⁸⁰ Prcela, J., *op. cit.*, p. viii, back-cover.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, front-cover, p. 83 (map).

¹⁸² Discussions between myself and Presbyter Srboljub Miletich, presbyter of St. Stephen's Serbian Orthodox Church, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia, October, 2004.

bones from a large number of bodies were exhumed from numerous burial pits and given Serbian Orthodox burial in 1991. These Serbian Orthodox were all killed by the Ustashi in 1941. For example, Mladenko Kumovic records that in “August of 1991, the remains of Serbs killed by the Ustasha in 1941 were excavated from karst pits in Prebilovci near Capljina, and then buried¹⁸³.” In the Yugoslavian film, *Here Are Our Children* (1991)¹⁸⁴, excavations were documented from nearby “Cave Goblinka” in November 1990, and some interviews were conducted with eyewitnesses, or close relatives of eyewitnesses, to the 1941 Nazi killing of Serbian Orthodox by the Croatian Roman Catholic Ustashi.

At the beginning of the film, *Here Are Our Children* (1991), there is a picture of a road sign showing “Mostar” (ahead), “Listica” (to left), and “Medugorje” (to right), and the commentator then refers to “Medugorje.” This Romish Marian shrine is then shown in the film, and a Popish priest at Medugorje is recorded invoking Mary, “Our holy virgin Mary, blessed among the women,” with Papists replying, “Blessed be the fruit of your womb.” The film then shows excavations of some of the nearby burial pits, amidst Serbian Orthodox priests conducting a religious service with a Serbian Orthodox congregation. This includes various invocations and chanting connected with providing a Serbian Orthodox religiously sanctioned burial service for these dead Serbian Orthodox killed by the Ustashi in 1941.

The film shows a stone memorial erected in “1987” to the dead, referring to how the “Ustase” killed these people here in “1941.” One of the eyewitnesses, Mr. Suhic, tells of how 30 members of the extended Suhic family were killed in three days between the 4th and 7th of August, 1941. His close relatives in the burial pit included his “Mother, sister, sister-in-law, their children,” and “uncles.” Mr. Suhic says that the “Ustashis were tried in 1957.” He says the delay resulted because Tito’s communist “regime” “wanted the genocide of the Serbs to be forgotten,” though those “in the pit were not guilty of anything, except being Serbs of [Eastern] Orthodox faith.” Other witnesses expand on these points, for example, one says that under Tito, “Nobody was allowed to come” to burial pits such as “Kakausa, the Wailing Pit,” “in the name of some kind of ‘Brotherhood and unity’ of [the second] Yugoslavia.” Another witness says “Only pure Croats of the [Roman] Catholic faith” were wanted to “live in the *Independent State of Croatia*.” He then tells of how “The Ustashis” “would take a child from its mother’s arms, and throw it over the pit” to certain death “yelling, ‘Look how the Serbian kid flies’.” A Serbian Orthodox presbyter points out a man in his 50s with a U-shaped scar on his right cheek, and says, “See the scar on the face of Ceda Unkovic? After his father was killed, they carved their sign on his face with a bayonet, the letter ‘U’” (for Ustashi).

It is clear from this film composed near the end of the twentieth century, that in the early twenty-first century, the horrors of the mass murders of Serbian Orthodox who had refused to convert to Roman Catholicism during World War Two, remain important religio-ethnic factors in defining the cultural relationships between Roman Catholics of mainly Croatian descent, and Eastern Orthodox of Serbian descent, in Medugorje and this associated region of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Therefore, the fact that those involved in popular Papist devotions at Medugorje find in the fake “visions” of Mary a “confirmation” that what the

¹⁸³ Kumovic, M., *op. cit.*, p. 31.

¹⁸⁴ *Here Are Our Children* (or *These Are Our Children*), Script & Director Zdrauko Shotra, Radio-Television, Belgrade, Serbia, Yugoslavia [c. 1991] (Serbian with English subtitles) [St. Stephen’s Serbian Orthodox Church, Sydney, Australia, Library copy].

Ustashi did to the Serbs in World War Two was “right;” the fact that the Franciscans running this sham pilgrimage site celebrate the “Franciscan martyrs” killed by Allied Forces seeking to destroy the Nazi Axis powers; the fact that this celebration of “Franciscan martyrs” is done on the “the Feast of Blessed Aloysius Stepinatz,” who was a Franciscan; and the general association of the crafty “apparitions” jugglings of men at Medugorje with the glorification of Stepinatz, as seen in the fact that the first “vision” of Mary was concocted to occur on the anniversary of Stepinatz’s episcopal consecration about six months after the process to beatify Stepinatz was started in December 1980, all remind us of the disturbing nature of Pope John Paul II’s actions in 1998 to beatify the convicted Nazi war criminal, Cardinal Stepinatz.

CHAPTER 9 CONNECTIONS BETWEEN STEPINATZ’S CULT AND IRISH ROMAN CATHOLIC TERRORISM AGAINST BRITISH PROTESTANTS

Introduction; General Irish Historical Backdrop; A Brief Protestant Hagiology about the Irish before 1922; The Irish Republican Army (IRA); Stepinatz, the Ustashi, and Ireland; The Omagh Bombing (1998)

Introduction

There is another disturbing element to the Pope’s beatification of Stepinatz, namely, the relationship of Stepinatz’s cult to possible acts of terrorism by a fringe group of Irish Roman Catholics aiming at British Protestants. In discussing the troubles of Ireland, it should be remembered that religion is only *one* factor. Ethnic or cultural tensions also exist between those who consider to be Irish is incompatible with being British, as opposed to those who (like Scots and Welsh) consider themselves to be British first and good Northern Irishmen second (or before 1922, good Irishmen). There may also be a tendency in poorer economic times for more Irish Roman Catholics to vent their financial frustrations through the “religious cloak of decency” by supporting an “anti-Protestant” terrorist group, although in the case of hard-core ideologues such economic factors would not be relevant to their motives.

Royalist as opposed to republican sympathies are also involved in this complex Irish interplay of ethnicity, religion, economics, and politics. It should also be noted that while terrorist bombs are targeted at British Protestants, when they explode they may injure, maim, or kill people outside this targeted group. Furthermore, many of those who are designated as “Roman Catholics” or “Protestants” are nominal in their religion, and are “Roman Catholic” or “Protestant” for cultural or family history reasons, rather than for reasons of any true religious conviction. Thus from a Reformed Biblical perspective, many of those who are called “Protestants” in some loose cultural sense, are not in fact true Protestants. Nevertheless, to the extent that religion is *one* factor, and attacks on the larger “Protestant” community *include* in their orbit that smaller number of true Protestant Christians who are regenerated by the power of the Holy Ghost and the blood of Jesus Christ, the troubles in Ireland are clearly relevant to Protestants.

General Irish Historical Backdrop

Pope Adrian IV (Pope 1154-1159) is the only Englishman to have ever been Pope of

Rome. In December 2008 I visited Tydd St. Giles, Cambridgeshire, in the *Church of England's* Diocese of Ely, where in pre-Reformation times the later Pope Adrian IV was a Curate with the name, Nicolas Breakspear. This now Anglican Church has a famous 50 foot (15 metre) tower; and inside it has a stained-glassed window of St. Giles, the Motif Saint of Cripples. On the one hand, that Nicolas Breakspear became Pope Adrian IV shows that in pre-Reformation England one could be a strong Roman Catholic; but on the other hand, the fact that *only one* Englishman ever became Pope also reflects the fact that the Inquisition did not come to England till the late 14th century (other than for the Knights' Templar), and the church was run with English government guidance with much greater tolerance than on the Continent e.g., John Wycliffe, the Morning Star of the Reformation (c. 1329-1384), though removed from his university teaching position for his proto-Protestant views, was still allowed to operate as a Roman Catholic priest at Lutterworth, whereas on the Continent he would have been burnt at the stake as a heretic.

Both Pope Adrian IV and Pope Alexander III (Pope 1159-1181), had encouraged King Henry II (King of England 1154-1189) to invade Ireland, and English kings were then established as "Lord of Ireland" (a title held by English kings till 1541, when under Henry VIII, it was changed by Act of the Irish Parliament at Dublin, to King of Ireland). But the Papal Bull of 1172 giving King Henry II Papal permission to invade "Ireland," also made mention of income that would then "belong of right to" "the" "Roman Church." It said that "in order to bring that [Irish] people into subjection to laws," "it was required "that you are willing to pay St. Peter an annual tribute of one penny for every house there, and to preserve the ecclesiastical rights of" the "Roman Church" in "that land."¹⁸⁵ The presence of the English Crown in Ireland thus preceded the rise of Protestantism by about 350 years. But following Henry VIII's *Supremacy Acts* of 1534 and 1537, the Roman Church lost both its ecclesiastical legal powers in Ireland, as well as its financial benefits. The Popes of Rome who had previously supported the presence of the English Crown in Ireland as "Lord of Ireland," now had a change of heart. Henry VIII had cut off the Pope's revenues from Ireland, and so after 350 years the Papacy's position on the English Crown in Ireland changed from support to opposition. Thus religion now acted to intensify the majority's Roman Catholic Irish identity, which in time came to be a readily recognizable and formal segregation between Ireland's majority Roman Catholic population, and Ireland's minority Protestant population who were happy to be under the Crown

Henry VIII (King of England 1508-47, Lord of Ireland 1508-1541, King of Ireland 1541-47), removed Papal power in England and Ireland by the (*English*) *Supremacy Act (1534)* and the (*Irish*) *Supremacy Act (1537)*. The Anglican Church, known as the *Church of Ireland*, became the Established Church of Ireland (like the *Church of England* was the Established Church in England and Wales). But the battle for the hearts and souls of the Irish would never be generally won by the Protestants. The Pope of Rome remained the *King of Hearts* for most Irishmen, and in her perverted Papist form, Mary the mother of Jesus, remained the *Queen of Hearts* for most Irishmen. The Protestant population included some persons of Irish descent, and especially in Ulster, Scottish Presbyterian, English Anglican, and English Non-Conformist or Puritan immigrants. The Scots were originally Irish immigrants, and so to some extent their migration to Ulster was a return to an earlier ancestral homeland. Beyond this, all were racially Japhethites (Caucasians) (Gen. 10:1),

¹⁸⁵ Alcock, H.J., *English Mediaeval Romanism, op. cit.*, pp. 32-3, quoting King's *History of the Irish Church*, Vol. 3, p. 1046.

including a group of French Huguenots who fled from France after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, and these all blended into a culturally Anglo-Irish Protestant community. Thus of the four provinces in Ireland, Ulster gained a majority British Protestant character from the seventeenth century, but the other three provinces remained largely Roman Catholic over the centuries¹⁸⁶.

Under the *Act of Union (1800)*, the *Anglican Church of England* and *Anglican Church of Ireland* were amalgamated to become the *United Church of England and Ireland*. Ireland also lost the greater autonomy it had held with its Dublin Parliament, as Irish representation was transferred to the Westminster Parliament in London. The French Huguenot's had brought commercial skills to Ulster with cloth linen manufacturing. But in the nineteenth century, industrialization in northern Ireland, centring on Belfast, occurred with cotton, textiles, linen, and shipbuilding. This in turn sharpened the contrast between industrialized, Protestant, Ulster, and the mainly agrarian, Roman Catholic, southern Ireland. A census in 1861 showed that about 80% of the Irish population were Roman Catholics, and though this was not a startling new revelation, nevertheless, this fact was then used by politicians in Westminster as a justification leading to the *Irish Church Act of Disestablishment (1869)*, which made the *Anglican Church of Ireland* independent from the *Church of England* in England and Wales, and no longer the Established Church of Ireland from 1870. In 1916, the *Easter Rebellion* at Dublin, in the heart of southern Ireland, manifested the anti-British Crown, Roman Catholic form of Irish nationalism, in opposition to the pro-British Crown, Protestant form of Irish nationalism. When southern Ireland became independent in 1922, it was about 80% Roman Catholic and about 20% Protestant.

The fact that Ireland was under what from the time of King James I (King 1603-1625) became the *British Crown*, meant that this predominantly Roman Catholic country was unable to facilitate anything comparable to the Spanish Armada, launched from Ireland. Thus in centuries when this type of thing was still possible, the larger Protestant community of England, Scotland, and Wales was protected by the presence of the British Crown in Ireland. Furthermore, let the reader ponder the special affection and tender care of Almighty God for his little flock of Irish Protestants. The Irish Protestants were spared the *state sanctioned* persecutions and killings for their faith, that happened to Protestants in Popish lands such as France or Spain, as all of Ireland was given the religious liberty to be Protestant, and so the Irish Protestants were hid under the protecting wing of the Protestant British Crown. "O give thanks unto the Lord; for he is good: for his mercy endureth forever" (Ps. 136:1). And when at length, southern Ireland left constitutional monarchy under British royalist government, for constitutional presidency under Irish republican government, it did so at a point of modern history in the twentieth century when it would no longer seriously entertain the possibility of a military invasion of the rest of the British Isles for the purposes of Romanizing them. Moreover, God did not allow southern Ireland such independence until it was prepared to grant broad protections of religious liberty to southern Irish Protestants. For "the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and" sometimes "setteth up over it the basest of men" (Dan. 4:17).

While the fairly rapid diminution of the southern Irish Protestant community after 1922, from about 20% to about 2% of the population, indicates conditions for Protestants

¹⁸⁶ Hamilton, T., *History of Presbyterianism in Ireland*, 1887, Ambassador, Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK, 1992 reprint, pp. 28-32.

were not ideal in southern Ireland, nevertheless, they were spared the worst forms of persecution and state sanctioned killings (such as they would have incurred under an independent Irish Romanist government in former centuries); and they could still move to Northern Ireland (Ulster) which remained part of the UK. “O give thanks unto the Lord; for he is good: for his mercy endureth forever” (Ps. 136:1). For the wise Irishmen of Protestantism have been wonderfully protected by Almighty God, as also more fully discussed below with respect to the time of Bloody Mary. But if the love of God for his Irish Protestants has been great, the hate of Satan for this “remnant according to the election of grace” (Rom. 11:5), has also been great. There is a long, sad, history of Irish Roman Catholics persecuting and killing British Protestants, though the number of such casualties is surely far less than it would have been, if southern Irish independence had been granted without religious liberty in earlier centuries.

The fact that the push for Irish autonomy from the united Crown of England and Ireland came with support from the Roman Church *only after* King Henry VIII’s *Supremacy Acts* of 1534 and 1537, when the Roman Church lost its jurisdictional powers in, and financial benefits from, Ireland, means that from the sixteenth century on there are essentially two rival Irish nationalisms. In broad-brush terms, one Irish nationalism is Roman Catholic, anti-British Crown, and anti-Protestant. In broad-brush terms, the other Irish nationalism is Protestant, pro-British Crown, and anti-Roman Catholic. The fact that the Roman Catholic form of Irish nationalism represented the majority Irish population helps to explain its later adoption of democratic republican principles. That is, it hoped on the basis of its majority status, to out-vote and so envelope and suppress the minority British Protestant form of Irish nationalism. In fact, both of these rival forms of Irish nationalism were ultimately formalized with their own national boundaries in 1922.

In 1922 the Republic of Ireland was formed in southern Ireland from three of Ulster’s nine counties (Cavan, Donegal, and Monaghan), together with the other three provinces of Ireland (Connaught in the west, Leinster in the east, and Munster in the south), representing the Roman Catholic form of Irish republican nationalism. At the same time, Northern Ireland was formed from six of the nine counties of the province of Ulster, in which Protestants formed the majority (Antrim, Armagh, Down, Fermanagh, Londonderry, and Tyrone), as a continuing part of the United Kingdom, representing the Protestant form of Irish royalist British nationalism. The six counties were replaced with twenty-six local districts in the 1970s, and Northern Ireland came to be commonly called “Ulster.” While I think the two-state solution is the best way to resolve the historic difficulties of Ireland, the failure to include provisions to ensure that the Roman Catholic population of Northern Ireland, or at least about 90 per cent of them, were humanly deported to southern Ireland as part of the agreed 1922 two-state solution, (like the movement of Mohammedans from India to form Pakistan and Bangladesh in 1947,) has created a festering blister in the north, since the two-state solution was not properly implemented, and the problems giving rise to the 1922 partition have therefore largely been transferred from Ireland in general, to Northern Ireland in particular.

A Brief Protestant Hagiology about the Irish before 1922

The Protestant martyrologist William Bramely-Moore (1831-1918) records that Bloody Mary sent Dr. Cole to Ireland with a commission to persecute Irish Protestants. But when he stopped at Chester, a Protestant woman at the house he stayed in, Elizabeth Edmonds, secretly removed the commission from Cole’s box and replaced it with a pack of

cards. Upon his arrival in Dublin in 1558, the Vice-Roy, Lord Fitz-Walters, upon opening the box declared, “We must procure another commission, and in the mean time let us shuffle the cards.” But as Cole was *en route* to England, the bastard queen born of an invalid incestuous union between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, Bloody Mary, (later “made legitimate” effectively by adoption in a succession Act.) then died, and her godly legitimate half-sister, Queen Elizabeth I, gave a pension to Elizabeth Edmonds¹⁸⁷.

But Irish Protestants have not always been so fortunate. For example, in Bramley-Moore’s edition of *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, he records “A full account of the Irish Massacre in the year 1641.”¹⁸⁸ At a place on, or near the spot, where according to tradition St. Patrick established Christianity in Ireland, stands St. Patrick’s *Church of Ireland* Cathedral in Armagh, Northern Ireland, UK. I was privileged to inspect this Anglican Cathedral in October 2001. Yet this symbol of Protestantism and Christianity, was targeted for attack by Papists during the Irish Massacre of 1641.

Hence we read in Bramley-Moore’s edition of *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* (1867), in the section entitled, “A Full Account of the Irish Massacre in the year 1641,” of how:

... The Cathedral of Armagh did not escape the fury of these barbarians, it being maliciously set on fire by their leaders And to extirpate, if possible, ... those ... Protestants who lived in or near Armagh, the Irish [Papists who were doing the massacring] first burnt all their house, and then gathered together many hundreds of those innocent people, young and old, ... and inhumanly murdered them all.

Notably, Bramley-Moore uses ethnic and religious terms interchangeably, for example, he uses “British” and “Protestants” in this way when he says, “As regards the number of Protestants massacred in Ireland” “the following are the estimates of various authorities: ‘Upwards of 30,000 British were killed’ *Sir W. Petty*. ‘In the first two or three days, ... 40,000 or 50,000 of the Protestants were destroyed’ *Lord Clarendon*¹⁸⁹.”

The *Church of Ireland’s* Book of Common Prayer of 1666-1800, which was based on the *Church of England’s* Book of Common Prayer of 1662, recognized the tradition that the Anglican Church’s highest liturgical honour, a red-letter with its own Office, was only to be given to Protestant figures. This 1666-1800 *Church of Ireland* prayer book thus contained such an Office for *Irish Massacre Day*; and the *Church of Ireland* recognized 23 October as a red-letter day until 1859. Memory of these events of 1641 continues, for example, in the official website of this Anglican Cathedral of Armagh, which refers in its section on “Cathedral History,” to how, “In 1641 it ... became a target for the O’Neills when ... Phelim O’Neill burned it during the rising of [Roman] Catholics”¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁷ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, p. 591; Hamilton, T., *op. cit.*, pp. 24-5.

¹⁸⁸ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, pp. 591-619.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 599. Though he also uses “English” (*Ibid.*, pp. 594,595), and “Protestant(s)” (*Ibid.*, pp. 592-4,597,598) as ethno-religious synonyms for “English Protestants” (*Ibid.*, p. 595), I think the usage here of “British” and “Protestants” better reflects the growth of a specifically Irish British identity comparable to Welsh British or Scottish British identities.

¹⁹⁰ “Saint Patrick’s Cathedral Armagh | Church of Ireland,” section: “Building

Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* also records the "remarkable" and "memorable siege of Londonderry" in 1689, when Protestants in the north of Ireland withstood the Papist armies of James II, until relieved by the Protestant forces of William of Orange (William III). Connected with this, in 1690 the Jacobite army moved north from Dublin, and the Williamite army moved south from Belfast, with the two armies meeting at the Boyne River. The famous *Battle of the Boyne* followed when "Irish Roman Catholics," known as Jacobites, "took up arms in favour of James II," the Papist king, and were defeated by the forces of the Protestant king, William III, known as Williamites¹⁹¹. This was the last time that two crowned kings of Great Britain have fought on the battlefield for the sovereignty of the British Isles. James II (Regnal Years 1685-1688) had sought to return Protestant Britain to the yoke of Popery. After James II contractual breach with the country, which had a legally Protestant throne e.g., making the monarch *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, so that he first *de jure* abdicated by his Popery, and then the Parliament recognized that by his actions he *de facto* abdicated; Parliamentarians acted decisively to bring over William III of Orange (Regnal Years 1689-1702, reigned jointly with Mary 1689-1694), who married James II's Protestant daughter, Mary (Regnal Years 1689-1694). (The "Orange" from the name of William of Orange, came to be a symbol of Protestantism in Northern Ireland, where Protestants are known as "Orangemen.") Both William and Mary were crowned. They no doubt suffered great family pain due to James II's commitment to Romanism. Queen Mary's faithfulness to Protestant Christianity in opposition to her father's Popery, and William's love for Mary and opposition to his father-in-law's Popery, manifested the words of Jesus, "A man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me" (Matt. 10:36,37).

The Parliament declared on 28 Jan 1689, that because James II had "endeavoured to subvert the constitution of this kingdom, by breaking the original contract between King and people," and had "by the advice of Jesuits" "violated the fundamental law," it followed that he had "abdicated the government," so that the throne was "thereby vacant" due to breach of contract. Then on 13 Jan 1689, the Parliament added, "That William and Mary, Prince and Princess of Orange, be and be declared, King and Queen of England, France, and Ireland."

The *Bill of Rights* (1689) recognized from the history of three successive monarchs, Charles I (Regnal Years: 1625-1649), Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1¹⁹²; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685), and James II (Regnal Years: 1685-1688), that it was "inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant Kingdom to be governed by a Popish Prince [such as James II], or any King or Queen marrying a Papist [such as the Roman Catholic-Protestant mixed marriages of Charles I and Charles II]." It stated, "that all and every person or persons that is [such as James II], are, or shall be, reconciled to, or shall hold

History" (<http://www.stpatricks-cathedral.org/cathedral-history/expansion-destruction-and-renewal/>).

¹⁹¹ Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, p. 599.

¹⁹² The British Isles were under republican government from 1649-1660 (England & Ireland), and 1651-1660 (Scotland). As a consequence of the unwelcome encroachments into Scotland of the invading republican army of Cromwell, Charles II held *de facto* power only in parts of Scotland from the latter half of 1650 through to 1651.

communion with, the See or Church of Rome [such as is one view of Charles II on his death-bed; although I think the better view is that this story was a piece of Popish propaganda put out by James II in cahoots with “Father” Huddleston¹⁹³], or shall profess the Popish religion, or shall marry a Papist [such as Charles I and Charles II], shall be excluded, and be ever incapable to inherit, possess or enjoy the Crown and Government of this realm and Ireland,” and that “in all and every such case” “the people of these realms shall be and are hereby absolved of their allegiance, and the said Crown and Government shall” “descend to,” “such person or persons, being Protestant, as” if these others “were naturally dead.”

The *Act of Settlement* (1701) also passed in the reign of William of Orange (12 & 13 William III, chapter 2), requires that, “whosoever shall hereafter come to the possession this Crown shall join in communion with the Church of England as by law established.” A Monarch must state his rejection of “any transubstantiation” in “the Lord’s Supper,” “and that the invocation or adoration of” “any” “Saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass,” “are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants.” (While initially this oath continued for a monarch after it ceased to be required for Members of Parliament in the 19th century, in 1910 this was altered to the oath first taken by George V in 1910. “I . . . , do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that *I am a faithful Protestant*, and that I will, *according to the true intent of the enactments to secure the Protestant Succession to the Throne* of my realm, uphold and maintain such enactments to the best of my power.”) The *Act of Settlement* (1701) and associated *Act of Union* (1707) ensures a Protestant monarch. This is black-letter law stating with regard to the legal requirement of a Protestant monarch, what the Common Law position was before its passage; but whereas before the passage of these Acts the title to office of a monarch was voidable for not being a Protestant, after the passage of these Acts it is void *ab initio*; and so e.g., it is no longer necessary for the Parliament to make out a case that the monarch has both *de jure* and *de facto* abdicated; and that the next Protestant in the line of succession should succeed. In legal commentary on the Williamite settlement, the common law jurist, Sir William Blackstone, in the first volume of his *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, said that it *means in law*, that the throne can go to “such heirs only of the body of the Princess Sophia, as are Protestant members of the Church of England, and are married to none but Protestants” (1 Bl. Com. 217). The Common Law thus interprets the black-letter legal requirement that the monarch must not marry a Papist, to mean that the monarch must marry a Protestant.

