

# Catholic Candle

☪ August 2021 ☪ catholiccandle.org ☪ catholiccandle@gmail.com

---

## ***Words to Live by – from Catholic Tradition***

*The importance of suffering for attaining heaven*

St. Bede, the Venerable, Doctor of the Church:

How can a man consider himself to be a Christian, if he desires to enjoy future glory with Christ, without attaining this glory through the means of suffering with Christ?

*Catena Aurea on St. Luke's Gospel*, St. Thomas Aquinas, quoting The Venerable Bede, Ch. 24, §3.

***Catholic Candle note:*** The article below refers to Rome's betrayal of the Catholic Faith. However, a reader would be mistaken if he assumed that Pope Francis' betrayal somehow means that he is not the pope.

Sedevacantism is wrong and is (material or formal) schism. *Catholic Candle* is not sedevacantist. On the contrary, we published a series of articles showing that sedevacantism is false (and also showing that former Pope Benedict is not still the pope).

We recommend a small book explaining the errors of sedevacantism. It is available:

- Here, for free: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/against-sedevacantism.html>  
or
- Here, at cost (\$4): [https://www.amazon.com/Sedevacantism-Material-Quanta-Cura-Press/dp/B08FP5NQR6/ref=sr\\_1\\_1](https://www.amazon.com/Sedevacantism-Material-Quanta-Cura-Press/dp/B08FP5NQR6/ref=sr_1_1)

Here is what St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Doctor of the Church, teaches concerning the need to recognize and respect the authority of a superior – such as the pope – even when he is bad:

Even should the life of any superior be so notoriously wicked as to admit of no excuse or dissimulation, nevertheless, for God's sake, Who is the source of all

power, we are bound to honor such a one, not on account of his personal merits, which are non-existent, but because of the divine ordination and the dignity of his office.<sup>1</sup>

However, even while recognizing the pope's authority and our duty to obey him when we are able, we know we must resist the evil he says and does. Read more about this principle here: <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/against-sedevacantism.html#section-7>

Lastly, in the article below, the reference to becoming an “ordinary saint” is not a reference to becoming a saint through attending the evil *novus ordo* mass, a/k/a the “ordinary rite”. The new mass is inherently evil and a sacrilege. This evil rite does not give grace<sup>2</sup> or help us toward heaven.

## Is Your Goal to Be an Ordinary or Extraordinary Saint?

You will have to be one or the other to get to Heaven. Only saints get to Heaven. Most people believe a lie of the devil, that “It’s too hard to be a saint; I’m not even going to try.”

We must want to be saints! In order to do this, we must love God. Yet, to love God we must have knowledge of Him.

Okay, let’s list things to do to increase your understanding and knowledge of a loving God, Who makes it so easy to love Him:

- ❖ Understand what He has done and continues to do for you. Here are a few especially important blessings to remember:
  - He created you specially;
  - He suffered and died for you so you could be happy here on earth and forever happy with Him in Heaven. He would have done the same if you were the only person on earth; and

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Third Sermon for Advent, entitled: *On the Three Advents of the Lord and the Seven Pillars which we ought to Erect within us.*

<sup>2</sup> <https://catholiccandle.neocities.org/faith/new-mass-never-grace.html>

- He keeps you in existence with His knowledge of you.
- ❖ Make a real effort to return His love for you by your love for Him.
  - Make many and frequent Spiritual Holy Communion; and
  - Discuss with Him (like you would with your best friend) all aspects of your life and how you want to be a saint and be forever with Him in Heaven.
- ❖ To increase your love, make an effort to study His life on earth and the aspects of that life. You must have knowledge of the Person you love, as well as of the things you could study and even touch, if permitted, *e.g.*, the Holy Cross He died on, the Crown of Thorns, *etc.*

At the top of the list is the Shroud, the “clean linen cloth” (as the Gospel calls it) in which Christ was laid when He was taken down from the Cross. Here is what the Catholic Encyclopedia says about the Shroud:


This relic, though damaged by a fire, bears the faint but distinct impress of a human form both back and front. The cloth is about 13 ½ feet long and 4 ½ feet wide. If the marks we perceive were caused by a human body, it is clear that the body (supine) was laid lengthwise along one half of the shroud while the other half was doubled over the head to cover the whole front of the body from the face to the feet. ...

In 1898 when the shroud was solemnly exposed, permission was given to photograph it, and a sensation was caused by the discovery that the image upon the linen was apparently a negative – in other words, that the photographic negative taken from this offered a more recognizable picture of a human face than the cloth itself or any positive print. In the photographic negative the lights and shadows were natural; in the linen or the print they were inverted. Three years afterwards, Dr. Paul Vignon read a remarkable paper before the *Academie des Sciences* in which he maintained that the impression upon the shroud was a ‘vaporigraph’ caused by the ammoniacal emanations radiating from the surface of Christ’s body after so violent a death.<sup>3</sup>

Shown below is a picture I believe was providentially developed using the shroud as a model. It is a big help to greatly improve your Spiritual Communion, increase your love, help in discussions with Him, and better understand how it demonstrates His love for you.

---

<sup>3</sup> 1912 Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. XIII, Article: *The Holy Shroud*.



Consider suffering and dying for Him (as He did for you) if it ever becomes necessary in the anti-God world we live in. It appears a possibility, just as in 16<sup>th</sup> century England, and in other periods of persecution throughout history.

Then, the persecutions sought to eliminate the Catholic religion; now it will be to eradicate completely all reference to, or thought about God, while promoting Mother Earth, the pagan Pachamama, *etc.* Don't expect any help from Rome. Our leaders there have already betrayed the Catholic Faith.

Our Lord knows the extent of your love and your willingness to suffer and die for Him because He can read your heart. Oh, what a blessing!

Be sure to fulfill all the duties and requirements of your state of life, which includes un-faillingly standing up for Christ.

If, by chance, you still consider it impossible to become a saint, then the devil is still trying hard to discourage you. Ask for God's help and discuss it with Him. He knows how to solve your problem.

It's possible to be an exceptional saint --- like St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Francis, St. Paul, *etc.* – but that requires not only your special dedication but also God leading a person to that greater state. However, even so, the road to that exceptional sanctity passes through “ordinary sanctity” as a preparation for even higher things. So, keep it up! You don't know what God has planned for you. Whatever God plans for you is not impossible; don't listen to the devil. You must first pursue becoming an “ordinary saint”.

