

Islam and the Errors of Russia

... As the Muslim invasion of Europe and America continues towards the Islamification of the West, let's look at the reality of Islam in the light of the Fatima prophecy of the Errors of Russia.



The Goal of Islam: Global Domination via Jihad

A question was asked of me recently, “Where does Islam fit in with the ‘errors of Russia’ “? If, by the errors of Russia, we understand a totalitarian, soul-destroying regime, then, Islam fits the bill quite nicely. In fact, Islam and Marxism (dialectical materialism) have much in common.

“Bolshevism combines the characteristics of the French Revolution with those of the rise of Islam... Those who accept Bolshevism become *impervious to scientific evidence, and commit intellectual suicide*. Even if all the doctrines of Bolshevism were true, this would still be the case, since no unbiased examination of them is tolerated...Among religions, Bolshevism is to be reckoned with Mohammedanism [Islam] rather than with Christianity and Buddhism. Christianity and Buddhism are primarily personal religions, with mystical doctrines and a love of contemplation. *Mohammedanism and Bolshevism are practical, social, unspiritual, concerned to win the empire of this world.*” [Jules Monnerot in “Sociology and Psychology of Communism” quoted by [Dr. Andrew Bostom](#)]

In his essay, Dr. Bostom quotes Monnerot to the effect that both Communism and Islam share two major characteristics, conversion and subversion. Both demand total submission and both work tirelessly, undeterred by any adversity, in order to subvert whatever culture impedes the progress of their anti-Christian goal.

Quoting from Dr. Bostom again, "Islam has provided the type of society in which the political and the sacred are indissolubly merged. *The law of the Koran was religious, political, and civil all in one; and an infidel could be no more than a tributary. In history and in law he appeared as an object, but not as a participating subject;* and the Ottoman Empire was interested in the children of infidels only because they could be recruited as janissaries."

Another ex-Communist, Arthur Koestler, writing in *Die Vossische Zeitung* (6/7/1928), had compared the Wahhabi ascendancy in Saudi Arabia to the revolutionary triumph of Bolshevism in Russia. Koestler contended that the "omnipotent Wahhabi brotherhoods of the Ikhwan," with "iron support of the omnipotent party" were a source of danger and fear for the neighboring Arab states—just as Bolshevism was for the capitalist countries of Europe.

Speaking of Wahhabism, Dr. John Lamont recently wrote in [Rorate Caeli](#), about the Saudi's backing of the militant, extremist Wahhabi sect from which ISIS originated. Dr. Lamont states, "*The House of Saud has enjoyed a close alliance with the Americans since the time of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the Saudis have bribed official Washington from top to bottom. As a result they have been able to promote their Wahhabist ideology with impunity.*"

We return to Dr. Bostom's masterful exposition of the similarities between Islam and Communism. "Bernard Lewis, the *doyen* of living Western Islamic scholars, in his 1954 essay "*Communism and Islam*," expounded upon on the quintessence of totalitarian Islam, and how it was antithetical in nature to Western democracy, while sharing important features of Communist totalitarianism — most notably, global domination via jihad.

Quoting from Lewis, "The traditional Islamic division of the world into the House of Islam and the House of War, two necessarily opposed groups, of which the first has the collective obligation of perpetual struggle against the second, also has obvious parallels in the Communist view of world affairs."

Bostom explains that *both Bernard Lewis and Whittaker Chambers noted that Islam and Communism alike mandated a ceaseless war, an unending jihad.* Indeed, in his book, *Witness*, Chambers affirmed, "Communism exists to wage war. Its existence implies, even in peace or truce, a state of war that engages every man, woman and child alive..."

Chambers stated the West refuses to acknowledge the crux of Communism—dialectical materialism— at its peril. "Obviously, a breed of men who hold that everything is in violent flux and change, moving by laws and in a pattern inherent in matter, and having nothing to do with God—obviously, that breed of men is different from the rest of mankind."

Next, Dr. Bostom presents this gem of a quote from Chambers, "*The success of Communism...is never greater than the failure of all other faiths.*" [How apt for Islam today: Islam succeeds to the extent that the Faith fails!]

Bostom quotes from Whittaker Chambers' book, *Witness*, in order to explain how American Muslims could rationalize such seditious behaviors—consistent with Islamic doctrine—and why this phenomenon remains largely incomprehensible to non-Muslim Americans, despite its existential threat to them. Speaking of American Communists:

“What went on in the minds of those Americans...that made it possible to betray their country? Did none of them suffer a crisis of conscience? The question presupposes that whoever asks it has still failed to grasp that *Communists mean exactly what they have been saying for a hundred years: they regard any government that is not Communist, including their own, merely as the political machine of a class whose power they have organized expressly to overthrow by all means, including violence.*

“The failure to understand that fact is part of the total failure of the West to grasp the nature of its enemy, what he wants, what he means to do and how he will go about doing it.”

Now, here is a video in which Nasim Ben Iman, who has turned from Islam who will clarify the point made above. It is brief, but informative.