The Church of England’s *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) included in the *Calendar* for 5 November, *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* and the associated *Gunpowder Treason Service* which gave thanks to God for his deliverance of the Protestant King and Parliament from what the service called the “Popish treachery” of Guy Fawkes “gunpowder treason” in 1605, in protection of “our religion.” William of Orange arrived on the same day in 1688, 5 November, and so from 1689 the *Gunpowder Treason Service* included further prayers thanking God, “for putting a new song in our mouths, by bringing His Majesty King William, upon this day, for the deliverance of our Church and nation from Popish tyranny and arbitrary

¹⁹³ For a discussion of the two views, see my Textual Commentaries (Matt. 1-14), at “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “(c) i) Charles the First’s Day (30 Jan.), Charles the Second’s Day (or Royal Oak Day) (29 May), & Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.),” subsection “Charles II’s final years and death” (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> at “Commentary on the Received Text”).

power.”

That fact that before 1689, God was thanked for his preservation of the Protestant “religion” from “Popish treachery” in 1605, is significant. This sentiment was reinforced when from 1689 the same service thanked God for “King William,” who came “to preserve” “our religion.” This was a powerful statement that what the *Bill of Rights* (1689) called the “Protestant” religion, was established and celebrated. Thus both before 1689 through reference to the events of 1605, and after 1689 through reference to both the events of 1605 and 1689, the *Gunpowder Treason Service* qualified the services in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) for Charles the First and Charles the Second. That is, while Charles I (remembered in the Calendar on 30 January) and Charles II (remembered in the Calendar on 29 May) were regarded as the legitimate monarchs, they were considered to be like King Solomon, whose “wives turned away his heart after other gods,” “and Solomon did evil in the sight of the Lord” (I Kgs 11:4,6).

The statement at the beginning of the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) 30 January service for Charles I, sought “the mercy of God” for “those” “sins, by which God was provoked to deliver up our King” to death. One of the prayers asked “God,” “who in thy heavy displeasure didst suffer the life of” “Charles the First, to be” “taken away,” to “pardon us for thy mercies’ sake, through the merits of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.” On the one hand, this service clearly condemned the fact that “King Charles the First” was “murdered” in 1649. But on the other hand, the fact that this was vaguely attributed to God’s judgement on various “sins,” meant that one could, but one did not have to, interpret this in a way that was to some degree critical of some of Charles I’s actions.

After 1689 a monarch was prohibited from “marrying a Papist” in the *Bill of Rights* (1689), which thereafter necessarily condemned in moral and religious terms the marriages of Charles I and Charles II (I Cor. 7:39; II Cor. 6:14). Such sentiments opposing mixed marriages with Papists were clearly part of the prayers thanking God for the coming of King William. The associated connection of the 1689 Bill of Rights with the *Act of Settlement* (1701) and associated *Act of Union* (1707) with Scotland reinforced this, since it meant Presbyterianism and the *Westminster Confession* were clearly part of the established *Church of Scotland*, and *Westminster Confession* 24:3 says, “Such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with ... Papists, or other idolaters.”

All three days in the Calendar, namely, Charles I (30 Jan.), Charles II (29 May), and Papists’ Conspiracy (5 Nov) were thus interconnected both before and after 1689. However, from 1689 they additionally acted to itemize one of the “sins” of Charles I, namely, his Roman Catholic-Protestant mixed marriage with a Roman Catholic wife; and by extension also itemized as sin the fact that Charles II entered a Roman Catholic-Protestant mixed marriage with a Roman Catholic wife (I Kgs 11:1-8; Neh. 13:26). And that Charles I’s wife “turned away his heart” (I Kgs 11:4) from the proper worship of God is seen in the tolerance he showed to the semi-Romanist Archbishop Laud whom he should have disciplined; and that Charles II’s wife “turned away his heart” (I Kgs 11:4) from the proper worship of God is seen in the tolerance he showed to his Roman Catholic brother, the Popish Duke, James II.

From 1689 the Office of Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov) also additionally acted to point to the legitimacy of the succession of William III of Orange as the rightful king, for notwithstanding the wrongness of the marriages that produced William’s wife, “God” once again showed that he makes “all things” “work together for good to them that love” him, and

“are” “called according to his purpose” (Rom. 8:28). The celebration in the *Gunpowder Treason Service* from 1689, of “King William” of Orange, for his upholding of Protestantism, thanking God “for making all opposition fall before him, till he became our King and Governor,” in opposition to those who in “Popish tyranny” would “bereave us of our religion,” were contextually unambiguous qualifications to the reigns of Charles I & II, who among other things, clearly erred in marrying Papist wives¹⁹⁴. But God made the “wicked device” of mixed marriages by which the Papists had hoped to murder Protestantism, “return upon” their “own head,” and they were “hanged on” their own “gallows” (Esther 9:25) when the daughter of this union, a Protestant, Mary, married William of Orange, and thus opened the throne up to a godly Protestant King. *Blessed be the name of the Lord!*

After the defeat of James II by William of Orange at the *Battle of the Boyne*, (celebrated as an annual public holiday on 12 July in Northern Ireland,) the war against James II was won, though some battles throughout Ireland continued a little bit longer. James II had failed to inspire his Papist troops, which included some crack cavalry from Popish France sent over by the Papist king of France, Louis XIV. With part of his army, James II had stayed some miles (or kilometres) away from the main *Battle of the Boyne* while it was raging, even though he knew about what was happening. His disgruntled Irish Roman Catholic soldiers, together with other contemporary Irish Roman Catholics, lost any respect they once had for James II, and called him, *James the Dunghill*¹⁹⁵. Thus the last Papist king of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, was so named by his own, and so remembered by his own.

“The next chronicle of blood that arrests our attention” in Ireland, says Bramley-

¹⁹⁴ All three days on the Calendar, 30 Jan., 29 May, and 5 Nov., together with the associated red-letter day Services (or Offices) attached to the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) since 1662 and modified in 1689 so as to include William of Orange, were removed in 1859. But in the wider popular culture, 5 November continued as Bonfire Day with the popular bonfires and fireworks on Bonfire Night. (It was celebrated in Australia when I was a boy in the 1960s & 1970s in those parts of south-eastern Australia that I grew up in; but due to bushfire problems, it was moved to the earlier time of the Monday long-weekend of Queen’s birthday, thus still being a day of loyalty to the Crown. But I recall how we were told that the idea of the fireworks came from the gunpowder Guy Fawkes had intended to use to blow up the Parliament.) Moreover, *King Charles I’s Day* was revived as a black letter on the Anglican Calendar of Canada in 1962, Australia in 1978, and England in 1980 where it is also an optional red-letter day. The primary focus of *King Charles I’s Day* is Charles I, but the secondary focus is the events of the interregnum, preservation of Charles II, and Restoration under Charles II in 1660. Thus in a diminished form, both Charles I and Charles II have also been restored to Anglican Calendars. Moreover, the memory of Charles II’s preservation in the oak tree at Boscobel in 1651 is kept alive in the memory of the “Royal Oak,” used e.g., as a name for various restaurants. (However, it is also sadly the case, that Puseyites and semi-Puseyites misuse *Charles I’s Day*, e.g., they are pro-Laud, and do not generally speak out against the Roman Catholic mixed marriages of Charles I and Charles II.)

¹⁹⁵ “James the Dunghill.” “Dunghill” is a censored form that conveys the basic idea. The exact title found on disgruntled Papist lips, is too coarse for a regenerated Protestant Christian to condone (Eph. 4:29 cf. Deut. 23:13,14; Isa. 6:5; I Peter 1:15,16), and is unfit for publication (“Battlefield Britain - Boyne 1690,” A Father & Son presentation by Peter & Dan Snow, Produced & Directed by Paul McGuigan, BBC TV, UK, 2004).

Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, "is the rebellion of 1798." Once again, it is clear that this conflict involved issues of both ethnicity and religion. Concerning ethnicity, there was the ongoing dispute between those Roman Catholics who considered an Irish national identity meant that the British were an alien power, as opposed to those who considered an Irish national identity meant they were part of a larger British kingdom in the British Isles, comparable in type to, for example, the Scots or Welsh. Concerning religion, the group hostile to the British were mainly Irish Roman Catholics who saw themselves as being opposed to British Protestants; however in the north of Ireland, a group of Puritan derived Protestants, mainly Irish Presbyterians who stood in a connected tradition with Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford in that they supported sedition against the Crown, spearheaded the 1798 rebellion, albeit with some lesser support from the Papists. By contrast, the 1798 rebellion in the south of Ireland was essentially Papist verses Protestant.

The 1798 rebellion to some extent was like the American Revolution of the mid 1770s in that it involved some support from the two groups kept out of powerful political positions in connection with the Test Acts in both England and Ireland, namely, Puritans and Papists. (These Test Acts were designed to help prevent a repeat of the sedition against the Crown that occurred under Charles I and Charles II in the 1640s and 1650s by Puritans in the Samuel Rutherford *Lex Rex* tradition under the leadership of Oliver Cromwell. This resulted from the ongoing glorification of Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford by large numbers of such English and Irish Puritans, who considered God's law of e.g., Rom. 13:1-10 or I Peter 2:17 could be set aside on the basis of the "higher law" of "reason" against what they deemed to be a "tyrant" king. But unlike McCracken and Munro, *infra*, they generally considered that this had to be done by the legislature. By contrast, Anglican Protestants in the *Church of Ireland* included in their Book of Common Prayer of 1666, the same services as the *Church of England's* Book of Common Prayer of 1662, annually remembering King Charles I - and to a lesser extent King Charles II - on 30 Jan., and then remembering the Restoration under King Charles II on 29 May; and thus were anti-Oliver Cromwell and anti-Samuel Rutherford.) The 1798 rebels in the north were mainly Irish Presbyterian Puritans who were unrepresentative of the wider Puritan Protestant community in the north, and those in the south were mainly Papists. But in the north some Papists joined with these minority Puritans in attacking the Anglican Protestant Christian State in Counties Antrim and Down.

In the north of Ireland the 1798 rebellion was mainly instigated by a minority group of Puritan Protestants against the Anglican Protestant Christian State, albeit with some lesser Roman Catholic support. But in Ulster, northern Ireland, this was confined to the three counties of Antrim, Derry, and Down. Mainly Irish Presbyterian rebels led by Henry McCracken rebelled in County Antrim, and while they briefly occupied most of the county, this rebellion was put down when the King's soldiers advanced into the town of Antrim. Likewise in County Down, rebels were led by Henry Munro (1758-1798), a Scottish Presbyterian. He was a Freemason and member of the *Society of United Irishmen*, an organization supporting revolutionary republicanism which looked with favour on both the American and French Revolutions. Munro's rebels had a short-lived military success at Saintfield, but then in the longest battle of the rebellion, these rebels were put down by the King's forces at Ballynahinch¹⁹⁶.

¹⁹⁶ See e.g., "Irish Rebellion of 1798" *Wikipedia* (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Irish_Rebellion_of_1798); & "Amazon com: The Summer Soldiers: The 1798 Rebellion in Antrim and Down," Paperback, Anthony Terence Quincey Stewart (<http://www.amazon.com> >...>History>Europe>England>19thcentury).

Writing in sympathy with the Irish Presbyterian tradition, Thomas Hamilton records that in the north of Ireland, once the insurrection of 1798 was put down, the “head” of “McCracken” was “impaled on Belfast Market House” (formerly on “the corner of High Street and Corn Market”). Thus McCracken’s head ultimately shared the same fate as that of Oliver Cromwell, whose head was hung at Westminster Parliament for most of King Charles II’s reign¹⁹⁷. But Hamilton also records that in “the south” of Ireland, the “1798 insurrection” “assumed” “the form of a religious war. Romanism was for the time in the ascendant, and in delirium of fierce joy feasted gluttonously on Protestant blood¹⁹⁸.”

For example, Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* records that in the south of Ireland, “‘In the house of Scullabogue, the property of a Mr. King, at the foot of Carrickburn mountain, had been left, when the rebel army marched to Corbet Hill, above 200 Protestant prisoners, of both sexes and all ages, under a guard, commanded by John Murphy, of Loughnagheer. Thirty-seven were shot and piked at the hall door, and the rest, 184 in number, crammed into a barn, were burned alive, the roof being fired, and straw thrown into the flames to feed the conflagration.’ *Gordon, confirmed by Sir Richard Musgrave.*” Hamilton refers to this same incident, and also another in the south of Ireland in “County Wexford,” where “a Romish priest, Father Murphy of Bolavogue,” “perpetrated the most horrid atrocities,” including murder of the “Protestant clergyman named Burrows,” his son, and other members of the Protestant congregation. “Father” Murphy then established a camp at Vinegar Hill. All Protestants for four miles around were brought there, and brought them “out in batches to be piked.” In order “to give the proceedings the solemn sanction of” the “Romish” “mother Church, twenty priests said mass at regular intervals in different parts of the camp, and a great tub of holy water was daily blessed, that the murderers might sprinkle themselves with it and go to their work feeling that they had the blessing of the Church in their pious work.¹⁹⁹”

Some elements of this 1798 Irish insurrection are found in a sequel six years later in the then the British colony of New South Wales (NSW), Australia, in 1804. At that time, the Irishman, William Johnston, who was serving a transportation sentence in NSW for his part in the 1798 rebellion, stirred up a pro-Irish and anti-British Protestant Ascendancy rebellion, which was put down in the *Battle of Vinegar Hill* in 1804. (This is located in Castle Hill, western Sydney, almost directly opposite what is now the Royal Oak Grill, a restaurant bearing the name, “Royal Oak” inside the Mean Fiddler Inn.) While this sequel once again contained both ethnic and religious elements, the selection by the NSW rebels of Vinegar Hill to continue the work of Vinegar Hill in Ireland, shows that to some extent the religious element was present in this symbolism, and was pro-Roman Catholic and anti-Protestant. A memorial now stands at Castlebrook Lawn Cemetery, Castle Hill, in Sydney, New South Wales, where this battle occurred. When the NSW Governor King published his thanks for those involved in putting down the rebellion, the NSW Corp Army Officer, John Brabyn was one of a select group singled out for special mention. In the list of “Governors of Tasmania (Including Lieutenant-Governors and Administrators)” produced by the Parliament of Tasmania in Australia, Captain John Brabyn, Commandant (North) (1808-10) is listed as the

¹⁹⁷ Hamilton, T, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.* .

¹⁹⁹ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, p. 599; Hamilton, T., *History of Presbyterianism in Ireland, op. cit.*, pp. 139-43.

sixth Administrator of Tasmania (an office later raised to the rank of Lieutenant-Governor, and then Governor of Tasmania). Brabyn also helped sow the seeds of the Evangelical Anglican Diocese of Sydney, Australia²⁰⁰.

Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, also makes reference to an Irish Roman Catholic "insurrection and massacre" that "took place" "in Dublin" in "1803" when those upholding what they called "[Roman] Catholic virtue" attacked what they called the "heretical" "scum of England," and he also refers to "the fiasco" of 1848²⁰¹.

The traditional account of John Kensit's martyrdom by Papist hands on English soil in 1902, is John Wilcox's *Contending For the Faith* (1902), which refers to the mob of "Romanists" who had threatened "to do" in, the President of the *Protestant Truth Society*, John Kensit, having "congregated" just before Kensit received his "mortal wound."²⁰² Writing some 20 years before southern Ireland left the UK in 1922, Wilcox makes no specific reference to the relevant issues of Irish ethnicity in Liverpool at the time of Kensit's martyrdom there. This defect in Wilcox's account has been corrected by Gordon Murray a century later. Murray is a former Principal of the Kensit Memorial College in London (1968-1975), former Chairman of the London Theological Seminary Board (1987-2003), and when he authored the book, *John Kensit's Death and the Threat to Free Speech* (2004), the incumbent Chairman of the *Protestant Truth Society* Council in London, UK²⁰³.

Murray documents the immigration of the Irish to Liverpool, England, so that in 1891 they were 12.6 per cent of Liverpool's population, the largest Irish population of any English city. The Orange Order in Liverpool held annual 12 July marches celebrating the *Battle of the Boyne* (1690), thus replicating their Ulster counterparts in Ireland. Murray refers to the autobiography of the former Head Constable of Liverpool, Sir William Nott-Bower, who started in the police force as a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary, and progressed to become the City of London Police Commissioner in 1901. Based on this first-hand account, Murray says that "one district" of Liverpool, "was, in its Irishness, just like Dublin." Thus "relationships between" Irish Roman Catholic republican "Nationalists and members of the" "Orange Order were as hostile as in Belfast."²⁰⁴ In the same month as he received his mortal

²⁰⁰ Clark, C.M.H., *A History of Australia*, Melbourne University Press, 1963, Vol. 1, pp. 171-3; Pike, D (Editor), *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Melbourne University Press, 1966,1977, Vol. 1, p. 144 on "Brabyn, John;" McGrath, B.G., *The Life and Times of John Brabyn of the New South Wales Corps and his extended family*, Total Print Control, Castle Hill, 1995, pp. 53-6 (Brabyn is one of my matrilineal four times great-grandfather's, and his sword was handed down to my mother, who comes from a long line of Protestants.) "Governors of Tasmania (Including Lieutenant-Governors and Administrators)" *Tasmanian Parliamentary Library* (www.parliament.tas.gov.au.tpl.datasheets/Governors_Table.htm).

²⁰¹ Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, pp. 599-600.

²⁰² Wilcox, J.C., *et al*, *Contending For the Faith*, 1902, 2nd edition 1957, 3rd edition 1989, 4th (Supplement) edition, 1998, Protestant Truth Society, London, UK, pp. 54.

²⁰³ Murray, G., *John Kensit's Death and the Threat to Free Speech*, Protestant Truth Society, London, Printed by Wright's (Sandbach), Cheshire, England, UK, 2004.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12; referring to Nott-Bower, W., *Fifty-Two Years a Policeman*, Edward Arnold, London, UK, 1926, p. 57.

wound, Kensit had encountered “opposition from the Irish Roman Catholics,” and at one meeting “several thousand Protestants” had “clashed with Roman Catholics.” At another meeting, “attended by a large number of Roman Catholics,” “an attack was made on the preachers who had to be rescued by police.” Just days before the fatal blow, an “estimated 3000 Roman Catholics gathered outside the” meeting “Hall, windows were broken, and afterwards the speakers had to be escorted to safety by the police.²⁰⁵” It was in this context, in which John Kensit’s campaign against Puseyite Anglicanism and Popery, “provoked riotous opposition from largely Roman Catholic crowds” of “Irish” descent; that “after” numerous “clashes between Protestants and Roman Catholics both at meeting halls and in open air gatherings,” John Kensit, “was struck by a missile hurled towards him on his way out of Liverpool” and was “killed.²⁰⁶”

Gordon Murray also refers to the fact that in 1867 three Fenians were hanged in northern Ireland for murdering a policeman while they were trying to help some prisoners escape who had been arrested after a riot²⁰⁷. Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* also refers to the “raid upon Canada” by the “Fenians in 1866²⁰⁸.” The Fenians were a republican secret society established in the USA by John Mahony and in Ireland by James Stephen in 1858. The American Fenians staged unsuccessful raids across the US-Canadian border into *British Canada* in 1866, 1870, and 1871. (The importance of Irish-American Roman Catholic support is discussed in greater detail below). The Irish group was sometimes called the “Republican Brotherhood,” and a member of it, Arthur Griffith, founded *Sinn Fein* in 1905. *Sinn Fein* is known as the *political wing* (non-military and professedly non-violent wing) of the *Irish Republican Army* (IRA) which is the military and violent wing.

The Irish Republican Army (IRA)

The IRA is one of the most important groups of Irish Roman Catholic terrorists, though by no means the only such group. The IRA was formed in 1919 as the successor of the military wing of *Sinn Fein* known as the *Irish Volunteers*. They used guerilla tactics in the Irish War of Independence (1919-21), and continued to fight for a united republican Ireland against British Protestants after 1922. The song, “It’s a long way to Tipperary” was sung by, for example, British Empire troops in World Wars One (1914-18) and Two (1939-45). The song came from Tipperary Barracks in southern Ireland. When I visited Tipperary in 2001, I found only the barracks’ walls, water tower, one building, and an officers’ entrance arch remained, the rest having been blown up by the IRA after the British left southern Ireland in 1922. Declared illegal in the 1930s, the IRA bombings have included a 1939 series of bombings on England, and other terrorist activities against the British during World War Two, when five IRA leaders were executed and many more imprisoned.

The IRA Chief of Staff in 1939 was Sean Russell, under whom over one hundred

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

²⁰⁶ Sherwood, J., Book Review of Murray’s *John Kensit’s Death and the Threat to Free Speech*, in *English Churchman* (7648), 15 & 22 October, 2004, p. 8 (changing Pastor John Sherwood’s abbreviation “R.C.” to “Roman Catholic”).

²⁰⁷ Murray, G., *op. cit.*, p. 11.

²⁰⁸ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, p. 600.

attacks occurred on different British cities in 1939. Russell visited the USA that year where he contacted a wealthy Irish-American Roman Catholic gun-runner for the IRA, Joseph McGarrity, in order to get more funds for his bombing campaign against British Protestants (some other historical connections between Irish Roman Catholic terrorists and Irish-American Roman Catholics are discussed below). Russell was a Nazi collaborator who voluntarily went to Berlin and was in an alliance with Nazi Germany at a time when the Nazis were mass murdering Jews and Gypsies as part of their racial theoretics, and mass murdering Serbs who had refused to convert to Roman Catholicism (and some who had “converted” to Romanism). In Nazi Germany Russell met up with two other IRA Nazi collaborators, Frank Ryan and Francis Stuart.

Francis Stuart was a former IRA Chief of Staff. An anti-Yugoslav federationist, Stuart supported the Nazi’s dismantling of Yugoslavia during World War Two, regarding the Yugoslav federation of 1921 to 1941 as something “created by the politicians and financiers of England and France.” He shared the Nazi’s Jewish conspiracy theory, and linked it to his anti-British sentiment by specifically targeting Britain’s Jews, attributing, for example, “the buying up of Serbian forests in Dalmatia” to “largely London Jews,” whom he claimed were in “control of the machine” of “money” “in England and America.²⁰⁹” Francis Stuart said, “I admired Hitler from the first days of power in Germany.” He strongly supported Nazi Germany in the Battle for Stalingrad (called Tsaritsyn before 1925, Volgograd since 1961), and while many Irishmen, particularly those of Northern Ireland would disagree with his claims to speak for “Ireland,” Stuart said of the Nazi’s failure to capture Stalingrad, that “Ireland’s sympathy and Ireland friendship” “increases at such times as these,” and saw in “the spirit of the German army” unsuccessfully besieging Stalingrad commendable “qualities of endurance and tenacity.²¹⁰”

Stuart clearly linked Nazi Germany’s fight with the United Kingdom to that of the IRA. For example, when six IRA men had been sentenced to death for the murder of the Royal Ulster Constabulary officer, Constable Patrick Murphy (the sentence of five of them was later commuted to prison, with only Thomas Williams being hung), he said on the radio, “the first thing I want to do is to send you the sympathy of many many Germans who have spoken to me of the fate of the six Irishmen condemned to be hung in Belfast.²¹¹” Or when Hugh McAteer and three other IRA men broke out of Belfast Jail, he spoke of “the pride and thrill,” with “which” we heard of the escape of the IRA men,” saying this “made a very deep impression” on him. He linked this to “the men of the” Nazis’ “Sixth German Army at Stalingrad,” who were, like the IRA, undergoing defeat, and tried to draw comfort from the Nazi’s army at Stalingrad, saying that “what the men, officers, and generals of the German Sixth Army are doing at Stalingrad is altogether beyond the ordinary standards of bravery.²¹²”

Sean Russell boarded a German U-Boat bound for southern Ireland, the U65, with the

²⁰⁹ Barrington, B. (Editor), *The Wartime Broadcasts of Francis Stuart 1942-1944*, Lilliput Press, Republic of Ireland, 2000, pp. 192,204 (Broadcasts of 9 Feb 1942 and 8 Jan 1944).