On this road to “ordinary sanctity”, God will direct you to what is best for you to reach your goal of Heaven in today's world in which you live. It will be somewhat different than in the past. Most likely He does not plan for you to live as a hermit in the desert, or on a platform atop a pole like St. Simon Stylite. It could be He wants you to join an uncompromising monastery (when one becomes available); or He may ask you to start one, or to finance one.

His plan for you certainly won't be impossible for you. No, He will give you all necessary help. So, it is up to you to use His help to succeed and to be happy with Him for all eternity.

It goes without saying that all of the above requires much prayer (*i.e.*, conversations with God).

## ✠ Mary's School of Sanctity ✠

***Catholic Candle* note:** This is the beginning of a reflections series which will be placed in the setting of a school where we, along side of our readers, study what Mary Our Mother would like us to learn—namely how to sanctify our souls.

This little schoolhouse, so to speak, will have for the staff of teachers Our Lady herself, St. Joseph, and Our Lord Himself. How can this be done? By following what the Church and saints have written about the topics covered, all of which are geared to instruct us in the sanctification of our souls.

Thus this series is intended to enrich our understanding of many subjects relevant to our spiritual lives, some examples of which are: meditation, the temperaments, and the Spiritual Exercises that Our Lady gave to St. Ignatius of Loyola.

There are so many topics that Catholics have always needed to study for perfection. In these times of Apostasy in which we live, we especially need the means that the Catholic Church has taught throughout the centuries, in order to defeat the evil one. Since the best teachers are Our Lord Himself, Our Lady, and good St. Joseph and we learn about them through the writings of the saints of Holy Mother Church, we delight to study and ponder these works along with our readers.

### ***Lesson #1 Introduction to our teacher– the Blessed Virgin Mary***

Let us enroll in Mary's School by taking a look at our Mother Mary, whom this school is named after, for she is God's special gift to us to be our model in sanctity. Our Lord gave us Mary while He hung on the cross. She is precious to Him but He wanted to give her to us because He knew we need her to gain our salvation.

Mary is a treasure for us. God has blessed Mary with many prerogatives. They are so numerous that we cannot address them all in one article. Indeed, many books have been written about her prerogatives. However, in order to appreciate Mary more and more we will look at a few of her prerogatives below:

- ***Mary is Immaculate.***
- ***Mary is the Mediatrix of all graces.***
- ***Mary IS LOVED BY God more than all the angels and other saints put together***
- ***Mary LOVES God more than all the angels and other saints put together.***
- ***Mary is omnipotent by grace.***

#### ***Mary is Immaculate.***

Mary is God's masterpiece whom He wants us to follow. He created her Immaculate. ***Mary's Immaculate Conception was solemnly defined in 1854.*** Because He intended for her to be the Mother of the Incarnate Word, she was conceived immaculately in the womb of St. Anne. This means that she never had original sin. She not only was conceived immaculate, she was also preserved from ever committing any actual sin, mortal or venial. It was fitting that she be always pure.

## ***Mary is the Mediatrix of All Graces.***

Mary is not only immaculate; ***she is also the Mediatrix of All Graces.*** St. Alphonsus de Liguori, in his book, *The Glories of Mary*, explains this Catholic dogma by citing several authorities. He tells how St. Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem says, “Truly was she full; for grace is given to other saints partially, but the whole plenitude of grace poured itself into Mary.”

St. Alphonsus cites St. Basil of Seleucia, saying, “Hail full of grace, ***mediatress*** between God and men, by whom heaven and earth are brought together and united.”

St. Alphonsus further cites St. Laurence Justinian, saying, “Otherwise, had not the Blessed Virgin been full of divine grace, how could she have become the ladder to heaven, the advocate of the world, and the most true ***mediatress*** between men and God.”

As Mediatrix, Mary is so precious in God’s sight. St. Alphonsus beautifully explains the connection between God’s plan that Mary be the Mother of Our Lord **and** the ***Mediatrix*** for the spiritual children given to her.

If Mary, as the already destined Mother of our common Redeemer, received from the very beginning the office of ***mediatress of all men***, and consequently even of the saints, it was also requisite from the very beginning she should have a grace exceeding that of all the saints for whom she was to intercede. I will explain myself more clearly. If, by the means of Mary, all men were to render themselves dear to God, **necessarily Mary was more holy and more dear to Him than all men together.** Otherwise, how could she have interceded for all others? That an intercessor may obtain the favor of a prince for all his vassals, it is absolutely necessary that he should be more dear to his prince than all the other vassals. And therefore St. Anselm concludes that Mary deserved to be made the worthy repairer of the lost world, because she was the most pure of all creatures. “The pure sanctity of her heart, surpassing the purity and sanctity of all other creatures, merited for her that she should be made the repairer of the lost world.”<sup>4</sup>

St. Thomas Aquinas says in his commentary on the *Angelic Salutation*:

So full of grace was the Blessed Virgin, that it overflows onto all mankind. It is, indeed, a great thing that any one saint has so much grace that it is conducive to the salvation of many; but it is most wondrous to have so much grace as to suffice for the salvation of all mankind. Thus, it is in Christ and in the Blessed Virgin.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> *The Glories of Mary* —discourse #2 the birth of Mary

<sup>5</sup> Of course, St. Thomas is not saying here that all men actually receive grace but he is only expressing Christ’s and Mary’s plenitude of grace.

Hence, we can see plainly that Mary is necessary for our salvation.

***Mary IS LOVED BY God more than all the angels and other saints put together.***

In addition, St. Alphonsus in the above quote hints at the next prerogative that we want to look at, namely, **that God loves Mary more than all the angels and saints put together.** In fact, St. Alphonsus states:

Let us conclude that our heavenly child [Mary], because she was appointed ***mediatrix of the world***, as also because she was destined to be the Mother of the Redeemer, received, at the very beginning of her existence, ***grace exceeding in greatness that of all the saints together.*** Hence, how delightful a sight must the beautiful soul of this happy child have been to heaven and earth, although still enclosed in her mother's womb! **She was the most amiable creature in the eyes of God**, because she was already loaded with grace and merit. ... And ***she was at the same time the creature above all others that had ever appeared in the world up to that moment, who loved God the most;*** so much so, that had Mary been born immediately after her most pure conception, she would have come into the world richer in merits, and more holy, than all the saints united.<sup>6</sup>

Also, St. Alphonsus cites St. Vincent Ferrer, saying, “that the Blessed Virgin was sanctified, in her mother's womb above all saints and angels.” Thus, God loves her the most.

