

# **Drawing Aside the Purple Curtain**

*The Papal System Today: an Analysis of the News*

## **The Second Elizabethan Age: *The Ongoing Papal Triumph***

**Shaun Willcock**

Britain's Queen Elizabeth II was a much-loved monarch for millions of people in the United Kingdom and around the world. She was doubtless a warm and charming lady, extraordinary in many ways. It is only natural that millions of her subjects felt a great sense of loss when she passed away. However, there is a great need for balance, as many of the unpalatable facts of her reign have tended to be forgotten or ignored. We are commanded to pray for monarchs while they live (1 Tim. 2:1,2), and to honour them because of the office they hold (1 Pet. 2:17); but we are certainly not to be blind to their faults or sins, or to say what is not true just because someone has died. Whatever may be said of her personal qualities (which were doubtless many), no true Christian should be guilty of spreading falsehoods about her supposed Christian faith, nor should any be blind to the glaring faults and sinful deeds of her reign.

### ***She Did Much to Destroy the Historical Protestant Character of the UK***

Queen Elizabeth II sold out the historical Protestant character of the United Kingdom (note: not biblical Christianity, but historical Protestantism – they are not one and the same). Now I do not wish to be misunderstood here. The queen, who was also called the head of the so-called “Church of England”, the Anglican institution, and the “Supreme Governor of the Church of England”, was not in any biblical sense head of a truly Christian church. Anglicanism is a hideous caricature of what a true Christian church is. But even if she had been a member of a *true* Christian church, biblically no woman may be the head of it (1 Tim. 2:11,12). Nor was she “the Defender of the Faith” (another title) in any biblical sense. She simply could not defend the true faith to which she herself was a stranger. At her coronation she swore to “uphold the Protestant faith”, but the Gospel of Christ does not need to be upheld by the head of any state, and never is.

Very correctly this issue was dealt with in the editorial of *The Link*, a Christian periodical from England:<sup>1</sup>

“There are... important lessons for the Lord's people to learn in connection with this title ‘Defender of the Faith’.... whatever its long history and other associations may be, it is fundamentally a vestige of Romanism, and therefore to be eschewed. It embodies one of the most grievous errors of that false system – that the promotion of ‘Christianity’ necessitates and justifies the use of force and physical violence. This policy has directly caused the deaths of countless martyrs through the ages, and is totally at variance with the Word of God (cf John 18:36, 2 Corinthians 10:3-4, Ephesians 6:12). The long shadow of Rome continues to darken the doctrine and practice of the church.

“... whatever ‘The Faith’ has been made to mean by the various holders of this title, it has never meant: ‘*the faith... once delivered unto the saints*’ (Jude 3), or ‘*the faith of God's elect*’ (Titus 1:1). Present-day, evangelical Christians, of an independent and baptistic persuasion, might imagine that they could take some comfort in this royal title, as though it afforded to them a degree of privilege, or protection. This is a false assumption. So-called ‘Defenders of the Faith’, have through the ages burned Bibles, martyred the saints, displaced pilgrims, ejected dissenters, imprisoned non-conformists, and outlawed the Truth. And ‘The Faith’ being defended today is that ritualistic, ecumenical

Anglicanism, brought out on special occasions, that stands for nothing, and embraces everything, and is so beloved of the world's media for its political correctness, and guaranteed absence of any real Christianity. Believing child of God – this is not your Faith! This is not your religion! The defence of such errors is an offence to you.”

What I mean by saying that Queen Elizabeth sold out the historical Protestant character of the United Kingdom is that she did much to increase the power of the Roman Papacy over the UK once again. The UK is not a *Christian* country, but for centuries, historically, it has been a *Protestant* one. Again, by “Protestant” I am referring to historical Protestantism, not biblical Protestantism. The two are not the same. Various western European countries have been historically Protestant since the Reformation. They rejected the control of the Papacy. They recognised the Papacy as a danger to the world. And they thrived because of the freedoms which they had come to embrace at the time of the Reformation and afterwards. J.A. Wylie, Protestant historian, wrote: “It is now several centuries since England and Protestantism began to be spoken of in the same breath. Protestantism found England bound and it made her free; it found her dark and it kindled in her sky the lights of philosophy and letters; it found her low and it raised her up and taught her to sit on high amid the princedom of the world.... Did commerce enrich, letters illuminate, art refine, and power ennoble Great Britain? Was its flag feared on the ocean and its voice heeded in the council-chamber of nations when its Protestantism was in the ascendant? - Does calamity now cloud it? - How sure the conclusion that England has anew fallen under the spell of Rome's evil genius and is now bowing the knee to her great enemy.”<sup>2</sup>