When listening to the above, it struck me just how devout and determined, how thoroughly consistent, these people are. *The goal of Islam has always and everywhere been the exact same: exterminate anyone who will not submit to islam. From the very beginning, their scripture has been and always will be, virulently anti-Catholic.*

All the above begs the question, In his recent article for [Rorate Caeli](#), Dr. John Lamont said, “Catholics naturally look to the leadership of the Church for guidance on the nature of Islam, its relation to the ideology of ISIS, and the approach that Catholics should take to the threat of ISIS terrorism and to Islam itself. Unfortunately, the episcopal leadership of the Church has not provided such guidance. If anything it has done the opposite, in Europe and North America at least; it has misled the faithful on the nature of Islam and the relationship between terrorist extremism and the main tenets of the Muslim religion. ...”

Dr. Lamont here refers to a pamphlet disseminated by the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops (CCCCB) which states, the purpose of this pamphlet is to ‘help Canadian Catholics better understand their Muslim neighbors’. It is signed by Archbishop Paul-André Durocher, the Archbishop of Gatineau in Quebec, in his capacity as president of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops. Dr. Lamont explains that “Its contents give Catholics a false conception of the nature and teachings of Islam. This is done more by omitting facts than by making false statements about Muslim belief, although such falsehoods are to be found in the pamphlet.”

“However, the pamphlet does not acknowledge that *Islam is the only major religion that was founded with the specific purpose of destroying and replacing Christianity*, and that these denials of Christian teaching are intended to further this purpose; they are not simply expressions of theological disagreement. No other major religion contains specific denunciations of the basic

Christian doctrines in its sacred texts. ...*This anti-Christian mission has always been central to Islam, and has been pursued in every stage of Muslim history.*

“It is a central Islamic teaching that Mohammed was sinless, and hence that all his actions were perfect and serve as models for the behavior of Muslims. But *Mohammed’s actions, as portrayed in the Koran and in universally accepted hadiths, include robbing caravans, consummating his marriage to his youngest wife Aisha when she was nine years old, and massacring all the men of the Jewish tribe of the Banu Qurayza and taking the women and children as slaves.* The worst crimes of contemporary Islamic terrorist organizations are presented by them as being legitimated by the example of Mohammed, and this argument is plausible if the sinlessness of Mohammed is accepted.”

Dr. Lamont concludes that, “Since the Koran contains specific denials of basic Christian teachings, logic entails that either Christian teaching is true and Islamic teaching is false, Islamic teaching is true and Christian teaching is false, or both Christian and Islamic teaching are false. Catholics cannot accept the second and third of these alternatives, so they can only argue that these denials are wrong because the Christian doctrines they attack are true.”

He then asks of the CCCB’s Islamic pamphlet, *“How is it that this document can offer a careful falsification of the nature of Islam, a falsification that seems to have been designed to leave Catholics in ignorance of the threat that traditional Islam poses, and in consequence to disarm them in the face of that threat?”*

“The answer to this question lies in the outlook held by Archbishop Durocher. When he was speaking at a press conference at the recent session of the Synod on the Family, he was asked if the question of giving communion to divorced and civilly remarried Catholics concerned doctrine or discipline. He replied ‘If you want doctrine, go read Denzinger’. *Such a remark could only be made by someone who holds the content of Catholic doctrine, and the very notion of Catholic doctrine itself, in contempt.* This neomodernist outlook on the Catholic faith is not restricted to Archbishop Durocher; it is the dominant culture within the leadership of the Catholic Church in Canada,

” ... because they do not take the doctrine of their own Church seriously, they cannot grasp that Muslims take their own religion seriously and literally, and consider themselves to be subject to its teaching. In presenting Muslim doctrine they change its content into what they consider to be an acceptable form, just as they change Catholic doctrine for the same purpose in their own religious views. The second is sympathy and attraction to Islam on account of its opposition to basic Christian doctrine. Not all of the Christian doctrines rejected by Islam are necessarily rejected by neomodernists, but *the essential Muslim stance on Christian teaching – that the doctrines of the Christian faith do not have divine authority and do not need to be accepted on account of this authority – is the fundamental principle of neomodernism. The neomodernist hatred of the*

doctrines they reject is also stronger than their adherence to the doctrines they find acceptable for their own reasons. The Muslim position on Christian doctrine is thus a sympathetic one to neomodernists, and it predisposes them in favor of that religion.

Dr. Lamont concludes, *“the CCCB document carefully conceals those aspects of Islam that pose a real danger to Catholics. This deception betrays those very numerous Christians who are now suffering and dying at the hands of Islamic persecutors, and it facilitates the further persecution of Christians by concealing the nature of the threat that they face. In doing this, neomodernism lets its mask slip for anyone with knowledge of Islam, and shows its malice and its origin.”*

The point of this long article is that the prophesied “Errors of Russia” are, in essence, the errors of Islam and that both have found support among the heretical modernists – and neo-modernists – of the post-Vatican Church.

In closing, here is a quote from Whittaker Chambers by way of Dr. Boston: Recalling a conversation he had with a Passionist priest when he was recuperating in a hospital,

“I asked: “Father, what am I to answer those people who keep writing me that I was wrong to write in ‘Witness’ that I had left the winning side for the losing side? They say by calling the West the losing side, I have implied that evil can ultimately overcome good.” Father Alan studied his hands, which were lying in his lap.

Then he glanced at me directly and asked: “Who says that the West deserves to be saved?”