St. Thomas Aquinas says in his commentary on the Angelic Salutation:

She is, therefore, full of grace, surpassing the angels in that plenitude. For this reason she is rightly called *Mary*, which signifies that in herself she is enlightened and that she enlightens others throughout the world. Thus, she is compared to the sun and to the moon.

***Mary LOVES God more than all the angels and saints put together.***

As St. Alphonsus stated just above, “... And ***she was at the same time the creature above all others that had ever appeared in the world up to that moment, who loved God the most;***”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> *The Glories of Mary* — discourse #2 the birth of Mary (emphasis added).

<sup>7</sup> Quoted from St. Alphonsus's *The Glories of Mary* discourse #2, *The Birth of Mary*.

Likewise, St. Alphonsus quotes Richard of St. Victor, saying, “Ah! Well might even the Seraphim have descended from heaven to learn, in the heart of Mary, how to love God.”<sup>8</sup>

St. Bernard, commenting on St. John’s Apocalypse, referring to *a woman clothed with the sun*, says that this woman must be Mary because, “She was so closely united to God by love, and penetrated so deeply the abyss of divine wisdom, that, without a personal union with God, it would seem impossible for a creature to have a closer union with Him.”<sup>9</sup>

Mary certainly gave herself entirely to God and did all that He wanted her to do in her life. She never denied anything He asked of her. As she said, “Behold the handmaid of the Lord. Be it done to me according Thy Word,” and her whole life was one loving “*Fiat.*” St. Bernardine explains this when he says, “The mind of the Blessed Virgin was always wrapped in the ardor of love,” and “That she never did anything that the divine Wisdom did not show her to be pleasing to Him; and that she loved God as much as she thought He was to be loved by her.”<sup>10</sup>

### ***Mary is omnipotent by grace.***

St. Alphonsus explains about this in his *The Glories of Mary*:

As the mother, then, must have the same power as the Son, justly was Mary made omnipotent by Jesus, who is omnipotent; it being, however, always true, that whereas the Son is omnipotent by nature, the mother is so by grace.

He quotes St. Bonaventure, who says, “Mary has this great privilege that with her Son she above all the saints is most powerful to obtain whatever she wills.”

Further, St. Alphonsus cites St. Peter Damian addressing Mary as follows, “All power is given to thee in heaven and on earth, and nothing is impossible to thee who canst raise those who are in despair to the hope of salvation.” And then adding that, “When the Mother goes to seek a favor for us from Jesus Christ, her Son esteems her prayers so greatly, and is so desirous to satisfy her, that when she prays it seems as if she rather commanded than prayed, and was rather a queen than a handmaid.”

---

<sup>8</sup> Quoted from St. Alphonsus’s *The Glories of Mary, part IV, The Virtues of Mary, section 2, The Charity of Mary towards God.*

<sup>9</sup> Quoted from St. Alphonsus’s *The Glories of Mary, part IV, The Virtues of Mary, section 2, The Charity of Mary towards God.*

<sup>10</sup> Quoted from St. Alphonsus’s *The Glories of Mary, part IV, The Virtues of Mary, section 2, The Charity of Mary towards God.*

St. Alphonsus gives additional quotes to prove this wonderful truth about Mary. He tells how St. Germanus addresses Our Lady, “Thou art the Mother of God, and all-powerful to save sinners, and with God thou needest no other recommendation; for thou art the Mother of true life.”

“At the command of Mary, all obey, even God,” says St. Bernardine, as St. Alphonsus also records in *The Glories of Mary*. As if these quotes weren’t enough, he supplies these also: St. Anselm addresses Our Lady: “Our Lord, O most holy Virgin, has exalted thee to such a degree that by His favor all things that are possible to Him should be possible to thee.” And further, “Whatever thou, O Virgin, willest can never be otherwise than accomplished.”

St. Antoninus proclaims, “And thus, God has placed the whole Church, not only under the patronage, but even under the dominion of Mary.”

St. Alphonsus reports that St. Bridget heard Our Lord talking with Mary and telling her, “Ask of Me what thou wilt, for no petition of thine can be void.” And the reason Our Lord gave for this statement was, “Because thou never didst deny Me anything on earth, I will deny thee nothing in heaven.”

St. Alphonsus explains then, “Mary then, is called omnipotent in the sense in which it can be understood of a creature who is incapable of a divine attribute. She is omnipotent, because by her prayer she obtains whatever she wills.”<sup>11</sup>

These quotes about Mary being omnipotent in grace are very impressive. Yet, it should not surprise us that the Lord, being so loving as to give us Mary while He was hanging on the cross, would make her such a powerful advocate and intercessor for us while we are exiles in this vale of tears.

## **Conclusion:**

Because Mary is our precious Mother in Heaven and God’s masterpiece who He gave to us on the Cross, she is the perfect teacher of sanctity. We delight in studying in her school of sanctity and cover the many topics she has to teach us through the great teachers of the Church. As a little gift of our appreciation for Mary our teacher, Mediatrix of all graces, let us give Mary a mystical apple— a little poem of gratitude.

---

<sup>11</sup> All of the quotes regarding Mary’s omnipotence in grace are from St. Alphonsus’s *The Glories of Mary*, chapter 6, section about Mary our Advocate.

## Mary, Our Mediatrix

Mary, what thanks do we not owe?  
To Our Lord Who hath loved us so,  
To give us such a dear sweet Queen,  
Whose watch over us is e'er keen.

A mother so sweet and so pure,  
Helping her children to endure,  
All God's graces come through her hands,  
'Tis how God obeys her commands.

God has bestowed on her great things,  
Far beyond one's imaginings,  
Her love of God is better than,  
All the angels and all of man.

God loves her most of creatures made,  
We can always count on her aid.  
In her power we can e'er trust,  
She conquers evil with one thrust.