The following is from my book, *The Madness of Multiculturalism*: “Essentially, then, in using the phrase, ‘western, Protestant-influenced culture’, I am referring, not to the proper understanding of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, of salvation by grace through faith in Christ, etc., but to aspects of Protestantism derived from the Scriptures, which have positively impacted upon certain western cultures. The vast majority of those within Protestant-influenced cultures were no more converted to Christ than those in other cultures; but the *influence* of the Bible and its teaching on these cultures was such, that the way of life for those within the Protestant-influenced cultures was vastly superior to the way of life for those in other cultures. And nowhere was this more so than in Britain, and in her colonies across the earth.”<sup>3</sup>

Queen Elizabeth II, however, did so much to undermine these freedoms, and to nudge the UK towards the Vatican again.

### ***The Romanization of the House of Windsor***

The fact that Queen Elizabeth II was not a true, biblical Protestant was even recognised (and lauded) by various Roman Catholics, who did not even care that she contradicted herself by acting contrary to her coronation oath (again, not that she could *in truth* swear to such a thing). One of them, Raymond Perrier, in an article in the Romish magazine, *The Southern Cross*, wrote:<sup>4</sup>

“When she took her oaths as monarch, she promised ‘to the utmost of her power, to maintain in the United Kingdom the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law’. And yet, she was the first British monarch since the Reformation to meet a pope – visiting five of them in the Vatican and welcoming two of them to the UK. She enjoyed warm relations with a number of Catholic bishops – most especially with the late Basil Hume OSB of Westminster. She invited Catholic clergy to preach at royal churches and she herself attended a service at a Catholic cathedral.

“The most striking change in her lifetime has been the removal of the prohibition on British monarchs (or their spouses) being Catholic: in 2015, the 1701 Act of Settlement was finally reversed. This, coupled with her personal commitment to ecumenism, has enabled the queen to play an exemplary role in fostering reconciliation in the north of Ireland. This was demonstrated in the respect she showed to the Irish president, the Gaelic language, the 1916 freedom fighters, and the current Nationalist politicians (and the reciprocal respect recently shown her by Republican Ireland).”

I wrote the following as the Introduction to an excellent article by Peter Trumper, written in 1993, entitled *1953-1993: Forty Inglorious Years*, republished by Bible Based Ministries:<sup>5</sup>

“The Romanization of the House of Windsor is something very few people understand; but it has very grave consequences. Let it be clearly understood that in no sense is Anglicanism a true church; nor does the true Church of Christ need the protection of a country’s monarch; nor is all that is ‘Protestant’ Christian; nor is the British monarch truly ‘the Defender of the Faith’ or the head of a denomination of Christian churches. The idea of a ‘national church’, ruled by a political sovereign, is entirely contrary to the New Testament. Anglicanism is a corrupt, worldly, Popish system, a daughter of the Mother of Harlots (Rev. 17:5). But it is certainly true that a country, knowing the awful nature of Popery, can and should pass laws forbidding any Papist to ascend the throne. And there is no doubt whatsoever that this prohibition was a great blessing to true Christians in Britain ever since the Reformation, for it meant that no persecuting Papist could ascend the throne and wage war against true Christians. The Vatican, of course, has always hated this prohibition. And ever since the Reformation Rome has done its utmost to destroy the British throne, and to once again subjugate the people of that once-blessed land to the feet of the Roman pontiff. What has happened to the British Royal Family over many decades is the culmination of centuries of Vatican intrigue.”