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 118,176 (Broadcasts 20 Feb 1943 and 13 Nov 1943).

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 83 (Broadcast 30 Aug 1942).

²¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 100,111-2 (Broadcasts 20 Jan 1943 and 30 Jan 1943).

other IRA Nazi collaborator he met up with in Germany, Frank Ryan. But Russell died in August 1940 when he became very ill on board the U65. He received a Nazi burial at sea from the navy of Hitler's Third Reich. (His fellow IRA Nazi collaborator, Frank Ryan, shortly after the Allied landings of 1944 in Normandy, died of a stroke in a German hospital at Dresden, reserved for high ranking Nazis.)²¹³ A statue of Russell stands in Fairview Park, Dublin. Here, in August 2003, Sinn Fein's Dublin candidate for the European elections, M.L. McDonald, together with the convicted IRA terrorist bomber, Brian Keena, chose to "pay respect" to Russell. Both delivered speeches to his honour²¹⁴. With the Republic of Ireland's capital maintaining a statue honouring the Nazi collaborator and former IRA Chief of Staff, Sean Russell, a murderer whose name is still honoured by Sinn Fein and Irish Roman Catholic terrorists alike, and who was connected with other IRA Nazi collaborators such as Frank Ryan and Francis Stuart, it should not surprise us that another Nazi collaborator, Aloysius Stepinatz, should also be viewed with favour by such Irish Roman Catholics.

IRA terrorism again flared in the 1960s, and after 1969 they divided into an "Official" communist wing and a "Provisional" non-communist wing. From 1970 the Provisional IRA carried out terrorist attacks killing many British Protestants, especially in Northern Ireland. In addition to hundreds and hundreds of IRA bombs in Northern Ireland, the IRA has planted bombs in other parts of the UK. In the 30 or so years to 2005, the IRA killed about 1,700 people²¹⁵. Consider e.g., the following IRA bombings. "Bloody Friday" (1972), Belfast, Northern Ireland, was hit by 22 bombs in 75 minutes, killing 9 and injuring 130. Guildford, England (1974) killed 5, and injured 182. Birmingham, England (1974) killed 19. Brighton, England (1984), where the British Parliamentary Cabinet was almost killed, injured a number of officials and killed 4. London (1983), Harrod's Department Store, killing 6, and wounding 90. London (1991), mortar bomb attack on British Prime Minister in cabinet meeting at 10 Downing Street. London (1993), a car bomb killed 2 and caused 350 million pounds of damage. Manchester, England (1996), 206 injured and 70,000 square metres of retail area destroyed.

Shootings have also occurred. The Hague, Holland (1979), British Ambassador, Sir Richard Sykes, murdered in front of his official residence. King's Mill (Kingsmill) (1976). 10 Protestants ordered out of a bus and shot dead at King's Mill, County Armagh, Northern Ireland²¹⁶. Not wanting to kill any Roman Catholics, the Roman Catholic bus driver was told "to get out of the way" and "run up the road," so that this was clearly a deliberate and

²¹³ *The Shamrock and the Swastika*, The Irish Film Board, TG4, 2002, English Version, SBS Australia, 2003. This program also make reference to, e.g., Hull, M., *Irish Secrets*, German Espionage in Ireland 1939-1945, Irish Academic Press, Dublin, Republic of Ireland & Portland, Oregon, USA, 2003, and O'Haplin, E., *Defending Ireland*, Oxford University Press, UK, 1999.

²¹⁴ Politics.ie The Irish Politics Website, 6 June 2004 (www.politics.ie/modules/php?name=News&files=print&sid=5451).

²¹⁵ *Newshour*, With Jim Lehrer (USA TV News), 28 July, 2005.

²¹⁶ James Byrnes, Robert Chambers, Reginald Chapman, Walter Chapman, Robert Freeburn, Joseph Lemmon, James McConville, James McWhirter, Robert Walker, and Kenneth Worton.

premeditated killing of Protestants by the IRA. An 11th Protestant, Alan Black, escaped, but was maimed for life. 9 of the 10 Protestants killed were buried at nearby Bessbrook, 6 were Presbyterians and 3 were Anglicans.

At Enniskillen, Northern Ireland (1987), the IRA killed 11, and injured 63, who were attending the war memorial cenotaph on Remembrance Day (11 November, remembering the end of World War One in particular, and to some extent Allied Wars in general). IRA victims also included the World War Two Allied vice-admiral and Supreme Allied Commander of Southeast Asia (1943-6), Lord Louis Mountbatten (1900-1979), who was the last vice-roy of India (1947), First Sea Lord (1955-9) and Admiral of the Fleet (1956). He was killed by an IRA bomb planted in his boat in which he was killed in Donegal Bay, in the north-west of the Republic of Ireland in 1979²¹⁷. Lord Mountbatten married his wife, Edwina, at St. Margaret's *Church of England* in Parliament Square, London, which is immediately next to the *Church of England's* Westminster Abbey, where his State funeral was conducted according to the rites of the Anglican Church. Given the IRA collaboration with the Nazis and IRA activities against the United Kingdom during World War Two, and their killing of the World War Two Allied Forces' Southeast Asia Commander, Lord Mountbatten, it is easy to see why such persons would be sympathetic to fascist anti-Allied forces in World War Two such as the Nazi Ustashi collaborator, Archbishop Stepinatz.

It should also be noted that at times the IRA has operated something like the Italian mafia against their fellow Roman Catholic republicans. For instance, in January 2005 the 33 year old Robert McCartney was in a Magennis's Pub, Belfast, N.I., in which his fellow Romanists were involved in anti-British enmities. In the ungodly atmosphere, one of McCartney's friends, Brendan Devine, got involved in a personal, rather than a political altercation, with a former Provisional IRA Commander. The IRA man yelled, "Do you know who I am?" and then gave a signal, at which point one of the IRA leader's henchmen, moved up and slit Devine's throat. In a bid to protect his friend, McCartney dragged Devine outside. More than a dozen men, armed with knives and metal sewer rods followed, and lunged hard into McCartney's heart, whilst others bashed his head. While Devine survived, McCartney did not. Police efforts to bring McCartney's murderers to justice have been blocked by an atmosphere of fear and intimidation. Though over 70 people were in the pub, they all *heard nothing, saw nothing, know nothing*.

Nevertheless, in May 2005 two men, Terence Davison and James McCormick were remanded in custody and charged. Davison with McCartney's murder, and McCormick with the attempted murder of Brendan Devine. The two former Sinn Fein men were put on bail, awaiting trial. Terence Davison is the uncle of Gerard "Jock" Davison," who is a current and senior member of the "Belfast Brigade" of the *Provisional IRA*, and its former Operations Commander. He has close ties with the President of Sinn Fein. Brendan Devine was sentenced in June 2005 to seven years in jail for a robbery in Belfast; and in June 2008, Terence Davison was found not guilty of McCormick's murder²¹⁸. Amidst these developments, the McCartney family were pushed out of their Roman Catholic republican area in Belfast, by fellow Papists who disliked their dispute with the IRA and allegedly made them leave under threats of violence. The last of the McCartney family to be driven out of

²¹⁷ *Encyclopedia Britannica CD 99, op. cit.*, "Irish Republican Army," "Fenian," "Lord Louis Mountbatten."

²¹⁸ "Murder of Robert McCartney," *Wikipedia* (23/8/2010), section on "Fight," (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Murder_of_Robert_McCartney).

the part of town they were living in by IRA sympathizers was the deceased's sister, Paula, who left Short Strand, Belfast, in late October 2005²¹⁹. The McCartney family report continuing intimidation by IRA sympathizers as at 2008²²⁰.

The IRA unit involved in this Italian mafia style murder, is part of a Roman Catholic community of about 3,000 which includes the former IRA "Commanding Officer" of Belfast. This Papist unit is notorious for their *Padro Pio style killings*. Named after the Italian Romanist stigmatic, Padre Pio (Beatified by Pope John Paul II in 1999), this involves the *Provisional Irish Republican Army* men tying the hands of their victim behind his back, and then shooting him through both wrists. The neighbouring Protestant community of about 60,000, is protected from them by a *peace line* bolstered by a large metal protection wall²²¹.

It is clear that even when certain Roman Catholics have been identified as members of the IRA, or a similar anti-British Protestant terrorist organization, arrested, and convicted of serious offences, including murder, the Church of Rome has never taken disciplinary action against them, such as excommunication. By contrast, Scripture says "murderers" "shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone" (Rev. 21:8). Thus e.g., in 2003, the Reverend James Dowson of Cumbernauld in Scotland, wrote in the *English Churchman* under the title, "Rome's Blessing of IRA Murderers." He stated his concern at the Romish Mass held at Clonard in West Belfast, Northern Ireland, "for IRA volunteers," describing this as an "arrogant display by some prominent" Roman Catholic "churchmen in Ireland of their solid and continuing support" for the IRA. "Shame on those" Roman Catholic "priests," he wrote, "who would honour and glorifying cold blooded murderers, who have butchered thousand of men, women, and children both Protestants as well as [Roman] Catholics."²²²

Stepinatz, the Ustashi, and Ireland

Hubert Butler (1900-1991) was a southern Irish "Protestant" republican. On the one hand, he held such objectionable views as: religious liberalism, pacifism (i.e., being unmanly, I Cor. 11:14, and "fearful" (AV) or "cowardly" (NKJV) in the face of enemy, Rev. 21:8, cf. Num. 1:3), pro-abortion, and ecumenism. But on the other hand, his life-long interest and work on Stepinatz and the Ustashi, means his works contain some valuable information. Though no orthodox Protestant would regard this religious liberal as a true Protestant Christian, his connection to an apostate form of Protestantism meant he still bore the label "Protestant" (most Irish Roman Catholics not knowing the difference, there being only a 2% to 3% "Protestant" population in the southern Irish Republic). In the southern Irish context, for his religious independence from Romanism, Butler was persecuted by Papists after

²¹⁹ "Robert McCartney (murder victim) - Wikipedia ... encyclopedia" ([http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_McCartney_\(murder_victim\)](http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_McCartney_(murder_victim))); "Gerald Davison - Wikipedia ... encyclopedia" (www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gerald_Davison); Peterkin, T. (Ireland correspondent), "McCartney sisters want spy to help solve murder of their brother" (Telegraph/News/McCartney sisters... www.telegraph.co.uk/.../news/2006/01/).

²²⁰ "Murder of Robert McCartney," *Wikipedia* section on "Intimidation" (23/8/2010) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Murder_of_Robert_McCartney).

²²¹ See e.g., Glenn Frankel in *Washington Post* 2 March 2005; David Durent, "Justice for Robert McCartney" (hereticallibrarian.blogspot.com/2005/03/).

²²² *English Churchman*, 27 June & 4 July, 2003, p. 2, Letters to the Editor.

upsetting the Papal nuncio to the Republic of Ireland for speaking out on the forced conversions of Serbs during World War Two. A graduate of St. John's College, Oxford, he learnt Serb-Croat during a three year stay in (the first) Yugoslavia. Then in Austria he worked with a group that helped Jews escape from Nazis in Vienna during 1938-9. He returned to southern Ireland in 1941. In 1946 he went to the capital of Croatia, Zagreb, in (the second) Yugoslavia, where he learnt of the World War Two Nazi Ustashi atrocities, associated involvement of the Roman Catholic Church hierarchy, and collaboration of Archbishop Stepinatz.

Back in Ireland, Butler found that *Stepinatz was being promoted by Irish Roman Catholic clergy as a heroic anti-communist figure whose example should be emulated by Irish Roman Catholics fighting against British Protestants.* By contrast, Butler spoke on Irish radio (*Radio Eirann*), about the Nazi Ustashi policy of forced "conversions" to Romanism. As a consequence, the Irish Roman Catholic newspaper, *The Standard*, which was under the editorship of an Austrian of Irish descent, Count O'Brien of Thomond, was highly critical of Butler. In 1947 over 150,000 people gathered in the southern Irish capital of Dublin to voice their support for the convicted Nazi war criminal, Stepinatz. The following year, Butler noted in his essay on "Ireland and Croatia," "the commotion caused in Ireland by the Stepinac trials," and said that "few events in Europe excited such widespread interest in Ireland as the trial of Archbishop Stepinac and the struggle between the [Roman] Catholic Church in Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav Government." For example, Butler records that the southern Irish Minister for Agriculture, Mr. Dillon, addressing some university students, "advised them to model themselves on" such persons as "Stepinac and Pavelitch, who had 'so gallantly defended freedom of thought and freedom of conscience'." Moreover, he notes that "Stepinac's martyrdom has been deliberately courted," because the Yugoslav government "offered him his freedom if he left the country."

Butler's reason for writing about Stepinatz and the Ustashi are significant. Butler witnessed the pro-Stepinatz book, O'Brien's *Archbishop Stepinac, The Man and his case*, with an Introduction by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, being promoted by Cardinal Spellman, who went so far as to lay a copy of it on the foundation of the then new Stepinatz Institute in New York, USA, the *Archbishop Stepinac High School*. This constituted the revisionist history that about 1,700 Roman Catholic schoolgirls who were arranged in the shape of rosary, were to believe. Referring to O'Brien's book, Butler said, "It seemed to me that there was a major error of fact or interpretation, or significant omission, on almost every page of this book."²²³

Butler expressed his concern that as early as 1948 Stepinatz was being portrayed as a "martyr," describing him rather as an "ecclesiastical politician" "whose political manoeuvres failed." In the same year, 1948, he said the "Stepinac legend is not dwindling, it is growing." In describing "something callous in this engineering of sympathy" for Stepinatz in Ireland around this time, he says "some of these manoeuvres seem to be almost obscene in their cynicism." For instance, "Father Schwartz," "got front-page prominence in" southern "Irish newspapers by inducing 4000 natives of the Pacific island of Guam to express their horror at Mgr. [Monsignor] Stepinac's trial." However quoting Willard Price's work, Butler notes that when the Jesuit missionaries arrived at Guam in 1668, the native population was about 55,000, but eighteen years after the Spanish Papists arrived, the number had dwindled

²²³ Butler's *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

to just one hundred (though some of this was due to disease). The Jesuit missionaries had come with the *Spanish Inquisition*, and “conversions were made at the point of the sword. Drums beat in the hills and the natives rose in bloody riots. The Spaniards fortified the Sweet Name of Mary” “Church in Aganya’,” and “turned their capital city into an armed camp and made war on the stubborn unbelievers. Slaughter of” these inhabitants of Guam “followed on a Hitlerian scale’,” though some “escaped from the island’.” Butler observes that in the Nazi Ustashi’s “Croatia,” “conversions on a far wider scale than at Guam were carried out and the slaughter far exceeded 55,000.” But given this shocking history of forced “conversions” to Popery on Guam, and its similarities to the Ustashi’s forced “conversions” to Popery in the *Independent State of Croatia* from 1941 to 1945, Butler asks, “Could” “Father Schwartz” “not have spared these poor half-breeds that silly pantomime?”²²⁴ .”

Butler said, “I felt that the honour of the small Protestant community in southern Ireland would be compromised if those of us who had investigated the facts remained silent about what we had discovered. In many Roman Catholic pulpits the sufferings of the [Roman] Catholics under Tito were being compared to the long martyrdom of [Roman] Catholic Ireland under Protestant rule.” “If we agreed that history should be falsified in Croatia in the interests of [Roman] Catholic piety, how could we protest when our own [Irish] history was similarly distorted?” For example, Butler records that a “well known Irish Jesuit, Father Devane, assuming a Slav name, Muhajlo Dvornik, to lend force to his accuracy, solemnly declared that there had been no forced conversions in Croatia.”²²⁵ (For those familiar with the history of Jesuitry, this type of deception comes as no surprise. For example, Blakeney records that in the Romish missionary work in India, an Italian Jesuit, Nobili, in order to acquire influence with the Hindus, claimed he was a Brahmin descended from the gods, and today Papists hail Nobili as a great missionary.²²⁶) In a series of articles in the Anglican *Church of Ireland Gazette* (1950-1), Butler demolished both Romish attempts to deny the reality of the mass murders and mass “conversions” of Serbs, and the claims being made by Irish Roman Catholics that Stepinatz was unaware of the Nazi Ustashi policy of mass killings of Serbs during World War Two who had refused to convert to Romanism. His most celebrated essay (1956), which later became the name of a book containing this essay, is *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue* (1990). This title is based on the above mentioned quote in Stepinatz’s November 1941 letter to Pavelitch, in which he quotes the Roman Catholic Bishop of Mostar, Bishop Mishitch, who said, (“The Vice-Governor” or) “The Sub-Prefect in Mostar, Mr. Bajic,” “publicly declared, (as a State employee he should have held his tongue), that in Liubina alone 700 [Serbian Orthodox] schismatics have been thrown into one pit’.”

Hubert Butler, (like Sherwood Eddy and Cyrus Sulzberger,) visited Stepinatz in his prison cell at Lepoglava. In 1952 at a public meeting of the Foreign Affairs Association at the Rotunda, in Dublin, Butler raised the issue of the World War Two persecution of Serbian

²²⁴ Butler’s *In the Land of Nod*, pp. 90-3,118,128-9; p. 90 quoted in Agee, C. (Editor), *Unfinished Ireland: Essays on Hubert Butler*, Irish papers in association with the Butler Society, 2003, chapter by Chris Agee, “The Stepinac File,” pp. 144-60, at pp. 154,155; Butler’s *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, pp. 272-3.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 272-3.

²²⁶ R.P. Blakeney, *Popery in its Social Aspects*, *op. cit.*, chapter 18, “The Jesuits,” pp. 153-67, at p. 157.

Orthodox and their option of either converting to Roman Catholicism or being killed. In doing so, Hubert Butler upset his predominantly Roman Catholic audience, and the Papal Nuncio to the Republic of Ireland, Monsignor Gerald O'Hara, who was present walked out in protest. This matter has been well reported and is known as *the Nuncio Incident*. Newspaper headlines in southern Ireland included the *Sunday Express*, "Pope's Envoy Walks Out. Government to Discuss Insult to Nuncio'."

A number of local government bodies both in the city and country convened special meetings in order to condemn Butler's "insult." Speeches came from Mayors, aldermen, and others. The Kilkenny County Council expelled Butler from one of its sub-committees, *thus showing pro-Romanist religious persecution by a government body* (that was meant to have religious freedom), and Butler was forced to resign his executive office in the Kilkenny Archaeological Society, *thus showing pro-Romanist religious persecution in a non-government* and a purely secular organization (that was meant to have religious liberty). Though it must be said that the Republic of Ireland granted religious liberty to Protestants in broad terms, these facts show that in the application of religious liberty laws to those who had clearly upset the Roman Church, a blind-eye was turned to *some* elements of religious liberty. Certainly it must be admitted, that the government's law enforcement process would still e.g., have sought to prevent, or where necessary, seek to punish, such egregious breaches of religious liberty as any attempts by Papists to kill someone like Butler. Thus in this *qualified sense*, it must be said that these actions showed the absence of *full* religious freedom in southern Ireland at the time, and so help us to understand the circumstances under which the Protestant population declined from about 20% to about 2% after 1922.

A Jesuit who had escorted the Papal nuncio to the meeting, Stephen Brown, subsequently defended the Ustashi regime against the charges of forced conversions in the *Irish Independent*. Butler met with Brown in order to try and clarify the problems giving rise to the *Nuncio Incident*. Butler says the Jesuit, Brown, "received me warmly." But after the meeting, in an act of stereotypical Jesuitry, Butler was double-crossed by the Jesuit, who a few days later published an account of the meeting in *The Standard* in which he falsely claimed, "Mr. Butler [was] rebuked"²²⁷.

One account of the *Nuncio Incident* is given by Sean O'Casey (1880-1964), an Irish playwright born into an Irish Protestant family. He is renowned for his realistic dramas of Dublin slums in war and revolution in which he juxtaposes comedy and tragedy. But for the godly, his language and themes are at times too coarse and worldly. But this playwright's depiction of the *Nuncio Incident* in *Sunset and Evening Star*, in the section entitled "Outside an Irish Window," is of some value in showing that some of the better sentiments of even the unregenerate Irish society were offended at the idea that an Irishman like Butler who professed to be a Protestant, was meant to publicly cow-tow down to a version of Croatian history approved by the Roman Church's *imprimatur*.

"Mick" or "Mickey" (diminutive of Michael) is sometimes used for a stereotypical Roman Catholic Irishman; or in countries such as Australia or America, a stereotypical Irishman (*impliedly* a Roman Catholic), or a stereotypical Roman Catholic (*impliedly* of Irish descent). Hence the Roman Catholic *Papal Nuncio* to the Republic of Ireland, Gerald O'Hara, who was an Irish-American, is here called "Mickey O'Hara" by O'Casey. In a

²²⁷ Butler's *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, pp. 274,280,281.

conversation between Mick and Dan, “Mick” says to “Dan,” “A week ago, the International Affairs Association” “heard the editor of the Roman Catholic paper, *The Standard*, giving a lecture on ‘The Pattern of Persecution in Yugoslavia,’ with the Papal nuncio, Monsignor Mickey O’Hara, sitting nice and easy in a front row.” “Up sprung a country gentleman, named Hubert Butler, who, low and behold, began to talk of the part Cardinal Stepinac took with Pavelic, the Fascist leader, in forcing them of the [Serbian] Orthodox Church over into the Roman ditto. Yep, yep! Stir your stumps for your spiritual good, till you’re all mangled and ironed out into good, hearty, Roman Catholics. Go on, yep! To your sure salvation! At the nonce, up bounced the noncio, and out he flounced, beset with such indignation that he forgot to bang the door after him. Close the meeting quick; oh, quick; nor more talk; no, none! What you’re hearing now, stranger, is an echo; the echo of what happened immediately after. The echo of thudding boots worn by them racing along to the nuncio’s dwelling to apologise for what had happened; and to beg his big blessing.” After some further conversation, Dan also says to Mick, “We’re working towards a population of holy, practising imprimaturs, stranger.” “We must insist on proper reverence to our bishops and our nuncio.”²²⁸

Notably, the classic pro-Stepinatz work of Papist propaganda is O’Brien’s *Archbishop Stepinac: The man and his case (1947)* (written by the editor of the Irish Roman Catholic newspaper, *The Standard*, which both Butler and O’Casey mention as attacking Hubert Butler,) in which he describes Stepinatz in the Preface as a “saintly prelate.” This revisionist work has been greatly criticized by Hubert Butler, and the work should be treated with great caution. O’Brien, was a Roman Catholic Austrian of Irish descent. His book, *Archbishop Stepinac*, is strongly interconnected with Irish Roman Catholicism, and is signed in the Preface by O’Brien at “Dublin” in “1946.” The book has a Foreword by John McQuaid, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin and Primate of Ireland, dated the “feast of our Lady of Lourdes, 1947.” In this Foreword, Archbishop McQuaid describes “Stepinac” as “heroic.”²²⁹

The Irish Roman Catholic fascination with, and fatal attraction to, Stepinatz, is reflected in the Dublin newspaper, *The Irish Catholic*. Various post World War Two articles appeared on him during his life, including such trifling soap-opera type detail as saying in the “Latest News From Archbishop Stepinac,” that he was feeling somewhat “depressed” in June 1952²³⁰. This Romish paper clearly sought to white-wash Stepinatz, and clearly presented him as an anti-Communist hero. For example, in 1952 it rejected the proposition that the “elevation” of “Cardinal-designate Stepinac” “was an ‘insult’ to the Yugoslav people” under the “‘War criminal’ Cry,” and said that it was an “encouragement to the local [Romanist] clergy” “in their fight” “against” the “communist State.”²³¹ When he died, Stepinatz was front page news in the *Irish Catholic* for three editions²³². In discussing his death, the *Irish Catholic* was prepared to quote the “Yugoslav Communist leader who is the local chief in Croatia,” “Vladimir Bakaric,” as saying “the communist” “Government has no quarrel with

²²⁸ O’Casey, S., *Autobiographies 2*, Pan Books in association with Macmillan London, UK, 1980, *Sunset and Evening Star*, section, “Outside an Irish Window,” pp. 641-3.

²²⁹ O’Brien, A.H.C., *Archbishop Stepinac, op. cit.*, p. vii.

²³⁰ *Irish Catholic*, 26 June 1952, p. 6.

²³¹ *Irish Catholic*, 18 Dec. 1952, p. 8.