Thank you, Mary, our teacher dear,  
You show us how to truly fear,  
To displease God in any way,  
Bring us closer to Him each day.

To thy school of holiness we,  
Gladly come to learn from thee,  
Many topics, without an end,  
Mary, you are our tender friend.

***Catholic Candle* note:** Below is a new, occasional feature of *Catholic Candle*, called *What We Stand Against*. It calls to mind the maxims and principles of a faithful and informed Traditional Catholic.

## What We Stand Against

Resist the beginnings of liberalism. Remedies come too late,  
when delay has caused this evil to become established and to gain strength.

**Catholic Candle note:** The article below is a warning about the harm caused by the free, online encyclopedia called *Wikipedia*. There are many ways in which Wikipedia does harm, *e.g.*, it has a huge amount of the vilest impurities, ready to send a person straight to hell.

However, the article below focuses only on a single type of Wikipedia's evil: its leftist bias.

## Wikipedia – a Deceptive Tool of the Leftists

One modern habit which is harming intellects and spreading error, is people's widespread excessive use of, and overreliance on, cell phones. Connected with that bad habit is many people's gullibility and intellectual laziness in using unreliable online sources as their "go-to" sources for practically all information.

By *gullible* and *intellectually lazy*, we mean a blind trust in information sources which are convenient, popular, and approved by the world, without making the effort to be more careful, dig deeper, do more thinking, reading, and searching for the truth in better, (but often less convenient), sources.

One of the common sources of falsehood frequently relied upon by the gullible and intellectually lazy, is Wikipedia.

Wikipedia was started about 20 years ago. It is a free, online encyclopedia available to anyone with an internet connection. The name "Wikipedia" is a combination of:

- a Hawaiian word "wiki", which means "quick", but in this context seems to connote collaboration; and
- the end of the word "encyclopedia".

Wikipedia is free and convenient and so, is very popular. Wikipedia claims to be:

the world's largest reference website, attracting 1.7 billion unique visitors monthly as of November 2020. It currently has more than fifty-six million articles in more than 300 languages, including 6,347,334 articles in English.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:About>

However, Larry Sanger, one of Wikipedia’s two co-founders<sup>13</sup> (who has since left the organization) warns that Wikipedia “completely ignores any conservative, libertarian, or critical treatment of the subject.”<sup>14</sup>

According to Sanger, Wikipedia did not start with its current heavy leftist bias. However, a decade ago, “as liberals, or leftists made their march through the institutions, Wikipedia became one of those influential institutions. They started their march and basically took it over.”<sup>15</sup>

One way Wikipedia prevents the (conservative) truth being presented in its articles, is that the encyclopedia has blacklisted most conservative media sources because these media sources do not hide the truth that the leftists want to hide.<sup>16</sup> These blacklisted sources are the only news sources doing *any* reporting on many important stories. Wikipedia bans even mainstream media sources that are less liberal, *e.g.*, like *Fox News*, the *New York Post*, and *Daily Mail* (UK).<sup>17</sup> Other examples of Wikipedia’s blacklisting include *Lifesitenews.com* and *TheEpochTimes.com*.<sup>18</sup>

Wikipedia allows anyone to author new articles. However, as a consequence of the above-mentioned bias, even if a Wikipedia article’s author hypothetically wanted to cite one of those less-liberal sources to support a statement in his article, he is not allowed to do so. If the author gives no citation to a source, he risks deletion of his statement by Wikipedia because it is unsupported.

Let us examine a few examples of Wikipedia’s leftist bias.

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:About>

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/inventor-of-mrna-technology-removed-from-wikipedia-after-he-warned-against-taking-covid-jabs/>

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/inventor-of-mrna-technology-removed-from-wikipedia-after-he-warned-against-taking-covid-jabs/>

<sup>16</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Reliable\\_sources/Perennial\\_sources](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Reliable_sources/Perennial_sources)

<sup>17</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Reliable\\_sources/Perennial\\_sources](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Reliable_sources/Perennial_sources)

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.lifesitenews.com/opinion/has-wikipedia-banned-lifesite-articles-as-a-reference-source>

## Wikipedia changes “facts” in its “historical” and “scientific” articles, serving leftist goals.

Have you ever heard of Dr. Robert Malone? According to Wikipedia in mid-June 2021, he is the principal inventor of the mRNA technology used in the Pfizer and Moderna COVID-19 vaccines. Here is a screenshot of the beginning of Wikipedia’s entry for the invention of mRNA technology, as it read on June 14, 2021:

### History

In 1989, Robert W. Malone, P. Felgner, et. al. developed a high-efficiency in-vitro and in-vivo RNA transfection system using cationic liposomes, which were used "to directly introduce RNA into whole tissues and embryos", as well as various cells types. The term and idea of "RNA as a drug" is first described in this paper.<sup>[15]</sup> Then, in 1990, Jon A. Wolff, Robert W Malone, et. al. demonstrated the idea of nucleic acid-encoded drugs by direct injecting in vitro transcribed (IVT) mRNA or plasmid DNA (pDNA) into the skeletal muscle of mice which expressed the encoded protein in the injected muscle. These studies were the first evidence that in vitro transcribed (IVT) mRNA could deliver the genetic information to produce proteins within living cell tissue.<sup>[16][17]</sup>

The first mRNA vaccine experiments were carried out by P. Felgner, J. Wolff, G. Rhodes, R.W. Malone and D. Carson. P. They completed a number of mRNA vaccination studies that resulted in nine patents on mRNA vaccination with a shared priority date of March 21, 1989. One experiment documented that NEF (an HIV protein) mRNA vaccination in mice, followed by HIV challenge reduced positively stained cells by 2-fold and p24 expression was reduced by 50% at eight weeks.<sup>[18][19][20]</sup>

This entry is now changed (as we will explain below); and so, we had to extract the above screenshot from a past version of Wikipedia which is stored at archive.org.<sup>19</sup>

On June 10, 2021, Dr. Malone joined biologist Dr. Bret Weinstein, Ph.D., on the *Dark Horse Podcast*, to discuss the use of mRNA technology in the COVID “vaccines”.<sup>20</sup> Dr. Malone raised numerous safety concerns about the Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna COVID-19 vaccines, both of which use the mRNA technology invented under his leadership. Among other hazards, he warned about future autoimmune risks caused by the spike proteins within the mRNA injections.