Evidence of the Vatican’s assaults on Britain through the years is there for anyone willing to look. For example: “In 1859, at Westminster in London Cardinal Manning... prepared for the battle which lay ahead. Within yards of Buckingham Palace, under Queen Victoria’s nose, he declared menacingly: ‘If ever there was a land in which work is to be done, and perhaps much to suffer, it is here. I shall not say too much, if I say that we have to subjugate and subdue, to conquer and rule, an imperial race. We have to bend or break that will... Were heresy conquered in England, it would be conquered throughout the world. All its lines meet here, and therefore in England the *Church of God* [i.e. popery!] must be gathered in its strength.’”<sup>6</sup>

“In the *Catholic Standard and Ransomer* for the 30 August 1894 it was stated, ‘It is a time of war, remember! We have set ourselves to win back England to Rome. This means war. Protestantism, whether high, low, broad, or dissenting, is the enemy, and we must oppose it.’”<sup>7</sup>

And truly, with Elizabeth II on the throne, Popery made great progress in winning back England (and all of the UK) to Rome. There is no getting away from this unpalatable fact.

### ***Her Visits to the Popes of Rome***

On various occasions she visited the biblical Antichrist, the pope of Rome, in the Vatican. When she did so she was dressed in black, a deliberate symbol of inferiority to the Roman pope as only Roman Catholic queens are permitted to wear white in the presence of the pope of Rome, who is always dressed in white. The only exception was when meeting Francis I. When the Roman pope visited Britain, the queen did not wear black.



In 1960, wrote Peter Trumper, “The archbishop [of Canterbury] visited [Pope] John XXIII, and prepared the way for the first official visit to the Vatican of a British monarch since the Reformation. The vow he encouraged Elizabeth to make in Westminster Abbey seven years earlier... was conveniently forgotten. Popery’s net was cast! Fischer [Anglican archbishop of Canterbury], having heard Elizabeth’s public profession of ‘utmost’ loyalty to the ‘Protestant Reformed Religion’ on Coronation Day (‘all this I promise to do’), then encouraged the young queen to hypocritically break her solemn vow by directing her toward Rome [not that she could truthfully take such a vow, as it was unbiblical – *author*]. On the 6 May [1961], she and her ‘unprotestant’ Consort visited the Vatican. She wore black, a matter of no importance to most of her gullible subjects. In fact, for Britain and the Commonwealth the colour of her dress was one

of the darkest hues of the 20th century. The pope and his children worldwide rejoiced. The representative head of a quarter of the world’s inhabitants was observed returning, in spirit at least, to

the fold as a penitent. There was no referendum. In the Queen, we all went to Rome whether we wanted to go or not. Thus a mere eight years after she ascended to the Protestant throne, short of one month, Her Majesty had incurred God's displeasure. The decline in the 'fortunes' of the Royal Family as a whole had set in."<sup>8</sup>



### ***The Roman Pope's Visit to Her***

In 1970 Queen Elizabeth gave permission for a meeting between Roman Catholic and Anglican priests in the chapel at Windsor Castle. Then a few weeks later she had a private audience at Buckingham Palace with a French Popish cardinal named Marty. All this was shocking enough, but still worse was to come in 1982, when the pope of Rome, John Paul II, visited Britain. "The British people were assured the visit was merely pastoral, the opportunity for Roman Catholics to see the pope at close hand. In no way would the visit be political, and to illustrate this fact his 'courtesy' call upon the Queen would take place at Windsor Castle and not at Buckingham Palace her official residence. Vocal protestants refused to believe it. Suddenly just prior to the pope's arrival... it was announced there had been a change in the diplomatic relations between the Vatican and Britain. Just like that!... It was then announced, that because of the closer ties the pope when he arrived would after all be visiting Her Majesty in Buckingham Palace! There was not even a parliamentary debate, and certainly no referendum. The British were forced to comply with the Vatican plan."<sup>9</sup>

### ***She was Praised by the Jesuit Pope, Francis I***

When the queen died, Francis I, pope of Rome, sent his condolences in a telegram to King Charles III and the people of the United Kingdom, expressing his "heartfelt condolences". He said he was "praying for the late Queen's eternal rest", "commending her noble soul to the merciful goodness of our Heavenly Father".<sup>10</sup> Praying for the eternal rest of the souls of the dead is demonic Romish doctrine. When one departs this life, one immediately enters either into heaven or hell.

He referred to "her steadfast witness of faith in Jesus Christ". When a Roman pope speaks of someone's "faith in Christ", this does not mean that person was a Christian, but it certainly can indicate that they were either Roman Catholic, or at the very least sympathetic to Roman Catholicism. This was the case with the late queen.

