

The definitive study of the differences between the Traditional Catholic Church and the current leadership in Rome, resulting from the Second Vatican Council.



- Updated and revised edition;
- Addendum by Dr. Coomaswamy on Pope Benedict XVI;
- New Preface by Dr. Coomaswamy;
- New Foreword by Bishop Robert F. McKenna, O.P.;
- New Introduction by Bishop Thomas C. Fouhy.

“Brilliantly written and fully documented. The author shows clearly at what point, according to strictly traditional Catholic doctrine, obedience becomes a sin, and at what point authority, even that of a Pope, becomes null and void.”

—**Martin Lings**, author of *The Eleventh Hour*

“The Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians orders us to expose the unfruitful works of darkness. In *The Destruction of the Christian Tradition*, Dr. Coomaswamy does just that clearly, decisively, brilliantly and, I dare say, inspiringly; for against the ugly backdrop of the new religion, one is shocked into a greater realization of the beauty of the true Religion. The good doctor demonstrates in a compelling way that ours is a Catholic heritage that is truly precious. This book deserves to be disseminated far and wide.”

—**Rev. Father Clarence J. Kelly**, Superior, Eastern Division (U.S.A.), Society of Pius X

“This is a really definitive work on the subject—a subject we have all talked about without really pinning it down.”

—**Mary Martinez**, Vatican Correspondent and author of *From Rome Urgently*

“Vatican II was convoked at the worst possible moment, when Western civilization was passing through particularly heady throes of revolt against established systems—spiritual, social, and political. And unlike the previous Vatican Council, which proclaimed a thirty-year moratorium for sober reflection before passing on any of the decrees, the Vatican Council II rushed through its reforms while asking our indulgence in believing this haste to be the work of the Holy Spirit.”

—**Whitall N. Perry**, compiler of *A Treasury of Traditional Wisdom*

“Well written with great care taken in documentation and precision, this book should serve as a beacon to guide those lost in the Post-Conciliar confusion. It will also clarify the perspective and strengthen the faith of those who remain within the Traditional Church.”

—*Studies in Comparative Religion*

World Wisdom



\$28.95 US / \$37.95 CAN

ISBN-13: 978-0-941532-98-3
ISBN-10: 0-941532-98-4



Rama P.
Coomaraswamy



The Destruction of the
Christian Tradition

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Updated and revised by
Rama P. Coomaswamy



Foreword by Bishop Robert F. McKenna, O.P.
Introduction by Bishop Thomas C. Fouhy

**THE DESTRUCTION OF
THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION**

Cover: Front cover of the Lindau Gospels, 9th century

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION

Updated and Revised

Rama P. Coomaraswamy, M.D.

Foreword by

Bishop Robert F. McKenna, O.P.

Introduction by

Bishop Thomas C. Fouhy

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition: Updated and Revised
© 2006 World Wisdom, Inc.

All rights reserved.
No part of this book may be used or reproduced
in any manner without written permission,
except in critical articles and reviews.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Coomaraswamy, Rama P.

The destruction of the Christian tradition / Rama P. Coomaraswamy ; foreword
by Robert F. McKenna ; introduction by Thomas C. Fouhy.-- Updated and rev.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN-13: 978-0-941532-98-3 (pbk. : alk. paper)

ISBN-10: 0-941532-98-4 (pbk. : alk. paper) 1. Catholic Church--Doctrines. I.

Title.

BX1751.3.C66 2006

282--dc22

2005029769

Printed on acid-free paper in Canada.

For information address World Wisdom, Inc.
P. O. Box 2682, Bloomington, Indiana 47402-2682

www.worldwisdom.com

CONTENTS

Publisher's Note	vii
Foreword by Bishop Robert F. McKenna, O.P.	ix
Preface to the Second Edition by Rama P. Coomaraswamy	xi
Introduction by Bishop Thomas C. Fouhy	xiii
1. The Problem: Is it the Same Church?	1
2. The Magisterium of the Church and Related Issues	10
3. The Nature of Revelation—Scripture	45
4. Just What Is Meant by the Word “Tradition”?	62
5. The Nature of the Catholic Faith	78
6. The Attitude of the Magisterium Towards Innovation	96
7. Can a Pope Depart From Unity of Faith and Worship?	107
8. The Problem of Obedience	120
9. The Post-Conciliar “Popes”—Part I	132
10. The Post-Conciliar “Popes”—Part II	163
11. Vatican II	184
12. The Liturgical Revolution	230
13. The <i>Novus Ordo Missae</i>	255
14. Orders and the Destruction of the Apostolic Succession	303
15. Communism, “Ostpolitik,” and Liberation Theology	357
16. Modernism in the Church: The Road to Hell Is Paved With Good Intentions	384
Conclusion	406
Addendum: Benedict XVI	436
Biographical Notes	439

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The spiritual person of today faces a bewildering world. More than at any other time in history, a staggering variety of possibilities present themselves: one need only look at religious book departments at the local branch of any national book “superstore” to encounter thousands of titles which recommend themselves. From India to Indiana, many different forms of religious fundamentalism are on the rise, and this phenomenon—which ignores centuries of traditional teachings with profound scriptural, historical, and intellectual foundations, often to serve some political agenda—touches the world everywhere and flames the fires of fanaticism. At the other end of the spectrum is secular fundamentalism—the religion of no religion—which denies any Absolute, except its own absolute claim that everything is relative. There are also advocates of ecumenism, inter- and intra-faith dialogue, and ecological, feminist, racial, ethnic, and other special interest groups too numerous to mention. And then there is the new age movement which promises everything from spiritual realization to relief from stress. Apart from the most conservative forms of religion, most of these groups, whether their objective is the reconciliation of faith and science, world peace, equality for a minority, or a host of other goals, do so through revising Revelation and reinterpreting the teachings of the saints and sages to suit the times. The Reality of God is made secondary to the reality of man; and, sometimes, because it is terribly unfashionable to assert an Absolute Reality, God is altogether removed, as if He were an embarrassment of the past. Spatially speaking, by moving the Center to the periphery, those who would seek to “update” Eternal Truth cast their boats upon the sea of change and drift out ever further on the ebbing tide.

These few comments bring us to the remarkable book in hand. To the dilemma posed above, and in response to what has been called “the contradiction of relativism,” Fr. Dr. Rama Coomaraswamy responds with an adamant clarity and force of reasoning. He answers directly for the Catholic faithful, and secondarily for all believers who uphold religious orthodoxy, regardless of religious affiliation. *The Destruction of the Christian Tradition* tells the story of the betrayal of the holy Catholic Church, undoubtedly one of the defining events of the latter half of the twentieth century. Exposing the massive secularist objectives which framed the Second Vatican Council, Fr. Dr. Coomaraswamy dismantles, brick by brick, an edifice of lies and theological half-truths which traded the wheat for the chaff, and he pulverizes the false gods of progressivism, evolutionism, scientism, ecumenism, secular humanism, and Marxism, all of which the

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Vatican II Church invited to hold places of honor within its inner sanctum. Outlining the descending course of events leading the Church hierarchy to turn its back upon the saving doctrines and sacraments which illuminated the lives of centuries of saints and led centuries of the faithful to salvation, these pages guide the reader through the history of degeneration of the Church through one compromise after another. All of these compromises were made in view of ultimately replacing the timeless Revelation of God with the ephemeral reason of man, and even worse, with the fashionable thought of the day.

Faithful Catholics will find in these chapters a path of return to their true Church. And all religious people should be grateful for this book because the forces of secular relativism, which Fr. Dr. Coomaraswamy so clearly exposes, undermine the basis of all religion. For faithful Catholics who have a longing for the true doctrines of the traditional Church, this book provides a map tracing a journey from the dark labyrinth of error and deception into the sunlit world of a religion which was the fountain of peace, beauty, and salvation for generations of faithful men and women during the last two thousand years.

World Wisdom
January 2005

FOREWORD

It is good to see a revision of this monumental work of Dr. Rama Coomaraswamy. It was the first of many studies he has since written in the last twenty-five years on the changes wrought by the Second Vatican Council. He has been a leading light for Catholics refusing to accept this new *Reformationem*—the “Traditionalists” as they quickly became known.

The year 2005 marks the fortieth since the close of the Council. We are well into the second generation of Catholics who have not known traditional Catholicism and live in woeful ignorance of it—if indeed they still “practice” the Faith at all. It is reckoned that about 50% have fallen away.

Tradition is indeed the keynote. Doctrine and Discipline are two aspects of the Catholic religion. Doctrine regards the teachings of the Church—the Faith itself—and Discipline its laws and customs. With Discipline is bound up sacred tradition, which in the words of the Catechism of the Council of Trent “is the interpreter and guardian of Catholic truth.” Traditions are not “changed;” they are either kept or discarded—destroyed. Destroy Christian (Catholic) Tradition—immemorial, if not Apostolic ceremonies, laws, and practices of the Church—and you undermine the Church itself.

Such was the strategy of the modernists who, under the aegis of John XXIII’s *aggiornamento* (“updating”), quickly seized control of his “Vatican II” Council. Doctrine by its nature is unchangeable but not Discipline. Laws made by the Church herself (ecclesiastical laws) can be changed by the Church. The most that could be done by the decrees of the Council doctrinally was to make the Church’s teaching ambiguous; but, under the guise of “updating” her legislation, the liberal Bishops of the Council, guided by their *periti* theologians, laid the groundwork in those decrees for overthrowing Tradition itself. The revision of the Mass and sacraments came in the wake of the Council.

All this is well documented and footnoted here by Dr. Coomaraswamy. The ensuing quarter century since its first publication serves to confirm how correctly he discerned the true aim of the Council. May this second edition of *The Destruction of the Christian Tradition* serve to awaken those Catholics who still sit in darkness of the imposter “Conciliar Church” and the shadow of death.

Bishop Robert F. McKenna, O.P.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

Even though the first edition was published some twenty-five years ago, I still get requests for copies. In bringing out a second updated and revised edition, very little has changed. Nor, in the space of almost three decades has anyone challenged the contents of the book. For example, the contents of the chapter dealing with Orders has been published in several languages and to the best of my knowledge has never been contradicted or challenged. The changes made in this second edition are quite minimal and consist mostly in the footnote references.

I would like to thank the innumerable people who have assisted in providing information and/or insight into the problems discussed. While it is not possible to mention all of them, I would in particular like to mention Patrick Omlor whose work on the changes in the consecratory prayers of the Mass was exemplary and Fr. Wathen whose “The Great Sacrilege” was particularly helpful. I would also like to thank Daniel Matthews whose willingness to edit the text as offered on the Internet made possible this second edition.

Rama P. Coomaraswamy, M.D.

INTRODUCTION

This remarkable book gives in detail the steps taken by the evil powers of Satan amongst men to destroy the magnificent infallible Church founded by Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. The amount of research and study and concentration the author has put into this fine book is quite amazing. The reader will gain richly in mind and in fervor by a careful study of these pages. In these days we hear everywhere people asking the question: What has become of order and peace in our world? And certain Catholic people called “Traditionalists,” are asking: How is it possible that the Catholic Church has changed so incredibly during the last forty years? Both questions are practical, important, and related.

The short answer to the first is simply this: The Ten Commandments of God have been rejected because God himself has been rejected by the overwhelming majority of mankind, and therefore the very basis of law and order no longer exists. The Almighty Infinite God and Creator of all things visible and invisible has been blasphemously cast out, denied by His proud infinitesimal creature called Man.

Again, we ask: Why? Well, that is because the most evil angelic creature, Satan, defined by Jesus Christ as “the liar, and father of lies, and a murderer from the beginning” deceived mankind in the person of Adam, the first man created, and with him all human creatures, and has led us into disobedience of all God’s laws. The sad story is clearly revealed to us in Genesis. You cannot expect order or peace when the conditions on which they rest have been demolished; and that same Satan is still with us, and continues working at his masterpiece of deception and hate, and will do so until the end of time and the General Judgment.

But there is yet another most important reason for the chaos that now afflicts human society. It is precisely the answer to that second question—how to explain the changes in the Catholic Church over the last forty years? The most noble Catholic Church seemingly still exists with its official headquarters in Rome, as usual, with a “pope” called Benedict XVI in union with bishops all around the world, along with priests and religious societies. But, I repeat, it is not possible or reasonable to call this recent establishment the true, original, traditional Catholic Church founded on St. Peter by Jesus Christ, the all-holy Son of God in the year A.D. 33.

Our Lord assured us that “a bad tree cannot bear good fruit.” This is the new establishment come into existence with the illegal Second Vatican Council (1962-1965), a diabolical, hateful event resulting in worldwide apostasy. As a result this new institution can no longer be called “The

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Church,” or “My Church” as Jesus called it: “Upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell (Satan) shall not prevail against it.”

Today’s Roman “Church” is the latest universal Protestant establishment, excelling greatly in size and in Satanic authority the so-called Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century by the apostate monk Martin Luther. What a notable victory the “gates of hell” have gained here! About the time of the Second Vatican Council, there were about six hundred million Catholics worldwide. Over many years liberalism, modernism, and heresy crept into the bosom of the Church, and Pope St. Pius X, in a famous encyclical, gave a clear and anxious warning, which was regrettably ignored by the world’s bishops until the powers of evil—Freemasonry and communism—had successfully organized and set in motion this Council, the result of which is the Conciliar Apostate Church of today. As our Lady at La Salette warned us in 1846: “Rome will lose the Faith . . . and become the seat of antichrist.”

What has become of the original, true Catholic Church? Is it still in existence? Of course it is! Jesus said: “I will be with you all days even to the consummation of the world.” But instead of the former six hundred million members in 1960, it is now a tiny remnant numbering perhaps—a fair estimate—only one quarter of a million. The Satanic Council has created a moral and dogmatic tsunami which has killed many millions of immortal souls, and will continue to do so. Our Lady’s warning has obviously come to pass.