This podcast was uploaded onto YouTube but it didn’t last there very long before YouTube deleted his warnings off of its site.<sup>21</sup>

Dr. Malone repeated his warning about the danger of mRNA “vaccines” when he appeared a few days later on *Fox News*.<sup>22</sup> So here was one of the principal inventors of the mRNA technology used in these COVID “vaccines”, who was warning about their

---

<sup>19</sup> [https://web.archive.org/web/20210614140319/https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RNA\\_vaccine](https://web.archive.org/web/20210614140319/https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RNA_vaccine)

<sup>20</sup> These mRNA treatments are called “vaccines” but don’t really fit the definition of what a vaccine is. Instead, they are really gene therapy. They are falsely called “vaccines” because that label makes them more acceptable to the public than if the experimental COVID mRNA treatments were called “gene therapy”. That is an issue we will return to in a future article.

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/inventor-of-mrna-technology-removed-from-wikipedia-after-he-warned-against-taking-covid-jabs>

<sup>22</sup> <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/inventor-of-mrna-technology-removed-from-wikipedia-after-he-warned-against-taking-covid-jabs>

danger. These warnings contradicted the mainstream media's constant promotion of those "vaccines" and Dr. Malone's status as chief inventor of this technology gave great weight to his warnings.

On June 16, 2021, Wikipedia changed its mRNA article to remove all credit and mention of Dr. Malone from the entry. Here is a screenshot, (again from archive.org<sup>23</sup>, because Wikipedia changed the mRNA article again, as will be explained below):

### History

In 1989, researchers at the Salk Institute, the University of California, San Diego, and Vical published work demonstrating that mRNA, using a liposomal nanoparticle for drug delivery, could transfect mRNA into a variety of eukaryotic cells.<sup>[15]</sup> In 1990, the University of Wisconsin reported positive results where "naked" (or unprotected) mRNA was injected into the muscle of mice.<sup>[3]</sup> These studies were the first evidence that in vitro transcribed (IVT) mRNA could deliver the genetic information to produce proteins within living cell tissue.<sup>[3]</sup>

The use of RNA vaccines goes back to the 1990s. The *in vitro* demonstration of mRNA in animals was first reported in 1990,<sup>[16]</sup> and the use of mRNA for immunization was proposed shortly thereafter.<sup>[17][18]</sup> In 1993, Martinon demonstrated that liposome-encapsulated RNA could stimulate T-cells in vivo, and in 1994, Zhou & Berglund published the first evidence that RNA could be used as a vaccine to elicit both humoral and cellular immune response against a pathogen.<sup>[9][19][20]</sup>

Wikipedia then tweaked the article again to give chief credit to Jon Wolff (a collaborator of Malone's in 1990), for the mRNA research experiments. Here is a screenshot from earlier July 2021<sup>24</sup>:

### History

The idea that mRNA could be used for therapeutic purposes was first realized in 1989 by researchers at Vical, a Californian biotechnology start-up.<sup>[3][15]</sup> Researchers working with the Salk Institute that year published an article showing that nanoparticles could transfect mRNA into cells.<sup>[16][15]</sup> In 1990, Jon Wolff at the University of Wisconsin collaborated with researchers at Vical and reported positive results where "naked" (or unprotected) mRNA was injected into the muscle of mice.<sup>[3][17]</sup> These studies were the first evidence that in vitro transcribed (IVT) mRNA could deliver the genetic information to produce proteins within living cell tissue.<sup>[3]</sup>


The demonstration of *in vitro* transcribed mRNA activity in animals by Vical and the University of Wisconsin in 1990,<sup>[18][19]</sup> led soon thereafter to the proposal of mRNA for immunization purposes.<sup>[20][21]</sup> In 1993, Martinon demonstrated that liposome-encapsulated RNA could stimulate T-cells in vivo, and in 1994, Zhou and Berglund published the first evidence that RNA could be used as a vaccine to elicit both humoral and cellular immune response against a pathogen.<sup>[3][22][23]</sup>



Katalin Karikó, a scientist behind a key discovery in the development of mRNA vaccines.<sup>[24]</sup>

Hungarian biochemist Katalin Karikó attempted to solve some of the main technical barriers to introducing mRNA into cells in the 1990s. Karikó partnered with American immunologist Drew Weissman, and by 2005 they published a joint paper that solved one of the key technical barriers by using modified nucleosides to get mRNA inside cells without setting off the body's defense system.<sup>[3][24]</sup> Karikó arrived at her key insight after she focused on why transfer RNA used as a control in an experiment did not provoke the same immune reaction as messenger RNA.<sup>[25]</sup> Harvard stem cell biologist Derrick Rossi (then at Stanford) read Karikó and Weissman's paper and recognized that their work was "groundbreaking",<sup>[24]</sup> and in 2010 founded the mRNA-focused biotech Moderna along with Robert Langer, who also saw its potential in vaccine development.<sup>[24][3]</sup> Moderna and BioNTech both licensed Karikó and Weissman's work.<sup>[24]</sup>

In 2010, US government agency DARPA launched a biotech research program called ADEPT as part of its mission to develop emerging technologies for the US military.<sup>[26]</sup> In 2011, DARPA recognized the potential of nucleic acid technology for defense against pandemics and began to invest in the field through ADEPT.<sup>[26][27]</sup> DARPA's grants were seen as a vote of confidence which in turn encouraged other government agencies and private investors to also invest in mRNA technology.<sup>[27]</sup> In 2013, DARPA awarded a \$25 million grant to Moderna.<sup>[28]</sup>



As you see, Wikipedia's article now also praises and promotes Katalin Karikó. Karikó strongly promotes these mRNA "vaccines".<sup>25</sup>

This is an example of Wikipedia's bias in countless articles. This reminds us of the warnings in George Orwell's novel, *1984*, in which the main character, Winston, worked in the *Ministry of Truth* to re-write articles in order to change the "truth" as it had been previously written, in order to fit the current desires of the totalitarian government.