All this praise from the Jesuit pope and his henchmen was very revealing, considering that the queen's predecessor in the sixteenth century, Queen Elizabeth I, was *marked for assassination* by the pope of Rome and his priests, and various attempts were made on her life!<sup>11</sup> How things had changed, with Queen Elizabeth II being praised by the Roman pope and his priestly cohorts as a great "Christian". Truly, the United Kingdom has been altered almost beyond recognition from Reformation times – and not by any means for the better!

### ***She was Praised by the Jesuits***

When a Jesuit magazine praises a "Protestant" queen of England, you know just how bad things really are. After the queen died, the Jesuit magazine *America* republished a column which had originally appeared in the issue of April 18, 2016:

“At precisely noon on May 17, 2011, the 85-year-old daughter of the last king of Ireland touched down at Casement Aerodrome, a military airfield southwest of Dublin. For the first time in a century, a reigning British monarch set foot in what is now the Republic of Ireland but for centuries had been the impoverished vassal of its English overlords. The royal visit marked the full realization of the Good Friday Agreement of 1998, the international agreement between the British and Irish governments that restored home rule to Northern Ireland and brought an end to decades of bloody conflict.”<sup>12</sup>

The column went on to praise the queen’s “sense of Christian duty to reconcile the estranged, to be a healer of the breach.” Now she was described as a Christian, whereas ever since the Reformation the Jesuits and other Papists had spoken of the British monarchs as heretics for rejecting Romanism. In this ecumenical age, however, the Jesuits preferred to refer to her as “Christian” – but only, of course, because she was now doing what they desired with regards to the Republic of Ireland! And what was that? Begging forgiveness for ever standing in the Papacy’s way. At a state dinner hosted by the Irish president, the queen said, “With the benefit of historical hindsight we can all see things which we would wish had been done differently or not at all. To all those who have suffered as a consequence of our troubled past I extend my sincere thoughts and deep sympathy.”

The Jesuit magazine also praised her for laying a wreath at a memorial garden in Dublin dedicated to the memory of “all those who gave their lives in the cause of Irish Freedom.” Except that many of those lives consisted of IRA terrorists, and their forebears in the bloodthirsty Vatican-directed terrorist revolution for “freedom” for Ireland.

### ***She was “a Driving Force Behind Excellent UK-Holy See Relations”***

So said Christopher Trott, the British ambassador to the Vatican who was of course appointed by the queen herself to his post. And before we get into what he said, we must ask: *why did the UK even have relations with the Vatican?* For centuries it did not, but this all changed some four decades ago, when full diplomatic ties were established. Tragic indeed.

In an interview with *Vatican News*, Trott said, “I was very moved by His Holiness the Pope’s message on the passing of Her Majesty, and I think that reflects a message that she personally had invested in building our relationship and supporting the Ambassadors to the Holy See, in building a relationship with five separate Popes over the time of her reign, her first meeting being with Pius XII in 1951 and her most recent one being with Pope Francis in 2014 and I think those really reflected a developing relationship between Britain and the Holy See.”<sup>13</sup>

Indeed so. Relations between the UK and the Vatican improved steadily over these decades, thanks in no small measure to Queen Elizabeth’s relations with five popes. No wonder Francis was able to speak so well of her when she died! The Jesuits certainly did not speak so well of Queen Elizabeth I, when *she* died back in the sixteenth century! They hated her and tried to assassinate her. Ah, but things are so much different now: the UK’s relationship with the Vatican is very cosy indeed.

Trott continued, “I think she had a huge amount of respect for each of the Popes that she met. And I think that when she met Pope Francis it was a really warm and spontaneous encounter, and there was a real expression of mutual respect which is reflected in the message Pope Francis sent on her death.” This “huge respect” the queen had for the popes of Rome spoke volumes about the “Christian faith” she was said to have had, and about which so many spoke after she died. A true Christian has *no* respect for any pope of Rome.

Trott added, “she was guided by her faith in the decisions she took. And I think for the Holy See this has always been something very striking and something they’ve hugely respected over the years.” Trott was very fond of that word, “respect”, as is obvious from these quotes, but he was very much mistaken: the Vatican had absolutely no respect for the queen or whatever her personal beliefs were. To the Jesuits she was a heretic, remained a heretic till her death, and was only useful insofar as she advanced Vatican/Jesuit interests in the UK.



