

ATHEISTS & MOHAMMEDANS

I say, as do all Christian men, that it is not fate but a
divine purpose that rules us.

King Alfred the Great¹

There are innumerable religions on the earth. Only one is grounded in love, the one founded by Almighty God Who created us. All others are the inventions of men.

The one doctrine of the Church founded by the God-Man Jesus Christ that can be shown experientially, as G K Chesterton remarked, is that of Original Sin whose taint disposes each of us to failure in moral action.² When our first parent, Adam, sinned against God he committed an infinite offence for Almighty God is infinitely great and the gravity of an offence is measured by the dignity of the one offended. Such an offence can only be remitted by an infinite act of reparation, and this could only be effected by One who was himself infinite. Here is the rationale for God the Son, the Word of God becoming man, suffering and dying for us. His act of reparation was one of infinite love.

Many earthly religions are founded in antipathy or hatred. Among these is Mohammedanism. The Catholic Church's common doctor, St Thomas Aquinas, remarked of it:

"Mohammed... seduced the people by promises of carnal pleasure to which the concupiscence of the flesh goads us. His teaching contained precepts in conformity with his promises, and he gave free rein to carnal pleasure... As for proofs of the truth of his doctrine, he brought forward only such as could be grasped by the natural ability of anyone with a very modest wisdom. Indeed, the truths that he taught he mingled with many fables and with doctrines of the greatest falsity.

"He did not bring forth any signs produced in a supernatural way which alone fittingly give witness to divine inspiration; for a visible action that can only be divine reveals an invisibly inspired teacher of truth. On the contrary, Mohammed said that he was sent in the power of his arms, signs not lacking even to robbers and tyrants."³

Mohammedanism is intolerant of and hateful towards all who refuse its draconian tenets. It claims to be a religion of peace but the peace it proclaims is false, a 'peace' imposed extrinsically on those prepared to submit to its oppression. It is not true peace, *the tranquility of order*, part of the common good *intrinsic to*, and characteristic of, all civilised societies. Mohammedanism's intolerance and hatred is manifest in its adherents' attitude towards the Jews. It was this hatred that underlay the appalling attack by Hamas militants on Jewish people in the state of Israel on October 7th, 2023. It is this hatred that motivated the Mohammedans in Iran to employ thugs to attack Jewish institutions in Australia.

How appalled, were they alive today, would be Australia's great grandparents and grandparents over the abandonment of moral principle at which innumerable of their offspring have arrived. How could those who gave their lives for their country to prevent the hatefulness of the German and Japanese regimes during the Second World War accept that in just three

¹ In the margin of his translation into early English of Boethius's epic *The Consolation of Philosophy*. Cited as epigraph by G K Chesterton in his *Ballad of the White Horse*.

² *Romans* 7: 15. "The good which I would do, I do not; and the evil which I hate, that I do"

³ *Summa Contra Gentiles* Bk. I, ch. 6, [4]

generations among their own descendants would be found men and women embracing, in other regimes, the savagery they had resisted with their lives? Appalled at the anti-Semitism of the Nazis, they swore, as did their children after them, that the hatred shown the Jews during the War would never be repeated. It has taken just eighty years for great numbers of their offspring to abandon that commitment, to defend anti-Semitism and to support the hatred precipitated by the Muslims' unprovoked attacks on the Jews.

How did this transformation of behaviour of Australians from the civilised and rational to something worse than that of the worst savages occur?

The Commonwealth of Australia came about from the development of a penal colony established to rid Protestant England of felons whose overwhelming numbers were the result of breaches of draconian laws passed by the English establishment to justify the dysfunctional religion it had adopted. With the First Fleet the governors of the new colony brought a semi-Christian ethos deriving from their Protestant rendition of the Christian faith. Under that ethos Australia prospered materially and, in some measure, spiritually. Yet the ethos was fragile because rooted in the Protestant imperative which, since it rejects God's ultimate authority, is inchoately atheistic. "Not what God directs me to believe," Martin Luther had said, "but what I choose." Henry Tudor (King Henry VIII) took that principle to its logical conclusion and ravaged the Church of Jesus Christ in the British Isles, forcing the Catholic faithful to submit.