<sup>23</sup> [https://web.archive.org/web/20210616161814/https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RNA\\_vaccine](https://web.archive.org/web/20210616161814/https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RNA_vaccine)

<sup>24</sup> This screenshot is found here: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RNA\\_vaccine](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RNA_vaccine)

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2020/nov/21/covid-vaccine-technology-pioneer-i-never-doubted-it-would-work>

There are countless other examples, besides the above, extended example of Wikipedia falsifying history and science by re-writing<sup>26</sup> what it claims as true. Wikipedia expediently changes its narrative of the science/history involved, thereby destroying Dr. Malone's important authority to speak on the subject, serving to promote the vaccines using the technology that Dr. Malone knew well and about which he began giving public warnings. Wikipedia was his "cheerleader" until political expedience caused Wikipedia to "cancel" him.

Let's look into more examples that show Wikipedia promoting leftist ideology rather than truth and facts.

## Gender dysphoria on Wikipedia

Wikipedia writes a solemn "academic" treatment of people's gender delusions as if those poor confused souls were not out of touch with reality.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Wikipedia is not the only leftist media company which changes its information *on the fly*, to serve the leftist agenda. Another prominent example is Merriam-Webster, owned by Encyclopedia Britannica.

In October 2020, when Mrs. Amy Coney Barrett (who is relatively conservative) was testifying at her Supreme Court confirmation hearings, she was asked, in substance, if she supported a person's "right" to live a life of unnatural impurity.

Mrs. Barrett replied obliquely that she never discriminated against people with that "preference". The leftists, including Sen. Mazie Hirono, D-Hawaii, quickly pounced on her for implying that people living like that were not "born that way". Senator Hirono and various leftist pressure groups said that Mrs. Barrett's comment was insulting to persons living that "lifestyle".

One problem for the leftists, though, was that the principal dictionaries, including Merriam-Webster, showed that Mrs. Barrett's word usage was correct and not insulting. So, ***the same day*** Merriam-Webster changed its definition to state that using the word "preference" the way she did was an insult.

Read the account of this incident here: <https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/us/merriam-webster-dictionary-updates-sexual-preference-entry-after-amy-coney-barrett-hearing/ar-BB1a3Glr> and <https://www.dailywire.com/news/merriam-webster-suddenly-alters-definition-of-preference-after-dems-attack-coney-barrett>

<sup>27</sup> For an examination of how this transgender delusion is a consequence of society's apostasy from the Catholic Church, read this article: <https://catholiccandle.org/2019/12/01/the-direct-road-from-apostasy-to-gender-confusion/>

Wikipedia writes how some people have no gender (“agender”).<sup>28</sup>

Wikipedia solemnly explains the teachings of “scholar” Finn Enke, a poor deluded woman professor at the University of Wisconsin at Madison (a university known for its craziness and its doctrinaire leftism, similar, in this way, to the University of California at Berkeley). On Enke’s website, you can also see that woman’s ugly, disorderly, talentless, and gimmicky “art” that she is promoting.<sup>29</sup>

With great seriousness, Wikipedia explains how “agender” is a gender, how a person can have multiple genders at once, or even all genders at once (whatever that means, and which absurdity is called “omnigender”).<sup>30</sup>

Wikipedia solemnly explains how some people (whom common sense recognizes as indecisive and confused) are “gender fluid” because they don’t want to commit to being either one of the two real genders or even firmly commit to any other specific (pretend) gender they might concoct.<sup>31</sup>

This Wikipedia article (as so many others) pretends that Nature does not exist, as if God does not exist, and as if reality were only whatever a person chooses, similar to a person deliriously deciding he is Napoleon.

Wikipedia gives no hint that this transgender delusion is irrational. Of course, we also know that this position (which Wikipedia sets forth) not only attacks sound reason and the magnificent Catholic culture which the Catholic Church built (*viz.*, Christendom), but also God’s Law and the Holy Catholic Faith itself.

Further, Wikipedia gives no hint that there is another side on this issue, besides the satanic lie that Wikipedia gives. Perhaps Wikipedia would object that it does present both sides of an issue when there are two sides worthy of mention. Wikipedia might then claim that its transgender position – which is the leftist position – is the only reasonable one and so that is why the article does not give the conservative (and true) position. However, even under that hypothesis, Wikipedia would still be no less biased and this would still result in Wikipedia being a purveyor of leftist propaganda.

---

<sup>28</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-binary\\_gender](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-binary_gender)

<sup>29</sup> <https://finnenke.com/>

<sup>30</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-binary\\_gender](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-binary_gender)

<sup>31</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-binary\\_gender](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-binary_gender)

Wikipedia’s article does not mention that this transgenderism was listed as a mental illness by the *World Health Organization* until 2019 and by the *American Psychiatric Association* until 2012.<sup>32</sup>

This is one of countless examples of Wikipedia pushing the leftist evils as if they were the only “orthodoxy”.

Truly, our times fit St. Paul’s warning:

For there shall be a time, when they will not endure sound doctrine; but, according to their own desires, they will heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears: and will indeed turn away their hearing from the truth, but will be turned unto fables.

2 *Timothy*, 4:3-4.

### **Wikipedia’s treatment of “conversion therapy”**

We know from our Holy Catholic Faith (as well as from the science of Ethics) that a man can follow reason and eschew sin and vice. In this he is not like the brute beasts, who follow instinct and have no free will. Unlike the brute beasts, man is both capable of sin and capable of overcoming sin. Unnatural vice is sinful<sup>33</sup> because a man has a free will and can stop sinning.

Thus, we know that a man who has fallen into unnatural vice was not “made that way” as some of those men claim, nor is he incapable of ceasing to commit those sins (as is also true of other sins).

So, we know that a person can stop committing these unnatural sins and that people can help him do so, by prayer, moral support, good habits, good advice, *etc.* This is Catholic, reasonable, and common sense.

Now let’s look at Wikipedia’s false and leftist treatment of the issue.

Wikipedia correctly says that “conversion therapy” involves trying to change someone who is involved in such unnatural impurity, and describes the methods as:

---

<sup>32</sup> <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/world-health-organization-removes-gender-identity-disorder-from-list-of-mental-illnesses>

<sup>33</sup> *Romans*, 1:27.

counseling, visualization, social skills training, psychoanalytic therapy, and spiritual interventions such as “prayer and group support and pressure”.<sup>34</sup>

In a rough sort of way, this description corresponds to the many Catholic moral helps which can aid a person to conquer this habit of sin.