Indeed, Vatican II is the main cause. Certain so-called “popes” bear the shameful responsibility—John XXIII who convoked the “pastoral” Council; then Paul VI, the greatest disaster in the long history of the Church; John Paul I, who intended to follow Vatican II’s direction; and “pope” John Paul II, who in his long reign so intensely ecumenized the Church. And what does the future hold? Where is a new traditional Pope to be found? All the cardinals have lost the Faith and belong to the new false establishment and therefore cannot act as a source for choosing a valid successor to St. Peter, Vicar of our Lord Jesus Christ and the visible and infallible Head of the one true Church on earth. Where does that leave us? It would seem to require the unmistakable intervention of God Himself. In fact, some prophecies have said that Saints Peter and Paul will return and choose the next valid Pope. That may well be the best solution to this serious problem. Let us pray earnestly and offer up our Rosaries for it.

A few more words about John Paul II. He was clearly not a true Pope. He taught ecumenism. He discouraged the old rite of the Mass, now called the Tridentine Mass (as it was required by the Council of Trent), and said the new, invalid *Novus Ordo Missae*. He was therefore not a Catholic. Putting it

Introduction

in simple terms, he did not clearly and firmly exercise the supreme authority that Jesus gave to Peter because he was not a valid successor to St. Peter. The throne of Peter is vacant. If you read *The Devil's Final Battle* by Fr. Paul Kramer, you will see documented the destructive apostate cardinals that John Paul appointed to top positions (Congregations) in the Vatican. Their objective can only be to destroy the true Church, which is exactly what they are doing. If he was a true Pope he would have excommunicated them without hesitation and without mercy. Moreover, he neglected the clear wish of Our Blessed Lady at Fatima, which was so effectively underlined by the great miracle of the Sun on October 23, 1917, and refused to make known to the world the Third Secret of Fatima, but allowed lies to be spread about it. It is too late now for this "Pope and the apostate bishops in union with him" to consecrate Russia to the Immaculate heart of Mary (as Our Lady directed) because they are no longer Catholic. Had this been properly done, the shocking tragedy of world-wide apostasy would not, could not, have taken place. Russia would have been converted, and peace would have returned to our poor world. We have Our Blessed Lady's assurance about this happy event.

All these points have been beautifully and fully developed in this most readable second edition of this already famous book—*The Destruction of the Christian Tradition* by Rama P. Coomaraswamy, M.D. It gives in detail the steps taken by the evil power of Satan among men to destroy the magnificent, infallible Church founded by Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. It is essential reading for anyone who wishes to find answers to the two questions posed at the beginning of this introduction.

The Most Reverend Bishop Thomas C. Fouhy,
Napier, New Zealand

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM: IS IT THE SAME CHURCH?

Vatican II can be described as a turning point in the history of the Catholic Church. Prior to this event the Church considered herself a “perfect society” in no need of change. Existing both now and in eternity, she called herself “the Church of all times.” After the Second Vatican Council, she described herself as “dynamic,” “progressive,” a “new Church,” and a “Church of our times.” She claimed to be adapting herself and Christ’s message to the conditions of the modern world.¹

But she sent out a mixed message. In the face of the drastic modernizations introduced, she also claimed that “nothing essential was changed” and that “she was only returning to primitive practice.” While many accepted these assertions without thought, others found them self-contradictory. The net result was a confusion of loyalties which the subsequent forty-five years have done little to alleviate.

Human reason tells us that Truth—assuming that such a thing exists—cannot change. Catholics hold to certain truths by definition, namely, that Jesus Christ is God, that He established a “visible” Church which He promised would continue until the end of time, and that this Church is the Catholic Church.² They further hold—or should—that this Church preserves intact and teaches the truths and practices Christ revealed.³ It is a matter of faith that only within this Church is to be found the fullness of Christ’s teaching, the Apostolic Succession, and the sacraments which are a visible “means of grace.”⁴

Throughout history there have been many who denied that the Catholic Church was the entity that Christ established—denied it on the grounds that she had added false doctrines invented by men; that she had distorted the original message (which amounts to the same thing); or that she failed to retain the original deposit intact. If she is guilty of such, she by definition departs from “unity” with the original body—the “One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.” If we are to call ourselves “Catholic”—and our salvation depends upon our adhering to her teachings—then we must be sure that our beliefs and actions conform to what Christ and the Apostles originally taught.⁵ Putting it differently, if we would call ourselves Catholic we must be sure that we are in the same Church which Christ founded, and that this Church has faithfully retained the original “deposit of the faith” given over to it by Christ and the Apostles.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

No one disputes the fact that after Vatican II, the Catholic Church was different.⁶ The fundamental question is whether the changes introduced were mere “window dressing,” or whether they involved fundamental points of doctrine and practice. If the latter is the case, one would be forced to conclude that the post-Conciliar Church is no longer the same as its pre-Vatican II counterpart.⁷

The problem can be posed on many levels—that of doctrine: Whether she has retained intact the Revelation which Christ and the Apostles entrusted to her as a “precious pearl”; whether or not her liturgy is valid in the same sense that it has always been considered such; whether or not her new Canon laws are consistent with those by which she governed herself throughout the ages; whether or not she has retained intact the Apostolic succession; and whether or not those who have sat in the chair of Peter since Vatican II speak with Peter’s voice (authority). The answer to the query posed at the start of this chapter—“Is it the same Church?”—will by and large depend upon the answers given to these questions. In general, it can be stated that traditional Catholics claim it is not, while those who would accept and justify the changes introduced by Vatican II and the post-Conciliar “Popes” strongly argue that it is.⁸ This leads us to a series of secondary questions: Did Christ intend that His Church should continuously adapt itself to changing circumstances? Are there certain areas where adaptation is legitimate, and others where it becomes a distortion of the original message? Are the changes introduced since Vatican II significant or are they just a matter of minor details? Do the Popes, as Vicars of Christ on earth, have the authority to make these changes? Is it possible that the Catholic Church, over the course of centuries, has deviated from the patterns established by her Founder to such a degree that it was incumbent upon her present leaders to bring her back to some original state of purity? This book will attempt to answer these questions.

Immediately we have a problem. Who is to speak for the Church? People who claim the title of Catholic no longer constitute an intellectually coherent group of individuals. Catholics today can be roughly divided into those that are “traditional” and those who are “post-Conciliar”—though even here the lines of demarcation are far from distinct. And post-Conciliar or “*Novus Ordo*” Catholics conform to a spectrum that ranges from “conservative” to “liberal,” while traditional Catholics vary in how they view the recent “Popes.”⁹ The problem is that each of these groups claims to represent the “true” Church and quote the documents of the Church in defense of their particular view. In an attempt to sort out the issues we shall quote only unequivocal sources of information. However, there is this caveat: The pre-Conciliar sources are invariably unambiguous and to the point. The post-Conciliar documents are verbose and ambiguous, and

The Problem: Is it the Same Church?

can be quoted on both sides of any issue. Given this situation, selection is unavoidable. We shall attempt to be as just as possible.

The Catholic faith can be described as an interconnected series of “facts” that, taken in conjunction with one another, form a consistent body of teachings and practice. It is as hard to isolate any one aspect of “the Faith” from the total content, as it is to determine where a spider’s web originates. Yet one has to start somewhere, and so it is that we initiate this study with what is called the “Magisterium” or the “teaching authority” of the Church. For those who are unfamiliar with this concept, let it be stated at once that this “teaching authority” follows as a logical consequence of Christ’s establishing a “visible” Church. In doing this, He established a hierarchical institution and intended that this entity—the “Mystical Body of Christ”—be an extension of His presence on earth (Eph. 5:23). As such, this Church, by her very nature, has the function and obligation of preserving intact and delivering to us the Message (teachings and inculcated practices) of Christ. “Going therefore, teach ye all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you” (Matt. 28:19-20). Those entrusted with this function of “feeding His sheep . . . in His name” were given no authority to teach any other truth “in His name” than that which He Himself established. Hence He also said, “He that heareth you heareth me” (Luke 10:10). It further follows that, as the Apostle Paul put it: “Even if an angel from heaven should teach you a gospel besides that which you have received, let him be anathema. . . . For I give you to understand, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not according to man; for neither did I receive it of man, nor did I learn it; but by the Revelation of Jesus Christ” (Gal. 1:6-12).

THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH’S MAGISTERIUM

In order to enable His Church to teach in His Name, he left us, not written works,¹⁰ but rather a “living Magisterium” (“the Pope and the bishops in union with Him”) which He endowed with His authority and to which He promised His assistance. This function, the transmission of the “deposit of the faith,” constitutes Tradition (literally, “what is handed down”) and hence the true Church and the Magisterium are by their very nature traditional.¹¹

The Church teaches and has always taught that there is a divine Tradition, that is the sum of truths which have been divinely revealed to the Apostles, has been handed down without error through the genuine Magisterium of Pastors.¹²

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Before considering the nature of this teaching authority to which all Catholics owe assent, it is important to stress that it is dependent, not on man, but on God. It follows that the teaching of the Magisterium is infallibly true. If it is not, then it is Christ who has lied to us. Defenders of the post-Conciliar Church often state that the Magisterium of the Church resides “in the Pope and the Bishops in union with him.” Such a statement, while true, cannot be taken in isolation. Used to defend the changes in doctrine, rites, and laws that this new Church has introduced, it becomes a classical case of *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*. The statement is true only when the Pope and the bishops in union with him have themselves, in their function as *depositi custodias* (guardians of the “deposit” of the faith as in 1 Tim. 6:20), in no way departed from or gone against that which was delivered to the Church by Christ and the Apostles.¹³

This principle has been expressed in a variety of ways. One of the clearest is that the hierarchy—those responsible for preserving and expounding the Magisterium must be members of the believing Church before they can become members of the teaching Church. The Pope, in his function as Vicar of Christ, is “one hierarchical person” with our divine Master. As such, he cannot teach other than our Master would, and cannot but be a member of the believing Church. It is because the Pope is in union with Christ that the bishops must be in union with him and we the laity (who have no teaching function as such) in turn with them.¹⁴

The Church has always taught that an individual Pope can stray from sound doctrine in his personal and public life.¹⁵ Should this be the case prior to his election, the election is deemed invalid;¹⁶ should he openly embrace doctrines that contradict this deposit after his election, and obstinately adhere to them, he would become a public heretic, and as such he would no longer be Pope.¹⁷ Such is only logical since, from the moment he publicly embraced heresy with obstinacy, he would cease to be a believing Catholic or the Pope, to say nothing of being Christ’s representative and a “*Pontifex*” or “bridge” between this world and the next. The oft-quoted maxim of St. Ambrose to the effect that “where Peter is, there is the Church” is valid only insofar as “Peter” remains rooted in orthodoxy or “pure faith and sound doctrine.”¹⁸ And when he is not, then as Cardinal Cajetan taught, “Neither is the Church in him, nor is he in the Church.”¹⁹ Cornelius Lapide, S.J., puts it bluntly:

Were the Pope to fall into public heresy, he would *ipso facto* cease to be Pope, yea, even to be a Christian believer.²⁰

Again, even in our times people place a high value on “moral purity.” Orthodoxy is “intellectual purity,” and as such an indispensable prelude

The Problem: Is it the Same Church?

to grace. Seen in this light—and far from “telling other people what to believe”—orthodoxy is no more than a reference to the primacy and priority of truth.

Thus the Pope and his function is limited precisely by that authority which is the basis of his own authority. As Christ’s representative on earth his monarchical function and quasi-absolute power to command is limited by the fact that he must act, not on his own behalf (which would be despotism), but on behalf of Christ, his Lord and Master. Vatican I teaches this in a *de fide* manner:

The Holy Spirit is not promised to the successors of Peter so that, through His revelation, they might bring new doctrines to light, but that, with His help, they might keep inviolate and faithfully expound the revelation handed down through the Apostles, the deposit of faith.²¹

This teaching of the Church is made particularly clear in the statement of Pope Pius XII:

Nor against this may anyone argue that the primacy of jurisdiction established in the Church gives such a Mystical Body two heads. For Peter in virtue of his primacy is only Christ’s Vicar; so that there is only one chief Head of this Body, namely Christ (*Mystici Corporis Christi*).

If we are to be in submission to the “teaching authority of the Church,” it is essential, in these latter days, when so many of our shepherds are walking “after their own [pseudo-intellectual] lusts,” when they have become “men speaking perverse things,” “vain talkers and seducers . . . erring and driving into error;”²² that we define these and related entities with clarity. Our failure to do so will only result in our giving assent to what is false, or else of our ascribing to “obedience” a false meaning that subverts the truth itself. The Church has never asked us to give our assent to error, or to submit to illegal and sinful commands in the name of “obedience.” We owe obedience to Christ—“one must obey God rather than man” (Acts 5:29)—and if we owe obedience to any authority in the Church it is precisely because that authority represents Christ. Should someone command or teach something in the name of Jesus that is manifestly against what God commands and teaches, we would be bound to disobey them and reject their novel doctrine.²³ As St. Ignatius of Antioch stated in his *Epistle to the Ephesians* in sub-Apostolic times:

Do not err, my brethren. . . . If a man by false teaching corrupt the faith of God, for the sake of which Jesus Christ was crucified, such a one shall go in his foulness to the unquenchable fire, as shall also he who listens to him.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Under normal circumstances the Popes and the bishops in union with him would take great care to teach only what had always been taught. They function to preserve and interpret the Magisterium. If in their definitions they seemingly add to the body of the Church's teaching, it is never in contradiction to what has already been taught because truth can never contradict itself. (There are circumstances where a pontiff must teach magisterially about issues that arise—as for example when the birth control pill became available, Pius XII taught that it could be used for medical reasons, but not as a means of birth control.) If in the present situation we find that there is a conflict between what is being magisterially taught today and what has always been taught in the past, then it is by the constant teaching of the Church that the present hierarchy must be judged. A Catholic cannot judge another person's soul, but he is obliged to judge another person's teaching. If he could not distinguish between what is Catholic and what is not, he would have no obligation to be a Catholic. To judge that what is being taught today by the post-Conciliar Church contradicts the constant teaching of the Church for the last two thousand years is not to judge anyone's soul but to fulfill our responsibility as Catholics.