²³² *Irish Catholic*, 16 Feb, 1960, p. 1; 25 Feb. 1960, p. 1; 3 March 1960, p. 1.

the [Roman] Catholic Church, but ‘with the fascists’,” that is, persons such as Stepinatz²³³. Nevertheless, it sought to maintain the depiction of him as one “Defending himself,” and what he called “‘the sacred things of [Roman] Catholicism’” against “‘the Yugoslav Communist party’.”²³⁴

The *Irish Catholic* newspaper’s coverage of Stepinatz’s death, once again shows the interconnection between Irish Roman Catholicism and the glorification of Stepinatz as a heroic anti-communist figure. The front page of *The Irish Catholic* of 16 February 1960, shows a picture of Roman “Catholics Farewell Tribute,” with what it calls “dense crowds” at Zagreb’s Roman Catholic Cathedral for Stepinatz’s funeral. This front page also refers the reader to an inside story on Stepinatz’s funeral. Here one also reads under the caption, “Ireland’s Sympathy,” that “Cardinal D’Alton, [Roman Catholic] Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All Ireland, has sent the following message to the Most Rev. Monsignor Seper, Apostolic Administrator of the Zagreb Diocese: ‘On behalf of [Roman] Catholic Ireland I offer sincere sympathy to the clergy and laity of Yugoslavia on the death of their venerated Cardinal Archbishop, who for many years bore witness to the Faith with intrepid courage’.” Likewise, the Roman Catholic “Archbishop of Dublin,” “the Most Rev. Dr. McQuaid,” gave “respectful sympathy on the death of your venerated Cardinal Archbishop, the unbroken champion of the one true Faith, of fidelity to the Holy See, and of genuine liberty.” And “Messages of sympathy” were also sent to the Pope by the Republic of Ireland’s President²³⁵.

To properly understand Cardinal D’Alton’s description of Stepinatz as a man of “intrepid courage,” Archbishop McQuaid’s description of him as a “champion” of Romanism, and “heroic,” and both Roman prelates description of him as a man to be “venerated,” one must understand the wider Irish context documented by Hubert Butler in his essay, “The sub-prefect should have held his tongue.” In this celebrated essay, Butler records how Stepinatz’s depiction as a heroic anti-communist was being cross-applied in Irish Roman Catholic pulpits as a role model for Irish Roman Catholics fighting against British Protestants. Notably then, for example, D’Alton had earlier said in 1952, “we will soon see one army for the whole of Ireland, and that an Irish army.”²³⁶

This wider backdrop is also important in understanding the reporting of Stepinatz’s beatification in the *Irish Catholic*²³⁷. In the 1998 edition following his Beatification, one finds a large serene *undated* photo of Stepinatz, evidently pre-1946, showing him with another Romish cleric on a hill overlooking Mary’s Basilica, near Zagreb, where the paper reports that the Pope had Beatified him. To the casual uninformed observer, this may appear as an innocuous reporting of his Beatification. But to this must be made a number of qualifications. In the first place, the same page has an article entitled, “Pope to canonise Edith Stein.” This tells of how Pope John Paul II said he was to canonize “Blessed Edith Stein” and make her “Saint Edith Stein.” The article refers to the fact she was of Jewish

²³³ *Irish Catholic*, 25 Feb 1960, p. 1.

²³⁴ *Irish Catholic*, 3 March 1960, p. 1.

²³⁵ *Irish Catholic*, 16 Feb, 1960, p. 8.

²³⁶ *Irish Catholic*, 18 Sept. 1952, p. 2.

²³⁷ *Irish Catholic*, 8 Oct, 1998, p. 8.

ancestry, having been born into a Jewish family in Poland, converting to Roman Catholicism at 31, becoming a Romanist Carmelite nun, and then dying in the Nazi gas chambers at Auschwitz in 1942. The Roman Church regards her as a “martyr for the faith,” but as numerous Jews have pointed out, this is quite absurd since she was killed for her Jewish ancestry, not for her Roman Catholic faith e.g., Hitler himself was a Roman Catholic. Stepinatz wanted a religious belief based *Inquisition* approach to Jews, rather than the racial based Nazi approach to Jews. But even on such Croatian Inquisition criteria, it would still be up to government officials to decide if a *converso* Jew was a “true convert,” and so in practice, it seems unlikely that Stein would have survived the Ustashi. Thus Stein’s canonization is a Devilish deception to cloak Rome’s Nazi support.

Moreover, for those who understand the *Irish religio-cultural context*, the matter is quite different. On the bottom of the same page of this 1998 edition of *Irish Catholic*, is an article stating how “Pope John Paul II said” that Roman Catholic “Eastern-rite churches can serve as bridges between the [Roman] Catholic and [Eastern] Orthodox churches.” For those knowledgeable of history, the Pope’s comments here are reminiscent of Stepinatz’s desire to use Eastern rite Roman Catholic churches as the vehicle to bring “converts” from Serbian Orthodoxy into Roman Catholicism. But in the Irish context that the *Irish Catholic* is published in, this desire to Romanize Eastern Orthodox and Jews in Europe, *would be easily understood by analogy as a desire to Romanize Protestants in Ireland*, with Stepinatz here understood by such persons as being pictured as a heroic anti-communist role model for the Irish Roman Catholic fight against British Protestants.

Indeed, earlier that year, the *Irish Catholic* had reported the Pope’s announcement to Beatify Stepinatz. The article was prepared to recognize that Stepinatz was “a controversial cardinal” who had been “sentenced to jail for collaborating with the” “regime established by the Germans in Croatia during” “World War II.” A religious and ethnic divide is reported, “Serbs consider Cardinal Stepinac a Nazi sympathizer, while Croat [Roman] Catholics view him as a hero for resisting postwar communist attempts to suppress religion in Croatia.” The article also included a 1946 picture of Stepinatz entering a Zagreb courtroom on charges of collaboration with the Nazi Ustashi²³⁸. In the *Irish religio-cultural context*, this divide could readily be cross-applied in readers’ minds as being analogous with the religious and ethnic divide between Irish Roman Catholics and British Protestants of Northern Ireland; and then this picture could easily be interpreted as being comparable to pictures of Irish Roman Catholic terrorists entering a British courtroom on charges of so called “trumped up” terrorism. Thus for those who understand the historical usage made of Stepinatz by Irish Roman Catholics, this type of article *has a loading* that signals and elicits some quite different responses, than the same article would for those outside of Ireland and ignorant of such *contextual loadings*.

This type of *understood context* was developed with a novel twist in an article by the Roman Catholic priest, “Father” Tom Stack in a June edition of the *Irish Catholic* the following year²³⁹. Stack’s article is entitled, “Kosovo’s history and the Serbian offensive.” In it, he says that in considering (the third) Yugoslavia’s claims and actions in Kosovo, “I couldn’t help recalling Archbishop McQuaid’s” “principled” “stand against the [the second] Yugoslav regime in the 1950s when freedom of worship was denied to citizens of the”

²³⁸ *Irish Catholic*, 21 May, 1998, p. 7.

²³⁹ *Irish Catholic*, 3 June, 1999, p. 10.

“Balkan federation.” (Compare the above *Irish Catholic* of 21 May 1998 and “Cardinal Stepinac” “as a hero for resisting postwar communist attempts to suppress religion in Croatia.”) This reference to “McQuaid” whose Preface to O’Brien’s *Archbishop Stepinac (1947)* was part of his “stand against the Yugoslav regime,” and anti-communism, are key concepts in the *Irish religio-cultural context* to illicit the notion of Stepinac’s “heroic” anti-communism being the role model for fighting against British Protestantism. Stack refers to what he calls “the curious atavistic drive that is embedded in the Serb character. The Serbian mind set seems deeply coloured by a 600 year old national myth.” “Since the defeat of the Serbs by the Turks in 1389 at the Battle of Kosovo, they have perceived themselves as beset by enemies on all sides: Ottoman (Turkish) Mohammedans, [Roman Catholic] Austro-Hungarians or Fascist Croat or German. Sadly the religious factors enter the Serbian martyr myth. The Serbian Orthodox Church” “must be wrested from the legacy of the Muslim [Mohammedan] invader of 1389. Irish people will be reminded of the Battle of the Boyne in the mythology of Northern Ireland;” “the ending of empires of whatever kind seems to lead to this dreadful fall-out the world over.”

Thus the Popish priest “Father” Stack, first elicits background “heroic” Stepinac anti-communist imagery directed against (the third) Yugoslavia, then he devalues the Serb’s Battle of Kosovo “myth,” then he claims that Serb fear of, for example, the “Fascist Croat” of World War Two are all part of this “Serbian martyr myth.” This downplaying of the seriousness of the Nazi Ustashi period as simply reflecting a “Serbian martyr myth,” since the Serbs “have perceived themselves as beset by enemies on all sides,” has some elements in common with the type of Irish Roman Catholic claims Hubert Butler battled against and successfully critiqued in, for example, the *Papal Nuncio Incident* of 1952, or the fact that Butler also says when “Artukovitch was on his way to Ireland, a Dublin publication told us” “that the massacre of the Serbian Orthodox had never happened,²⁴⁰” or the type of Croatian Roman Catholic claims Milan Bulajic battled against and successfully critiqued in *Tudjman’s “Jasenovac Myth” (1996)*.

Finally, Stack draws an analogy between this Serbian “Battle of Kosovo” “myth,” and the “Northern Ireland” Protestant “mythology” of “Battle of the Boyne” in 1690, when the Protestant forces of King William of Orange triumphed over the Roman Catholic forces of James II. In Northern Ireland, 12 July is a public holiday in celebration of the *Battle of the Boyne* and so contextually, this is quite a strong attack on the so called “mythology of Northern Ireland,” which in a derogatory way Stack is equating with the “Serbian” “national myth” of “the Battle of Kosovo.” Given that Irish Papists were defeated and came to refer to their leader, James II, as *James the Dughill*, Stack’s desire to downplay the significance of the *Battle of the Boyne* is understandable. But Stack’s use of history is very selective. Kosovo Albanian Mohammedans seeking secession from Serbia in (the third) Yugoslavia wanted to merge with Mohammedan Albania, but Stack does not mention that this is the legacy of an old Mohammedan (Islamic) Empire that once sought the Mohammedanisation (Islamisation) of all Europe on the basis of Jihad Suras in the Koran²⁴¹. In 2001, I stood on

²⁴⁰ Butler, H., *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue, op. cit.*, p. 285.

²⁴¹ See e.g., Mohammed’s *Koran’s* Sura 47:4-9, “When ye encounter the infidels, strike off their heads till ye have made a great slaughter among them, and of the rest make fast the fetters.” “And whoso fight[eth] for the cause of God, their works will not suffer to miscarry; he will vouchsafe them guidance, and dispose their hearts aright; and he will bring them into the Paradise But as for infidels, let them perish.” Sura 8:66 & 67, “Stir up

the banks of the Boyne River at the spot of the battle marked for sightseers at Drogheda, with such signs as “Williamite Encampment,” and I note this was deep within the territory of southern Ireland, near Dublin. Thus, Northern Irish Protestant celebration of the *Battle of the Boyne* does not now bring with it a British Empire claim to this region in the Republic of Ireland, and thus Stack’s analogy is flawed.

Stack’s article in the *Irish Catholic* shows a novel twofold transition from the old established anti-(second) Yugoslavian, anti-communist, pro-Stepinatz imagery, (through the contextually relevant McQuaid’s preface to O’Brien’ classic pro-Stepinatz book,) as an analogy for Irish Roman Catholics fighting against British Protestants; to a new anti-(third) Yugoslavian, anti-Serbian Orthodox, anti-Serbian, anti-Battle of Kosovo “myth” imagery as an analogy for Irish Roman Catholics adopting an anti-British Protestant Battle of the Boyne “mythology” stance against “Northern Ireland.” Stack then makes a further novel transition in seeking to draw an analogy between a Serbian *empire* in (the third) Yugoslavia that includes Kosovo but which is now “ending,” and a British *empire* including Northern Ireland which Stack seems to think, or would like to think, is “ending.” *Though Stack does not say so plainly, if this analogy is taken seriously,* then it surely means that the violence of Irish Roman Catholic terrorists against British Protestant is simply the “fall-out” of “the ending of empires,” and akin to the violence of Albanian Mohammedan Kosovars against Serbian Orthodox Yugoslavs which Stack evidently sympathizes with (although the small Protestant community is also subject to violence from Albanian Kosovar Mohammedans²⁴²). On the

the faithful to fight. Twenty of you who stand firm shall vanquish two hundred. And if there be a hundred of you they shall vanquish a thousand of the infidels,” “if there be a thousand of you, they shall vanquish two thousand by God’s permission; for God is with those who are resolute to endure.” Sura 4:72,76, & 79, “O ye who believe! Make use of precautions, and advance in detachments, or, advance in a body;” “Let those then fight on the path of God.” “Small the fruition of this world; but the next life is the true good ...!” (*The Koran*, translated by J.M. Rodwell, *op. cit.*).

²⁴² Kosovo’s population varies in estimates between about 1.9 million to 2.4 million. Estimates I have vary and thus figures are somewhat “rubbery” and unclear, but understood as a general guide only, c. 89% are Mohammedan (Muslim), c. 5.2%-7.8% are Serbian Orthodox (the variation in these figures may be complicated by the movement of Serbs in and out from, but in recent times mainly going out from, Kosovo), c. 3% are Roman Catholic, c. 0.03% are Protestant, and other religions include Jews, Gypsies, Pentecostals, and cults (Seventh-day Adventists and Jehovah’s Witnesses). As at 2004, the small Protestant community of less than 600 has less than 30 churches. The *Banner of Truth Trust* records that when Stephen Ross of Grace Baptist Church, Manchester, UK, visited Kosovo, with the Director of the Albanian Evangelical Mission, as at 2000 the capital had an evangelical Baptist Church and the Messiah Evangelical Church, with another church being established by the Presbyterians, and another by the Calvary Chapel movement. It said that there were 26 churches in the Albanian Evangelical Alliance. Most Protestants are Albanian Kosovars, but some are Serbian Kosovars. Most Protestant Christians report persecution by Mohammedan terrorists, with Protestant churches being broken into and stolen from, and when this happened at e.g., Messiah Evangelical Church in the capital, Pristina, on Christmas Eve 2001, the police were not prepared to prosecute the thieves even though they were clearly identified. Likewise, the US Office in Pristina, reported that in May 2003, in Gjilan “a Protestant Evangelical” was “badly beat” “on his way home from church,” and said that Protestants reported Mohammedans attending church services in order to identify them and then subject them to “discrimination,” “harassment,” and “violence.” (“A visit to Kosova,

one hand, Stack's novel twofold transition appears limited in scope to this article. But on the other hand, his connected usage of the *old chestnut* rhetoric of heroic anti-communism, anti (second) Yugoslavia, and pro McQuaid which necessarily brings with it in this context Archbishop McQuaid's Preface to the classic pro-Stepinatz work about Serbs and (the second) Yugoslavia, in O'Brien's *Archbishop Stepinac (1947)*, shows the continuing power among Irish Roman Catholics of this type of thinking in their fight against the victors of "the Battle of the Boyne," found in the Protestant "mythology of Northern Ireland."

It must be said that in contemporary times, those Irish republican Roman Catholics who engage in acts of terrorism and violence against British Protestants in general, and Northern Irish Protestants in particular, are a small minority of the overall Irish Roman Catholic population in either the north or south of Ireland. But they are, regrettably, still a very real minority. What does this group of violent terrorists make of the historical glorification of Stepinatz in Irish Roman Catholic pulpits, and the comparison of Stepinatz's struggle against the communists after World War Two with Roman Catholics fighting against British Protestants? Is the Ustashi distinction between Protestants of German descent whom they did not generally persecute and kill, and Protestant converts of Serbian descent whom they did persecute and kill, in any way used as an analogy for the distinction made by these Roman Catholic terrorists between Protestants in southern Ireland whom they do not kill, and Protestants in Northern Ireland whom they do kill?

Do they find in Stepinatz's collaboration with a regime which persecuted and killed Protestants who were of Serbian descent, some justification or analogy in which to harm or kill British Protestants today? Do they find any added Irish symbolic significance in the fact that on the 300th anniversary of the *Irish Massacre of 1641*, that is, in 1941, the Ustashi killed Protestants of Serbian descent who had refused to convert to Roman Catholicism in the Srem (Serbia, 1941-2) and Slatina (Croatia, 1941)? What message do these violent terrorists take from the decision of the Pope to Beatify Stepinatz? It should be remembered that between the time Butler raised his concerns about Stepinatz being used by Irish Roman Catholics as a role model to justify fighting against British Protestants, and *before Stepinatz was beatified in 1998*, the *Irish Republican Army (IRA)* (and in more recent times the *Real IRA*), have killed a number of innocent people in terrorist attacks. When one considers the pre-Beatification promotion of Stepinatz among Irish Roman Catholics, and the false analogies that have been made in Roman Catholic pulpits between Stepinatz fighting against communism and Irish Roman Catholic's fighting against British Protestants, it is clear that the Pope's actions in beatifying Stepinatz *have thrown fat on the fire* in an already inflammatory situation in Ireland.

The Omagh Bombing (1998)

Some three months after it was announced in May 1998 that "Venerable Aloysius

Banner of Truth Trust General Articles, <http://www.banneroftruth.org/pages> ; Human Rights Report of Kosovo, 2003, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, U.S. Office, Pristina, Kosovo, www.usofficepristine.rpo.art; "Religious Freedom Report for the Protestant Evangelicals in Kosovo" Forum 18, 2002 in Kosovo: Religious freedom Survey, 2003, by Branko Bjelajic & Felix Corey, www.forum18.org/archive; *Presbyterian Online Today*, "Kosovo close encounters with the gospel" by E. Stinson, <http://www.pcusa.org/today/archive> .)

Cardinal Stepinatz” was to be beatified, and some three months before he actually was beatified and made “Blessed Aloysius Cardinal Stepinatz” in November 1998, the civilized world was shocked to learn of the *Omagh Bombing* in August 1998. This gruesome attack was perpetrated by Irish Roman Catholic terrorists seeking to kill British Protestants in Northern Ireland. Colin Murphy, aged 49 of Dundalk County, Louth, was implicated and found guilty of conspiring to cause an explosion, then sentenced to 14 years imprisonment. Murphy had previously served two prison sentences in the 1970s for *Provisional IRA* activity, and a further 1980s prison sentence in the USA for attempting to buy machine-guns for the *Irish National Liberation Army*. But the actual perpetration of the *Omagh Bombing* was admitted by the *Real Irish Republican Army* (the Real IRA). In May 2005, Sean Hoey, a 35 year old electrician from Molly Road in Jonesborough, South Armagh, Northern Ireland, was the first person to be formally charged with the Omagh Bombing. He stood without showing emotion during a ten minute hearing before Magistrate Alan White, where he was remanded in custody to appear before Belfast magistrates at a later date. His lawyer, Peter Corrigan, said the lack of new evidence meant the case should not continue, since the evidence offered by the prosecution consisted of old witness statements, and there had been delays in prosecuting him.

About 300 people were injured, and 30 killed at the time of the Omagh Bombing, with a further death occurring the next day when Garry White (aged 38), a Protestant, died from an ambulance crash as he was rushing an injured Roman Catholic Spanish girl caught in the blast, from Erne Hospital to Ulster Hospital in Dundonald. The thirty killed in the actual bombing consisted of nineteen Roman Catholics, one Mormon (a 16 year old schoolboy), and ten Protestants. Roman Catholic victims ranged in age from two unborn twins who both died when their seven month pregnant mother was killed, up to a 66 year old woman. The fact that about two-thirds of victims were Roman Catholic, some of whom were Spaniards visiting Northern Ireland, and another killed was a Mormon, graphically shows that Roman Catholic Irish terrorist bombs do not always hit their intended target of British Protestants.

The two-thirds of non-Protestant victims killed were unintentional victims that the Irish Roman Catholic terrorists sincerely did not mean to kill. By contrast, the ten or one-third of victims identifiable as British Protestants, were intended targets because of their ethno-religious identity. The *Omagh Bombing* of 1998 is historically part of a long line of Irish Roman Catholic attempts to kill British Protestants, since the reign of Bloody Mary (1553-8), some four and a half centuries earlier. British Protestants killed were: Deborah Anne Cartwright (aged 20), cremated at Roselaw Cemetery, Belfast. Esther Gibson (aged 36), the niece of the Ulster Democratic Unionist Party’s (DUP), Northern Ireland Assembly member for West Tyrone, Oliver Gibson (born 1934). Her funeral was held at Sincmitecross *Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster* (whose Moderator was the Reverend Ian Paisley till 2008, is a Member of Parliament, and was First Minister of Northern Ireland 2007-8; made by Queen Elizabeth II in 2010, Baron Bannside of North Antrim in County Antrim, Northern Ireland). This martyr was a Sunday School teacher at this church. Olive Hawkes (aged 60, married with two children), whose funeral was held at the Mayne Methodist Church. Julia Hughes (aged 21, a student), whose funeral was held at Omagh Methodist Church. Anne McCombe (aged 48, married with two children), whose funeral was held at Mount Joy Presbyterian Church, where she was a member of the church choir. Samantha McFarland (aged 17, a student), whose funeral was held at Holy Trinity Anglican Church, Lislimnaghan, where the Minister, Reverend Derek Quinn said, “There will be people who have been terribly maimed returning to the community, children who have lost limbs who will be around for” “years. They will be” “visible signs” of the Omagh Bombing. Veda Short (aged

56, married with four children), whose funeral was held at Seskinmore Presbyterian Church. Frederick White (aged 60, married with two children), and his son, Bryan White (aged 27). Both were involved in the Omagh Ulster Unionist Association (in which Frederick was an office-bearer). Their funerals were at Creevan Presbyterian Church, where both were committed church members, and Frederick had been the church treasurer for twenty years. Lorraine Wilson (aged 15, a schoolgirl), whose Anglican funeral was held at Cappagh *Church of Ireland*, Tyrone, where the Bishop said, “the dark cloud of evil is being penetrated by numerous acts of love and goodness which are happening all around us.”

The question naturally arises as to what extent the Irish cult of Stepinatz can be related to the *Omagh Bombing*? Certainly there is a historic presence of background thinking in which Stepinatz’s anti-communism is used to depict him as a heroic role model by Irish Roman Catholics in their fight against British Protestants. But there are a number of other factors in the *Omagh Bombing* that show the further fingerprints of Stepinatz’s Irish cult. It was perpetrated by the *Real IRA* (a group whose name indicates they broke away from the IRA, and who see themselves as the true successors of that terrorist organization). This is significant since the IRA World War Two terrorist activities against the United Kingdom, and their killing of the World War Two Allied Southeast Asia Commander, Lord Mountbatten, is clearly conducive to them being sympathetic to anti-Allied fascist World War Two forces, such as the Nazi Ustashi collaborator, Archbishop Stepinatz.

Moreover, its timing is also significant. On 8 May 1998 the Croatian government issued postage stamps with Stepinatz’s portrait on them celebrating the 100th anniversary of his birth. On the same day, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Zagreb, Joseph Bozanc, addressed a Romanist crowd in Stepinatz’s hometown of Krasic where he died, and announced that “Venerable Stepinatz” was to be beatified and made “Blessed Stepinatz” between 2 and 4 October that year²⁴³. This means that the *Omagh Bombing* on 15 August 1998 was sandwiched between these two known dates of importance for followers of Stepinatz’s cult.

Furthermore, Romanist killers of Protestants sometimes select “Saints” days of special significance to kill Protestants on, for example, the *Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre* (Paris, France, 1572); or the *Irish Massacre of 1641* on 23 October on St. Ignatius’ Day. As seen by the selection of *Vinegar Hill* New South Wales in 1804 for the Irish rebellion as a sequel to the importance of *Vinegar Hill* Ireland in the 1798 Irish rebellion, symbolic significance may be important in the Irish context. In the case of the Irish Massacre of 1641, it should be understood that this occurred in a general atmosphere of glorifying “Venerable” Ignatius Loyola (1491-1556), the founder of the Jesuits, who had been Beatified and made “Blessed Loyola” by Pope Paul V (Pope 1605-1621) in 1609²⁴⁴.

²⁴³ Reuters and Hina State News, “Vatican Cardinal Stepinac - Article 1” (philologos.org/bpr/files/Vatican); “Pope Visit to Croatia, Beatify Cardinal,” *Daily Catholic*, 11 May, 1998, Vol. 9, No. 91 (www.daily.catholic.org/issue/May/91news3.htm).