Yet the mate-ship which is characteristic of Australians in peace and at war was rooted in Christ's teaching of love for one's fellow man imported, notwithstanding its defects, with the Protestant ethos. It exemplified the natural order known as *the common good* which, as Pope Pius XI said against the Nazi regime in Germany,

"takes its measure from man's nature which balances personal rights and social obligations and from the purpose of society established for the benefit of human nature. Society, was intended by the Creator for the full development of individual possibilities, and for the social benefits, which by a process of give and take, every one can claim for his own sake and that of others."⁴

The common good, as Pope John XXIII taught 26 years later,

"requires that all members of the political community be entitled to share in it, although in different ways according to each one's tasks, merits and circumstances. For this reason, every civil authority must take pains to promote the common good of all without preference for any single citizen or civil group."⁵

This *good*, arising naturally on any establishment of human society, is directed to man's ultimate end. It involves, therefore, the provision to every man in society of the resources in this life to enable him to attain it. This, man's ultimate destiny, is no merely material good, no 'paradise' of material pleasures as Muslims contend, but union of the mind of man with his Creator and Redeemer in heaven. This *good* is contradicted in any society that suffers Mohammedan rule.

Because it was grounded in no more than qualified acceptance of what Christ had taught, Australia's Christian ethos was fragile, a fragility exposed by the effects of the two world wars. Statistics show that whereas the beliefs of the average Australian in 1900 were predominantly Christian, by the year 2000 they were predominantly atheistic or agnostic. The atheistic tendency grew exponentially in the 1960s amid a burgeoning hedonism, love of pleasure for its

⁴ Encyclical on the Church and the German Reich, *Mit Brennender Sorge*, March 14th, 1937, directed to the archbishops and bishops of Germany, n. 29.

⁵⁵ Encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, April 11th, 1963, n. 63

own sake, fueled by the country's increased material prosperity. It manifested itself in serial moral evils. The first of these was a growing abandonment of the vows made in marriage with a concomitant flourishing of the evil of divorce. Under dysfunctional legal provisions dictated by Protestantism's defective understanding of government, the State's duty of acting to preserve the natural good (and Christian sacrament) of matrimony and to keep records of its celebration for the common good, was enlarged to *authorise interference with* the institution, including the asserted exercise of a power to dissolve its sworn commitments.

This evil which provisions in the Australian Commonwealth Constitution facilitated (as had the Constitutions of the various States prior to its taking effect) was of a piece with the step that precipitated the Protestant revolt when Henry Tudor breached his marriage vow to his Queen, Catherine of Aragon, elevating the State above God as English society's highest authority. His act began a process of abandonment of the sense of the sacred in sworn oaths. Of this betrayal of principle historian, E. E. Reynolds, has remarked:

"This was the beginning of what may be termed a riot of oaths. For a generation men swore and foreswore themselves so many times that oaths lost all meaning."⁶

With the flourishing of divorce after the Second World War, it was but a short step for those caught up in hedonism to deny the purpose of marriage and demand access to contraception for all. This evil had been facilitated by the Anglicans permission of it 'in exceptional circumstances' in August 1930.⁷ Their abandonment of principle quickly spread to other members of society extending the attack on the natural institution of the family that wholesale divorce had begun. There developed a widespread disregard for marriage in society, an attitude entirely understandable where government authorities had accorded its destruction such facility. Birth out of wedlock ceased to be regarded as misfortune. There occurred a rise in dysfunctional families which lacked the presence of fathers who grasped the opportunity to avoid their responsibilities. The substitutes imported only added to the problems.

It was not long before there appeared elements advocating induced abortion, again to be allowed 'only in exceptional circumstances'. The effect of such permission, given by indulgent judges excusing offenders condemnation for their crimes of murdering the innocent, was the same. *Once a principle is admitted consequences flow* and Australian society suffered further with this additional attack on the family. The evils of contraception and abortion flourished to the extent where vocal and physical opposition grew against anyone who stood against them. In due course, atheists came to dominate the political parties and 'passed into law' provisions to suppress all reasonable opposition. Moves to embrace euthanasia, to 'legalise' it and to do the same with moral perversions followed inevitably. While this was going forward, the atheistic urge in the 1960s underlay the opposition to Australia's commitment to aid those opposing the Marxist-inspired Viet Cong in Vietnam. The selfishness at work grounded the arguments advanced against Australians assisting their fellow men under attack from an atheist regime. The unspoken premise at work was a common embrace of disbelief in God.

As if these deleterious influences were not enough, another arose to aid and abet the flourishing of the atheism in Australia. From the early 1970s the bishops, priests and religious of the one institution that offered Protestantism and atheism rational resistance here, the Catholic Church,

⁶ *Life of St Thomas More, The Field is Won*, Milwaukee IL, 1968, p. 297 footnote

⁷ In the Lambeth Conference of their Church in England.

failed in their duties. The causes of their lapse from Catholic principle were the innumerable faux determinations of the Church's bishops at a synod called by Pope John XXIII in 1962 and denominated 'an ecumenical, or general, council' of the Church, a synod carried to its conclusion by his successor, Paul VI. Time has demonstrated that the modernist utterances of the members of this synod were more heterodox by far than those of the pseudo-synod of Pistoia condemned comprehensively by Pope Pius VI in *Auctorem Fidei* in 1794.