Notes

¹ Certainly many of the forces let loose at the Second Vatican Council had been at work in the Church over the past two to three hundred years—if not from the very moment of her foundation. Vatican II brought those forces into the heart of the Church and made them part of her official teaching.

² A Church must be “visible” or we could never be able to identify it as such. We identify this Church by means of her teachings and practices which have been constant throughout the ages. Protestants believe in an “invisible” Church, or rather, several invisible Churches.

³ Strictly speaking, Revelation ended with the death of the last Apostle.

⁴ Melchior Canus, a theologian at the time of the Council of Trent (1545-1563), capsulated this principle in the following terms: “We have only one master or doctor, Jesus Christ, both God and man, the same yesterday and today. It is through Him that God the Father has done all things. . . . Jesus Christ is thus the primary source of all truth and all certain knowledge, both in the natural and supernatural order. . . . Insofar as this Church represents God on earth, insofar as God Himself is incorporated in her, this Church is the natural and supernatural necessary and infallible organ of the faith and of divine reason” (quoted by Rohrbacher, *Histoire Universelle de L'Église Catholique* [Letouzey et Ane, Éditeurs: Paris], Vol. 10, p. 118).

⁵ This book is written by a Catholic primarily for Catholics. Protestants intrinsically recognize this principle in that they claim to be returning to the original Christianity. It is their belief that throughout the ages the Catholic Church has distorted and changed the original “deposit” beyond recognition. The term “Catholic” means universal. It is pertinent

The Problem: Is it the Same Church?

to quote St. Augustine on this point: “We must hold fast to the Christian religion, and the communion of that church which is Catholic, and is called Catholic not only by her own children, but even by all her enemies. The heretics and followers of schisms, whenever they talk not with their own but with strangers, despite themselves, call nothing else the Catholic Church but the Catholic. For they cannot be understood unless they call her by the name which she bears throughout the world” (*Lib. de Unit. Eccl.*, Chap. 7, n. 12).

⁶ As one quip put it: “In the pre-Vatican II Church nothing changed but the bread and wine. In the post-Vatican II Church everything changed except the bread and the wine.”

⁷ Many Catholics who adhere to the “new” Church—the Church after Vatican II, object to the title “post-Conciliar.” However, it is the hierarchy of this new Church which has itself coined this designation. It was used by Paul VI’s representatives sent to remonstrate with Archbishop Lefebvre at Ecône. Paul VI has also used the phrase “Church of the Council” and John XXIII called it a “new Pentecost.” Not to be outdone, John Paul II has called it a “new Advent.”

⁸ It would be more accurate to say that traditional Catholics believe the true Church cannot change, while modernists, who deny the fixity of truth, and hold that religion is a matter of “feeling,” believe it can. The majority of post-Conciliar Catholics have been unconcerned with these principles and have gone along with the changes because they find them easy to accept. The new Church makes far fewer demands on its members.

⁹ Many conservative post-Conciliar Catholics describe themselves as traditional. The phrase “*Novus Ordo* Catholics” follows from the fact that they attend the New Order of the Mass. By and large traditional Catholics insist on the traditional rites of the Church, but differ on whether or not they accept the post-Conciliar “Popes” as Catholic. Inevitably confusion reigns.

¹⁰ The Scriptures were written down at various times after his death—the Apocalypse some 80 years later. The Canon of Scripture was not put together till the year 397. Hence Scripture is seen by the Church as an aspect of Tradition rather than as an entity existing by itself.

¹¹ The word “traditional” comes from the Latin *trado*, to hand down. The word “religion” comes from the Latin *religare*, to bind. One can speak of being “bound” to Tradition, but in reality this is nothing other than to be bound to the origin or center, that is, to the “Word” which “was in the beginning.” To conform to Tradition is to keep faith with the origin; it is to dwell in the primordial purity and in the universal norm. Protestants base their beliefs on Scripture alone, while for Catholics Scripture is part of Tradition.

¹² Tanqueray, *Dogmatic Theology* (Desclee: N.Y., 1959).

¹³ As the French Bishops stated in their 1976 Congress at Lourdes, a meeting convened to discuss the terrible crisis facing the Church in France: “The unity of the Church comes before everything else and is guaranteed only by being at one with the Pope. To deny this is to exclude oneself from this unity.” Another example is provided by Fr. Normandin in *A Priest Out in the Cold*: When the Most Rev. Paul Gregoire, Archbishop of Montreal, deprived Fr. Normandin of his parish because he insisted upon offering the traditional mass, the bishop said: “My conscience imposes a serious obligation on me to obey my superior, the Pope. I prefer to be wrong with him rather than to be right against him.” Either the Archbishop doesn’t know his theology, or he isn’t a Catholic.

¹⁴ Laymen do not have a public teaching function, though of course they have an obligation to teach those under their authority such as family members, and must be able to respond to questions posed to them even by casual acquaintances.

¹⁵ The Pope’s “infallibility” does not make him a robot. He has free will and like the rest of us is fully capable of sinning.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

¹⁶ Pope Paul IV, in his Apostolic constitution *Cum ex Apostolatus officio* (1559) states that, “if ever it should happen that . . . a reigning Roman Pontiff, having deviated from the faith, or having fallen into some heresy prior to his nomination . . . as Pope . . . , the election is null and void, even if all the Cardinals have unanimously consented to it. It cannot become valid . . . despite the crowning of the individual, despite the signs of office that surround him, despite the rendering of obeisance to him by all, and no matter how long the situation continues, no one can consider the election as valid in any way. Nor can it confer, nor does it confer, any power to command in either the spiritual or temporal realms. . . . All their words, all their actions, all their resolutions, and all that results from them, have no juridical power and absolutely no force of law. Such individuals . . . elected under such circumstances, are deprived of all their dignity, position, honor, title, function, and power from the very beginning.”

¹⁷ Cardinal St. Bellarmine teaches: “*Papa hereticus est depositus*.” A Pope may of course be in error on a given point, but may retract when his error is pointed out. (He has theologians to consult with so as to avoid such mistakes.) What is required is that he persist in an error after being made aware that it is an error, or to use the theological term, that he be a *formal* and not just a *material* heretic. This “formality” adds the sin of “obstinacy” to the heresy. Pope Honorius I was condemned by the Third Council of Constantinople, the Sixth Ecumenical, in the following terms: “After having taken account of the fact that they (his letters to Sergius and Sergius’ writings) are not in conformity with Apostolic dogma, and the definitions of the Holy Councils and all the Fathers worthy of approbation, and that, on the contrary, they uphold false and heretical doctrines, we reject them absolutely and denounce them as a grave threat to the salvation of souls. . . . It is our judgment that Honorius, formerly Pope of Rome, has been cast out of God’s Holy Catholic Church and made anathema.” Pope Leo (d. 683) on whom fell the necessity of confirming such statements, wrote: “We declare anathema those who instigated these new errors . . . [including] Pope Honorius who was shown to be incapable of enlightening this Apostolic Church by the doctrine of Apostolic Tradition, in that he allowed its immaculate faith to be blemished by a sacrilegious betrayal.” All admit that there was no obstinacy in his error, and the majority that the letter, being private, was not a papal act and hence not *ex cathedra*. Most hold that Leo II condemned him for his carelessness, but did not anathematize him (See *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1908). Pope Paschal II (1099-1118), having been imprisoned by the Emperor Henry V, was forced to make concessions and promises that were impossible to reconcile with Catholic principles (relating to the investiture of ecclesiastics by temporal rulers), and St. Bruno, Guido of Burgundy, the Archbishop of Vienna, the future Pope Callistus II, as well as St. Hugh of Grenoble (among others) told him that “should you, in spite of our absolutely refusing to believe it possible, choose an alternative path and refuse ratification of our decision (that you must retract the agreements with Henry V), may God protect you, for were this to be the case, we should be forced to withdraw our allegiance from you.” The Pope retracted. Other examples could be given (Rohrbacher, *Histoire Universelle*, Vol. 6, p. 380).

¹⁸ “Pure faith and sound doctrine” is the *Catholic Encyclopedia*’s (1908) definition of the term “orthodoxy.” The modernist attempt to paint orthodoxy as a sort of fanatical rigidity belies the fact that there are certain things about which we are meant to be rigid. If we were not meant to be rigid about the truth, we would not have had any martyrs. “What came ye out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken in the wind?” (Matt. 11:7). The Church is founded upon a rock, and not on shifting sands.

¹⁹ Cited by Journet in *L’Église du Verbe incarné* (Sheed and Ward: London/New York, 1954), Vol. II, p. 840.

The Problem: Is it the Same Church?

²⁰ Cornelius Lapide, S.J. (d. 1637), *Commentaria in Scriptura Sacram* (Parisiis, Ludovicus Vives, 1893). This commentary, running to some thirty volumes, is one of the great masterpieces of the traditional Church. Unfortunately, only those on the New Testament have been translated into English. This is the common teaching of the Church. “As Cajetan says, ‘He who is not a Christian can in no way be the Pope.’ He cannot be the head who is in no way a member and he who is not a member is not a Christian. But a manifest heretic is in no way a Christian as says Cyprian in his Book IV, Epist. 2; as says St. Athanasius in his second sermon against the Arians; as says St. Augustine in his book *De gratia Christi*, Chapter 20; as says St. Jerome (*contra Lucifer*) and many others. Hence it follows that a manifest heretic cannot be the Pope” (Fr. Joaquin Saenz y Arriaga, *Sede Vacante—Paulo VI no es legitimo Papa* [Editores Asociados, Urraza: Mexico, 1973], p. 112). Canon Law clearly states that “a cleric who publicly abandons the Catholic faith loses every ecclesiastical office *ipso facto* and without any declaration” (2314). The subject will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 7.

²¹ Henry Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, a classical source of Catholic doctrine, cited hereafter as Denzinger. The English translation, entitled *The Sources of Catholic Dogma* (B. Herder: N.Y., 1955) is in some places defective.

²² These phrases are Scriptural and are cited from the introductory paragraphs of Pope St. Pius X’s encyclical *Pascendi* against the modernists. The *didaskolai* (as in the Second Letter of Paul to Timothy) have, to paraphrase St. Vincent of Lerins, “always been with us, are with us now, and always will be with us.”

²³ As St. Francis de Sales said: “Obedience is a moral virtue which depends upon justice.” (Faith, Hope, and Charity are theological virtues, and therefore of a higher order.) Even the Jesuit vow of obedience states: “. . . in all things, except what your conscience tells you would be sinful.” As St. Thomas Aquinas says: “It sometimes happens that commands issued by prelates are against God; therefore, in all things are prelates not to be obeyed. . . . Not in all things are prelates to be followed, but only in those things which accord with the rules which Christ has laid down” (*Summa* II-II, Q. 104, Art. 5, and his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* 2:14). As St. Catherine of Siena wrote to Pope Gregory XI: “Alas Holy Father, there are some times when obedience can lead directly to damnation.” She proceeded to quote to him the Scriptural passage: “If the blind lead the blind, they shall both fall into a pit” (*Lettres de St. Catherine de Sienne* [Editions P. Tequi: Paris, 1886], Letter I). The virtue of obedience is stressed in Catholicism because it is a means to interior perfection, but such is true only within the bounds of a traditional setting. It should not be forgotten that Satan also has those who obey his commands.

CHAPTER 2

THE MAGISTERIUM OF THE CHURCH AND RELATED ISSUES

Before embarking on a study of the Magisterium we should pause for a moment lest the present confusion within the Catholic Church tempt us to an attitude of despair. The present confusions have their purpose, even though we, with our limited outlook, cannot always understand. As St. Paul explains: “To them that love God all things work together unto good” (Rom. 8:28) and St. Augustine adds “*etiam peccata*, even sins.” In the same sense, in the *Exultet*, on Holy Saturday, the Church sings: “*Felix culpa, quae talem ac tantum meruit Redemptorem*—O happy fault [of our first parents], that merited so great a Redeemer.” As Augustine says: “God in His wisdom has deemed it better that good should come out of evil than that evil should never have been.” God has the power and wisdom to turn to His own glory the evil that He permits on earth. Angels and saints can take only joy from the divine wisdom that rules the world so wonderfully.¹

Holy Mother Church, like the loving mother she is, has provided us with the necessary guidelines on how to think and behave in the present circumstances. These are provided for us in what is called her teaching Magisterium. The present chapter is dedicated to an understanding of the nature and purpose of the Authentic Magisterium of the Catholic Church.²

The Church, which is the “Body of Christ,” is as it were the presence of Christ in the world.³ Now Christ combined in Himself and bestowed on His Apostles whom He “sent forth” the three qualities of Teacher (Prophet), Ruler, and Priest (Sanctification)—symbolized in His Vicar by the triple crown or papal tiara.

With regard to this Christ told us that, “He who believed in Him would know the truth which gives true liberty” (John 8:31), but he who did not would be condemned (Matt. 10:33; Mark 16:16). He allowed Himself to be called the Master and even stressed that He was the true Master who not only taught the truth, but was the Truth (Matt. 8:19, 23:8-10; John 3:17, and Matt. 13:8-10). He communicated these truths to his Apostles and sent them forth to teach in His name, telling them that “just as my Father sent me, so also I send you,” and telling them: “He who hears you hears me, and he who rejects your words, rejects me, and he who rejects me rejects the Father who sent me” (Matt. 10:40; Luke 10:16). And so we see that the

The Magisterium of the Church and Related Issues

Apostles were given the charge of continuing Christ's mission as infallible Master. He promised that "the Spirit of Truth would always be with them." Moreover, Christ demanded an absolute obedience to His teaching, for He said, "he who does not believe will be condemned." It goes without saying that He specified that it must always be His and not some other person's teaching—for He said through the mouth of His Apostle John that even if an angel from heaven taught some other doctrine, it was to be rejected. He further admonished them, saying: "Therefore go ye into all nations and teach them to safeguard all that I have taught you. And I will be with you till the end of the world" (Matt. 12:18-20).