## *The Queen, Mugabe and Mandela*



As a Rhodesian by birth and a South African by nationality, of English and Scottish descent, during my boyhood the British Royal Family was held in very high regard. As a girl my mother stood in the long lines of school children who waited in Salisbury, Rhodesia, to see Princess Elizabeth when she and other members of the Royal Family visited the country in 1947. She was raised intensely loyal to the Royal Family, as was my father. But for my parents, as for so many other Rhodesians and English South Africans, their loyalty began to be rocked by the tumultuous events of the 1960s through to the 1990s, when Britain supported the Communist terrorist revolutionaries who were waging their bloody guerilla campaign against Rhodesia and South Africa.

The photos of the British queen standing next to the Zimbabwean terrorist and mass murderer, Robert Mugabe, and riding in state with the terrorist Nelson Mandela of South Africa, still make Rhodesians, and English and Afrikaner South Africans, feel sick to their stomachs.

When I think of how Rhodesians were described as being “more British than the British,” so devoted to the queen, and of how the young men of this little country fought so bravely, and so long and hard, to prevent Mugabe and his band of terrorists from coming to power, only to see this Jesuit-educated madman *knighted* by the queen (yes, he was stripped of his knighthood years later, but it was still bestowed in the first place); or when I see photos of the queen riding in state with a triumphantly grinning Mandela beside her, and I think of all the brave South African soldiers who lost their lives to prevent this man and his terrorist outfit from coming to power – then no matter how sweet the queen may have appeared, how gracious or regal, I am simply unimpressed. Rather, I am broken-hearted.

Author and commentator Ilana Mercer, a South African by birth, wrote, “It cannot be denied that Queen Elizabeth II... partook in the decision to support the unchecked majority rule of the African National Congress (ANC) in South Africa, my homeland. Like her Majesty at the time, most politicians and public intellectuals thought nothing of delivering South Africa into the hands of professed radical Marxist terrorists. Yet anyone suggesting such folly to the wise Margaret Thatcher risked taking a hand-bagging. The Iron Lady had ventured that grooming the ANC as South Africa’s government-in-waiting was tantamount to ‘living in cloud-cuckoo land.’ (*Into the Cannibal’s Pot: Lessons for America from Post-Apartheid South Africa*, p. 147.)

“But what do you know? Queen Elizabeth did just that! Over Mrs. Thatcher’s objections, in 1987 the queen had bullied Prime Minister Thatcher to sanction South Africa. And in 1979, noted British paleolibertarian Sean Gabb, the queen also muscled Mrs. Thatcher to go back on her election promise not to hand Rhodesia over to another bunch of white-hating black Marxists.

“Most disquieting to decency: Although search engines are energetically scrubbing this fact from the Internet – the Queen had knighted Robert Mugabe. Mugabe was chief warlord of Zimbabwe, formerly Rhodesia (may that country rest in peace).

“To quote *Into the Cannibal’s Pot*, the book aforementioned:

“By the time the megalomaniac Robert Mugabe was *knighted by Queen Elizabeth II* (1994) – and given honorary doctorates from the Universities of Edinburgh (1984), Massachusetts (1986), and Michigan (1990) – he had already done his ‘best’ work: slaughtering some 20,000 innocent Ndebele in Matabeleland (1983).”<sup>14</sup>

## *The Queen's Funeral*

The queen's funeral was held at Westminster Abbey with 2000 guests present, including presidents and prime ministers, and the service was broadcast live to multiplied millions across the world. It was also attended by such religious leaders as the Romish cardinal, Vincent Nichols, and various other false shepherds of false "churches". The sermon was given by the Anglican archbishop of Canterbury, Justin Welby (sinfully called "the Most Rev. Justin Welby"). This man is a false Christian, a false minister, a Mr Facing-both-Ways, an utterly untrustworthy man who presides over the corrupt, rotten-to-the-core, Anglican institution which (to quote C.H. Spurgeon) "with none too much humility calls itself '*The Church of England*'". Anglicanism is nothing but a daughter Harlot of Rome, the Mother of Harlots (Rev. 17:5). Its leaders deny or alter a great many of the great doctrines of the Christian faith; it is increasingly being led by priestesses (it is shocking enough its "ministers" call themselves "priests", but having "priestesses" makes its paganism all the more glaring); it supports and even ordains sodomites; it supports and has massively financed terrorist organisations; it is an ecumenical, interfaith monstrosity. It bears no resemblance whatsoever to a Christian church, and is filled with unregenerate, worldly souls.