Wikipedia adds that *all* such efforts to help a person free himself from this unnatural vice are “pseudoscientific”.<sup>35</sup> Wikipedia defines “pseudoscience” in a way that shows Wikipedia is saying that conversion therapy does not and cannot work:

Pseudoscience consists of statements, beliefs, or *practices that claim to be both scientific and factual but are incompatible with the scientific method*. Pseudoscience is often characterized by *contradictory, exaggerated* or unfalsifiable claims; reliance on confirmation bias rather than rigorous attempts at refutation; lack of openness to evaluation by other experts; absence of systematic practices when developing hypotheses; and continued adherence long after the pseudoscientific hypotheses have been *experimentally discredited*.<sup>36</sup>

Wikipedia not only falsely declares that efforts to help a person to stop committing sins of unnatural vice are unscientific, discredited, and futile, but also connects these efforts (in the article) with “icepick lobotomies”, electric shock therapy, and other weird things<sup>37</sup> which have nothing to do with helping a person eschew sin by increasing virtue in the soul, as God wants us all to do.

As with the transgender article discussed above, this Wikipedia article (as so many others) pretends that Nature does not exist, that God does not exist, and that acts of unnatural vice are good, if that is what a person chooses.

Again, Wikipedia’s position is not only attacking reason and the magnificent Catholic culture which the Catholic Church built, but also the Holy Catholic Faith itself.

Also, Wikipedia gives no hint that there is another side on this issue, beside the satanic lie that Wikipedia gives. If Wikipedia does not even recognize there is a conservative (and true) position worthy of discussion, that would merely cement Wikipedia’s status as a leftist mouthpiece.

---

<sup>34</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conversion\\_therapy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conversion_therapy)

<sup>35</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conversion\\_therapy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conversion_therapy)

<sup>36</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pseudoscience> (emphasis added).

<sup>37</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conversion\\_therapy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conversion_therapy)

Wikipedia gives no hint that, only a few decades ago, before society became as degraded as it is, this unnatural vice was listed as a mental illness and also was a felony. This crime traces its way back to the law of God, making it a capital offense. *Leviticus*, 20:13

This is one of countless examples of Wikipedia pushing the leftist evils as if they were the only “orthodoxy”.

Historically, Catholic morality has been reflected in the civilized world’s common law. That is a subject for a different article, but many of the basic principles of our law, like the right to confront witnesses, were first established in the Church’s own courts.

Of course, the Catholic Church and the Natural Law are the source of much of the civilized world’s substantive laws too, such as the recognition of the criminality of unnatural vice. *See, e.g.*, the U.S. Supreme Court upholding the criminality of unnatural vice, in *Bowers v. Hardwick*, 478 U.S. 186 (1986).

### **Wikipedia casts doubt on the truth of the Gospels**

With a thin veneer of pseudo “scholarship”, Wikipedia rolls out the usual claims made by Our Lord’s enemies that the Gospels are uncertain, unreliable, disputed, contradictory, and not historically accurate.<sup>38</sup> Wikipedia simply echoes the assertions of centuries of heretics, Jews, and other non-believers in telling the reader that the Gospels tell us little or nothing about the “historical Jesus”.<sup>39</sup> Rather, they are merely pious assertions and falsehoods which are disputed by “truth-telling” scholars.<sup>40</sup> Wikipedia asserts that its pronouncements on the Gospels are the conclusions of “the majority of scholars”, although Wikipedia makes no effort to prove this false assertion.

### **Wikipedia’s promotion of abortion**

Wikipedia’s article on abortion is full of falsehoods and leftist bias. For example, it claims that “When properly done, abortion is one of the safest procedures in medicine.”<sup>41</sup> This is a statement straight from Planned Parenthood’s own propaganda.

Wikipedia’s claim omits the obvious fact that abortion murders a baby, so it is a **deadly** procedure. Further, this claim ignores the vast body of evidence proving the grave harm

---

<sup>38</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Historical\\_reliability\\_of\\_the\\_Gospels](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Historical_reliability_of_the_Gospels)

<sup>39</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quest\\_for\\_the\\_historical\\_Jesus](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quest_for_the_historical_Jesus)

<sup>40</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Historical\\_reliability\\_of\\_the\\_Gospels](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Historical_reliability_of_the_Gospels)

<sup>41</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abortion#Safety>

to the mother, morally, emotionally<sup>42</sup>, intellectually, and, often, physically<sup>43</sup>, when she consents to be an accomplice to this murder of her baby.

### **Wikipedia’s promotion of legalizing mind-altering drugs**

Wikipedia minimally acknowledges some of the obvious problems with legalizing hallucinogenic drugs, *e.g.*, legalization leads to increased consumption of drugs.<sup>44</sup> But Wikipedia’s treatment is like the typical leftist talking points which promote the legalization of “recreational” narcotics. Although Wikipedia mentions that legalization foreseeably will cause drug use to increase, the encyclopedia then quickly transitions to the pro-legalization talking points, such as decreased gang violence, saving the costs of enforcing these laws, ability to tax “recreational” narcotic use to increase government tax revenue, and the police’s ability to concentrate on enforcing other laws.<sup>45</sup>

### **Wikipedia’s promotion of allowing the adoption of children by persons who live lives of unnatural impurity**

Wikipedia’s leftist bias is on display on this adoption issue too. Wikipedia presents (supposed) “science”, “fairness”, and “civil rights” in favor of this evil, and says that those people opposed to such adoptions are against it because of their own personal assumptions and personal faith-beliefs.<sup>46</sup> The implication is that these assumptions are unscientific and unfair and that the particulars of such people’s personal beliefs are not a basis for society to prohibit such adoptions.