Perhaps the most important error abroad today relates to the teaching authority of the Church; specifically to the idea that the Ordinary Magisterium of the Church is not infallible. Lest there be doubt about this, let us listen to Pope Leo XIII:

Wherefore, as appears from what has been said, Christ instituted in the Church a living, authoritative, and permanent Magisterium, which by His own power He strengthened, by the Spirit of truth He taught, and by miracles confirmed. He willed and ordered, under the gravest penalties, that its teachings should be received as if they were His own. As often therefore, as it is declared on the authority of this teaching that this or that is contained in the deposit of divine revelation, it must be believed by everyone as true. If it could in any way be false, an evident contradiction follows: for then God Himself would be the author of error in man. The Fathers of the Vatican Council [I] laid down nothing new, but followed divine revelation and the acknowledged and invariable teaching of the Church as to the very nature of faith, when they decreed as follows: "All those things are to be believed by divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the written or unwritten word of God, and which are proposed by the Church as divinely revealed, either by a solemn definition or in the exercise of the ordinary and universal Magisterium" (*Satis Cognitum*).

Because the Magisterium provides us with the only solid objective criteria by which we may judge what is true and false, it is important that we examine its nature in greater detail.

The *Catholic Dictionary* defines the Magisterium as:

The Church's divinely appointed authority to teach the truths of religion. "Going therefore teach ye all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. 28: 19-20). This teaching, being Christ's, is infallible.⁴

This Magisterium or "teaching authority of the Church," exists in two different modes. It is termed *Solemn* or *Extraordinary* when it derives from

the formal and authentic definitions of a General council, or of the Pope himself: that is to say, dogmatic definitions of the Ecumenical councils, or of the Pope's teaching *ex cathedra*. Such truths are *de fide divina et Catholica*, which means that every Catholic must believe them with divine and Catholic Faith.⁵

Included under the category of *Solemn* are “symbols or professions of the faith,” such as the Apostles' Creed, the Tridentine or Pianine Profession, and the so-called “Oath Against Modernism” required by Pius X since 1910 (and no longer required by the post-Conciliar Church).⁶ Finally, included in this category are “theological censures,” or those statements that qualify and condemn propositions as heretical.⁷

It is termed *Ordinary* and *Universal* when it manifests itself as those truths which are expressed through the daily continuous teaching of the Church and refers to the universal practices of the Church connected with faith and morals as manifested in the “unanimous consent of the Fathers, the decisions of the Roman Congregations concerning faith and morals, in the consensus of the faithful, in the universal custom or practice associated with dogma (which certainly includes the Roman liturgy or traditional Mass), and in the various historical documents in which the faith is declared.”⁸ Included in this category are Papal encyclicals.⁹ It is termed *Pontifical* if the source is the Pope and *Universal* if it derives from the bishops in union with him.¹⁰ Such truths, as Vatican I teaches, are also *de fide divina et Catholica*.¹¹

It is termed *Living* because, being true, it exists and exerts its influence, not only in the past, but in the present and future. As Vatican I (Session III) explains, it is infallible:

All those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith, which are contained in the word of God, written or handed down, [i.e., Scripture or Tradition], and which the Church, either by a solemn judgment, or by her ordinary and universal Magisterium, proposes for belief as having been divinely revealed.

This statement is important because there are many theologians who proclaim that the teachings of the Ordinary Magisterium are not binding. Some attempt to mitigate the authority of the Ordinary Magisterium by claiming that it can at times contain error.¹² Others claim on their own authority that “only those doctrines in the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium that have been taught everywhere and always are covered by the guarantee of infallibility.”¹³ Still others attack this teaching by limiting the contents of the Ordinary Magisterium—removing from it anything not couched in absolutist or solemn terminology. Finally, there are those who

claim that the Magisterium can change—that it can teach differently today than in the past because doctrine and truth evolve. Before dealing with these secondary errors, it is necessary to understand why the Magisterium is infallible.

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE MAGISTERIUM

As noted in Chapter 1, the Church, by God's will, is a hierarchical institution. At its "head" is the Pope, the Vicar of Christ, the "rock" on which the Church is founded. He is endowed with all the unique authority of Jesus Christ "who is the shepherd and bishop of our souls" (1 Pet. 2:25), and depending upon Him, the Pope is also—but vicariously—the shepherd and bishop of the whole flock: both of the other bishops and of the ordinary faithful (John 21:15-17). He is the evident and effectual sign of the presence of Christ in the world, and it is through him that Christ, who is invisible in the bosom of the Father, visibly presides over all the activities of this enormous Body and brings it under His control. As Dom Grea has said, "the Pope is with Jesus Christ—a single hierarchical person—above the episcopate, one and the same head of the episcopate, one and the same doctor, pontiff, and legislator of the universal Church." Or more precisely, "Jesus Christ Himself is the sole Head, rendered visible, speaking and acting in the Church through the instrument whom He provided for Himself. Christ proclaims Himself through His Vicar, He speaks through him, acts and governs through him." When Christ speaks, acts, and governs through the Pope, the Pope is endowed with infallibility, a quality that derives, not from him as a private person, but from his being "a single hierarchical person" with Christ.¹⁴

This conception is made clear by Pope St. Leo's third sermon on the anniversary of his own election where he paraphrases the words of Christ:

I make known to thee thy excellence. For thou art Peter: that is, as I am the invulnerable rock, the cornerstone, who make both one, I the foundation beside which there can be laid no other; so thou too art a rock, in my strength made hard, and I share with thee the powers which are proper to me. And upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it (Office of St. Peter's Chair at Antioch, Feb. 22).

The Pope is also a private person (an ordinary human being) and a private theologian (doctor). It is, however, only when he functions as "a single hierarchical person" with Christ that he is endowed with infallibility (or partakes of the Church's, that is, Christ's infallibility). It is only then that

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Christ's scriptural statement "he who hears you, hears me" applies. And it follows logically that his authority is extended through those bishops who "are in union with him." The bishops have no independent authority apart from him for the simple reason that he has no independent authority apart from Christ. Thus it is that he is called the "Bishop of bishops," and that he "confirms" them in their doctrine—not the other way around. Thus it is that no statement of an Ecumenical Council has any authority until it receives his approbation.

The Pope then has an almost limitless authority. He can however lose this authority in a variety of ways. He can lose it when he dies (physical death), if he loses his reason (madness), if he separates himself from the Church (schism), or if he loses his faith (heresy and therefore spiritual death). At such a point the Pope is no longer Pope because it is the very nature of this bishop's function and ministry to be the Vicar of Christ and nothing else.

The Pope's authority is almost unlimited—however, it is not absolute. He has full powers within his charge, but his powers are limited by his charge. In order fully to understand this doctrinal point, let us once again recall the nature of this charge.

The ecclesiastical hierarchy was instituted by God to teach, that is to say, to transmit the deposit of the faith. At the head of this teaching Church Christ appointed a Vicar to whom He gave full powers to "feed the faithful and the shepherds" (John 21:11-17). Consequently, it is within the bounds of this function, the transmission of the deposit of the faith, that the Pope has "full powers." He has these precisely to enable him to transmit the deposit of the faith—in its entirety—"in the same meaning and the same sense" (Denzinger, 1800). "For," as Vatican I clearly taught, "the Holy Spirit has not been promised to Peter's successors in order that they might reveal, under His inspiration, new doctrine, but in order that, with His help, they may carefully guard and faithfully expound the revelation as it was handed down by the Apostles, that is to say, the deposit of the faith" (*Pastor Aeternus*, Denzinger, 1836).

Hence it follows that the Pope can and must make all his determinations entirely within the bounds of orthodoxy, and this is true whether they concern the reformation of the liturgy, of Canon Law, or to use the phraseology of earlier Councils, the reformation of the clergy "in its head or in its members." The Pope may indeed abrogate all the decisions of his predecessors, even those deserving of special mention, but always and only within the limits of orthodoxy. As the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908) states: "The scope of this infallibility is to preserve the deposit of faith revealed to man by Christ and His Apostles." It goes without saying that under such

circumstances, any changes introduced would affect only matters that are mutable and never the faith itself. A Pope who presumed to abrogate the smallest iota of dogma, or even attempted to change the meaning of the Church's constant teaching, would step outside the bounds of orthodoxy and outside the limits of his function of preserving the deposit of the faith. He would in doing so, teach a new doctrine and a "new gospel," and as such would be subject to the anathema pronounced by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians (1:8-9).

It is, then, clear that the infallibility of the Magisterium or "teaching authority of the Church" derives from the Pope functioning as one hierarchical person with Christ. Thus the source of this infallibility is Christ, and indeed, it could not be otherwise. For the Church to claim infallibility on any other grounds would be absurd. And just as there is only one source, so also there is only one Magisterium. When the Pope uses his infallibility—be it by solemn proclamation or within the bounds of the Ordinary Magisterium, he partakes, not of some personal charisma, but of Christ's infallibility. As the official text puts it, "when he speaks *ex cathedra* . . . he has the same infallibility as that with which the divine Redeemer invested His Church when it is defining a doctrine concerning faith or morals; and that therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church, irreformable" (Denzinger, 1839).

THE MEANING OF *EX CATHEDRA* AND THE REASON FOR THE DEFINITION OF PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

When does a Pope use his infallibility or, to use the technical phrase, speak *ex cathedra*? In the temple in Jerusalem, there was a chair in which the teaching rabbi would sit and in which Christ also at times sat. In Holy Scripture *cathedra* is synonymous with the authority of a "master" or "teacher" (Ps. 1:1; Matt. 23:2; Luke 20:46). Once again the teaching of the Church is manifest and clear. He teaches *ex cathedra* "when serving in the capacity of pastor and Doctor (shepherd and teacher) of all the faithful; in virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine with regard to faith and morals that must be held by the whole Church." According to Vatican I, four conditions are required:

- 1) The Pope must be functioning as Pastor and supreme Doctor. It is not his teaching as a private or particular Doctor that is in question.
- 2) He must be dealing with matters of faith or morals, and it is only the

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

proposed doctrine—not the adjoining considerations—the *obiter dicta* that is guaranteed by infallibility.

3) He must intend to define; his teaching must be given with authority and with the intent that it be believed by the entire Church.

4) He must manifest his intention to bind all Catholics.

The Pope is not required to use any specific formulas to accomplish this. All that is required is that he clearly manifests his intention to compel the entire Church to accept his teaching as belonging to the deposit of the faith.

It is obvious that by the very nature of his function as the Vicar of Christ, this authority has always been with Peter and his valid successors. Why was it then necessary that this doctrine be defined in an extraordinary manner at the time of Vatican I? The answer to this question is highly instructive.

The Church does not ordinarily define a doctrine “in an extraordinary manner” unless it comes under dispute or is denied by a significant number of the faithful (as the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin). Nor does a doctrine so defined become truer than it was before. The Church,

has the duty to proceed opportunely in defining points of faith with solemn rites and decrees, when there is a need to declare them to resist more effectively the errors and the assaults of heretics or to impress upon the minds of the faithful clearer and more profound explanations of points of sacred doctrine. . . . Not because the Church has defined and sanctioned truths by solemn decree of the Church at different times, and even in times near to us, are they [truths not so defined] therefore not equally certain and not equally to be believed. For has not God revealed them all? (Pope Pius XI, *Mortalium Animos*)

In the decades prior to Vatican I, the Popes repeatedly condemned liberal Catholicism and parallel efforts aimed at bringing the Church’s thinking into line with the modern world—Pope Pius IX summarized these censures in his *Syllabus of Errors*. Those who came under such strictures attempted to defend themselves by claiming that their attitudes had never been formerly condemned by the teaching Magisterium and that such documents only represented the private opinion of the Pontiffs. Such a claim placed the infallibility of the Pope in doubt. During Vatican I furious debates were waged on the subject. The liberals were perfectly aware of the fact that if they voted for the definition of infallibility they would condemn themselves, but that if they voted against it, they would be denying a doctrine of the Church. Every conceivable objection capable of preventing, or of at least postponing the definition, was put forth and

strongly supported by those who labeled themselves as “inopportunist.”¹⁵ One orthodox bishop, Anthony Claret—later canonized—was so distressed by these attempts that he died of a heart attack during the Conciliar debate. The cases of Popes Liberius, Honorius I, Pascal II, Sixtus V, and others were brought forth in an attempt to influence the Fathers against defining something the liberals claimed was both unnecessary and insane. Needless to say, they were supported in this by the secular press, by world leaders, and even by governments. It is of interest to note that the Freemasons held a simultaneous “anti-Council” in Naples which proclaimed several principles as essential to the dignity of man—principles which later were incorporated into the documents of Vatican II.¹⁶

Unlike John XXIII, whose machinations in favor of the liberals at Vatican II will be detailed later, Pope Pius IX, aware of his responsibilities, did everything in his power to fulfill his obligations towards our divine Master. Listen to the comments of Cardinal Manning:

The campaign against the Council failed, of course. It failed because the Pope did not weaken. He met error with condemnation and replied to the demands to modify or adapt Catholic truth to the spirit of the age by resisting it with the firmness and clarity of Trent—and despite the prophecies of her enemies that the declaration of Papal Infallibility would mark the death blow to the Church, she emerged stronger and more vigorous than ever. This of course evoked the full fury of the City of Man. The hatred of the world for the Church was made manifest, and at the same time manifested the divine nature of the Catholic Church; for the hatred of the world was designated by Christ Himself as one of the marks of His Mystical body which must not only teach Christ crucified, but will live out the mystery of His crucifixion and resurrection until He comes again in Glory. . . . Had Christ been prepared to enter into dialogue with his enemies, had he been prepared to adapt, to make concessions, then He would have escaped crucifixion—but of what value would the Incarnation have been? Pope Pius IX followed the example of Christ whose Vicar he was and, as the highest point attracted the storm, so the chief violence fell upon the head of the Vicar of Christ.¹⁷

One does not have to be an expert in theological matters to know that, if the Conciliar Fathers had found themselves incapable of unequivocally refuting every one of the objections of the inopportunist, and of showing in a peremptory manner that, throughout the preceding nineteen centuries not one Pope—even among those whose lives had been scandalous in the extreme—had ever erred in his function as Pope, in his teaching function as the universal Pastor and Doctor, the Church could never have solemnly promulgated this dogma. Indeed, if the issues and facts had not been

made absolutely clear, the adversaries of infallibility and the enemies of the Church would certainly have published abroad all the supposedly false teachings of the previous Popes and used this as a means of making the Church appear ridiculous. “No man,” say the Fathers of the great Council of Nice, “ever accused the Holy See of a mistake, unless he was himself maintaining an error.”¹⁸

When the final vote came, the adversaries of this dogma, foreseeing how things would go, left Rome in order to avoid personally participating in this decision. They however, not wishing to be ejected from the Church, declared in advance that they accepted the decision—a decision that ultimately depended, not on the Council, but on the Pope promulgating the Council’s teaching.¹⁹

Unable to any longer deny this principle, the liberals in the Church rapidly shifted tactics. “The Pope is infallible,” they said, “and such is certain for the Church has proclaimed it as a dogma. But be careful! The Pope is not infallible every time he opens his mouth.” And under the pretense of defending this dogma by sharply defining its limits, they cleverly stressed the concept that the Pope only uses this privilege on rare occasions—“once or twice in a century.” Today we hear the same cry from those who would defend the post-Conciliar changes. “Nothing *de fide* has been changed,” by which they mean no part of the extraordinary Magisterium. “The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light” (Luke 16:8).²⁰

Because the infallible nature of the Ordinary Magisterium is currently so much in dispute, the following pertinent quotations are appended:

Even if he makes this submission efficaciously which is in accord with an act of divine faith . . . he should extend it to those truths which are transmitted as divinely revealed by the ordinary Magisterium of the entire Church dispersed throughout the world (Pius IX, *Tuas libenter*).