Apart from all the other nonsense he spouted during the funeral sermon, Welby said that Queen Elizabeth's son, now King Charles III, "shares the same faith and hope in Jesus Christ as his mother". Charles certainly does *not* have faith and hope in Christ! He has been for many years a follower of various branches of the occult;<sup>15</sup> he is a strong supporter of the satanic interfaith movement; in addition to which he is an immoral man who for many years kept his present wife as his lover, even when he was married to another woman. He is certainly no Christian.

Incredibly, some "ministries" described the queen's funeral as truly Christian! Revealing astounding blindness to the true and biblical Gospel of Christ, a "ministry" called "Apostasy Alert", which obviously cannot recognise true apostasy even when it is staring these so-called "watchmen" in the face, stated that the funeral "surprisingly exposed billions of watchers and listeners around the globe to the message of Biblical Christianity."<sup>16</sup> *Biblical Christianity?* A funeral presided over by the priests and priestesses, bishops and bishopesses, of the falsely-named "Church of England", which is not a true Christian church in any sense and does not proclaim biblical Christianity?

The article went on: "It has been described as the largest Christian event in human history.... In rapid succession a clear Gospel was spoken from cathedral pulpits in London, Cardiff, Belfast and Edinburgh, and finally in Saint George's Chapel in Windsor castle. Far from being scripture-reticent or attempting to be 'seeker-friendly' toward all the false religionists out there, the 'exclusive' Gospel was front and centre. The services in each location were saturated with sound Christian theology, and the fact that Christ died for the 'many' was strongly affirmed. A large slice of humanity was exposed to more scripture from the ceremonies at Westminster Abbey and thereafter than is presently heard in hundreds of thousands of pulpits today." Oh, where to even begin to refute such lies?

Regardless of the fact that it may have been described as the largest Christian event in history, *it was not*. The "clear Gospel" has not been heard in Anglican cathedrals for a very, very, *very* long time, and in some of them in the past it was never heard at all. To speak of effeminate, ecumenical, syncretistic, wishy-washy, bells-and-smells Anglican "clergy" as if they were preaching the exclusive Gospel of Christ reveals an ignorance of that Gospel that is breathtaking in someone claiming to be a Protestant and warning about apostasy.

It declared: "Then, there were the glorious Christian hymns – songs that highlighted the Queen's faith in Christ, including, 'The Lord is My Shepherd,' a favourite of the late monarch." We have news for "Apostasy Alert": having a favourite hymn does not mean someone is a Christian! Yes, Anglicanism still makes use of some of the great hymns of the Christian faith, but what does this prove? Nothing! "The Lord is My Shepherd" has been the favourite hymn of politicians and paupers, priests and pastors, atheists and agnostics, through the centuries. Singing a favourite hymn no more proves a person to be a true Christian than "saying one's prayers" before bedtime, or attending a church service faithfully every week.

The article went on: “Dr David Hoyle, Dean of Westminster acknowledged, ‘With thanksgiving we praise God for her constant example of Christian faith and devotion,’ and expressed thanksgiving, ‘for her unswerving devotion to the Gospel.’” If Queen Elizabeth was a true Christian, she would have lived like a true Christian. She would not have met with and praised various popes. She would not have viewed Roman Catholics as true Christians. She would not have given her blessing to sinful activities which no Christian participates in, including dances, sinful movies and rock music. She would also have forsaken Anglicanism – that harlot daughter of the Mother of harlots in Rome.

Finally, the article stated: “one of the most poignant moments in the state funeral service was the declaration, ‘Go forth, O Christian soul, from this world, in the name of God the Father almighty, who created thee; in the name of Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, who suffered for thee; in the name of the Holy Spirit, who was poured out upon thee and anointed thee.’” *Really?* When the queen died, her soul immediately left her body, as the Bible teaches. It did not wait for some Anglican “clergyperson” to *order it* to “go forth from this world”. This was Popish doctrine, not biblical Christianity!