---

<sup>42</sup> <https://www.lifenews.com/2021/08/05/woman-attempted-suicide-three-times-after-having-abortion-thanks-god-for-saving-her-life/>

<sup>43</sup> Although the mainstream media ignores the frequent medical emergencies, the serious physical injuries to the mothers of the murdered babies is so common it is hardly “news”. Here is one of countless reports: <https://www.lifenews.com/2021/08/05/woman-hemorrhages-after-abortion-clinic-lacerates-her-uterus-during-botched-22-week-abortion/>

<sup>44</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drug\\_liberalization](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drug_liberalization)

<sup>45</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drug\\_liberalization](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drug_liberalization)

<sup>46</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBT\\_adoption](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBT_adoption)

## Wikipedia promotes the leftists’ “climate change” narrative

Wikipedia promotes the leftists’ climate alarmism.<sup>47</sup> The encyclopedia falsely claims that there is an “overwhelming scientific consensus” for global warming caused by humans. Wikipedia falsely says *all* research scientists agree on this “fact” and that “no scientific body of national or international standing disagrees with this view”.<sup>48</sup>

Wikipedia says that the only persons who disagree are the deniers spreading misinformation, who are funded by conservatives and the self-interested fossil fuel industry. Wikipedia says that the uncertainty and controversy are not real but only manufactured.<sup>49</sup> The article does not give any of the great abundance of evidence disproving the leftists’ climate alarmism.

## Wikipedia promotes the leftists’ narrative on the 2020 U.S. presidential elections

Wikipedia gives a false, one-sided account of the 2020 election fraud controversy, saying that the Republican side was merely “promoting the conspiracy theory that falsely posits” election fraud. Here is one place Wikipedia states this leftist propaganda:

**Stop the Steal** is a far-right and conservative campaign and protest movement in the United States promoting the conspiracy theory that falsely posits that widespread electoral fraud occurred during the 2020 presidential election to deny incumbent President Donald Trump victory over former vice president Joe Biden.<sup>50</sup>

This article is false and completely one-sided, failing to provide any of the extensive evidence of the actual voting fraud.<sup>51</sup> However, leaving to a different time an examination of the truth of the fraud evidence (which exists in large amounts), for the present we note that this is another example of Wikipedia giving a one-sided narrative setting forth only the leftists’ talking points.

---

<sup>47</sup> Climate alarmism is really a power grab to control people. Read this analysis here: <https://catholiccandle.org/?s=climate>

<sup>48</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Climate\\_change](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Climate_change)

<sup>49</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Climate\\_change](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Climate_change)

<sup>50</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Attempts\\_to\\_overturn\\_the\\_2020\\_United\\_States\\_presidential\\_election](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Attempts_to_overturn_the_2020_United_States_presidential_election) (Emphasis in the original).

<sup>51</sup> See, among many other analyses of election fraud, White House trade representative Peter Navarro’s three-part analysis available here: <https://peternavarro.com/the-navarro-report/>

So, if anyone seeks only to know what the leftists say about the election fraud, he can find it in Wikipedia. But for anyone seeking to understand what evidence has moved 41% of U.S. voters to believe that Biden did not win the election fairly,<sup>52</sup> Wikipedia withholds this information.<sup>53</sup>

## Conclusion

Wikipedia is largely not a source of truth but of leftist ideology. Wikipedia can (and often does) change its articles almost instantaneously to take today's news into account. So, what was "true" yesterday, might be denied or deleted today, with no indication that yesterday's "truth" was the opposite.

Beware of Wikipedia's leftist bias on a large number of topics:

- ❖ from philosophy to foreign policy;
- ❖ from science to civil unrest;
- ❖ from technology to elections;
- ❖ from biography to religion;
- ❖ from history to immigration;
- ❖ from morals to medicine;
- ❖ from forensics to the Constitution;
- ❖ from medicine to music;
- ❖ from law to culture; and
- ❖ from politics to the rule of law.

---

<sup>52</sup> [https://www.rasmussenreports.com/public\\_content/politics/general\\_politics/june\\_2021/55\\_of\\_voters\\_support\\_election\\_audits](https://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/general_politics/june_2021/55_of_voters_support_election_audits)

<sup>53</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Attempts\\_to\\_overturn\\_the\\_2020\\_United\\_States\\_presidential\\_election](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Attempts_to_overturn_the_2020_United_States_presidential_election) (Emphasis in the original).

With few exceptions, only globalist, progressive mainstream sources – and sources friendly to globalist progressivism – are permitted. What is against Wikipedia’s leftist agenda is either ignored or is summarily dismissed as “misinformation” or a “conspiracy theory”. In saying so, Wikipedia (and other, similarly-biased institutions) are plainly claiming exclusive control over what is thinkable. They want any debate to occur only on the leftist playing field and want to set the boundaries of that debate, in order to tell you how to think about countless important issues. Wikipedia articles are the perfect bait for intellectually lazy and gullible people, who are looking for a “go-to” source which is convenient, popular, and approved by the world, which does not require the effort to be more careful, dig deeper, do more thinking, reading, and searching for the truth in better, (but often less convenient), sources.

A further “advantage” for lazy Catholics, that get their information from Wikipedia, is that they do not risk the possibility that they might learn something which would require them to withstand opposition from the world in order to defend truth and Christ the King.

We are not saying that Wikipedia never ever says anything true – even Satan tells some truths/half-truths, for his own ends. But we urge everyone to remember whenever he is on Wikipedia (if ever) that he is in enemy-occupied territory, which exists to move the reader toward the left.

***Catholic Candle* note:** To assist parents in homeschooling, we call your attention to a new Traditional Catholic homeschool which is now accessible worldwide. Here is some information about this homeschool:

### ***Angelic Doctor Academy***

We would like to introduce *Angelic Doctor Academy*, a Traditional Catholic homeschool for grades 9 - 12 (lower grades coming soon). We think Traditional Catholics will appreciate our unique and militantly Traditional Catholic curriculum. We have written many new textbooks because we saw the problems in many books commonly used, whether they were history, science, or in other disciplines. We think Catholic parents – especially busy mothers – will appreciate our unique grading system in which we correct everything, including handwritten essays. This allows the parents to concentrate on teaching, explaining, and keeping order. Please visit <https://www.ada.school> to learn more. Mention that you are a *Catholic Candle* subscriber for a 10% discount on materials. Thank you!

*Catholic Candle*’s purpose is to promote and defend the Traditional Catholic Faith. Many of our Readers assist us in this task by spreading the word about *Catholic Candle* and by sharing email copies (or paper copies) of our monthly magazine. To those readers: thank you for your help promoting Traditional Catholic Faith and Practice! We

encourage the rest of our readers to share *Catholic Candle* with whoever would be interested. Anyone can subscribe to our free monthly magazine by emailing us this request or by subscribing on our website.