Leo XIII reiterated the teaching of Vatican I to the effect that

the sense of the sacred dogmas is to be faithfully kept which Holy Mother Church has once declared, and is not to be departed from under the specious pretext of a more profound understanding.

He adds:

Nor is the suppression to be considered altogether free from blame, which designedly omits certain principles of Catholic doctrine and buries them, as it were in oblivion. For there is the one and the same Author and Master

The Magisterium of the Church and Related Issues

of all the truths that Christian teaching comprises: *the only-begotten son who is in the bosom of the Father*. That they are adapted to all ages and nations is plainly deduced from the words which Christ addressed to His Apostles: *Go therefore teach ye all nations: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world*. Wherefore the same Vatican Council says: “By the divine and Catholic faith these are to be believed which are contained in the word of God either written or handed down, and are proposed by the Church whether in solemn decision or by the ordinary universal Magisterium, to be believed as having been divinely revealed.” Far be it then for anyone to diminish or for any reason whatever to pass over anything of this divinely delivered doctrine; whosoever would do so, would rather wish to alienate Catholics from the Church than to bring over to the Church those who dissent from it. Let them return; indeed nothing is nearer to our heart; let all those who are wandering far from the sheepfold of Christ return; but let it not be any other road than that which Christ has pointed out. . . . The history of all past ages is witness that the Apostolic See, to which not only the office of teaching but also the supreme government of the whole Church was committed, has constantly adhered *to the same doctrine in the same sense and in the same mind*. . . . In this all must acquiesce who wish to avoid the censure of our predecessor Pius VI, who proclaimed the 18th proposition of the Synod of Pistoia “to be injurious to the Church and to the Spirit of God which governs her, in as much as it subjects to scrutiny the discipline established and approved by the Church, as if the Church could establish a useless discipline or one which would be too onerous for Christian liberty to bear” (Leo XIII, *Testem Benevolentiae*, emphasis mine).

The Pope is infallible in all matters of Faith and Morals. By matters of faith and morals is meant the whole revelation of the truths of faith; or the whole way of salvation through faith; or the whole supernatural order, with all that is essential to the sanctification and salvation of man through Jesus Christ. The Pope is infallible, not only in the whole matter of revealed truths; he is also indirectly infallible in all truths which, though not revealed, are so intimately connected with revealed truths, that the deposit of faith and morals cannot be guarded, explained, and defended without an infallible discernment of such unrevealed truths. The Pope could not discharge his office as Teacher of all nations, unless he were able with infallible certainty to proscribe and condemn doctrines, logical, scientific, physical, metaphysical, or political, of any kind which are at variance with the Word of God and imperil the integrity and purity of the faith, or the salvation of souls. *Whenever the Holy Father, as Chief Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, proceeds, in briefs, encyclical letters, consistorial allocutions, and other Apostolic letters, to declare certain truths, or anything that is conducive to the preservation of faith and morals, or to reprobate perverse doctrines,*

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

and condemn certain errors, such declarations of truth and condemnations of errors are infallible, or ex Cathedra acts of the Pope. All acts *ex Cathedra* are binding in conscience and call for our firm interior assent, both of the intellect and the will, even though they do not express an anathema on those who disagree. To refuse such interior assent would be, for a Catholic, a mortal sin, since such a refusal would be a virtual denial of the dogma of infallibility, and we should be heretics were we conscious of such a denial (Alphonsus Liguori, *Theol. Moral. lib. I*, 104). It would even be heresy to say that any such definition of truths or condemnations of perverse doctrines are inopportune (Fr. Michael Muller, C.S.S.R.,²¹ emphasis mine).

This Magisterium [the ordinary and universal] of the Church in regard to faith and morals, must be for every theologian the proximate and universal rule of truth, for the Lord has entrusted the Church with the entire deposit of the faith—Holy Scripture and Tradition—to be kept, to be upheld, and to be explained. In the same manner, we must not think that what is proposed in the encyclicals does not require in itself our assent because the Popes did not exercise their supreme magisterial powers in them. Our Lord's words "he who listens to you listens to Me" also applies to whatever is taught by the ordinary Magisterium of the Church (Pope Pius XII, *Humani Generis*).

In a word, the whole Magisterium or doctrinal authority of the Pontiff as the supreme Doctor of all Christians, is included in this definition [at Vatican I] of his infallibility. And also all legislative or judicial acts, so far as they are inseparably connected with his doctrinal authority; as for instance, all judgments, sentences, and decisions, which contain the motives of such acts as derived from faith and morals. Under this will come the laws of discipline, canonization of the saints, approbation of Religious Orders, of devotions, and the like; all of which intrinsically contain the truths and principles of faith, morals, and piety. The definition, then, does not limit the infallibility of the Pontiff to his supreme acts *ex cathedra* in faith and morals, but extends his infallibility to all acts in the fullest exercise of his supreme Magisterium or doctrinal authority (Cardinal Manning, *The Vatican Council and Its Definitions*).

At this point we can come to certain conclusions: 1) Christ instituted a hierarchical Church which is His own Mystical body, and as such the prolongation of His presence in the world. 2) He revealed to this Church certain truths and entrusted these to it as a precious pearl—the deposit of the faith. 3) He established a Magisterium in order to keep intact the deposit of revealed truths for all time and to assure their availability to all mankind. 4) He instructed the Church to teach these truths. The Magisterium is a "divinely appointed authority to teach . . . all nations . . . all things whatsoever I have commanded you." 5) This single Magisterium

of the Church is entirely in the Pope, the Vicar of Christ, and through him in all the bishops that are in union with him. 6) Insofar as these truths are revealed to us by Christ, they are infallibly true. 7) The Pope when he functions in his capacity as the Vicar of Christ, as one hierarchical person with our Lord, is to be obeyed as if he was Our Lord. 8) When the Pope teaches in this capacity—*ex cathedra*—he teaches infallibly. 9) The Pope and the bishops in union with him are in no way empowered to teach anything other than what pertains to this original deposit “in the same sense and mind” that they have always been understood. 10) Obviously doubts may arise as to the exact nature or meaning of some point of doctrine contained in this deposit. When such occurs, the hierarchy functions to explain and define, but not to innovate. “The Pope [and by extension, the hierarchy] is only the interpreter of this truth already revealed. He explains, he defines, but he makes no innovation.”²² 11) “The revelation made to the Apostles by Christ and by the Holy Spirit whom He sent to teach them all truth was final, definitive. To that body of revealed truth nothing has been, or ever will be added.”²³ 12) There is no need for the Pope to use special formulas or attach anathemas to his *ex cathedra* teachings. 13) The Ordinary Magisterium is to be believed with the same divine and Catholic faith as the Extraordinary Magisterium.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS ON THE MAGISTERIUM

The Magisterium is also called “living,” not because it “evolves” in the manner that modern man erroneously ascribes to all things, but because it exists today as a viable entity within what the theologians call the “visible” Church. It is “living” because it is vivified by the Holy Ghost. As Cardinal Manning explains: “This office of the Holy Ghost consists in the following operations: first, in the original illumination and revelation. . . ; secondly, in the preservation of that which was revealed, or, in other words, in the prolongation of the light of truth by which the Church in the beginning was illuminated; thirdly, in assisting the Church to conceive, with greater fullness, explicitness, and clearness, the original truth in all its relations; fourthly, in defining that truth in words, and in the creation of a sacred terminology, which becomes a permanent tradition and a perpetual expression of the original revelation; and lastly, in the perpetual enunciation and proposition of the same immutable truth in every age.”²⁴

In giving assent to the teaching authority of the Church we should recognize the fact that we are giving assent, not to a series of “dry” doctrines decided upon by mere men, but rather to Christ Himself. Moreover,

insofar as the Church and Christ are one, this obligation of giving assent also extends to certain matters intimately related to the faith such as the sacraments instituted by Christ and the ecclesiastical laws by which she governs herself. As St. Catherine of Siena says, “the Church is no other than Christ Himself, and it is she who gives us the sacraments, and the sacraments give us life.”²⁵

The Catholic Church is not a congregation of people agreeing together, it is not a School of Philosophy or a Mutual Improvement Society. It is rather the Living Voice of God and Christ’s revelation to all people, through all time. It teaches only what its divine Master taught. It is in God’s name that the Church makes the awesome demand she does on the faith of men—a demand that cannot be merely waived aside as being incompatible with the so-called rights of private judgment.

It will be argued that the Church has been far from pure in her worldly actions. This is to misunderstand her nature. She is by definition a “perfect society,” the divinely instituted Mystical Body of Christ. The human failings of individual Catholics—or groups of Catholics—in no way alters the Church’s essentially divine character. She certainly contains sinners within her bosom, for she, like Christ, is in the world for the sake of sinners. Those who would reject the teachings of her divine Master because of her human failings, are similar to the Pharisees who rejected Christ because he ate with publicans. Despite such defects, the fundamental nature and purpose of the Church cannot change. She has never asked the world to follow anything other than the doctrine of Christ. “The Proximate end (purpose) of the Church is to teach all men the truths of Revelation, to enforce the divine precepts, to dispense the means of grace, and thus to maintain the practice of the Christian religion. The ultimate end is to lead all men to eternal life.”²⁶

Man is free to examine the reasonableness and validity of the Church’s claims; he is also free to accept or reject them. If he chooses the latter, which is in essence to refuse the authority of God’s Revelation, he is forced, if he is rational, to seek some other basis and authority for his actions and beliefs. And this brings us to the topic of *private judgment*.

PRIVATE JUDGMENT

In the last analysis man must, in religious matters, rely upon some authority. Either this derives from some objective “teaching authority” that is independent of himself, or else it derives from an “inner feeling” that can be characterized as “private judgment.”²⁷ Clearly, the prevailing basis for

religious beliefs in the modern world—be they Protestant or “modernist-Catholic”—is private judgment, which is to say that paramount authority resides in that which at any moment commends itself to the individual or group most strongly.²⁸ According to Vatican II, man’s dignity is such that in religious matters, he is to be guided by his own judgment.²⁹ Such a principle by its very nature represents a revolt against the Church (and Christ), for it proclaims that what the Church teaches is not morally obligatory. Vatican II seems to have forgotten that man’s freedom resides, not in his being at liberty to believe anything he wants, but in his ability to accept or refuse what God teaches; that his dignity resides, not in acting like gods (the false promise of the snake), but in his conforming himself to divine principles.

Private judgment always starts out by accepting some of the teachings of the established faith and rejecting others—it is only a matter of time before the “new” suffers in turn from the same principle. Within Luther’s own lifetime dozens of other Protestant sects were formed, and one might add that within the post-Conciliar church much the same thing has happened. That this is less obvious is because this Church blandly accepts the most divergent views—other than traditional orthodoxy—as legitimate. St. Thomas Aquinas said: “The way of a heretic is to restrict belief in certain aspects of Christ’s doctrine selected and fashioned at pleasure” (*Summa* II-II, 1.a.1). Obviously, this “picking and choosing” is nothing other than the free reign of private judgment. And as sects give rise to other sects, it soon happens that all truth and falsehood in religion becomes a matter of private opinion and one doctrine becomes as good as another. Again, it is only a matter of time before all doctrinal issues become irrelevant (who can ever agree about them anyway?). What follows is that morality loses its objective character, and being based on “social contract,” can alter in accord with prevailing social exigencies.³⁰ Man, not God, becomes the center of the universe and the criteria for truth; doing good to others becomes his highest aspiration, and “progress” his social goal. The idea of “sin” is limited to what “hurts” our neighbor or the State. What need is there for God, for truth, for doctrines, for authority, for the Church and for all the “claptrap” of the ages that has held man back from his worldly “destiny”? All that is asked of modern man is that he be “sincere,” and that he not disturb his neighbor excessively. If in this milieu he manages to retain any religious sense at all, it is considered a purely “private matter.” Man’s “dignity,” which traditionally was due to the fact that he was “made in the image of God,” is now said to derive from his independence of God. In reality, man has been so seduced by the serpent—“Ye shall be as gods”—that he has proclaimed himself his own God. (As Paul VI said on the occasion of the moon landing, “honor to man . . . king of earth . . . and today, prince of heaven!”). He

lives by his own morality and only accepts the truths that he himself has established. (It used to be said of the Protestants that “every man was his own Pope.”) A satanic inversion has occurred and man cries out, as did once the Angel of Light—*non serviam*—I will not serve any master other than myself.³¹