### ***Unpalatable Truth***

If Queen Elizabeth II was the wonderful Christian the world has been told she was, she would never have visited even one pope of Rome, much less five of them, and she would never have addressed them with deep respect, nor ever behaved as if they were Christians.

If she was a true Christian, she would never have attended multifaith events which degraded Christ the Lord to just one of many supposed “ways to God”, or ecumenical events which were working for the eventual absorption of the Protestant denominations into the Roman Catholic institution.

If she was a true Christian, she would never have knighted such moral degenerates of the rock music industry as the bisexual Elton John, the sex-obsessed Rod Stewart and Tom Jones, the ecumenical, pro-Papist, false “Christian” Cliff Richard (who said on record, “If I’m gay would it make any difference?”), the Satan rocker Mick Jagger, and so many other rock “stars”, not to mention actors and actresses whose filthy lives have also disgraced Britain.

If she was a true Christian, she would not have dabbled in occult practices, such as going for treatment to a spiritualist medium who went into trances and offered psychic and spiritualist healing therapies.<sup>17</sup>

If someone who behaves this way, and believes such things, is called a true Christian, then what precisely a true Christian is has lost all meaning. “By their fruits ye shall know them.” The evidence of true conversion is seen in the fact that one is a “new creature” in Christ (2 Cor. 5:17), loves God supremely, delights to live according to His Word, remains separate from the world and from false religion, and thus glorifies God by one’s life. Whether queen or commoner, a true child of God lives as a Christian, and believes as a Christian. There is no special status, or lowered standard, for someone just because she is a queen.

November 2022

---

**Shaun Willcock is a minister, author and researcher. He runs Bible Based Ministries. For other articles (which may be downloaded and printed), as well as details about his books, audio messages, pamphlets, etc., please visit the Bible Based Ministries website; or write to the address below. If you would like to be on Bible Based Ministries’ email list, to receive all future articles, please send your details.**

---



# Bible Based Ministries

[info@biblebasedministries.co.uk](mailto:info@biblebasedministries.co.uk)

[www.biblebasedministries.co.uk](http://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk)

**This article may be copied for free distribution if it is copied in full**

## ENDNOTES:

---

1. *The Link*, October-December 2022, pgs. 20-22. North Road Chapel Bideford, England.
2. *The Reformer*, January/February 2012. The Protestant Alliance, Bedford, England.
3. *The Madness of Multiculturalism*, by Shaun Willcock, pgs. 9-10. Bible Based Ministries, 2014.
4. *The Southern Cross*, November 2022, pgs. 28-29. “Queen, Church and Change.” [www.scross.co.za](http://www.scross.co.za).
5. *1953-1993: Forty Inglorious Years*, by Peter Trumper. Published by Bible Based Ministries: <https://www.biblebasedministries.co.uk/pamphlets/1953-1993-forty-inglorious-years/>
6. *1953-1993: Forty Inglorious Years*.
7. *1953-1993: Forty Inglorious Years*.
8. *1953-1993: Forty Inglorious Years*.
9. *1953-1993: Forty Inglorious Years*.
10. *L' Osservatore Romano*, 9 September 2022. “Queen Elizabeth II dies, a life devoted to service.” [www.osservatoreromano.va](http://www.osservatoreromano.va).
11. See *Jesuit Plots from Elizabethan to Modern Times*, by Albert Close. The Protestant Truth Society, London.
12. *America*, April 18, 2016, reprinted in September 2022. “How Queen Elizabeth put forgiveness into action.” [www.americamagazine.org](http://www.americamagazine.org).
13. *Vatican News*, 10 September 2022. “Queen Elizabeth was ‘a driving force behind excellent UK-Holy See relations.’” [www.vaticannews.va](http://www.vaticannews.va).
14. *Ilanamerccer.com*, September 15, 2022. “Mourning the Queen – But Did Elizabeth II Drop the Ball?”
15. See *The Prince and the Paranormal: The Psychic Bloodline of the Royal Family*, by John Dale. W.H. Allen and Co PLC, London, 1987.
16. *Faith and Freedom*, October-November 2022, pg.1, quoting *Apostasy Alert*. [www.faithandfreedom.com.au](http://www.faithandfreedom.com.au).
17. *The Prince and the Paranormal: The Psychic Bloodline of the Royal Family*, pgs. 69-70.