²⁴⁴ Bramley-Moore, W., *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, 1563, revised folio edition, 1684, 3rd edition, Cassell, Patter, and Galpin, London, 1867, pp. 591-600 (Irish Massacre). On the basis of Bramley-Moore’s statement, “The day fixed for this horrid massacre was the 23rd of October, 1641, the feast of Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuits” (*Ibid.*, p. 592), I formerly thought this must have then been Loyola’s day. Having now investigated the matter further (Papists remember Loyola on 31 July), I would make some qualifications that Bramley-

This occurred just four years after Jesuit involvement in what the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) *Calendar* called, “Papists’ Conspiracy” day, with the Guy Fawkes Gun Powder Plot to blow up the British Protestant King James (King of Great Britain 1603-1625) (to whom the King James Bible is dedicated) and British Parliament in 1605²⁴⁵. The subsequent canonization of “Saint Loyola” by Pope Gregory XV (Pope 1621-1623) in 1622, was then followed less than twenty years later with the Irish Massacre of 1641 on “St. Ignatius Day” (23 Oct.); which the Jesuits were in some way using as a symbolic day in deference to Ignatius Loyola, seemingly on the basis that they were saying he was named after this earlier Ignatius of Constantinople (d. 877)²⁴⁶.

In harmony with this type of thinking, the *Omagh Bombing* of 1998 occurred on the major Marian Feast known as “the Assumption of Mary” (15 August). This Marian Feast is as important to Croatian-American Roman Catholics, as St. Patrick’s Day is to Irish-American Roman Catholics. (Of course, St. Patrick’s day also has significance to a number of Protestants in connection with Ireland.) On this Marian day is celebrated *Velika Gospa*, a Croatian Roman Catholic procession, which is strongly associated since 1913 in the United States of America with St. Jerome’s Roman Catholic Church, located on *Cardinal Stepinac Way* in Chicago, Illinois (further discussed below). This is also significant because this Marian Feast of “the Assumption” is strongly connected to Pope Pius XII. As the introductory remarks to this Romish feast remind us in the *Saint Andrew Daily Missal* (1962), “On November 1, 1950, Pius XII defined the dogma of the Assumption” and the “new mass

Moore does not. Loyola (d. 1556) was originally baptized with the common Basque name, “Inigo,” after Enecus (Innicus), Abbot of Ona. When he left the Basque country, he started to call himself the similar but different name, “Ignatius.” There were then two relatively well known church figures of this name, Ignatius of Antioch (d. c. 110) remembered on 1 Feb., and Ignatius of Constantinople (c. 799-877) who died on, and is remembered on, 23 Oct. . This leads to the question, *Did Loyola rename himself “Ignatius” in honour of Ignatius of Antioch, or Ignatius of Constantinople, or both?* There is no definitive answer. The Jesuits were deeply involved in the Irish Massacre, and the day set was 23 October. Taking into account the tradition referred to by Bramley-Moore that this massacre occurred on *St. Ignatius Loyola’s Day*, the implication is that the crafty Jesuits were saying something like, “23 October is the day to strike because it is St. Ignatius’ Day, after whom St. Ignatius Loyola was named.” I.e., the inference appears to be that they were making some reference to 23 October as “St. Ignatius Day” *in deference to* the renaming of “Ignatius” Loyola, and so there is a qualified sense in which 23 Oct. was being used by them as a day to remember Ignatius Loyola. (Of course, they could have done a similar thing on 1 Feb. with reference to Ignatius of Antioch.) Given the involvement of Jesuitry in the 1641 massacre, and this issue of “Inigo” Loyola renaming himself after one or both earlier persons named “Ignatius,” either *with greater qualification*, one can say it occurred on “Ignatius Loyola” “day,” “the 23rd of October” (Bramley-Moore); or *with lesser qualification*, one can simply say it occurred on “*St. Ignatius Day* (23 Oct.) in deference to Ignatius Loyola” (myself, *supra*).

²⁴⁵ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, pp. 126-34;587-91;592. The Lectionary containing “Papists’ Conspiracy” Day and the associated “Gunpowder Treason” Service (5 Nov.), which had been modified since 1689 to also thank God for the coming of William of Orange on 5 November in 1689, was sadly removed from the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* at the behest of religious apostates in 1859.

²⁴⁶ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, p. 592.

for the feast brings out clearly” the matters so defined²⁴⁷. This took the form of an “infallible” Papal declaration, and the “Assumption of Mary” is a public holiday in a number of predominantly Roman Catholic countries, including Stepinatz’s Croatia, and Poland - the land of the Pope who Beatified Stepinatz, John-Paul II. Of course, it was this same Pope Pius XII who made Stepinatz a Cardinal in 1953. Thus through reference to both Pope Pius XII’s who is strongly connected in the Romanist mind to this Marian feast, and his *elevating Stepinatz from Archbishop to Cardinal in 1953*, as well as the Croat celebration of Velika Gospa, August 15 was an “appropriate” symbolic date for Irish Roman Catholic terrorists to “celebrate” *elevating Stepinatz from “Venerable” to “Blessed” in 1998* with the *Omagh Bombing* of 15 August 1998 against British Protestants.

On the one hand, we do not have detailed knowledge of the thought processes of the Irish Roman Catholic terrorists responsible for the *Omagh Bombing*. But on the other hand, the combination of these four factors indicates a strong case finding the fingerprints of Stepinatz’s Irish cult on this bombing. Firstly, the known historical presence of Irish Roman Catholics using Stepinatz’s anti-communism as an analogous heroic role-model figure in fighting against British Protestantism. Secondly, the involvement of an IRA spin-off group in the *Real IRA* is significant, since the IRA historically collaborated with the Nazis and was anti-Allied forces in World War Two. The IRA killed the World War Two Supreme Allied Commander of Southeast Asia (1943-6), Lord Mountbatten in 1979, thus making them a group sympathetic to a Nazi collaborator like Stepinatz. Thirdly, the date of the bombing being sandwiched between the announcement about three months earlier that “Venerable Stepinatz” would be beatified to become “Blessed Stepinatz” about three months after the bombing. Finally, the symbolic significance of the “Assumption of Mary” feast on 15 August, because of its connection with Pope Pius XII, who gave an “infallible” declaration defining the “Assumption of Mary” remembered on this day, and who elevated Archbishop Stepinatz to Cardinal Stepinatz in 1953. And also because of the connection of this Romish feast to the Croatian Romanist feast of Velika Gospa, celebrated both in Stepinatz’s Croatia, and also in the USA, where it is strongly associated with St. Jerome’s Roman Catholic Church, located on *Cardinal Stepinac Way* in Chicago, Illinois.

CHAPTER 10

INTERCONNECTIONS BETWEEN NAZI USTASHI WAR CRIMINAL ARTUKOVITCH, STEPINATZ, IRISH ROMAN CATHOLICISM, AND ROMAN CATHOLICS IN THE USA

A related matter showing the importance of Irish Roman Catholicism in an interconnection between the Nazi Ustashi, Stepinatz, Croatia, the Roman Catholic Franciscans, Ireland, and America, relates to Artukovitch. Andrija Artukovitch (Artukovic) (1899-1988), was the Minister for Interior in Anton Pavelitch’s Nazi Ustashi regime, and the highest ranking Nazi war criminal to find safe haven in America, till he was finally extradited from the USA and convicted as a Nazi war criminal in Yugoslavia in 1986. He studied at the Church of Rome’s Siroki Brijeg Franciscan monastery in Herzegovina before joining the Ustashi in exile. As Minister for the Interior he approved virtually all the Ustashi atrocities, and in May 1941 personally ordered the murder of about 4,000 Serbs in his native town of

²⁴⁷ Lefebvre’s *Saint Andrew Daily Missal*, *op. cit.*, p. 1401.

Siroki Brijeg. In September 1941, he approved the construction of the concentration camp system, including the Nazi's third largest concentration camp, Jasenovac.

After the Nazi Ustashi regime collapsed, the Yugoslavian Government brought some of the Ustashi Romish monks and clergy to justice. For example in Feb 1947, a Court in Banja Luka, Bosnia-Herzegovina, sentenced the Romish priest, Dr. Nikola Bilogrovitch, to be put to death by shooting for his participation in the forcible conversion of Serbian Orthodox to Roman Catholicism. Or in December 1947, five Franciscan monks, Friars Gomiero, Beninka, Belato, KoziANCHIC, and Matielo went on trial in Pula (Pola), Croatia, on charges of espionage, including the sending of coded messages out of the country to a foreign power. Together with another two friars, they were found guilty, and sentenced to terms of up to six years imprisonment. Their espionage included "organizing an underground railroad for escape of" "Ustashi" "war criminals'." "Brother" Tavchar, a priest near the capital of Slovenia, Liubliana, together with other defendants, were "in contact in 1945 with Friar Modesto Martinitich of Zagreb, one of the co-defendants in the trial of Archbishop Stepinatz.²⁴⁸"

Fearful that the long arm of the law might likewise catch them, Pavelitch and his trusted friend Artukovitch, escaped to Austria. Pavelitch then went to his spiritual home of Rome, disguised as a Spanish Popish priest, called "Father Gomez." In 1948, Pavelitch escaped to Argentina in South America, and following an unsuccessful assassination attempt on his life in 1957, he fled to Paraguay in South America, though later, (like Archbishop Sharitch,) Pavelitch finally ended up in Franco's Madrid, Spain. Artukovitch met up with three people, Dr. Dragonovitch, Romish Professor of Theology at Zagreb, who had Vatican support with a Vatican passport, and had been touring internment camps. In his more general efforts to help Nazi Ustashi escape, he had been securing the release of hundreds of Roman Catholic priests, all of whom had left Croatia around the same time as Pavelitch. Dragonovitch got Artukovitch papers under the false name of "Alowz Anitch," and deposited money for him in a Swiss bank account. He was further assisted by two other Popish priests, Juretich, and the Franciscan monk and priest, Manditch. Significantly, both Dragonovitch and Juretich had been appointed in 1941 to be part of Stepinatz's *Commission of Five For the Conversion of the [Serbian] Orthodox*. With these sponsors, Artukovitch arrived in Switzerland and was safe there till the Police learnt that he was a Nazi war criminal.

Butler records that "in Irish papers" "Pavelitch" has been presented "as a simple-hearted patriot who merely did his best for his country in difficult circumstances." With this type of sentiment in southern Ireland, Artukovitch was now once again assisted by the Franciscan monks, who helped him flee to the Republic of Ireland. In southern Ireland, where Stepinatz was being glorified, Artukovitch received further monkish assistance from the Franciscans. In southern Ireland, Artukovitch and his family lived in Dublin for about 12 months. He and his wife went to the Roman Mass daily, and sent their two daughters to Sacred Heart Romanist Convent. Their son, Radeslav, was born in Dublin in 1948.

A Franciscan monk from what had been the Ustashi's Croatia, "Brother" Ivanditch,

²⁴⁸ "Three Yugoslavs To Die, Priest, Two Puppet Officials Sentenced by Court," *New York Times*, 12 Feb. 1947, p. 15; "Yugoslavs Try Monks, Five Charged With Organizing Espionage Ring in Pola," *New York Times*, 21 Dec. 1947, p. 22; "Yugoslav Friars Get Prison Terms," *New York Times*, 22 Dec. 1947, p. 10.

whose religious name was “Brother Louis” (Croatian, Luji), also lived in southern Ireland for a slightly longer period at the hostel of the Franciscan’s House at Galway, St. Anthony’s College. (Galway is a west coast city about 180 kilometres or 110 miles due west of the east coast capital of Dublin). Ivanditch came from near Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia-Herzegovina, which had been part of the Ustashi’s *Independent State of Croatia*. According to the Stepinatz Trial Report, *Sudenje Lisaku, Stepincu, Salicu I Druzini*, Ivanditch received a large sum of Ustashi money from the Provincial of the Franciscan Order in Bosnia-Herzegovina, “Father” Modesto Marinchitch, and escaped with this from Bosnia-Herzegovina after the war. He appears to have been sent to southern Ireland by the General of the Franciscan Order in Rome as an under-cover agent to help Artukovitch. His cover-story, which Butler exposed as false, was that he had fled to southern Ireland because the communist government of (the second) Yugoslavia had sentenced him to death, and that he was the “nephew” of “uncle” “Alois Anitch” (the false name being used by Artukovitch in southern Ireland). Ivanditch helped find Artukovitch and his family accommodation when they arrived in Dublin, and made numerous visits to Dublin, visiting the Artukovitch’s on, e.g., the birth of their son in Dublin.

In 1948 Artukovitch left southern Ireland and entered the USA with a false Republic of Ireland identity card, and settled in California. Ivanditch’s under-cover work as a Franciscan “minder” for Artukovitch having expired, Ivanditch then left from Dublin to Quebec, Canada. He arrived in Quebec’s capital, Montreal, and then worked as a Chaplain to a Croatian-Canadian Roman Catholic community at Windsor in Quebec, building there the Chapel of St. Joseph. As an anti-communist and pro-Ustashi Papist, we cannot doubt that Ivanditch was a supporter of the Ustashi collaborator Stepinatz. In Canada around this time, Ivanditch was not the only such pro-Stepinatz Romanist. In Canada, the western border of the Province of Quebec meets the eastern border of the Province of Ontario, whose capital is Toronto. James McGuigan, a Canadian of Irish descent, was Roman Catholic Archbishop of Toronto from 1934 to 1971. He was elevated to Cardinal in 1946, and in that same year Cardinal McGuigan said of Stepinatz, “The Archbishop of Zagreb was” the “victim of a hypocritical trial.”²⁴⁹ Though Ivanditch’s later movements are uncertain, there is a possibility he ended up in Franco’s Romanist Spain.

Notably, a fellow Franciscan at Galway in Ireland, “Brother” David, recalled that when he was in southern Ireland, Ivanditch said the Republic of Ireland “‘should invade the six counties’” of Northern Ireland, “‘and’” so “‘settle that matter’” “‘immediately.’” This view is of some special significance in showing that the polarity between Roman Catholic Zagreb and Serbian Orthodox Belgrade has some similarities to the polarity between Roman Catholic Dublin and Protestant Belfast; and the Ustashi desire to include Belgrade in its territorial orbit, seen in the fact that Belgrade was part of the *Independent State of Croatia* from 1941 to 1945, has some similarities with the Irish Roman Catholic desire to include Belfast in its territorial orbit, seen in the fact that de Valera refused to accept the *Anglo-Irish Treaty* of 1921 because the six Ulster counties were not part of the new Irish state of southern Ireland. Ivanditch’s Ustashi connections and comments endorsing military violence against Northern Ireland, are a good example of how Roman Catholics supporting Stepinatz and the

²⁴⁹ *Stepinac: The Man for his Time, op. cit.*, p. 107 quoting Cardinal McGuigan in *L’Osservatore Romano*, 12 Oct, 1946, No. 239; *Catholic Insight: Culture* (catholicinsight.com/online/culture/article_500.5html); “James Charles Cardinal McGuigan” (www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/bmcguigan.html).

Ustashi find it easy to cross-apply their thinking to “justify” southern Irish Roman Catholic violence against British Protestants of Northern Ireland.

In the USA, Artukovitch’s real identity became known and in 1952 the Yugoslavian Government sought his extradition. In a manner reminiscent of what Roman Catholics say about Stepinatz, the *Croatian [Roman] Catholic Union* claimed that “his only crime is his ceaseless fight against communism.” Erstwhile, Manditch had been the Treasurer of the Romish Franciscan Order, and controller of a printing press at the Italian camp of Fermo, where he assisted Nazi Ustashees fleeing Croatia both with money and propaganda. He then became Superior of the Popish Franciscan Monastery in Drexel Boulevard, in Irish-American Chicago, Illinois, USA. With Artukovitch facing possible extradition from the USA, there was monkey afoot as this Franciscan monk, “Father” Manditch, now suddenly reappeared to help Artukovitch.

Also coming to Artukovitch’s aid in 1958, Cardinal Stepinatz’s secretary, “Father” Lachovitsch emerged from Youngstown, Ohio, USA. The Croatian-American community’s influence in Ohio is, for example, seen in John Prcela. A former secretary and president of the *United American Croatians in Cleveland*, his pro-Stepinatz work, *Archbishop Stepinac in His Country’s Church-State Relations* (1990), contains a Preface signed in Cleveland, Ohio, USA. In this book, Prcela promotes the cult of Stepinatz, describing him some eight years before his beatification as having “the spirit of a Saint” and “saintly.” He finds significance in the fact that “in Stepinac’s Croatia exactly on the anniversary of his episcopal consecration” in 1934, on “June 24, 1981, the Blessed Virgin Mary began appearing to six Croatian youths in the Herzegovinian village of Medjugorje under the title of Queen of Peace,” and “she continues appearing to them.” He quotes three Irish-American Roman Catholic Bishops in support of Stepinatz; Bishop Fulton Sheen, a former Romish Auxiliary Bishop of New York who said, “Msgr. [Monsignor] Stepinac appeared in court as the spiritual leader of the Croatian people, and came off as the leader of his people and an example to the whole world;” (what would the Lutheran Protestants of Croatia at this time have said to the idea that a Papist Archbishop was their “spiritual leader”?;) Cardinal Spellman who refers to Stepinatz’s “heroic example;” and Archbishop Joseph Hurley, who describes Croatian Romanists as a “bulwark of the true faith” and says “Stepinac gives” “hope.”²⁵⁰

Prcela’s quote from Archbishop Joseph Hurley is a reference to the man who was the Papal Nuncio (Regent of the Apostolic Nunciature in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, 1945-50,) who had attended Stepinatz’s court case, and whom the *New York Times* reported “rose and bowed to” “Stepinatz.”²⁵¹ Bishop Joseph Patrick Hurley, was born in Cleveland, Ohio, USA. In 1919 he was made a Romish priest in Cleveland. As the Irish-American Romish Bishop of Saint Augustine, Florida (1940-1967, with personal title of Archbishop from 1949,) he brought a large number of Irish Roman Catholic “mission” priests into Florida in an attempt to further Romanize the predominantly Protestant State. The Roman Catholic Archivist for the Diocese of St. Augustine, Charles Gallagher, in seeking to explain Hurley’s large land investments for the Roman Church, said “maybe the love of the land is innate in the Irish.”²⁵²

²⁵⁰ Prcela, J., *op. cit.*, pp. viii, x, xi, 75-7, back-cover.

²⁵¹ “Stepinatz replies Tito is Terrorist,” *New York Times*, 4 Oct. 1946, p. 7.

²⁵² “Archbishop Joseph Patrick Hurley [Catholic-Hierarchy]” (www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/bhurleyj.html); Larkin, W.T. (Romanist Bishop of St. Petersburg) &

Certainly the power of Stepinatz's American cult in Ohio around the time "Father" Lachovitsch sprang out of Youngstown, Ohio, in order to help Artukovitch in 1958, is seen in the fact that in 1959 the Governor of Ohio declared 3 May 1959, to be "Stepinac Day." An alliance between Croatian-Americans in Ohio such as Lachovitsch and Irish-American Roman Catholics in the glorification of Stepinatz, is evident in the fact that the Irish-American Cardinal Spellman of Irish-American New York, prepared a special message in March 1959 to be published for this "Cardinal Stepinac Day" in Cleveland, Ohio, in May 1959. In it, Cardinal Spellman said "Cardinal Stepinac" is "the most outstanding example of our time" of "heroism" and "bravery" against "atheistic communism." With Stepinatz still alive and living in the Croatian town of Krasic (then part of the second Yugoslavia), Lachovitsch was reported "as saying that he had seen Artukovitch almost daily and that he had been 'the leading [Roman] Catholic layman of Croatia and the lay spokesman of Cardinal Stepinac and had consulted him on the moral aspect of every action he took'."

With this type of support, in the East-West Cold War political atmosphere of this time, Artukovitch managed to avoid extradition in the 1950s and 1960s. But by the late 1970s and early 1980s things began to change, and in July 1981 the USA Board of Immigration Appeals, following the 1979 ruling of Congress, ordered Artukovitch's extradition in order for him to stand trial in (the second) Yugoslavia as a Nazi war criminal. The Justice Department of the USA, acting on a law forbidding "Nazi collaborators" from seeking refuge, sent Federal Marshal's with "gun's drawn" into Artukovitch's Californian house on 14 November 1984. He was eventually extradited to Yugoslavia on 12 February 1986. At his trial he pleaded, "I have always acted according to my conscience and the teachings of the [Roman] Catholic Church²⁵³. Artukovitch was convicted as a Nazi war criminal on 15 May 1986, and sentenced to death by a firing squad. However, he was now enfeebled by old age, and he died of natural causes in 1988 while in custody at a Yugoslav prison hospital.

Here I note that unlike Stepinatz and Artukovitch who both committed war crimes and who both received trials from the Yugoslav Government, those victims of the Ustashi mass murders committed no crimes and received no trials. Moreover, the Nazi Ustashi showed no respect to the aged or those in high office, killing, for example, the Serbian Orthodox Bishop Platou, who in his 80s had his feet shockingly shod like a horse, and was then made to walk as a public gazing stock till he collapsed, at which time his beard was painfully ripped out of his face, and his chest then set on fire. But by contrast, Stepinatz and Artukovitch were both shown respect for their high office and compassion in their old age. The Yugoslav government treated Stepinatz with generosity and kindness by giving him what, compared to prison life in Lepoglava, were the *relative* cushy-comforts of house arrest in, and freedom to move around, Krasic. Likewise, the Yugoslavian Government treated

Wilson, M., "Joseph P. Hurley, 1894-1967, Roman Catholic Archbishop," *St. Petersburg Times* 28 Nov. 1999 (www.sptimes.com/news/112899/news_pf/Florida/Joseph_R_Hurley_1894.shtml); Gallagher, C., "Archbishop Joseph P. Hurley (1894-1967)," (www.st.augustine.com/stories99/032899/topcitizens/hurley.html).

²⁵³ Butler, H., *Escape from the Anthill*, *op. cit.*, pp. 283-305; quoting "Father" Lachovitsch in *The Mirror News*, Los Angeles, California, 24 Jan 1958, and *The Sunday Times* 12 Jan 1985; Butler, H., *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, pp. 282,292-303, section 2, in "The Artukovitch File," *Pavelic Papers*, *op. cit.* (Internet); *Stepinac: The Man for his Time*, *op. cit.*, pp. 65-7,68-9.

Artukovitch with a good deal of consideration and compassion, choosing to place him in the *relative* comfort of a prison hospital rather than taking him out to be shot.

Artukovitch's case is significant for a number of reasons, including the fact that it shows *the Franciscans acted as linchpins between the Nazi Ustashi in Stepinatz's Croatia, Austria, southern Ireland, and the USA*. Whilst supporters of Stepinatz's cult can be found outside Romanists of Croatian or Irish descent, these two religio-ethnic groups are particularly significant. The importance of Croatian-American and Irish-American influence in Ohio and Chicago, the fact that the Papal nuncio at Stepinatz's trial was the Irish-American Bishop Joseph Hurley, and Ivanditch's later work with Croatian-Canadians, also reminds us that in understanding the impact of Stepinatz's cult, it is important to consider related religio-ethnic groups of Roman Catholics. For example, in 1947 the Yugoslavian Embassy in the USA issued a pamphlet entitled, "The Case of Archbishop Stepinatz." The Yugoslav Ambassador, Mr. Kosanovitch, "said he was making public the pamphlet material on the Stepinatz case, 'because the arrest and trial of the Archbishop are still being used in the United States in a campaign of misrepresentation'." For example, the Ambassador said "'a group of nine priests sent Secretary of State Marshall a petition <on behalf of the American Croatian [Roman] Catholic clergy in the United States>.'" The Ambassador said one of the signers, Nicolas Sulentic of Waterloo, Iowa, was 'not of the [Roman] Catholic clergy,' but was 'vice-president of the Croatian National Representation for Independence of Croatia - an organization whose activities were considered so harmful to America's war effort that it and its newspaper were suppressed by the FBI [the USA's Federal Bureau of Intelligence]²⁵⁴."