Of course, all this occurs in stages. What is remarkable is the similarity of pattern seen in all “reformation movements.” What starts out as the denial of one or two revealed truths (or of truths derived from revelation), progressively ends up in the denial of them all.³² Similar also are the various subterfuges by which this is achieved. Almost all reformers declare that they are “inspired by the Holy Spirit” (and who can argue with the Holy Spirit?) and end up by ignoring or denying His existence. All claim to be returning to “primitive Christianity,” which is nothing other than Christianity as they think it should have been all along. All, or almost all, claim that they are adapting the Faith to the needs of modern man, which is nothing else than an appeal to the pride and arrogance of their followers and an attempt to make Christianity conform to their personal needs.³³ All quote Scripture, but selectively and out of context, and never those parts that disagree with their innovative ideas—thus it follows that they reject the traditional interpretation given to the sacred writings by the Church Fathers and the Saints. All mix truth with error, for error has no attractive power on its own. All attack the established rites, for they know that the *lex orandi* (the manner of prayer) reflects the *lex credendi* (the manner of believing); once the latter is changed, the former becomes an embarrassment to them.³⁴ All use the traditional terms of religion: love, truth, justice, and faith, but attach to them a different meaning. And what are all these subterfuges but means of introducing their own private and personal judgments on religious matters into the public domain? Finally, none of the reformers fully agree with each other except in their rejection of the “fullness” of the established Catholic faith, for error is “legion” and truth is one. As one mediaeval writer put it: “they are vultures that never meet together except to feast upon a corpse.”³⁵

The traditional Church has of course always eschewed the use of “private judgment” in religious matters. From a traditional point of view, man should seek to “think correctly” rather than to “think for himself.” (What kind of mathematician would a person be who computed for himself and considered the correct answer to be a matter of “feeling” arising from his subconscious?) The Jewish Fathers considered private judgment the greatest form of idolatry because it made oneself rather than God the source of truth. As has been pointed out above, man’s “liberty” lies, not in his freedom to decide for himself just what is true and false, but in his freedom to accept

or reject the truth that Christ and the Church teach and offer. It is a saying of common wisdom that no man should be his own advocate or physician, lest his emotions interfere with his judgment.³⁶ If we are careful to obtain authoritative advice and direction in the management of our physical and economic well-being, it becomes absurd for us to relegate the health of our soul to the “whims” of our emotions. As Socrates said, “Being deceived by ourselves is the most dreadful of all things, for when he who deceives us never departs from us even for a moment, but is always present, is it not a most fearful thing” (*Cratylus*, 428D)? As soon as we make ourselves, rather than God speaking through the Church, the criterion of truth, we end up by making man *qua* man the center of the universe and all truth becomes both subjective and relative. This is why Pope St. Pius X said: “We must use every means and bend every effort to bring about the total disappearance of that enormous and detestable wickedness so characteristic of our time—the substitution of man for God” (*E Supremo Apostolatus*).

There is of course an area in which legitimate use can, and indeed must, be made of what is sometimes—though erroneously—called private judgment. In this case what are being made are not judgments in the Protestant sense, which are mere opinions, but rather objectively certain judgments that are nevertheless reasonable.³⁷ It must never be forgotten that the intellect of a private individual is capable in certain far from infrequent circumstances, of making judgments which are not liable to error, because within due limits the human intellect is infallible. As Fr. Hickey states in his *Summa Philosophiae Scholasticae*, “the intellect is *per se* infallible, although *per accidens* it can err.” As Dr. Orestes Brownson states: “Private judgment (in the Protestant sense) is only when the matters judged lie out of the range of reason, and when its principle is not the common reason of mankind, nor a Catholic or public authority, but the fancy, the caprice, the prejudice, or the idiosyncrasy of the individual forming it”³⁸

Such, for example, is the judgment a man makes use of in seeking the truth, and which makes him aware that in matters where he lacks full understanding, it is appropriate to use a guide. Again, there is the use of judgment in the application of principles to a given situation (conscience as the Catholic understands it), or in areas where the Church has never specifically spoken and where it allows for differences of legitimate “theological opinion.” In all these situations there is a criterion of certainty beyond the individual and evidence is adducible which ought to convince the reason of every man, and which when adduced, does convince every man of ordinary understanding. Having stated the distinction between mere opinion and the proper individual use of judgment we can further add that such judgment can never rationally be used to abrogate principles

or deny revealed truths. (The claim of some that abortion does not violate their conscience ignores the fact that abortion is the taking of innocent life and such is forbidden by both the natural law and by revealed truth.) These same distinctions make it clear how false it is to accuse traditional Catholics who adhere to the teachings and practices of the Church of All Times, and who reject innovations that go against the deposit of the faith, of using private judgment in a Protestant sense. To label them as “Rebels” or “Protestants” because they refuse to change their beliefs is either an abuse of language or pure hypocrisy.

Private judgment in the Protestant sense is inimical to the spiritual life, not only because it denies the authority of Revelation, not only because it replaces docility with rebellion, but because it also denies intellection. God gave us an intellect by means of which we can know truth from falsehood and right from wrong. Reason is normally the “handmaid” of the intellect, which means its function is that of ratiocination or discoursing from premises to conclusions. Truth does not depend on reason, but rather truth becomes explicit with the help of Reason. We do not say something is true because it is logical, but rather that it is logical because it is true. Reason must then feed on some sustenance, and this it gets from above or from below; above from intellection and Revelation; below from feelings and sense perceptions. Modern man, while occasionally using his higher “cognitive” faculties, in the practical order refuses to grant their existence. More precisely, being Nominalist, he refuses to accept any premises from above and limits the function of reason to dealing with what comes from below, from his feelings or sense perceptions. In this schema Reason is placed at the apex of man’s faculties (Rationalism). Given these truncated principles, it follows that all truth is based on feelings and sense perceptions and hence is relative.³⁹ Modern man lives on “opinions divorced from knowledge,” which in Plato’s words “are ugly things.”⁴⁰ At the same time there was a parallel attack on the will. While mechanists and evolutionists deny free-will altogether, pseudo-theologians obliterate it in the name of a false concept of grace. (What else is “justification by faith,” but the denial of “good works,” those acts we “willfully” perform? Surely grace builds on nature and will abandon us in proportion to our refusal to cooperate with it.)⁴¹

Those who see the futility of resolving religious issues on the basis of their (or someone else’s) personal and subjective opinions, and who seek objective and external sources for the Truth, must inevitably turn to the various “churches” for a solution. Of all the various “ecclesiastical communities” that hold out the possibility of finding objective truth, only one has consistently rejected “private judgment” as a source. Only one

proclaims that God Himself (through Christ and the Apostles) has revealed the truth, and only one claims and can demonstrate that it has retained this “deposit” intact from Apostolic times down to the present. This is of course, the “One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.” To quote St. Alphonsus Liguori:

To reject the divine teaching of the Catholic Church is to reject the very basis of reason and revelation, for neither the principles of the one nor those of the other have any longer any solid support to rest on; they can be interpreted by everyone as he pleases; every one can deny all truths whatsoever he chooses to deny. I therefore repeat: If the divine teaching authority of the Church, and the obedience to it are rejected, every error will be endorsed and must be tolerated.⁴²

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

One Lord, one faith, one baptism.
St. Paul (Eph. 4:4-5)

Having determined the nature of the teaching authority of the Church we can now turn to yet another quality inherent in her nature: *inerrancy*. In essence, she cannot wander from the original deposit and still claim to be the “One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.”

It is amazing to what a degree these four qualities hang together—lose one and you lose them all. The Church is one in the doctrines she teaches. “She is called Holy and without spot or wrinkle in her faith; which admits of no sort of errors against the revealed word of God.” She is called Catholic not only because her teachings extend across time and space in this world, but because the term means “universal” and the doctrines she teaches are true throughout the entire universe, in heaven, on earth, and in hell. She is called Apostolic because she teaches the same doctrines which the Apostles taught, and because she retains intact the Apostolic Succession. Only the Catholic Church has these qualities, and it follows that other Churches which deny one or more of her teachings cannot be considered as the Church which Christ founded any more than they can claim “union” with her.⁴³

Oneness or “unity” exists as a characteristic of this Church, not because the faithful agree with “the bishops in union with the Pope,” but because all its members, including the bishops and the Pope “agree in one faith” established by Christ, use “the same sacrifice,” and are “united under one Head.”⁴⁴ It is not the agreement of the faithful with *any* faith the hierarchy

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

may wish to teach, or to use *any* rite the hierarchy may wish to establish, but rather the agreement of both the laity and the hierarchy (who one hopes is also to be numbered among the faithful) with the doctrines and the rites that Christ and the Apostles established. Nor is the concept of unity restricted to the living, for by the very nature of things, we must be in agreement with all those Catholics who have gone before us back to the time of Christ, with those Catholics in the Church Suffering (Purgatory) and the Church Triumphant (Heaven).

It is repeatedly claimed by the present hierarchy that the Church has lost this “unity” and that the various divisions among Christians constitute a scandal that must be repaired. The Latin title for the Vatican II document on Ecumenism is *Unitatis redintegratio* or “The Restoring of Unity.” John XXIII established the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and specified that *Unity* was the word, not *Reunion*. A new “unity” is to be restored by claiming all Christian bodies that accept baptism are part of the true Church. In a similar manner the Documents of Vatican II state that the Church that Christ established *subsists* in the Catholic Church rather than *is* this Church. Recently the entire body of English post-Conciliar “bishops”—some 42 individuals in all—publicly declared in an official communiqué on the nature of the Church that the Catholic Church embodies the Church of Christ in a special way, but that such a statement “is not intended to exclude the fact that other Christian bodies also belong to the Church of Christ.” They further stated that the Church which Christ established also subsists in the Anglican Church. The response of an Anglican “bishop” is pertinent: “What has been swept aside from the ecumenical scene is the idea that the Church of Christ is identical with the Roman Catholic Church. Instead we have a picture of the Church of Christ embracing all the Christian churches, though not in the same way.”⁴⁵ If such is the position of the English hierarchy, it would seem clear that it has apostatized to a man from unity of the faith. And what of Rome which never reprimanded them?

As opposed to such a view, and based on what has been the constant teaching of the Church, unity exists and has always existed in the true Church. This unity exists even if the majority of the present hierarchy deviates from orthodoxy—indeed it is a matter of faith that such is the case.⁴⁶ This is witnessed by the *de fide* statement of the Holy Office on November 8, 1865:

That the Unity of the church is absolute and indivisible, and that the church had never lost its unity, nor for so much as a time, ever can.⁴⁷

The Magisterium of the Church and Related Issues

If the new Church is telling us it lacks unity, it is also telling us that the Pope and the bishops in union with him have deviated from orthodoxy and hence lost all magisterial authority. That the greater majority of modern-day “Catholics” agrees with such an errant hierarchy adds nothing to their authority. The personal views of the hierarchy do not make up the “deposit of the faith,” but rather, it is the “deposit” that provides the hierarchy with their *raison d'être*. “It is the office of the Church . . . in fulfilling Christ’s function as teacher, not to make new revelations, but to guard from error the deposit of faith, and authentically, authoritatively, to proclaim and interpret the Gospel of Jesus Christ.”⁴⁸ As the Holy Office states: “The primacy of the Visible Head is of divine institution, and was ordained to generate and to preserve the unity both of faith and of communion.”⁴⁹ Authority exists to protect the faith and not the other way around. In the face of the post-Conciliar attitude, it is of interest to recall the statement of the Anglican convert Henry Manning:

We believe union to be a very precious gift, and only less precious than truth. . . . We are ready to purchase the reunion of our separated brethren at any cost less than the sacrifice of one jot of a little of the supernatural order to unity and faith. . . . We can offer unity only on the condition on which we hold it—unconditional submission to the living and perpetual voice of the Church of God. . . . It is contrary to charity to put a straw across the path of those who profess to desire union. But there is something more divine than union, that is the Faith.

There is no unity possible except by the way of truth. Truth first, unity afterwards; truth the cause, unity the effect. To invert this order is to overthrow the Divine procedure. The unity of Babel ended in confusion. . . . To unite the Anglican, the Greek, and the Catholic Church in any conceivable way could only end in a Babel of tongues, intellects, and wills. Union is not unity. . . . Truth alone generates unity. The unity of truth generated its universality. The faith is Catholic, not only because it is spread through the world, but because throughout the world it is one and the same. The unity of the faith signifies that it is the same in every place [and time].⁵⁰

As the English Bishop John Milner said of the Anglo-Catholic Ecumenical movement in the nineteenth century:

If we should unite ourselves with it, the Universal Church would disunite itself from us.

If we are then to speak of believing in the “One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church” we must understand the phrase in the “same sense and

mind” that the Church has always understood it.⁵¹ “There is only one true Church which remounts to Apostolic times by means of its traditions. . . . For us, we recognize only one ancient and Catholic Church, which is one by its nature, by its principles, by its origin, by its excellence, which reunites all its children in the unity of one same faith” (St. Clement of Alexandria). “Such is the faith, which the Church received; and although she is spread throughout the universe, she guards with care this precious treasure, as if she inhabited but one house; she professes each of these articles of faith with a perfect conformity, as if she had only one soul and one heart. Behold what it is she teaches, what it is she preaches, what it is she transmits by tradition, as if she had only one mouth and only one tongue” (St. Irenaeus). “What they [the Church Fathers] believe, I believe; what they held, I hold; what they taught, I teach; what they preached, I preach” (St. Augustine). It is with these principles in mind that we shall, in the next chapter, investigate the sources of the Church’s teachings and practices.⁵²

THE PRESENT SITUATION

Few would deny but that the present situation in the Church is one of massive confusion. No two priests or bishops teach the same doctrine and every possible aberration is allowed in liturgical functions. How is a Catholic seeking to live the faith able to sort out the issues? The answer is the Magisterium. It is amazing to what degree this organ provides us with answers as to how to react and function, the limits of obedience to a false hierarchy, and even with regard to the authority of a Pope who officially promulgates heresy under the cover of magisterial authority.