The neutering of the papacy and of the episcopacy it brought about removed the stout resistance to moral error in Australia and in the world the Catholic Church had ever provided.

Atheism is not only a theological evil but a philosophical one, irrational in its refusal to acknowledge reality, one's utter reliance on an extrinsic influence which brought him into existence and which keeps him in existence. The atheist lives as if *suo jure*, a law unto himself. G K Chesterton remarked that those who refuse to believe in God lose their common sense.⁸ They fail to act prudently, lose all foresight. These defects are manifest in the enthusiasm of atheists for every crazy fad and especially those which involve denial of the workings of divine providence in men's lives, in the operations of the world and in the natural order generally.

They are behind the ideology which rejects use of natural energy sources on the basis that their use 'harms the planet' which has loaded the average Australian with increasing and unnecessary burdens. They are present in the decisions by both major political parties which have allowed entry into the country of refugees from Mohammedan countries without consideration of the inevitable long term consequences of allowing their hatreds to affect the country's citizens.

Christ taught that the one who commits sin becomes a slave (*John* 8: 34). Atheism is among the worst of sins because committed against God Himself Who is the first truth on which faith is founded.⁹ The result of Australians' rejection of true religion and embrace of atheism, then, is that the nation has descended further and further into slavery.

The extent of that slavery was demonstrated by the proportion of the populace—something in excess of eighty percent—who submitted unresistingly to government mandated vaccines over the SARS-Cov-2 virus. It was patent to reasonable men that these vaccines were questionable—

- in their provenance, because sourced from cells derived from aborted infants,
- in the lack of any adequate prefatory testing,
- for their inefficacy and
- for their deleterious side effects.

These four issues were quite sufficient to warn Australians of impending evils. But the populace at large declined to act reasonably. Chesterton's remark about abandonment of common sense is to the point. Worse still, the subservient populace joined in criticising and ostracising those who raised reasonable objections, mocking their arguments in line with the defective subjectivist principle that, where a majority is in favour, it is impossible that they could be wrong.

⁸ On this see Dale Ahlquist, *Common Sense* 101, Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 2006, Ch. 20, p. 265.

⁹ *Romans* 1: 18. St Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* II-II, q. 39, art. 2, ad. 1 & 3.

Appallingly, this abject submission was accompanied after the event by a popular refusal to acknowledge that the vaccines' chief effect had been to increase the country's average death rate, the very evil those fleeing the effects of the virus had sought to avoid!

It was inevitable, then, that atheistic selfishness would come to affect Australia's society profoundly. Its tendency to hedonism brought about a steady decline of the birthrate. The country ceased to produce children to carry on the traditions in which its people had been established, and had flourished. The hole had to be filled and this was done through immigration. Thus, atheism's attack on the family has been the disposing cause for the influence which is at work changing the Australian character. With the flood of Muslims into the country there is an Orwellian inevitability about the business.

If the exponents of Mohammed's false religion, driven from their own lands by the draconian behaviour of their tyrannical rulers, have been allowed by Australia's incompetent politicians to fill the demand so artificially contrived by the atheist paradigm, it has to be seen as a scourge with which Divine Providence has seen fit to punish Australians for their rejection of the gifts Almighty God bestowed on them through the natural order for their welfare.

There is then comity, sympathy, between atheist and Muslim to this extent that each rejects the authority of his Maker and Redeemer in favour of his own authority. Moreover, atheists are at one with Mohammedans in their focus on the material and on carnal pleasures. If the two do not agree in everything—the Mohammedan does not willingly embrace contraception or abortion and believes in a sort of life after death—they agree in reducing the spirit of man to a focus exclusively on the physical, the material.

For Mohammedans atheists are 'useful idiots'¹⁰ whose vapid enthusiasms serve their programs of hatefulness, oblivious to the full ambit of Mohammedan claims. Blind as he is, the atheist fails to understand that eventually the Mohammedan will turn on him and force him to endorse his faux 'religion'.¹¹

Michael Baker

August 28th, 2025—*Feast of St Augustine*. The 231st anniversary of *Auctorem Fidei*, Pius VI's bull condemning the pseudo-synod of Pistoia.

¹⁰ Fools whose gullibility can be used to advantage by political or religious ideologues. The term 'useful idiots' is attributed to Lenin in respect of enthusiasts in the West for the Soviet Communist regime.

¹¹ Neither set of believers is *in favour of* something so much as against something. In this they share the signal characteristic of Protestantism which is grounded not in what its members accept but in what they reject, the licit demands of Almighty God via the Church He established.