CHAPTER 11

STEPINATZ'S IRISH-AMERICAN CULT AND CROATIAN-AMERICAN CULT

A number of relevant pro-Stepinatz communities have existed. For example, a number of Nazi Ustashi fled to Argentina in South America after World War Two. A U.S. State Department Report (1998), found that Dragonovitch, (who as already noted helped Artukovitch to escape,) may have profited from this racket of taking money for false documents, and helping Nazi refugees escape to Argentina. Upon arrival in Argentina, they established Ustashi clubs, and one of these Nazi Clubs was named the *Stepinac Club*²⁵⁵. But comprehensive analysis of all relevant religio-ethnic or political groups is beyond the scope of this work.

²⁵⁴ "Envoy Here Issues 'Case of Stepinatz'," *New York Times*, 1 Aug. 1947, p. 4; referring to *The Case of Archbishop Stepinac*, Embassy of the Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia, Washington, D.C., USA, 1947, with a Foreword by the Ambassador, Sava Kasanovic.

²⁵⁵ US State Department Report: US & Allied Wartime & Postwar Relations and Negotiations with Argentina, *et al*, on looted gold and the fate of the Wartime Ustasha Treasury, June 1998 in "The Vatican and the Nazis" (www.sxws.com/charis/history_6.htm); Butler's *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, p. 272; *Pavelitch [/ Pavelic] Papers* (www.pavelicpapers.com/documents/artukovic) recording: *CIA File*: Reported Arrival of Pavelitch and other Ustashi in Argentina 2 Dec. 1948, *CIA File*: Franjo Cuijic and the Ustashi Treasury going to Argentina 17 June 1949, *Munich Report*: Croatian Emigrant Movement 23 Nov 1954.

However, an important religio-ethnic group are Irish Roman Catholics outside of Ireland. I think the Irish-American community warrants special attention given the importance of Stepinatz's Irish cult, and also the importance of Stepinatz's American cult. This is seen, for example, in the *Nuncio Incident* with Hubert Butler, that involved Gerald O'Hara, the Irish-American *Papal Nuncio* to southern Ireland; or the request of the Irish-American Roman Catholic Archbishop of Omaha, Nebraska, Archbishop James Ryan, to petition the U.S. President on Stepinatz's behalf in 1947. Furthermore, it is clear that Roman Catholics in both the Republic of Ireland and the USA were important to Artukovitch's post World War Two escape from Europe. Moreover, it is clear that such links between Ireland and America have a long history since as noted above, in America, the Fenians sent terrorists across the American-Canadian border into *British Canada* in 1866, 1870, and 1871. Such linkages have continued to historically contemporary times with, for example, Noraid. Noraid was founded in 1969 by Michael Flannery, a member of the IRA in the 1920s. Noraid says its activities do not go beyond acting as an American support group to provide relief for families of Irish Roman Catholic terrorists jailed or killed by the British government. If so, this is still enough to show the nexus between Irish Roman Catholic terrorists and the Irish-American community. In 1977 the United States *Department of Justice* made Noraid register as an agent of the Provisional IRA. Noraid says the money it raises in America is distributed through *Sinn Fein* in Dublin, southern Ireland, and *Green Cross* in Belfast, Northern Ireland. In 1982 Flannery said he approved of, though did not himself engage in, gun-running to the IRA²⁵⁶.

In Ireland, a prominent Fenian, Arthur Griffith (1872-1922), founded *Sinn Fein* in 1905, which became known as the *political wing* of the *Irish Republican Army*, since when the IRA was formed in 1919 it took over as the military wing of *Sinn Fein* known as the *Irish Volunteers*. Griffith was a member of the *Irish Volunteers*. He was imprisoned in 1916-17 and in 1918. When *Sinn Fein* won the 1918 election they tried to declare Ireland a republic with Edward (Eamon) De Valera as President, and Griffith as Vice-President. De Valera (1882-1975) was born in New York, America, of a Spanish father and an Irish-American mother. He moved to Ireland as a boy, joined the *Irish Volunteers*, and commanded a small military force of rebels in the 1916 Easter Rebellion in Dublin. Imprisoned in 1917, he escaped from jail in 1919, and in disguise went to the USA in order to raise funds for the Irish republican cause. He was later Prime Minister of the Republic of Ireland (1932-1948, 1951-1954, 1957-1959), and President of the Republic of Ireland (1959-1973).

During World War Two, Prime Minister De Valera kept southern Ireland neutral, although he condemned the establishment of American bases in Northern Ireland to help the liberation of Europe. Butler records Nazi Ustashi sympathies to the Republic of Ireland, evident in the fact that in a Zagreb newspaper, *Deutsche Zeitung in Kroatien*, in 1942, southern Ireland, together with the *Independent State of Croatia*, were said to be "model 'allied' states in German Europe," and other newspaper contained "much" "flattering" "about the common loyalty of Croats and Irish to [Roman Catholic] Faith and Fatherland." Hence "Irish plays continued to be played in Zagreb, when English were tabu [taboo]." Adolf Hitler named Admiral Karl Donitz, (the creator of the Nazi's World War Two U-Boat fleet,) as his successor as Head of State of the Nazi German Reich, and upon Hitler's death by

²⁵⁶ "Northern Ireland Glossary: Noraid" (www.megastories.com/ireland/glossary2/noraid.htm).

suicide in 1945, Prime Minister De Valera sent his condolences to Admiral Donitz for the death of the Nazi's beloved Fuhrer, Adolf Hitler. (At Nuremberg, Donitz was subsequently sentenced in 1946 to ten years imprisonment.) De Valera openly expressed pro-Stepinatz sentiments. As southern Irish Prime Minister, he claimed in 1946 that Stepinatz's case was "but an instance of a campaign of persecution," due to Stepinatz's "representations on behalf of religious freedom." Yet he failed to simultaneously state that Stepinatz's case was brought about because he collaborated with a Nazi regime that denied religious freedom to Serbs not wanting to convert to Romanism. Later as President of southern Ireland, in 1960 De Valera sent "Messages of sympathy" to the Pope for Stepinatz's death²⁵⁷ (although the titular nature of the office of the southern Irish President means he would have been acting with his southern Ireland Prime Minister's advice).

The post 1918 elections attempt to declare Ireland a republic occurred in conjunction with IRA guerilla tactics in the Irish War of Independence from 1919-21. Following the *Anglo-Irish Treaty* of December 1921, ratified by the *Assembly of Ireland* (Dail Eirann) in January 1922, southern Ireland was granted independence as a republic, with the six predominantly Protestant Ulster counties forming *Northern Ireland*, being part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. De Valera refused to accept the terms of the *Anglo-Irish Treaty* because it liberated British Protestants in Northern Ireland from Irish Roman Catholic control, by putting them under the freedoms and liberties of the Protestant British Crown. Hence he immediately resigned his position after the ratification by the *Assembly of Ireland* in 1922, thus making Arthur Griffith the first president of the Republic of Ireland (although those who claim the earlier declaration of independence was valid, also claim De Valera was the first president and Griffith the second president).

In discussing the Irish-American Roman Catholic community, it should be clearly understood I am not seeking to *tar-brush* all persons in this religio-ethnic group, but only a *small irresponsible group of persons within this larger group* connected with Irish terrorism and/or the connected glorification of Stepinatz. For example, the founder of Bob Jones University in South Carolina, USA, Bob Jones Sr. (1883-1968), had an Irish-American (Protestant) mother. But Hubert Butler recorded that in the Republic of Ireland, "I constantly see in the newspapers contemptuous little gibes at" "Bob Jones University" by Roman Catholics²⁵⁸. Indeed, I myself am also of Irish-American descent²⁵⁹.

²⁵⁷ Butler's *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, p. 255 ("The Invader Wore Slippers"); "Patron Saint of Genocide: Archbishop Stepinac" (Internet: humphreys.humanist.net/fascism.html); *The Tidings*, Los Angeles, USA, 15 Nov. 1946; *Irish Catholic*, 16 Feb, 1960.

²⁵⁸ Johnson, R.K., *Builder of Bridges*, A biography of Bob Jones, Sr., Bob Jones University Press, Greenville, South Carolina, USA, 1969, 1982, pp. 4-5; Butler's *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, p. 316 ("American Impressions").

²⁵⁹ Thomas McGrath (Roman Catholic), born 1830 in Boston, Massachusetts, USA, married Emma Nott (of no professed religion,) from Cambridge, England, UK, at St. Mary's Roman Catholic Cathedral, Sydney, Australia, in 1855. Their son, Martin McGrath (Roman Catholic), married Eliza De Mainson (Salvation Army) according to the rites of the Roman Catholic Church at Urana, NSW. Their son, Norman McGrath (Presbyterian as derived from the Church of Scotland), married Lily Lush (Baptist) from Bowerchalke, England, in the Castlereagh Street Methodist Church, Sydney. Their son, my father, N. Keith McGrath (Anglican), married my mother, Betty Davis (Anglican) at St. Clement's Anglican Church,

In the *Nuncio Incident* involving Hubert Butler discussed above, it is noteworthy that the Papal Nuncio, Gerald O'Hara, was an Irish-American. He was born in Philadelphia, where he attended a Romanist Seminary before undertaking doctoral work at the Pontifical Roman Seminary in Rome. In 1937, at the age of 34 he was appointed Auxiliary Roman Catholic Bishop of Philadelphia, USA, and later Roman Catholic Bishop of Savannah in Atlanta, USA. In 1947 Pope Pius XII appointed him Regent of the Apostolic Nunciature in Bucharest, the capital of Rumania. He was critical of the communist regime's treatment of the Roman Church, and was deported from Rumania in 1950. In recognition of his services, the Roman Church then bestowed on him the title of "Archbishop" while in Atlanta, USA, and he retained the Romish Bishopric of Savannah-Atlanta (formerly called the Diocese of Savannah, and then later split into two dioceses, namely Savannah and Atlanta). From 1951 to 1954 he was Papal Nuncio to southern Ireland, and from 1954 till his death in 1963 he was the Apostolic Delegate to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland²⁶⁰. He clearly had a lot in common with Stepinatz, who like him, had studied in Rome, had been appointed to a Romish Bishopric when relatively young, and had served the Roman Church in a European communist country which clearly disliked him. His defensiveness about Stepinatz and the Roman Church in Croatia during World War Two which sparked the *Nuncio Incident* of 1952, in part highlights attempts to justify more fanatically violent tendencies of Romanism in both twentieth century Croatia and Ireland, and also highlights the sympathies between Irish-American Romanists and Irish Romanists in their glorification of Stepinatz.

The three major historic centers of Irish-American Roman Catholicism in the USA are Boston in Massachusetts, New York City in the State of New York, and Chicago in Illinois. I visited both Boston and New York City, USA, in March 2009, among other things inspecting St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Cathedral in New York. An outside plaque on this Romish Cathedral says that "Pope Paul VI" on a "Papal visit to America came to this Cathedral to adore the ... sacrament" in "October 1965" i.e., to commit idolatry; for as the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 says, "adoration" "either unto the sacramental bread or wine" is "idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians" (Final Rubric, Communion Service). Inside this Popish Cathedral there were busts of Pope Paul VI (Pope: 1963-1978), John Paul II (Pope: 1978-2005; who visited the cathedral in Oct. 1979), and a framed picture of Pope Benedict XVI (Pope: since 2005).

In a sermon in the Romish Cathedral of Holy Cross, Boston (4 Oct. 1946), the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Irish-American Boston, Monsignor Cushing, said, "Archbishop Stepinac is guilty of" "the crime of being Archbishop of the [Roman] Catholic Church." "The Communist dictatorship will not tolerate any" "challenge to its monstrous claims."

Mosman, Sydney. (NSW Marriage Certificate of T. McGrath, No. 46, Vol. 101; Victorian Birth Certificate of M. McGrath, No 754 of 1859; NSW Marriage Certificate of M. McGrath, No 5235 of 1880; NSW Marriage Certificate of N.H. McGrath, No 782 of 1920; NSW Marriage Certificate of N.K.D. McGrath, No 3667 of 1952.)

²⁶⁰ "Death Claims Archbishop Gerald P. O'Hara," *The Georgia Bulletin*, The Newspaper of the [Roman] Catholic Archdiocese of Atlanta, 18 July 1963 (www.georgiabulletin.org/local/1963/07/18/a); "Archbishop O'Hara Well Known to All Atlantians," *The Georgia Bulletin*, 30 Aug. 2004 (www.georgiabulletin.org/local/1963/07/18/b).

“Therefore, it deforms the [Roman] Catholic Church²⁶¹.” The *New York Times* recorded that when told of “the conviction of Archbishop Stepinatz,” “Cushing, Archbishop of Boston” described this as a “‘Red Fascist crime against an innocent man’. ‘As they read that Archbishop Stepinatz has gone to the hard labor of a Communist prison’” (the element of “hard labour” in Stepinatz’s sentence was never carried out), “[Roman] Catholics” “‘will remember other Bishops similarly persecuted by other totalitarian dictatorships’²⁶².” *Perhaps Cushing could have developed his view here by mentioning as examples the three Serbian Orthodox Bishops killed for refusing to convert to Roman Catholicism by the totalitarian Nazi Ustashi dictatorship that Stepinatz collaborated with, though Cushing let the opportunity to do so pass by.*

The Irish heritage of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York is reflected in the name of the Cathedral which is called “St. Patrick’s.” The Irish-American Cardinal Spellman, was first a Roman Catholic Auxiliary Bishop of Boston, and then the Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York. This is significant given his establishment of the *Archbishop Stepinac High School* at White Plains in the city of New York, in 1948. This school is mentioned by, for example, Sherwood Eddy, Hubert Butler, and Pope Paul VI, as an example of the early formal usage of Stepinatz as a figure the Roman Church upholds as “heroic” and worthy of emulation²⁶³. It also acts as a link to the Irish-American Roman Catholic community, for example, the White Plains, New York, *Saint Patrick’s Day Parade* information list for 2005, said that the parade will include the *Archbishop Stepinac High*

²⁶¹ *Stepinac: The Man For His Time, op. cit.*, p. 61.

²⁶² “Cushing Hits ‘Red Fascist Crime’,” *New York Times* 12 Oct 1946, p. 7.

²⁶³ On their web-site homepage as at 2010 (see next footnote), the *Archbishop Stepinac High School* claims: “During the Second World War, Stepinac never turned his back on refugees, or the persecuted. His door was always open not only for Croatians, but also Jews, Serbs, and Slovenes that needed his help. Stepinac always stood for political freedom and fundamental rights In May of 1943, he openly criticized the Nazis, and as a result, the Germans and Italians demanded that he be removed from office. Pope Pius XII refused, and warned Stepinac that his life was in danger. In . . . 1943, . . . the BBC commented on Stepinac’s criticism of the Ustasha regime. At the end of the war, Stepinac was found guilty of Nazi collaboration at a mock trial . . . by communist persecutors.” There is some truth in elements of these claims, since Roman Catholic Croatian Inquisition simultaneously justified itself in terms of secular Nazi racial theoretics, and this meant that certain Inquisition discretions were necessarily exercised in a manner that was harmonious with Nazi racial theoretics e.g., all Jews were treated under Spanish Inquisition “purity of blood” (*limpieza de sangre*) type laws as insincere “converso” Jews and executed even if they converted, as were a number of Serbs; whereas an Inquisition discretion was exercised in favour of tolerance to Lutheran Protestants of Germanic dissent, much to Stepinatz anti-Protestant sentiments. We cannot doubt that Stepinatz wanted an Inquisition whose discretions were unfettered by such Nazi racial theoretics. His “door was always open” to those that “needed help” on how to convert to Popery, and he “criticized the Nazis” because he did not want the Croatian Inquisition to exercise its discretions so as to accommodate Nazi racial theoretics, with the result that the Ustashi did want him removed from office. But it also true that his level of collaboration was sufficiently high for them to regard him as someone they could and did work with. He most assuredly did not stand “for political freedom and fundamental rights,” and he was found guilty of collaboration but not “at a mock trial.” It seems from this extract that the propaganda work of the *Archbishop Stepinac High School* is still continuing.

School Crusader's Band under Monsignor O'Keefe²⁶⁴.

At the same during World War Two that Archbishop Stepinatz was the Nazi Ustashi Chaplain-General of the general militia in the *Independent State of Croatia*, Archbishop Spellman was the Chaplain to Roman Catholic troops in the USA army. But in 1943, after a Vatican official handed Spellman a copy of a book written in Latin, entitled *Ustashi Principles*, he said, "God Bless Croatia!"²⁶⁵ At the time of Stepinatz's trial in October 1946, Cardinal Spellman called on 50,000 Romanists at a rally in which Roman Catholic schoolgirls formed a huge rosary, "to pray for Archbishop Aloysius Stepinatz." Joined on the occasion by the Roman Catholic Auxiliary Bishop of Boston, Louis Kelleher, Spellman said that "Archbishop Stepinatz" "would 'gloriously and gladly' accept martyrdom," denounced the trial saying that Stepinatz's "persecutors" were "satanic Soviet sycophants," and "announced that the next educational building in the Archdiocese of New York would be named the 'Archbishop Stepinatz Memorial'²⁶⁶." (Two years later, this became the *Archbishop Stepinac High School*.) Later in October 1946, when Stepinatz had been convicted, Cardinal Spellman said of "Stepinatz," that he "is but one of thousands" of "martyrs" of "ruthless dictators"²⁶⁷. This clearly shows that the Roman Church were looking to style Stepinatz as a "martyr" figure as early as the 1940s, and many years before his actual death. *Perhaps Spellman could have developed this by mentioning as examples the Slatina Protestants of Serbian descent killed for refusing to convert to Roman Catholicism by the ruthless Nazi Ustashi dictatorship in 1941 that Stepinatz collaborated with, though Spellman let the opportunity to do so pass by.*

In 1947 Cardinal Spellman addressed the annual New York Roman Catholic Archdiocesan *Union of the Holy Name Society Convention*, and "the Cardinal described Archbishop Stepinatz as a 'hero' and a 'martyr to religious liberty'²⁶⁸." The following year, at the time of the *Archbishop Stepinac High School's* establishment, the convicted Nazi war criminal, Stepinatz, was still behind bars in (the second) Yugoslavia. O'Brien's *Archbishop Stepinac: The man and his case (1947)* had just been published. In Ireland, Stepinatz was being glorified and his fight against communism was being used as a role-model for Irish Roman Catholic's fighting against British Protestants. Butler records that "Cardinal Spellman laid a copy of" O'Brien's *Archbishop Stepinac (1947)* "on the foundation stone of" the *Archbishop Stepinac High School*, "and told 1700 schoolgirls, drawn up on a polo-ground in the form of a rosary, what they were to think about Croatian ecclesiastical history." Later, O'Brien's book, "published in Ireland," was "put into a bronze box and built in the corner

²⁶⁴

"Saint Patrick's Day Parade.com" (www.saintpatricksdaysparade.com/white_plains/white_plains.htm). The website as at 2010 says the President of Archbishop Stepinac High School, James Scully, is a member of the White Plains St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee ("Archbishop Stepinac High School, http://www.Stepinac.org/Re/Id?606332/Isvars/default/Foundation_Board.htm).

²⁶⁵ Falconi, C., *op. cit.*, pp. 371-3, quoting Lobkowicz's Report.

²⁶⁶ "Spellman Predicts Stepinatz Will Die," *New York Times*, 7 Oct. 1946, p. 5.

²⁶⁷ "Fight Communism, Spellman Pleads," *New York Times*, 25 Oct. 1946, p. 48.

²⁶⁸ "Stepinatz Lauded Here," *New York Times*, 10 Feb. 1947, p. 10.

stone” or “foundation-stone of” this “new Stepinac Institute in America²⁶⁹.” At Stepinatz’s death in 1960, Cardinal Spellman said, “The news about Cardinal Stepinac’s death has been received here with distress.” “We are proud that the Archdiocese of New York has erected a living memorial to Stepinac, Aloysius Stepinac High School, where young people are trained and taught how to respect and enhance the principles for which this brave man lived and died.” Spellman also conducted a Requiem Mass for Stepinatz at the *Archbishop Stepinac High School*, and at that time the school’s principal discussed “the heroic career of Cardinal Stepinac.” Furthermore, the newspaper of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York, *The Catholic News* (20 Feb 1960), at the time of Stepinatz’s death described him as a “martyr,” “heroic,” “brave, and possessing “the courage of the long roster of saints whom the [Roman] Church venerates as martyrs.” The paper’s editorial subverts the Biblical doctrine of justification by faith, claiming, “Stepinac” “offered his sufferings to God in atonement for the sins of his persecutors.²⁷⁰” Once again, this shows a loose and inaccurate usage of the term “martyr,” and exhibits the Roman Church’s desire to present Stepinatz as a “martyr” figure, long before it finally distorted the circumstances of his death to actually claim he was a “martyr.”

From 1950 to 1966, Fulton Sheen was Director for the Society for the Propagation of the [Roman] Faith, the Papists’ chief mission organization in the USA. He was appointed as the Romish Bishop of Rochester, New York, in 1966, where he served till his retirement in 1969, at which time he was given a titular Roman Catholic bishopric, with the title of Archbishop. This Irish-American Archbishop said, “Monsignor Stepinac appeared in court as the spiritual leader of the Croatian people and came out of the courtroom as the leader of his people and an example to the world.²⁷¹”

While the *New York Times* did not pander to the Irish-American Roman Catholic community in the same way as Cardinal Spellman and Archbishop Sheen, it did make reference to some matters of undoubted interest to this community, including reference to a book by an Irish Franciscan that Stepinatz was reading in his prison cell. The *New York Times* chief correspondent (1944-54) and author (1954-78), Cyrus Sulzberger (1912-93), who was regarded as particularly distinguished because of his dispatches from Yugoslavia, obtained an important and exclusive prison cell interview with Archbishop Stepinatz, (although interviews with him were obtained by others,) and his report on Stepinatz got him the *Pulitzer Prize* in 1951. In the relevant 1950 *New York Times* article, he records that “Archbishop Aloysius Stepinatz, the leading Roman Catholic prelate of Yugoslavia,” “said” “that his future depended not upon Marshal Tito or his Government but only upon the Holy See.” That is, “Tito” had “said that it was possible Archbishop Stepinatz might” “be removed from Lepoglava” Jail where he was “incarcerated following his conviction on

²⁶⁹ Butler’s *The Sub-Prefect Should Have Held His Tongue*, *op. cit.*, p. 272; Butler’s *In the Land of Nod*, *op. cit.*, pp. 92,114.

²⁷⁰ *Hrvatski glas* 7 March, 1960, in *Croatian Roman Catholic Home Page*, “Statements about Archbishop Stepinac and by him,” (www.papa.hr/pop/english/stepinac/12_eng.html); *Stepinac: The Man For His Time*, *op. cit.*, pp. 67,99.

²⁷¹ Sedlar, J., *Stepinac*, Video-film, London, UK and Zagreb, Croatia, Yugoslavia, 1988, in *Croatian Roman Catholic Home Page*, “Statements about Archbishop Stepinac and by him,” *op. cit.*.

charges of being a war criminal,” and “be sent to a monastery within Yugoslavia or, possibly, be permitted to leave the country.” But the “condition imposed” “was that the prelate should never return to Yugoslavia to function as a priest.” Stepinatz thus left the matter to the Pope, and hence the *New York Times* front page headline, “Stepinatz in Cell Interview Says His Fate Is Up to Pope.”

It is thus noteworthy that the later official depiction of Stepinatz as a “martyr” (more accurately from the normative Romish theological paradigm a “confessor”) suffering under communism, is unsustainable if for no other reason (and in fact there are other reasons why this depiction is false,) Stepinatz could have left prison and the country if the Pope agreed to the simple terms that Stepinatz not again “function as a priest” in “Yugoslavia.” If Stepinatz suffered at all in (the second) Yugoslavia, it was because he left his fate in the hands of the Pope to determine whether or not he left Yugoslavia, and the Pope was happy for him to stay in some form of imprisonment in Yugoslavia. Sulzberger says that in Yugoslavia, “Orthodox Serbs of all political shades came up to me and growled: ‘Stepinatz should have been hanged. It was he who condoned the murder of thousands of [Serbian] Orthodox. The only good thing this regime has done was to put the rascal in jail’.” But “Roman Catholic” “Croats” “beckoned” him “aside in secluded places and whispered: ‘You should know’,” that ““no matter what they tell you we adore him. He is the great hero of the people and no slanders launched against him are believed. He is our hero and our martyr’.” Once again, this shows that long before his death, there was an inaccurate desire to depict Stepinatz as a “martyr,” and his later death then became a classic case of *ramming a square peg into a round hole* in order to meet this desire, and claim Stepinatz died a “martyr’s” death.