We can of course debate as to what is part of the ordinary Magisterium and what is not. The criteria provided by Vatican I are all we really need to determine this. What we cannot do is deny the *de fide* teaching that the ordinary Magisterium is just as infallible as the extraordinary Magisterium.⁵³

The greatest error possible is to deny the total authority of the Magisterium (remembering that there is only one Magisterium that expresses itself in a variety of ways). To do so is to cut oneself off from truth and to turn oneself into a Protestant.⁵⁴ We have spoken of the possibility of holding theological opinions, but when one examines the Magisterium, there is almost nothing significant left about which to have theological opinions.⁵⁵ Those who would tell us that the Ordinary Magisterium can contain error are wolves in sheep’s clothing. If such is the case we must all become super theologians so as to pick and choose what is true and

false among some 95% of the Church's teaching. Such an attitude allows one to reject anything one doesn't personally approve of while at the same time allowing for the introduction of every possible error. It is a satanic proposition.

And all this highlights the present situation in the Church with clarity. It is clear that Vatican II teaches a host of doctrines under the cover of magisterial infallibility that directly contradict what the Church has taught through the ages as true. If one accepts the teaching of Vatican II and the definition of the Mass that is promulgated in the General Instruction on the *Novus Ordo Missae*⁵⁶—which all must do who accept the authority of the post-Conciliar “Popes”—one is forced to deny previously taught truths, which is to apostatize from the Catholic faith as it has always existed.⁵⁷ Putting this in different terms, the Catholic today is forced to choose between two different Magisteriums. That such is the case is glossed over by claiming that the living character of the Magisterium allows for development, progress, or the evolution of doctrine, another concept embraced by Vatican II. As Paul VI said: “If the world evolves, why should not religion evolve?” Now certain principles are clear. We can develop or deepen our understanding of the Magisterium, but the Magisterium itself cannot change under the euphemism of development. The reason for this is that Truth cannot change. Another principle involved is that once something is declared to be magisterial teaching, it takes priority over any change. Two contraries cannot be simultaneously true. It follows that one cannot remove what is magisterial from the Magisterium.

Once again this is affirmed by the Magisterium:

Hence, also, that understanding of its sacred dogmas must be perpetually retained, which Holy Mother Church has once declared; and there must never be recession from that meaning under the specious name of a deeper understanding [Can.3]. Therefore . . . let the understanding, the knowledge, and wisdom of individuals as of all, of one man as of the whole Church, grow and progress strongly with the passage of the ages and the centuries; but let it be solely in its own genus, namely in the same dogma, with the same sense and the same understanding (Denzinger, 1800).

We have then the Magisterium as it existed up to the death of Pope Pius XII which can be called “authentic,” and a second Magisterium, established during the reign of John XXIII and enlarged upon by his successors, having its roots and origin in an attempt to bring the Church into line with the modern world. Apart from Roncalli's prior Freemasonic connections, we have as his first act on assuming the papal role, the deletion of the prayers for the conversion of the “perfidious Jews” from the Good Friday services.

(Obviously, there were perfidious and non-perfidious Jews, just as there are perfidious and non-perfidious Catholics. Who would say Nicodemus or Simeon was perfidious? Who would not say Simon Magus was not perfidious?) This seemingly simple act, disguised under the cover of a false charity, was a declaration on his part of the principle of *non serviam*. It was a first step in the direction of the new false ecumenism which is a leitmotiv of the new post-Conciliar Church and was followed with a host of other doctrinal changes.⁵⁸

Catholics are often confused about the term “Faith.” Faith has, as St. Thomas explains, two aspects. There is the objective side of The Faith—which refers to the teaching of Christ and the Apostles and is incorporated or expressed by the Magisterium (and this is a “gift”), and there is the subjective side of Faith which is the assent we give to these teachings. Thus to claim to have the Catholic Faith requires that we give our whole-hearted assent to the Magisterium including those parts that we may not be fully aware of. The same is true of those who follow the post-Conciliar pseudo-Magisterium. Those of us who believe in a Revelation that is true and who strive to be able to say with St. Paul, “I live, not I, but Christ within me,” must be sure to adhere to the authentic Magisterium given us by Him who is “the Way, the Light, and the Truth.” People who hide behind the present confusions, the shibboleths of doctrinal development, or obedience to the Popes, *et cetera*, are in essence refusing to make the choice and run the risk of being included among the “lukewarm” that are spewed forth. (The degree of responsibility varies greatly with circumstance but clearly falls more on the hierarchy responsible for preserving and teaching the “deposit of the Faith,” than on the laity.) The reason why Catholics who adhere to the authentic Magisterium call themselves “traditional,” is because tradition is what is “handed down.” Those adhering to the post-Conciliar pseudo-Magisterium have no right to use this term. To see faith as a matter of “feeling” is a modernist deception because our feelings are tied to the subconscious and not to the truth. Feelings in themselves are neither good nor bad. If they are consistent with Truth they are of course good.

One can in fact label the objective side of faith as being equivalent to the authentic Magisterium. St. Thomas Aquinas teaches that faith (i.e., the authentic Magisterium) “holds the first rank in the spiritual life because it is by faith alone that the soul is bound to God and that which gives life to the soul is that which binds it to God, namely faith. God has opened to us no other way to eternal happiness than that of faith. . . . He who has been raised to contemplation look not upon faith as inferior to this extraordinary gift. The clearer and more comprehensive his vision, the stronger does one’s faith become.” As St. Catherine of Siena said, “The gift of prophecy can be recognized as true only by the light of the Faith.”

This brings us to the issue of orthodoxy which is defined as “true doctrine and sound faith.” It is only in light of the above need to be one with Christ and His Magisterium that heresy has meaning and also clearly risk. This is why the Magisterial condemnation of error always demands our assent. It is pertinent that the post-Conciliar Church has dropped the use of the Index and declares itself unwilling to condemn the grossest of errors. “Pope” John Paul I publicly stated that in the Old Church “only the Truth had rights, but now we know that even error has rights.” Once again however we must be careful. The True Church distinguishes between the possibility that we may be mistaken about some Magisterial point and therefore speaks of “material” heresy (some “matter” about which we are mistaken) as opposed to “formal” heresy. She requests that a “competent authority” point out a material error to the individual involved and allow him six months to study the issue and correct himself. If after six months this correction is not made, the Church considers the individual to have added an attitude of “obstinacy” to the error and normally deprives the individual of at least his teaching function. This is not “thought control,” but the insisting on responsible people thinking correctly. “Brethren, let this mind be in you, which was also in Jesus Christ” (Phil. 2:5).

All this highlights the dilemma of the Catholic in the post-Conciliar era and there is no rational way around this. Catholics who do not wish to drift are forced to choose. In order to get a perspective on the need to take a stand, one has only to ask how many Catholics would run their stock portfolio without investigations and choices. Despite all the supposed confusions fostered by “the world, the flesh, and the devil,” Holy Mother Church has provided us with all the criteria needed to make the right choices. The grounds for such choices are further delineated in other parts of this book.

One further point: Those that assert their own opinions between the Magisterium and the faithful in essence create a cult in the pejorative sense of the term. Thus it is that both the post-Conciliar Church and such organizations as the Society of Pius X (advocating disobeying a Pope whose authority they recognize) are from this point of view “cults” and not Catholic.⁵⁹

All this raises the issue of obedience. Now obedience is a moral virtue. Faith, Hope, and Charity are theological virtues and of a higher order. Obedience without the theological virtues is an absurdity because it is always possible to give obedience to a wrong authority, even to Satan himself. Faith, Hope, and Charity are the proper objects of obedience—normally they are mediated through the Church hierarchy, but they reside ultimately in Him who is the Truth, the Way, and the Light. Now this

Truth, Way, and Light resides above all in what He taught and teaches, which is incorporated in the Magisterium—once again, both the Ordinary and Extraordinary. Hence it follows that we must give our obedience (or what the Church calls our “intellectual assent”) to the entire Magisterium. Only by so doing can we think with Christ. And if we are to be baptized with Christ, buried with Christ, and resurrected with Christ, we must then also think with Christ.⁶⁰

SACRAMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

One of the most important functions of the Authentic Magisterium is to protect sacramental integrity. The faithful have an absolute right to the sacraments as they were given to us by God as a “vehicle” for the transmission of Grace. Now the post-Conciliar establishment has violated the Magisterial structures aimed at protecting these sacraments in every possible way. Consider the traditional Mass. This rite was protected by the Papal Bull *Quo Primum*, which states that no priest can be forbidden to say this Mass, and that the faithful shall always have access to it. Moreover, this Papal Bull was re-affirmed by every Pope from Saint Pius V (who promulgated it) to John XXIII. This is now a forbidden Mass. The new Church attempts to disguise this fact by allowing for the so-called “indult” Mass, or the *Novus Ordo* in Latin with Chant. Similarly, organizations of seemingly traditional priests such as the Society of St. Peter are organized, but their “priests” are ordained by bishops who themselves are “consecrated” by the new and almost certainly invalid post-Conciliar rites, and hence do not have the power to ordain. Furthermore, they are committed to accepting the validity of the *Novus Ordo Missae*. But the fact remains that the Mass of All Times is forbidden and if one doubts this statement, simply go and ask a post-Conciliar “bishop” for permission to attend it.⁶¹ Now this rite is not only forbidden, it has been replaced by a false Mass in which the “Words of Consecration” (no longer called such) given us by Christ Himself have been changed. Remembering that we are dealing, as Scripture says, with “powers and principalities,” this action of the post-Conciliar establishment must be labeled diabolical.⁶² In a similar manner all the sacraments that depend upon the priesthood, and particularly that of Episcopal consecration have been rendered at least doubtful if not totally destroyed.⁶³

An excellent example illustrating many of these issues is provided by E. Sylvester Berry: “According to Protestant teaching, all men are free to worship ‘God according to the dictates of their own conscience.’ The doctrine is widely proclaimed today as ‘freedom of conscience’ or ‘freedom

of worship.' It simply means that every man is free, not only to believe according to his own interpretation of the Scriptures, but also to worship God in his own way. This either denies that Our Lord established any definite form of worship in the New Law, or maintains that we cannot know with certainty what it is, for surely no Christian, if he admits that Christ has established a definite form of worship to be used by His followers, could believe that he is free to worship as he pleases."

A WORD ON THE USE OF ONE'S CONSCIENCE

Many hold that their decision as to how to behave in the present circumstances is one of following their conscience. Catholics should understand just what this means and again the Magisterium makes it quite clear. One's Catholic conscience is not a "still small voice" such as Newman and the Protestants believe in. There is a theological and metaphysical teaching that Synderesis (the divine spark within us) cannot err, but conscience can. Our consciences are far too easily influenced by our emotions and passions, by the milieu in which we live, and this is to say nothing of the effects of Original Sin. For a Catholic the conscience is a faculty used to apply God's laws (knowable from the Magisterium) to a given circumstance where the Church has not provided clear guidance. One cannot perform an abortion because one's conscience "allows" one to do so. Nor can one use one's conscience to choose the "lesser of two evils," when both are against God's laws. One of course is responsible for having a well formed conscience, which is to say, for knowing the laws of God (as they pertain to one's station in life), as promulgated by the Church and how they apply. But it would be impossible for the Church to formulate specifics for every conceivable situation. Hence it is that Our Lord provides us with a conscience that allows us to apply the laws we know to some specific circumstance.⁶⁴ Where there is doubt as to such application, the Church recommends consulting a competent (and orthodox) confessor.

It should be abundantly clear on the basis of what has been said that a Catholic cannot reject the authentic Magisterium of the Church on the grounds of conscience. The Magisterium, the "proximate rule of faith," is in fact God's law for man. It is the Truth, and one obviously cannot deny the truth on the grounds of conscience.

The idea that God's love will protect us from the consequences of our rebellion is fraught with danger. Love is a reciprocal affair and as St. Francis de Sales instructs us in his *Treatise on the Love of God*, it has three aspects: love of delight in the divine perfections; love of benevolence, by which we

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

will to praise the Lord, to serve him, and work for His glory; and love of conformity, by which we accept all that God wills or expects of us, a love which has its consummation in the total donation of ourselves to God.

In the final analysis the Church has not left us orphans. She has provided all that we need to be Catholic in the present circumstances. Those who would argue that rejecting the heterodox teachings of the post-Conciliar “Popes” leads to denying the indefectibility of the Church are simply not rational. It is precisely the opposite. If one accepts them one proclaims that the post-Conciliar Church has in fact defected, for it has changed its teachings and practices which is the essence of defection. The same can be said about rebellion. It is those who have changed Christ’s teaching (and those who knowingly accept the changes) who are in rebellion. As opposed to such, it is those who have loyally adhered to the traditions, and who have refused to change their beliefs that have proven that the Church, like the Truth she represents, has never and never can defect. The gates of hell cannot prevail against the Truth.

There is a way back. The paradigm is found in the parallel of the Prodigal Son. Having demanded our inheritance and left our home, many of us have ended up eating the swill of modernism fit only for pigs. When we came to our senses we realized we must return home to the embracing bosom of Our Father. Then it is that the “fatted lamb” who “is slain and is yet alive” can be returned to us—the lamb which is none other than Christ Himself. Those of us who, for whatever reason, have left our traditional home in Holy Mother Church must make the choice.

In the last analysis, we must all choose between Barabbas and Christ!

Notes

¹ Lines taken from Georges Panneton’s *Heaven or Hell* (Newman Press: Westminster Maryland, 1965). Consider the Jews in Egypt: They had saved the land from famine, but had subsequently been enslaved. How cruel and unjust the God of Abraham must have appeared to them. But would they have followed Moses into the wilderness in any other circumstance? One may be permitted to doubt it.

² In discussing the layman Eusebius’ attack on the heretic Nestorius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Dom Guéranger wrote: “When the shepherd turns into a wolf the first duty of the flock is to defend itself. As a general rule, doctrine comes from the bishops to the faithful, and it is not for the faithful, who are subjects in the order of Faith, to pass judgment on their superiors. But every Christian by virtue of this title to the name Christian, has not only the necessary knowledge of the essentials of the treasure of Revelation, but also the duty of safeguarding them. The principle is the same, whether it is a matter of belief or conduct, that is, of dogma or morals.”