Stepinatz became a Franciscan of the Third Order shortly after becoming Archbishop of Zagreb. In 1934, the Franciscan “Father” Leonardo Bello, went to Zagreb to assist in the celebration of the 700th anniversary of the Franciscans in Croatia, and invested Archbishop Stepinatz with the scapular and girdle of the Franciscans²⁷². But of particular interest to Irish-American Roman Catholic New Yorkers, Sulzberger records that “Stepinatz” was “studying” “church history” “on the Franciscan Order by an Irish” monk “named Wadding.” Sulzberger also referred to this fact in his 1960 *New York Times* article about Stepinatz’s death, saying when he visited Stepinatz in 1950 he “was studying the work of an Irish Franciscan friar.²⁷³” Luke Wadding (1588-1657) wrote this work, *Annales Ordinis minorum* (in eight volumes, published 1625-54; reprint 1931), as a history of the Franciscan order up to 1540. Wadding’s brother, Ambrose, was a Jesuit, as were his cousins, Peter and Michael Wadding. Luke Wadding studied under the Jesuits at the Irish Seminary located at Lisbon in Portugal. He was appointed head of the Franciscan Friary in 1625, the Friars of St. Isidore, Rome. He also founded the Irish Franciscan College of St. Isidore²⁷⁴. Writing some 40 years after his death in 1696, Wadding was highly regarded as “a man of eminent merit” in a joint letter by the Jesuit Superior in Ireland, Anthony Knowles, Friar John Coghlan, the Prior of the Order of St. Francis, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, and

²⁷² Alexander, S., *op. cit.*, pp. 26-7.

²⁷³ *Encyclopedia Britannica CD 99, op. cit.*, “Book of the Year (1994): Obituary: Sulzberger, C(yrus) L(eo).” Sulzberger, C.L., “Stepinatz in Cell Interview Says His Fate Is Up to Pope,” *New York Times*, 13 Nov 1950, pp. 1,13; Sulzberger, C.L., “A Dead Cardinal and a Live Cause,” *New York Times*, 15 Feb. 1960, p. 26.

²⁷⁴ *Catholic Encyclopedia*: Luke Wadding (www.newadvent.org/cathen/15521.htm).

others²⁷⁵. Significantly, Wadding supported the *Irish Massacre* of British Protestants in 1641. The *Kilkenny Confederation* was formed in 1641 and inaugurated in 1642 in a Synod under the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, Archbishop O'Reilly. It specifically endorsed the Irish insurrection against the King, and sought assistance from Popish princes in France, Spain, and Italy. Wadding's very favourable biographer, Joseph O'Shea, says, "Communications" with the *Kilkenny Confederation* "were opened with Luke Wadding," who "immediately engaged himself in collecting money, arms, and supplies, and inducing [Papist] Irish officers serving abroad to return" "and assist in the" Irish Papists' "cause."²⁷⁶

In the first place, the fact that Stepinatz was reading this work, is significant in showing a connection between Stepinatz's interests, Franciscans, and Ireland. It also shows a link to a man, in Luke Wadding, who was prepared to support the cause of the *Irish Massacre* of 1641 and thus the mass killing of British Protestants in order to try and achieve a Papist state. The 1641 mass killings of Protestants in Ireland have some obvious parallels in the mass killing of Serbian Orthodox under the Ustashi, and the killing of Protestants of Serbian descent exactly 300 years later at Slatina in 1941 and the Srem in 1941-2. But the fact that this was twice recorded in the *New York Times*, and on the first occasion in a *Pulitzer Prize* article on Stepinatz, also reminds us of the interest Irish-American Roman Catholic readers would have in this piece of information, which is additionally significant given the glorification of Stepinatz by the Romish Archdiocese of New York also evident in the *Archbishop Stepinac High School*.

At the time of Stepinatz's death, the *Catholic Herald*, USA, 19 Feb. 1960, claimed, "The Cardinal was a saintly spiritually-minded man." "He died a martyr's death" "Under Tito's rule." Likewise, in Irish-America Chicago, *Chicago's American* of 11 Feb, 1960 claimed, "The death of Aloysius Stepinac has removed a great living symbol of the resistance to communism, but the moral provided by his life has remained, as long as there are people of any religion who do not intend to make compromises with a pernicious dictatorship, such a dictatorship is not safe."²⁷⁷ The *Chicago's American* may have, though chose not to, develop this general theme the way the Reformed French Pastor, Andre Barnaud did, in *Le Monde* (21 October 1958). At that time, Pastor Barnaud referred to an earlier article in *Le Monde* dealing with "religious persecutions" against Roman Catholics "during the Pontificate of Pius XII" (Pope 1939-58). But he noted that this failed to detail persecutions by Roman Catholics against non-Roman Catholics under Pius XII's pontificate. For example, "Twenty thousand Spanish Protestants are being mistreated if not cruelly persecuted by the [Roman] Catholic Church" under Franco; the Roman Catholic "clergy and [Roman] Catholic masses in Colombia (South America) a few years ago organized bloody persecutions of the Protestants;" and in "Croatia, during the" second world "war, the Ustashi [Roman] Catholics massacred thousands of Orthodox Serbs." Pastor Barnaud notes that the Roman "Church" has failed "to condemn and put an end to such horrors," and that "silence" is the normative

²⁷⁵ Cleary, G., *Luke Wadding and St. Isidore's College, Rome*, Foto G. & M - P. Pigna, 53 Roma, Rome, 1925, p. 69; quoting the Records of Richard, Roman Catholic Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, in the City of Waterford, 1696 Letter of the Bishop *et al.*

²⁷⁶ O'Shea, J., *The Life of Father Luke Wadding*, Founder of St. Isidore's College, Rome, M.H. Gill & Son, Dublin, Ireland, 1885, pp. 156-8.

²⁷⁷ Quoted in *Croatian Roman Catholic Home Page*, "Statements about Archbishop Stepinac and by him," *op. cit.*.

Papal response²⁷⁸.

Moreover, if one takes seriously this claim by the *Chicago's American* that Stepinatz's "death" is a "symbol" for "people of any religion who do not intend to make compromises with a pernicious dictatorship," then it necessarily raises the question yet again of why Stepinatz did not refuse "to make compromises with" the Nazi Ustashi's "pernicious dictatorship." Perhaps the explanation for such bizarre historical selectivity is best explained by Chris Agee who observed that in "1998, the Pope initiated the process of" Stepinatz's "canonization. Shortly afterwards, in Italy, a "respected religious press published a book about the conversion campaign" in World War Two "Croatia," "entitled *The Genocide Archbishop*" (Marco Rivelli, *The Genocide Archbishop*, Kaos, Milan, Italy, 1998). "The struggle between biography and historiography" "is still engaged. It would appear that the Stepinatz file, which Hubert Butler did so much to keep open in the West, cannot soon be closed.²⁷⁹" Thus while these type of pro-Stepinatz statements found in the *Catholic Herald* and *Chicago's American* are understandable when viewed through the paradigm of propagandist Romish hagiography, they are unintelligible when viewed through the paradigm of reasonable and rational historical analysis.

The American State capital of Illinois, Chicago, is of some special interest because it is not only a historic centre for Irish-Americans, but also for Croatian-Americans. The influence of these groups is clearly wider than just the State capital. For example, 5 April, 1959 was declared "Cardinal Stepinac Day" by the State Governor, and his proclamation refers to "Americans of Croatian origin" "commemorating his sixtieth birthday this year," and also said "Aloysius Cardinal Stepinac is a symbol" "for" "persons in countries under Communist domination." But here in the State's capital of Chicago an interesting chapter in the Stepinatz saga shows co-operation between Romanists of these two ethnic communities uniting in the common goal of promoting Stepinatz's American cult. As previously noted, Manditch who initially helped Artukovitch escape from Europe, and later came to his aid in America, after completing his work in helping other Nazis escape from Croatia, became the Roman Catholic Superior of the Franciscan Monastery in Drexel Boulevard, Chicago. In 1998, this same monastery produced *Stepinac: The Man For His Time*, a work glorifying the now beatified "Blessed Stepinatz." For example, it contains long excerpts from the classic pro-Stepinatz work, *Archbishop Stepinac (1947)* by "Count O'Brien of Thomond" who was "born in Austria of Irish lineage." Also the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Chicago, Cardinal Bernadin, is quoted as referring to Stepinatz as a "martyr" of "courage."²⁸⁰

Of some interest in this context are the actions in 1998 of the Mayor of Chicago, Richard Daley Jr. . First elected Mayor of Chicago in 1991 (re-elected in 1995, 1999, 2003, and 2007²⁸¹), he is a prominent Roman Catholic of the Irish-American community in

²⁷⁸ Paris, E., *op. cit.*, pp. 257-8.

²⁷⁹ Agee, C. (Editor), *Unfinished Ireland: Essays on Hubert Butler*, *op. cit.*, chapter by Chris Agee, "The Stepinac File," pp. 144-60, at p. 159-60; referring to Rivelli, M.A., *L'Arcivescovo del genocidio*, Monsignor Stepinac, il Vaticano, a la dittatura ustascia on Croazia, 1941-1945, Kaos, Milan, 1998.

²⁸⁰ *Stepinac: The Man For His Time*, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-41,71,162-80.

²⁸¹ He announced in Sept. 2010 that he would not run for re-election when his term expires in 2011. Once he goes beyond 25 Dec. 2010, he will exceed his father's record term,

Chicago. He is a graduate of De Salle Academy (named after the Romish Saint, John Baptist De la Salle), and also the largest Roman Catholic University in America, De Paul University (named after the Romish Saint, Vincent de Paul, whose order of nuns ran the *Little Kids Concentration Camp* at Jastrebasco under the Ustashi). In 1997, the Jesuit's *Loyola Press* published a book by E. Sherriett (Editor) and Richard Daley Jr., entitled, *At the Crossroads: Old Saint Patrick's and the Chicago Irish*. This book is a celebration of Chicago's oldest Romanist Church, St. Patrick's, which is a symbol of Irish-American Romanism in Chicago. Richard Daley Junior's father, Richard Daley Sr.²⁸², was the grandson of Irish Roman Catholic immigrants, and a former Mayor of Chicago (1959-76). One of the instruments of Richard Daley Sr.'s rise to power was a Chicago Club, which ethnically divided into Lithuanian-Americans, Irish-Americans, and Croatian-Americans. In the Irish context, one distinguishes between *The Orange*, that is, Protestants, and *The Green*, that is, Roman Catholics. Notably then, as Mayor of Chicago, Richard Daley Sr. started the tradition, continued by his son, Richard Daley Jr., of dyeing the Chicago River *green* on St. Patrick's Day. (It is a sad commentary on the small number of Protestants in the Irish-American community, that this river is not dyed *orange* every 12 March on St. Patrick's Day, or every 23 October on *Irish Massacre Day*)²⁸³.

The Chicago Franciscan Monastery's publication, *Stepinac: The Man For His Time* (1998), records a good example of the Irish-American and Croatia-American Roman Catholic communities of Chicago working in an alliance to promote Stepinatz's cult. Here we learn that at the time of the Beatification of "Blessed Stepinatz" in October 1998, the Irish-American Roman Catholic Mayor of Chicago, Richard Daley Jr., made a Mayoral Proclamation that in deference to "the Croatian-American community," "Princeton Avenue between 26th and 33rd Streets" was to be renamed "Cardinal Stepinac Way." Moreover, "I RICHARD DALEY, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO, do proclaim October 3, 1998, as CARDINAL STEPINAC DAY IN CHICAGO" (that is, the day of Stepinatz's Beatification)²⁸⁴. Were they to proclaim e.g., 5 November as "Papists' Conspiracy Day" or 23 October as "Irish Massacre Day," this would no doubt be rejected as "inconsistent with the secular state." Yet they are happy to promote such Popish figures as Stepinatz.

Though not specifically stated in Richard Daley Junior's Mayoral Proclamation, the naming of "Cardinal Stepinac Way" provides a further link to the Franciscans, since *St. Jerome's Croatian [Roman] Catholic Church of Chicago* is located on this street. This church was established by, and is connected with, the Romish Order of Franciscans. E.g., in 1969 the parish priest, "Father" Marko Kozina, left St. Jerome's, Chicago, in order to take up a position as Superior of the Croatian Franciscan Fathers; and the internet's home page for this church has a "Welcome" page with a "Message from the Croatian Franciscans," together with various other information also provided on the Franciscans²⁸⁵. Thus Irish-American

and himself become the longest serving Mayor in Chicago's history.

²⁸² Richard Daley Sr. is sometimes distinguished from his son by being called, Richard J. Daley, and Richard Daley Jr. is sometimes distinguished from his father by being called Richard M. Daley.

²⁸³ Barnes, J.A., & McKiernan, E., *Irish-American Landmarks*, Gale Research, Boston, USA, 1995, pp. 53,315-7,319,323; & homepage of Richard Daley, Mayor of Chicago.

²⁸⁴ *Stepinac: The Man For His Time, op. cit.*, p. 238.

²⁸⁵ St. Jerome's homepage (www.st.jeromecroatian.org).

Richard Daley Junior's 1998 Mayoral Proclamation has given this Croatian-American Franciscan Church an address that now bears the name of "Cardinal Stepinac," and *thus another Stepinatz religious site*.

Even apart from these events in Chicago, there are a number of religious sites to Stepinatz. In Sydney Australia, I have seen at the *Cardinal Stepinac Village* a stained-glass window of Stepinatz in the nursing home's chapel. When I visited Croatia in 2004, I found at Mary's Basilica (Marija Bistrica) a stone statue to "Blessed Aloysius Stepinatz" ("Blazeni Alojzije Stepince") at the main entrance going into this church bearing the 1998 date of his Beatification; and also outside in the "Blessed Aloysius Stepinatz Auditorium," a Stepinatz Chapel containing a full length picture of Stepianc above an altar where the Roman Mass was conducted, with a nearby statue of Pope John-Paul II referring to his Beatification of Stepinatz in 1998.

In Zagreb, there is the Stepinatz shrine where he was buried, behind the main altar, which contains photos of Stepinatz, the sale of picture cards of Stepinatz, signs talking about Stepinatz, and candles bearing Stepinatz's portrait. In 2004 I witnessed various devotions to Stepinatz here, including an old man (evidently from the Ustashi era), walking round and round the shrine repeatedly, saying various prayers at certain points, and when he reached the front of it, repeatedly kissing a golden death-mask of Stepinatz attached to the front; and when he had finished this he went to a confessional. Above this golden death-mask of Stepinatz wearing a two-horned bishop's mitre, are various coats of arms, including those of Pope John-Paul II who Beatified him. This old man was not the only Romanist I saw kissing this death-mask relic, which is worn down to a silver colour on a spot of the nose where Papists kiss it. Kissing is a form of Romish idolatrous veneration relatively rare in the Roman Catholicism of Croatia, and not since visiting St. Peter's Basilica in Rome have I seen Romanists so constantly kissing an idolatrous shrine (although such practices are more common among Spanish Romanists). On a wall opposite this shrine, is another stone depiction of Stepinatz.

In America, there is the *Archbishop Stepinac High School* (1948) in New York. But less than a fortnight after Richard Daley Junior's Chicago Mayoral Proclamation of 3 October 1998, on 11 October 1998, the number of Stepinatz shrines was increased with Chicago's Roman Catholic *Angel Guardian Church* renamed the *Blessed Aloysius Stepinac Church*²⁸⁶.

CHAPTER 12

STEPINATZ'S CROATIAN-AUSTRALIAN CULT

In Australia, the Croatian-Australian newspaper *Spremnost*, reported in 1964 that a group of Croatian-Australians held a Roman Mass for the departed soul of Anton Pavelitch (1889-1959). Pavelitch is referred to under his old Ustashi title of "Poglavnik" ("Head"), and the paper shows a picture of this event in Hobart, Tasmania, with a group of Croatian-Australians standing under an Ustashi flag²⁸⁷. The Croatian-Australian newspaper *Sredisnji Odbor Izvjestava* reported that a similar Roman Mass for Pavelitch was held in December

²⁸⁶ See www.midwest-croatians.org/archives/blstepinac.

²⁸⁷ Hesman, F., "HOBART, Tas," *Spremnost*, Siecanj-Evljaca, 1964, Strana 6,

1971 in Melbourne, at which time the Croatian-Australian Roman Catholics present observed a one minute silence. Some Romanists in Australia of Croatian descent have engaged in other Ustashi supporting activities against those in Australia of (the first or second) Yugoslav descent, or what since 2006 would be more likely to be those of Serbian descent; or against those from the former six states of (the first or second) Yugoslavia who support the proposition that Croatia should be part of a Yugoslavian federation, including, for example, bashings, stabbings, intimidation threats, intimidation of witnesses to murder, bombings, and murders. For instance, the bombing of St. George's Serbian Orthodox Church, St. Albans, Melbourne, in July 1971²⁸⁸. And seemingly connected with the Croatian-Yugoslavian war in which Croatia left the Yugoslav federation, in 1991 Molotov cocktail hand-grenades were thrown at St. Stephen's Serbian Orthodox Church in Melbourne, Victoria. Then within the next couple of years, Presbyter Srboljub Miletich was awoken during the night at St. Sava's Serbian Orthodox Monastery at Elaine, near Geelong in Victoria, by drivers in cars firing about 10 to 15 gun-shots at the monastery before driving off into the dark²⁸⁹.

Marjan (Merjan / Marijan) Jurjevic of Melbourne, a Roman Catholic of Croatian descent, and a supporter of retaining the six states of the first and second Yugoslavia in the Yugoslavian federation, was a former Chairman of the *Yugoslav Settlers' Association of Australia*. In his book, *Ustasha Under the Southern Cross* (1972), he strongly opposed the Nazi Ustashi, and noted that their programme of mass murder against Serbs, Jews, and others, included the "brutal extermination" of some "democratically minded Croats."²⁹⁰ On the one hand, Jurjevic recognized the involvement of large numbers of Roman Catholic "clerical thugs" in these mass killings, for example, the "Jesuit priest," "Dr. Kamber," "who was responsible for the killing of at least 300 Jews and" Serbian "Orthodox," or "the Franciscan friar, Miroslav Filipovic, who was responsible for the murder of 40,000 [Serbian] Orthodox, Jews, and anti-fascist [Roman] Catholics;" and that "Stepinac remained silent throughout the massacres despite the fact that he was a member of the Senate appointed by Pavelic²⁹¹." But on the other hand, Jurjevic looked to the example of that small number of clergy who were of his Roman Catholic religion, and who opposed the Nazi Ustashi during World War Two. Thus he refers with favour to the Roman Catholic Canon Loncar of Zagreb who preached "a sermon in August, 1941, on the theme: 'Thou shalt not kill,' for which he was condemned to death, a sentence later commuted to hard labour for life."²⁹²

Jurjevic reported that an organization in Australia known as the "Cardinal Stepinac Association" published a calendar in the *Hrvatski Dom (Croatian Home)*, with a picture

²⁸⁸ Jurjevic, M., *Ustasha Under the Southern Cross*, Printed in Australia, 1972, pp. 36-7,63-6. (Cf. M. Farrel's *Ravens Wolves*, Protestant Publications, P.O. Box 26, Glebe, N.S.W., 2037, inside cover.)

²⁸⁹ Discussions between myself and Presbyter Srboljub Miletich, presbyter of St. Stephen's Serbian Orthodox Church, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia, October, 2004.

²⁹⁰ Jurjevic, M., *Beware of Genocide*, Short History of Ustashi crimes and their activities in Australia, Published by the Yugoslav Settlers' Association of Australia, Printed by Australian-Greek Publications, 1963, p. 8.

²⁹¹ Jurjevic, M., *Ustasha Under the Southern Cross*, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

²⁹² Jurjevic, M., *Beware of Genocide*, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

showing Stephen Radic (a politician who died in 1928, who was leader of the Croatian Peasant's Party), Archbishop Stepinatz, and Pavelitch, with the inscription, "They have given their lives for Croatia, God, and Justice."²⁹³ The "Cardinal Stepinac Association" also produced a calendar in 1963 featuring a large photograph of Ustashi troops marching in Zagreb, and was connected with other Ustashi groups in Australia "arrested on a terrorist mission to Yugoslavia in 1964." Jurjevic says the "Cardinal Stepinac Association" was connected with an assault upon him in which he was "beaten" in Sydney in 1963. This "Cardinal Stepinac Association" was dissolved in 1965²⁹⁴.

In 1986 the "Australian Croatian Cardinal Stepinac Association Incorporated" was founded, and it owns and administers the *Cardinal Stepinac Village*. In November 1998, the Romanist Archbishop Josip Bozanic, who had announced Stepinatz's future beatification in May 1998, travelled to the State of New South Wales in Australia. Here at St. John's Park in Sydney, he "blessed" the *Cardinal Stepinac Village* (hostel and nursing home). This was then being built by the Croatian-Australian Roman Catholic community, and was subsequently opened in June 1999. The *Cardinal Stepinac Village* internet home-page includes a picture of Pope John-Paul II kneeling in prayer before the tomb of Stepinatz at the Zagreb Cathedral²⁹⁵. When I visited the *Cardinal Stepinac Village* in October 2004, I found a large statue of Stepinatz behind the hostel, a bust of Stepinatz at the entrance way to the nursing home, and a stained-glass window of Stepinatz in the nursing home's chapel. This is clearly a Stepinatz shrine.

Under such circumstances in which Rome so brazenly glorifies Stepinatz, underpinning religio-racialist enmities between Serbs and Croats are surely being fanned. Therefore we cannot be surprised that in March 2005, a soccer game between two Sydney teams, the Croatian-backed Sydney United, and Serbian-backed (or third Yugoslavian-backed) Bonnyrigg White Eagles, ended in violence between persons in Australia of Serbian descent and Croatian descent. It was reported and accepted that the violent brawling related to issues of ethnicity. This Serbian-Croatian clash of violence, included bottles and flares being thrown, and eleven New South Wales police officers were injured. Five people were arrested. The racialism continued long after the match, with the Croatian-backed Sydney United Club being subsequently firebombed, and the Serbian-backed White Eagles Club at Bonnyrigg being riddled with a dozen bullets²⁹⁶. A New South Wales State Government Enquiry, headed by the NSW Community Relations Commissioner, referred to "ethnic hatreds." It found that the Croatian supporters of Sydney United were responsible for a lot of the violence, with this Croatian backed soccer club allowing supporters to enter the area

²⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (picture reproduced p. 11).

²⁹⁴ Jurjevic, M., *Ustasha Under the Southern Cross*, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-51,63.

²⁹⁵ "Who are we and what we do: Cardinal Stepinac Village" and "Cardinal Stepinac Bibliography: Cardinal Stepinac Village," (www.cardinalstepinacvillage.com). The *Cardinal Stepinac Village* is located at 24-32 Runcorn St, St. John's Park, N.S.W., 2176, Australia.

²⁹⁶ Cockerill, M. & Kennedy, L., "Clubs face fan lockout after brawl," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 15 March 2005, p. 3; Noonan, G. & Kennedy, L., "Shooting takes suburban violence up a notch," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 March 2005, p. 5.

with flares, ethnic banners, and the carcass of a pig painted with Serbian insignia²⁹⁷.

Less than a month after these events of mid March 2005, Pope John-Paul II died in early April 2005. On the one hand, his actions in beatifying Stepinatz in 1998 had, in all probability, been contributory factors in fuelling the violence of Irish Roman Catholic terrorists against British Protestants in the Omagh Bombing of 1998 in Northern Ireland; and they had also surely helped exacerbate tensions between Serbian and Croatian ethnic groups, such as those in Australia involved in the violence, firebombing, and gun shootings of March 2005. But on the other hand, world leaders, such as the Mohammedan Arab President of Palestine, Mahmoud Abbas, hailed him in his death as “a great religious figure,” “devoted” “to” “peace;” or the Roman Catholic Prime Minister of Italy, Silvio Berlusconi, (whose predominately Romanist country of Italy went into four days of mourning,) referred to his “work” “against all forms of” “violence.” The Vatican has diplomatic relations with over 130 states, and most of these sent representatives to Pope John-Paul II’s funeral on 8 April 2005, with a large number of Heads of State and world leaders anxious to attend. Those who attended his funeral included such apostate Protestants as the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, and the first USA president to attend a Papal funeral, George Bush, Jr.²⁹⁸.

Following this glorification of Pope John-Paul II at his funeral in early April, in late April the world further glorified the man who had been Prefect of the *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith* when Stepinatz was beatified, Cardinal Ratzinger, by attending his enthronement as Pope Benedict XVI on 24 April 2005. Ratzinger’s selection of the name “Benedict” is notable. Before he became Pope Benedict XII (Pope 1334-42), Cardinal Fournier was an Inquisitor. Among other things, Vatican records released in 1998 reveal that Fournier followed a “convert or die” policy with a Jew named Baruch. Baruch had been force “converted” by being told he must be baptized or die, and so he chose to be baptized, and was renamed “John.” But he evidently did not understand what baptism was, and when he later learnt that this meant he must leave Judaism and become a Papist, he refused to do so. The Inquisitor Fournier gave him a simple “convert or die” ultimatum, and he chose death²⁹⁹. Cardinal Ratzinger was thus happy to become Pope Benedict XVI in a succession of Benedicts that included Pope Benedict XII; indicating that he does not have the strong aversion to force conversions that he pretends to. This same sympathy was manifested in his support for the beatification of Stepinatz.

Benedict XVI had been a member of both the Hitler Youth, and Nazi German *Wehrmacht*; and from this background appears to have felt he could empathize with Stepinatz’ Nazi collaboration in what was simultaneously a Croatian Inquisition and a Nazi Ustashi racial theoretics secular political programme, in which Ustashi Officers could choose to “justify” their actions on either Romish religious reasons or Nazi secular political reasons,

²⁹⁷ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 May, 2005, p. 3.

²⁹⁸ “Global Tributes,” “John Paul II Tribute,” *Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 April 2005, p. 4; Petre, J. & Johnston, B., “St Peter’s set to become the centre of the world,” *Sydney Morning Herald*, 6 April 2005, p.8; *Newshour*, With Jim Lehrer (USA TV News), 4 & 5 April, 2005.

²⁹⁹ “Secret Files of the Inquisition: Part 1,” Inquisition Productions Inc., Canada & UK (Television), 2006.

or some combination thereof. Benedict XVI did not use his powerful position as Prefect of the *Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*, formerly, known as Grand Inquisitor of the Inquisition, to try and halt Stepinatz's beatification. Those attending Benedict XVI's enthronement included the Papist king and queen of Spain, the Duke of Edinburgh; the Presidents of Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Poland, and Argentina; the Prime Minister of France; the Governor of Florida, representing the President of the United States of America; and the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury³⁰⁰.

The Panzer Cardinal, who became the Panzer Pope, made some statements in his Regensburg University speech at Germany in September 2006 against forced conversions by Mohammedans. Referring to the 14th century Byzantine Emperor, Manuel II Palaeologus, Benedict XVI said, "The emperor turned to his colleagues with the central question of the relationship between religion and violence. He said, I quote, 'Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new. And there you will find things only evil and inhuman. Such as his command to spread by the sword, the faith he preached'." This sparked both violent and non-violent reactions from the Mohammedan world, with Sheik Abubakar Hassa Malin, a Somalian cleric, calling on Mohammedans to "hunt down" and kill the Pope, and an Italian Roman Catholic nun being gunned down at the Somalian capital of Mogadishu. The Pope responded saying that, "I wished to explain that not religion and violence, but religion and reason go together."³⁰¹

To be sure, this was an instance of "the pot calling the kettle black." This same year of 2006 was the 400th anniversary since the Westminster Parliament enacted in 1606, that Papists' Conspiracy Day should be an annual day of remembrance for the Popish gunpowder treason plot to blow up the Protestant King and Parliament on 5 November the previous year. It was also the 450th anniversary of the martyrdom of the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, under the reign of the Papist Queen, Bloody Mary.

The year 2006 was also the 450th anniversary of the martyrdom of Pomponio Algerio. As a law student of Padua University (near Venice, Italy), Pomponio had been put through a heresy trial for holding Lutheran teachings. Padua University was renown for giving academic freedom; and so at his trial, Pomponio had worn an academic cap and gown, in order to remind the Inquisition Tribunal that as a student of the University, he was meant to have an academic freedom to investigate and reach his ideas and beliefs. Among other things, he stated the Protestant belief, that "the Church" of Rome "deviates from the truth, in so far as it says that a man can do anything in any way good on his own; since nothing praiseworthy can proceed from our corrupt infected nature, except to the extent that the Lord God gives us his grace." This type of thinking is e.g., found in the Anglican 39 Articles, Articles 11-14. Algerio also said "the Roman Catholic is a particular church, and no Christian should restrict himself to any particular church, since this Roman Church deviates in many things from truth." I.e., he rejected the central claim of the Roman Church to be the only true church, and thus rejected their concomitant claim to authority. The Inquisition had sentenced him to prison, telling him to reconsider his beliefs. The 24 year old Pomponio was languishing in prison. Then, the Roman Inquisition on the Italian Peninsular, under the zeal of Pope Paul IV (Pope 1555-9), wanted this Protestant killed. He was martyred on 22

³⁰⁰ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 April, 2005, p. 9.

³⁰¹ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 Sept. 2006, p. 7; 19 Sept. 2006, pp. 1,7; 21 Sept. 2006, p. 13; *Newshour*, With Jim Lehrer (USA TV News), 16 Sept, 2006.

August, 1556, in Venice, by the Inquisition's new excruciating technique of murder. The Protestant Pomponio, had been made the offer of first being strangled so as to reduce his execution pain, if he would recant. He refused to either recant his Protestant beliefs, or make an auricular confession to a priest, or take the Roman Mass. He was publicly boiled alive for a quarter of an hour in a caldron of oil, tar, and turpentine, before finally dying. In a report filed on the event, the Venetian Ambassador spoke of how "the student Pomponio went to his death," saying that "he displayed so much steadfastness in the face of death, that everyone was in awe³⁰²."

2006 was also the 140th anniversary of the martyrdom of Protestants by Papists at Barletta, Italy, in 1866 (the St. Joseph's Day Martyrs). 2006 was also the 65th anniversary of the killing of the Lutheran Protestants of Serbian descent at Slatina, Croatia, who refused to convert to Popery. The same media which "wondered after" the Pope (Rev. 13:3), failed to give comparable coverage to these anniversary events. For instance, with respect to Thomas Cranmer, this included a memorial service with the *Church of England (Continuing)* Bishops Malcolm and Samuel, that I attended in March at Oxford, England; and a Cranmer exhibition case I inspected at (the Evangelical Anglican) Moore Theological College Library in Sydney, Australia that included a picture of Cranmer with long flowing white "Beard of Sorrow" that he grew in honour of Henry VIII after the king died. But the media failed to report that in Rome is "found the blood" "of the saints" (Rev. 18:24).

Actions speak louder than words. Benedict XVI chose the name of an inquisitor who gave a "convert or die" ultimatum under the Spanish Inquisition; and he did nothing to try and stop the canonization of the mass murderer of Protestants, Sarkander of Moravia, or the beatification of the Nazi Ustashi collaborator, Stepinatz. Under strict scrutiny, the fact that Benedict XVI helped beatify a World War II Nazi collaborator like Stepinatz who was involved in the forced "conversions" of about a quarter of a million people, and the murder of more than twice that number who refused to "convert" to Popery, means that the Devil-possessed and controlled Pope is simply up to his old tricks. The Devil who came with guile by possessing a serpent in Eden (Gen. 3), still comes with guile by possessing the Roman Popes for about the last 1,400 years since 607 A.D. (II Thess. 2:3,9; Rev. 12:3,9; 13:1,2). He wants to present himself as "a man of peace," and the media is happy to give him coverage for this, and happy to conceal his hypocrisy as seen in his support for the beatification of Stepinatz, and the roll on effect of Stepinatz's glorification with Irish Roman Catholic terrorism. For "the Devil" "is a liar, and the father of it" (John 8:44), and the Roman Papacy operates "with all deceivableness" (II Thess. 2:10).

Why with first the funeral of Pope John-Paul II in early April, and then the enthronement of Pope Benedict XVI in late April 2005, "have" "the kings of the earth" so "committed" spiritual "fornication" with Rome (Rev. 17:2), and why has "the world" so "wondered after the" Pope (Rev. 13:3)? The answer must surely be, that "God" did "send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness" (II Thess. 2:11,12).

Amidst all this glorification of two Popes clearly connected with Stepinatz's Beatification, it should not surprise us that ethnic hatred between Serbs and Croats again

³⁰² "Secret Files of the Inquisition: Part 3," Inquisition Productions Inc., Canada & UK (Television), 2006.

flared at another Sydney soccer match. Less than a fortnight after Pope Benedict XVI's enthronement, the *Sydney Morning Herald* reported that "despite measures including segregating United's Croatian fans from the Serbian White Eagles during the match, violence still erupted." E.g., Serbs from the Bonnyrigg White Eagles, rushed Croats in the Sydney United's bus. The *Sydney Morning Herald* showed a photo of the scene at the soccer oval that looked like a battlefield, with smoke from flares on and around the oval, belching up into the sky. Flares and other projectiles were hurled by both sides at each other. Six arrests were made, and police charges included both assault and causing malicious damage³⁰³.

While one cannot prove in a legal sense a direct link between Papal glorification and such violence, it cannot be reasonably doubted that the world's glorification of two Popes clearly connected with Beatifying the sinister figure of the convicted Nazi war criminal, Cardinal Stepinatz, helped to create a backdrop where such conduct was more likely. But the spiritually and morally blinded media, hid such factors under vaguely defined terminology such as "ethnic hatreds" between Serbs and Croats³⁰⁴. On the one hand, such statements about "ethnic hatreds" are not inaccurate, and in arguing for an Australia made up of "Anglo-Celtic stock," Sir Garfield Barwick referred to suchlike when he referred to "the depths and intractability of the mutual disapproval of some ethnic groups, an antipathy which may prove ineradicable and is often attended by violence."³⁰⁵ But on the other hand, the reality is that the conduct of these Popes, and the world's glorification of them, has helped create an environment in which those of Serbian descent and those of Croatian descent, are *more likely* to be embroiled in such racist violence. That is because *actions speak louder than words*, and irrespective of what the Roman Church may officially *say*, both Croats and Serbs may not find it hard to see the Roman Church condoning such sentiments, i.e., their *actions* in Beatifying Stepinatz. These actions were surely exacerbated by both the Roman Church's and the world's glorification of those Popes involved in this process.

CHAPTER 13 GLORIFICATION AND HONOUR OF STEPINATZ EXPOSES THE POPE AS ANTICHRIST

While the same Satan who has devil-possessed every Pope of Rome since the first Pope, Boniface III in 607, will seek to bring people into the Church of Rome by various artful designs and tricks, e.g., sexual allurement (mixed marriages with Papists in which documents are signed stating the offspring will be raised in Popery); at the end of the day, such techniques generally have a limited success rate, usually measurable in "conversion" rates of less than 1%. By contrast, nothing is more "successful" than an Inquisition, whether like the "Holy" Roman Empire established in 800 it does not use the name "Inquisition," but still persecutes groups like the Waldenses; or whether like the Spanish Inquisition, it does use that name. Either those under it "convert" to Popery, or they die and so are "gotten out of the way." Thus over time an area becomes 100% Papist, or close to it, with less than 1% usually holding out in hidden locations.

³⁰³ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2 May, 2005, p.3; and 3 May 2005, p. 12.

³⁰⁴ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 May, 2005, p. 3.

³⁰⁵ Barwick, G, *A Radical Tory*, *op. cit.*, p. 300. As Attorney-General of the Commonwealth of Australia (1958-63), Sir Garfield upheld the *White Australia Policy*, and ensured that Australia maintained a clear Anglo-Celtic cultural identity.

Such a minority were the *Vaudois*. In the beautiful high mountains area of Terra Pellice (near Turin, Italy), in September 2001, I was privileged to inspect a once secret Waldensian cave (Guieiza d'la Tana). Here these French speaking proto-Protestants took refuge from various Papist persecutions in the Middle Ages, and later took refuge as Protestants. For we read in Holy Writ, that “the earth helped the woman” (Rev. 12:16).

Let the reader consider e.g., the fact that wherever the Spanish Empire went, the Office of the Inquisition went with it. That is why e.g., the Philippines, or most of Central America and South America is Papist today. Study of e.g., the “Holy” Roman Empire, or Spanish Inquisition, reveals that the normative operations of establishing and running an inquisition are generally left to the government. I.e., an inquisition is generally set up by a Romanist government, such as e.g., that of Spain under Ferdinand and Isabella; or by Parliament in 15th century England with a general blessing of that government from Rome. By convention, the Pope of Rome generally keeps “a safe distance” from the government running such an inquisition; but in broad terms gives that government his “blessing,” is *silent* with respect to any fundamental criticisms of its inquisition, and beatifies or canonizes some relevant person or persons from it.

E.g., Pedro de Arbues (Peter Arbues) went to Sargossa to torture and kill *converso* Jews i.e., Jews who had converted to Roman Catholicism. Faced with the option of at best, *convert or be excluded from all better societal positions*, or at worst, *convert or die*, many Jews converted to Popery. But one group of Jews only pretended to be Papists, and behind closed doors secretly practised Judaism, whereas another group were sincere converts to Popery. It was hard to tell the difference, and so all *converso* Jews were persecuted by the Spanish Inquisition. As a pre-emptive strike, those who were to be his victims, the *converso* Jews, killed Arbues first in 1485. Hailed by the Papists as a “martyr,” he was beatified as “Blessed” Arbues in 1664, and canonized as “Saint” Arbues in 1867.

Nazi racial theoretics wanted the elimination of Jews, Gypsies, and Serbs for reasons theoretically disconnected with the religious motives of an inquisition. Their concern was with the elimination of all mixed race persons, and all non-Aryans. The Jews were one of three racial groups, Caucasians (they claim Ashkenaz in Gen. 10:3 as a progenitor, and they are certainly right to claim Japheth as their main racial progenitor, i.e., Ashkenazi Jews were originally Aryan converts, and many remained pure-blooded Aryans, a fact Nazi propaganda could not accept); or an admixture of Caucasian Caucasoids (Ashkenazi Jews) and Mediterranean Caucasoids (Sephardic Jews); or in a relatively small number of instances, they were Sephardic Jews (Semitic Mediterranean Caucasoids) of the Jewish race. (Anti-Nazi propaganda often misrepresents the Nazis as killing six million Jews because they were of “the Jewish race,” or uses vague terminology like “genocide of the Jews” so as to allow this misinterpretation. While “genocide” is not an incorrect description of the Nazis intent, it lacks detail, and in fact those so killed by Nazis who were of the Jewish race were a small fraction of the six million Jews they killed.) One group of Serbs were an admixture of Caucasian Caucasoids and Mediterranean Caucasoids, with some Mongoloid admixture, largely, though not entirely, from the Ottoman Empire legacy; although another group of Serbs were pure Aryans. Nazis did not generally recognize this internal distinction among the Serbs, and wrongly regarded them all as admixed. I.e., one of the bizarre features of Nazi racial theoretics, was that it justified killing a large number of Aryan Serbs and Aryan Jews, because it refused to accept that any persons in either group could be Caucasians. (Notably, “human rights” propaganda does not point out the Nazis gross incompetence in this

area, in part, because many of its promoters are themselves grossly ignorant of quality racial classification; and in part because for political reasons they want to use the Nazi extermination of Serbs and Jews for their own anti-patriotic, anti-nationalist, and connected anti-racist propaganda reasons.)

The Ustashi realized that the same goals could be achieved under a Papist inquisition, by usage of inquisition “discretions” to achieve a largely comparable outcome. The establishment of the Croatian Inquisition in Greater Croatia from 1941 to 1945 by the government of Anton Pavelitch, whose government received the “blessing” of Archbishop Stepinatz in 1941, and the “blessing” of the Pope in 1943, may be fairly characterized as fitting within the normativity of other inquisitions, such as those under the “Holy” Roman Empire or the Spanish Inquisition. It was possible to conceptualize Ustashi actions either under Nazi racial theoretics, or as the exercise of government discretions under Papist inquisition rules. Nazi racial theoretics required that those of Germanic Aryan descent i.e., about 68,500 Lutherans not be touched, and the Caucasian Mohammedans of Bosnia-Herzegovina who had converted to Mohammedanism under the Ottoman Empire likewise be spared. Under the Hapsburg’s “Holy” Roman Empire, a discretion was used to allow a small number of areas for Jews. I.e., these were not *converso* Jews, and while inquisition rules allowed a *convert or die* ultimatum, it also allowed the exercise of a discretion not to give this ultimatum. On this precedent of Jewish areas, one could, under inquisition rules, allow a relatively small number of Lutherans (of Germanic descent) and Mohammedans, not to be given the *convert or die* ultimatum.

If an Ustashi officer killed a Jew, Gypsy, or Serb who was not a convert to Popery, he could in his mind, justify it on the basis of either Papist religious inquisition theoretics in what he thought of as a Croatian Inquisition, such as one finds in the *Crusades Against the Waldensians and Albigensians* (Lateran III & IV Councils, 1179 & 1215) i.e., these “heretics” had never converted to Popery in hundreds of years; or on the basis of secular Nazi racial theoretics in what he thought of as a Nazi political action. If the Ustashi Officer killed a Jew, Gypsy, or Serb who had been converted to Romanism, whether before this time, or in the case of a Serb, by forced “conversion” during this time, his general anti-Jewish, anti-Gypsy, and anti-Serb sentiment, would lead him to distrust non-Croat Papists, and so, in his mind, he could justify it either under *converso* Jew Papist inquisition racial theoretics in what he thought of as a Croatian Inquisition, or Nazi racial theoretics in what he thought of as a Nazi political action. Thus Croatian Inquisition thinking constituted a Romish religious reason, whereas Nazi racial theoretics constituted a secular political reason; and which of these two reasons, or combination thereof an Ustashi officer chose, was determined on an individual by individual basis. Thus e.g., an eyewitness, Damir Mirkovic tells of how in 1941, 700 Serbs were brought to Glina, ostensibly “under the pretext of religious conversion to Roman Catholicism,” and after they were “forced to shout in unison: ‘Long live the Leader!’ (Pavelic),” the Ustashi “killers” then “butchered” them all³⁰⁶.

In the case of e.g., the many Franciscan Ustashi officials, their motivation was probably Papist inquisition religious; but for others it may have been Nazi racial theoretics.

³⁰⁶ Mirkovic, D., “Memoirs: Recollection of a forced conversion to [Roman] Catholicism and of Ustasha Genocide,” *op. cit.*, p. 80. Glina is about 50 km or 30 miles south, south-east of Zagreb; although the Glina River that it is on, is a river of both Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

In practice, these two approaches blended imperceptibly, as part of the political pact between the Nazis and the Roman Church in Greater Croatia. The only requirement was that the Roman Church got *some* “converts,” and so while all Jews and Gypsies could be killed, and some Serbs who “converted” to Popery also killed; nevertheless, some force “converted” Serbs had to be spared. While I know of no instance where such Papist inquisition theoretics were applied elsewhere under the Nazis, it is instructive to note that the Pope supported them in Greater Croatia, and this may constitute a reason why he remained *silent* about the Nazi holocaust of Jews i.e., minor exceptions like Edith Stein aside, over the centuries they had generally not converted to Popery, so he was happy to be rid of them, though obviously he could not say so publicly. Satan who devil-possesses the Pope, (and has so devil-possessed every Pope since the formation of the Roman Papacy in 607,) may simply have taken such a brutally candid assessment; and then covered his tracks as he moved into the bodies of successor Popes, by e.g., canonizing Edith Stein. The depiction of Stepinatz as a “martyr” clearly has a precedent in the depiction of the Spanish Inquisitor, “Saint” Arbues as a “martyr; and the beatification of Stepinatz in 1998 has a precedent in the beatification of Arbues some 200 years before his canonization.

They are not wrong who look to find the blood of saints in Rome. Such blood is evident in numerous proto-Protestant martyrs from before the Reformation, and Protestant martyrs after the Reformation killed by Roman Catholics. For example, the martyred Waldenses of the twelfth century and later; Huss of Bohemia (martyred 1414); Jerome of Prague (martyred 1416); the Marian martyrs (martyred 1555-7), for example, Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley; the Saint Bartholomew Day martyrs of Paris (1572); the Ancien regime martyrs of France, for example, Reverend Claude Brousson (martyred 1689), Sieur Boeton (martyred 1705), Chevalier Del la Vay (martyred 1766); the southern French martyrs of the restoration (1814-20). Then there are the Protestant martyrs of Barletta, Italy, (martyred 1866), an event which *The Times* said “had renewed in little Barletta the savage scenes of the night of St. Bartholomew in France,” also saying that “the *Moniteur of the Marches* mentions the arrival in that city of Signor Giannini, the Evangelical pastor, who, with his two sons, ‘escaped miraculously from the new St. Bartholomew which took place in that town on the 19th [of March].’” Thus the Protestant Minister of Barletta and his sons constitute confessors. Indeed I have thrice visited Barletta and been to the Baptist Church there where in 1966 a centenary memorial plaque was erected to the five (Baptist) Protestant martyrs killed there by Papists in 1866. Or the President of the Protestant Truth Society, (Low Church Evangelical Anglican) John Kensit, joined the noble army of martyrs when he died in England at Papist hands in 1902³⁰⁷. A London Baptist Church and Theological Seminary which I have visited is named in John Kensit’s honour.

But one does not need to go further than our own day to find the blood of Protestant saints oozing out of Rome (Rev. 17:6; 18:24). For among the many persecuted and killed by the Ustashi during 1941-5, there is included (Lutheran) Protestants who were of Serbian

³⁰⁷ *The Times*, Wed. 4 April, 1866, p. 9; Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, pp. 666,715-719; *The London Times* during March and April 1866; Furbush, W.B. (Ed.), *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, A History of the early Christian and the Protestant martyrs, revised edition 1926, reprint: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, USA, 1962; Wilcox, J.C., *et al. op. cit.*, pp. 11,12,17,30,31,34,35,40,53ff; “Speaking the Truth in Love: Introducing the Work and Witness of the Protestant Truth Society” (pamphlet), Protestant Truth Society, London, UK, [c. 2000 A.D.], pp. 2-3.

descent. These Protestant confessors and martyrs refused to convert to Roman Catholicism, and one finds in the subsequent Roman Catholic treatment of the convicted Ustashi collaborator, the Nazi war criminal, Archbishop Stepinatz, a figure glorified and honoured by the Church of Rome. Glorified and honoured by promoting bizarre, far-fetched, and fanciful pro-Stepinatz revisionist histories. Glorified and honoured by institutions dedicated by the Church of Rome to his memory, such as the *Archbishop Stepinac High School* in New York, USA, named after him in 1948. Glorified and honoured by his elevation to Cardinal in 1953. Glorified and honoured by his burial behind the main altar of the Zagreb Cathedral in 1960, and the making of his tomb into a shrine. Glorified and honoured by Irish Roman Catholic terrorists in the killing of British Protestants (and others) from the 1940s and 1950s on, seemingly, at least to some extent, manifested in later times with the *Omagh Bombing* (1998). Glorified and honoured with his beatification by Pope John-Paul II in 1998, elevating “Venerable Cardinal Stepinatz” to the status of “Blessed Cardinal Stepinatz.” Glorified and honoured by the *Blessed Aloysius Stepinac Church* in Chicago, America (1998). Glorified and honoured by the *Cardinal Stepinac Village* in Sydney, Australia (1998-1999).

Glorified and honoured by “the man of sin” and “iniquity” (II Thess. 2:3,7) who sets aside the ninth commandment, “Thou shalt not bear false witness” (Exod. 20:16), as he falsely portrays the evil Stepinatz as a good man, though the prophet Isaiah declares, “Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil” (Isa. 5:20). And as previously detailed, the Pope also sets aside the tenth commandment, “Thou shalt not covet” (Exod. 20:17) and the eighth commandment, “Thou shalt not steal” (Exod. 20:15), in overlooking the way Stepinatz coveted and then stole the Orahovica Serbian Orthodox monastery; and the sixth commandment, “Thou shalt not kill” (Exod. 20:13), in overlooking Stepinatz’s collaboration with the mass murdering Nazi Ustashi regime. All these things the Papal “man of sin” does, as like Stepinatz he sets aside the third commandment, “Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain” (Exod. 20:7) by falsely claiming to be a “Christian.” Thus the Pope sets about to honour and glorify Aloysius Cardinal Stepinatz, whose death-mask on his tomb in the Zagreb Papist Cathedral receives adoration via kissing in violation of the Second Commandment, “Thou shalt not make, bow down to, nor serve, any graven image” (Exod. 20:4-6).