³ “God showed me the very great delight that He has in all men and women who accept, firmly and humbly and reverently, the preaching and teaching of Holy Church, for he is

The Magisterium of the Church and Related Issues

Holy Church. For He is the foundation, He is the substance, He is the teaching, He is the teacher, he is the end, He is the reward” (Julian of Norwich, *Showings*, Chap. 16).

⁴ Donald Attwater, *Catholic Dictionary* (Macmillan: N.Y., 1952).

⁵ “Must,” that is, if he wishes to call himself Catholic.

⁶ The Church could never require its members to take an oath that violated the infallible truth. These specifics are drawn from Tanquerey’s *Manual of Dogmatic Theology*.

⁷ According to Tanquerey, *Manual of Dogmatic Theology*, “The Church is infallible when it condemns a certain proposition with some doctrinal censure. A doctrinal censure is ‘a qualification or restriction which indicates that a proposition is opposed, in some way, to faith or morals.’ It is *de fide* that the Church is infallible when she specifies that a doctrine is heretical; it is certain that the Church is infallible when she states that a doctrine approaches heresy or that a doctrine errs in a matter of faith, or that it is false. All this is apparent from the consensus of theologians, and from the practice of the Church from the earliest days. The Church has always made judgments against false propositions and also imposed upon the faithful the obligation of adhering to these judgments. Many assert that in all doctrinal censures the Church is infallible.”

⁸ Tanquerey, *Manual of Dogmatic Theology*.

⁹ According to Etienne Gilson’s Introduction to *The Church Speaks to the Modern World* (Doubleday: N.Y., 1956), “These [encyclical] letters are the highest expression of the ordinary teaching of the Church. To the extent that they restate the infallible teachings of the Church, the pronouncements of the encyclical letters are themselves infallible. Moreover, while explaining and developing such infallible teachings, or while using them as a sure criterion in the condemnation of errors, or even while striving to solve the social, economic, and political problems of the day in the light of these infallible teachings, the popes enjoy the special assistance of the Holy Spirit.” Another way to look at encyclicals is to ask if in issuing them the Pope uses his Apostolic authority; if he is dealing with matters of faith and morals, and if he intends to define and to bind the consciences of all Catholics. “If he does, he is speaking from the Chair of Peter and exercising his *ex cathedra* authority.”

¹⁰ Also from Tanquerey, *Manual of Dogmatic Theology*. Other classifications can be found, but the essential principles remain the same. Melchior Canus, one of the principal theologians of the Council of Trent, taught that there are ten theological “*loci*” (or places) where the “teaching imparted by Christ and the Apostles could be found.” They are the following: 1) The Scriptures; 2) The divine and Apostolic Traditions; 3) The universal Church; 4) The Councils, and above all the General (Ecumenical) Councils; 5) The Roman Church; 6) The holy Fathers; 7) The Scholastic theologians; 8) Natural reason; 9) The philosophers and jurors [of Canon law]; and 10) Human history. According to him the first seven belong to the realm of theology, while the last three relate to the other sciences (Cited from Rohrbacher, *Histoire Universelle*, Vol. 10, p. 118).

¹¹ The infallibility of Council teachings is dependent upon the Pope’s approbation. The pseudo-Council of Pistoia never received this and was never recognized as a Council.

¹² Michael Davies claims that the Declaration on Religious Liberty made by Vatican II is “only a document of the Ordinary Magisterium of the Church, and that the possibility of error occurs or can occur in such documents where it is a matter of some novel teaching. The Magisterium can eventually correct such an error without compromising itself. . . . It will therefore be the eventual task of the Magisterium to evaluate the objections made to the Declaration and then to explain how it is compatible with previous teaching, or to admit that it is not compatible and proceed to correct it” (*Archbishop Lefebvre and Religious Liberty* [TAN: Rockford, Ill., 1980], and *The Remnant*, St. Paul, Minn., June 15, 1982).

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Suffice it to say—the matter will be discussed in detail later—that not only this Declaration, but also Michael Davies’ opinion are contrary to innumerable Magisterial statements of the traditional Church.

¹³ According to this view, the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium consists, in some manner, of the sum total of bishops in every place and throughout the course of history from the time the Church was founded down to the present day; while at the same time the community of bishops (with the Pope), at any given period during the course of history, is in no way infallible in its ordinary teaching. This is essentially the position of Archbishop Lefebvre.

¹⁴ Dom Grea, *The Church and its Divine Constitution*, quoted from *Forts dans la foi* (Publ. Noel Barbara: St. Louis, MO., 1989). The term “episcopate” refers to the body of bishops. Strictly speaking one cannot speak of a “bad Pope.” Being the instrument of Christ, a Pope as such is necessarily “good.” Such adjectives as applied to Popes relate to the state of their soul and not to their function. A sinner, just like anyone else, the Pope, even when he functions as Christ’s minister, can be, as a human being, in a state of grace or one of mortal sin. It is a teaching of elementary theology that the state of a minister’s soul has no influence or effect on his ministry, because this effect comes totally and exclusively from Christ who is its source. Thus it is that whenever a Pope is functioning in his office of Pope, it is Christ who speaks, who acts, and who governs through him. There is never any justification for a member of the believing Church to disobey a valid Pope when it is Christ who speaks, acts, and governs through him. And just as one cannot speak of a “bad Pope,” so also one cannot speak of a “heretical Pope,” or of one who is only “materially” Pope, or of one who is only “juridically” a Pope. Assuming a valid election, assuming that the individual is a member of the “believing Church,” either a man is, or he is not, a Pope. He can never be “half a Pope.”

¹⁵ It is never inopportune to declare the truth. Cardinal Newman was one of the leaders of this faction.

¹⁶ *Approaches* (Ayrshire, Scotland), No. 89, 1985.

¹⁷ Cardinal Henry Manning (an Anglican convert), *Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy of the Diocese*, several editions.

¹⁸ Rev. M. Muller, C.S.S.R., *Familiar Explanation of Catholic Doctrine* (Benzinger: N.Y., 1888).

¹⁹ The infallibility of Council teachings is dependent upon the Pope’s approbation. The pseudo-Council of Pistoia never received this and was never recognized as a Council. The post-Conciliar “Popes” have declared Vatican II (all of it) to be the “highest form of the ordinary Magisterium.”

²⁰ An important consequence of the declaration on infallibility at Vatican I was that the *Syllabus of Errors* of Pius IX was clearly declared to fall within the realm of the Ordinary Magisterium. Prior to this many attempts were made to examine the sources of the condemned errors in order to show that they were not “worded” in such a way as to make them binding. It also protected the list of errors—*Lamentabili*—associated with Pope St. Pius X’s *Pascendi*. Here again the modernists tried the same tactics, forcing Pius X to declare them to be binding in his *Moto Proprio “Praestantia Scripturae”* (Nov. 18, 1907). (“Anyone having the temerity to defend any proposition, opinion, or reprobated doctrine will *ipso facto* incur . . . excommunication *latae sententiae* simply reserved to the Roman Pontiff.”) Again, the “Oath Against Modernism” has been dropped by the post-Conciliar Church. Despite this, anyone who cannot give his assent to this Oath, once required of every prelate at every step in his journey towards the priesthood or episcopacy, places himself outside the true Church.

The Magisterium of the Church and Related Issues

²¹ *Familiar Explanation of Catholic Doctrine*, No. 16.

²² *Exposition of Christian Doctrine*—Course of instruction written by a Seminary Professor of the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools (Catholic Restoration: Madison Heights, Michigan, 1991).

²³ Muller, *Familiar Explanation of Catholic Doctrine*, No. 14.

²⁴ Cardinal Henry Manning, *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost* (Burns, Oates: London, 1909).

²⁵ Quoted by Jorgensen in his *Life of St. Catherine of Sienna*.

²⁶ W. Wilmers, S.J., *Handbook of the Christian Religion* (Benzinger: N.Y., 1891). This manner in which the Church sees itself is a far cry from the teaching of Vatican II and the post-Conciliar “Popes.” The Vatican II document entitled *The Church Today* teaches: “Christians are joined with the rest of men in search for truth” and Paul VI tells us that today “the Church is seeking itself. With a great and moving effort, it is seeking to define itself, to understand what it truly is.”

²⁷ Atheists and those that deny the existence of any “religious issue” also exercise private judgment—either their own or by submitting to the private judgment of others. Ultimately the only authority for private judgment is what an individual or group “feels” is true. Some claim their beliefs are based on reason, but if reason were a sufficient guide to religious truth, and if all men reasoned alike, all would believe the same “truths.” The Church teaches that we are not allowed to believe anything against reason, but at the same time offers to us many mysteries or truths that, even though they cannot be proved by reason, are in themselves reasonable. Such truths are said to be “beyond reason” in the sense that they derive from Revelation. If neither Revelation nor reason is the source of our beliefs, then they must arise from our subconscious. Thus William James defines religion as the “feelings, acts, and experiences of individual men in their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine” (Quoted in Fulton Sheen, *God and Intelligence in Modern Philosophy* [Longmans: N.Y., 1925]). The idea that religion is a feeling arising in the subconscious (Immanentism) is a modernist proposition that has been condemned by the Magisterium.

²⁸ “Groups” or “ecclesiastical communities” may agree on broad issues, but never on detailed doctrine. The Protestant denominations early found it necessary to distinguish between “fundamental” and “non-fundamental” beliefs—the latter of which their followers were free to “pick and choose.” Catholics are forbidden to make such distinctions. They must believe everything that the Church teaches—even those things of which they may not be specifically aware. Yet this is the basic concept that underlies the modern (and post-Conciliar) ecumenical movements: as long as we are “baptized in Christ,” we are free to believe anything we want. In order to get around the difficulty Vatican II teaches that “when comparing doctrines, they should remember that in Catholic teaching there exists an order or ‘hierarchy’ of truths, since they vary in their relationship to the foundation of the Christian faith” (*De Oecumenismo*). Dr. Oscar Cullman (one of the Protestant “observers”) considers this passage the “most revolutionary” to be found in the entire Council, and the Protestant Dr. McAfee Brown concurs while adding that the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption which are “stumbling blocks in the ecumenical discussion” should clearly be well down on the scale of the “hierarchy of truths” (Michael Davies, *Pope John’s Council* [Augustine: Devon, 1977]).

²⁹ *Religious Freedom*, Para. II.

³⁰ Consider the following statement given out in June 1978 by the Catholic Theological Society of America: “Any form of sexual intercourse, including both homosexuality and

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

adultery, could be considered acceptable so long as it is 'self-liberating, other-enriching, honest, faithful, socially responsible, life-serving, and joyous.'" (The traditional Church considers homosexuality a sin "crying unto heaven for vengeance on earth"—Gen. 18:20-21; Rom. 1:26-32.) It will be argued that Rome protested against this statement—however all the individuals responsible are still functioning as Catholic priests with full faculties to hear confession and some of them teach in seminaries. No recantation was ever required. Much closer to the Catholic position is the statement of the Rev. Jesse Jackson, a black activist leader. "One has to have an ethical base for a society. Where the prime force is impulse, there is the death of ethics. America used to have ethical laws based on Jerusalem. Now they are based on Sodom and Gomorrah, and civilizations rooted in Sodom and Gomorrah are destined to collapse."

³¹ To quote Michael Davies (*Pope Paul's New Mass* [Angelus Press: Dickenson, Texas, 1980], p. 140): "It was the Council as an event which gave the green light to the process of the formal deification of man." He quotes Fr. Gregory Baum, one of the *periti* (experts) at the Council, and currently head of the congregation in charge of seminaries, as stating: "I prefer to think that man may not submit to an authority outside of himself." Or again, John Paul II's statement: "To create culture, we must consider, down to the last consequences and entirely, Man as a particular and independent value, as the subject bearing the person's transcendence. We must affirm Man for his own sake, and not for some other motive or reason; solely for himself! Even further, we must love man because he is man, by reason of the special dignity he possesses" (Address to UNESCO, June 2, 1980).

³² A Catholic cannot deny any truth the Church teaches. He must accept them all. As Pope Leo XIII said, "To refuse to believe in any one of them is equivalent to rejecting them all" (*Sapientiae Christianae*).

³³ Few recognize the internal contradiction between returning to primitive practice and adapting the faith to the needs of modern man. The combination attacks the faith at both ends and leaves very little in the middle.

³⁴ Pertinent is Paul VI's statement quoted in *La Documentation Catholique* of May 3, 1970 to the effect that his *Novus Ordo Missae* (the new mass), "has imparted greater theological value to the liturgical texts so that the *lex orandi* conformed better with the *lex credendi*." This is a frank declaration that either the liturgical texts in use for hundreds of years by the Catholic Church did not possess the degree of theological value that was desirable, or that his new "mass" reflects a change in the *lex credendi*. Jean Madiran commented on this to the effect that "the new Eucharistic prayers must conform better than the Roman Canon [did] with the true faith; this is also the opinion of the Taizé community, the Anglicans, the Lutherans, and the World Council of Churches" (*Itinéraires*, Dec. 1973).

³⁵ It is of interest to listen to Luther's own words on the nature of heresy, words he used prior to his open rupture with the Church, but at a time when he had already embraced and expressed certain opinions inconsistent with Apostolic teaching: "The principal sin of heretics is their pride. . . . In their pride they insist on their own opinions. . . . Frequently they serve God with great fervor and they do not intend any evil; but they serve God according to their own wills. . . . Even when refuted, they are ashamed to retract their errors and to change their words. . . . They think they are guided directly by God. . . . The things which have been established for centuries and for which so many martyrs have suffered death, they begin to treat as doubtful questions. . . . They interpret the Bible according to their own heads and their own particular views and carry their own opinions into it" (*Theological lectures on the Psalms* [Dresden, 1876]; quoted by J. Verres, *Luther* [Burns Oates: London, 1884]). *Ex ore tuo te iudico!*

The Magisterium of the Church and Related Issues

³⁶ It has also been said that a man who is his own spiritual guide has Satan for his spiritual director.

³⁷ “Here is the error of our Protestant friends. They recognize no distinction between reason and private judgment. Reason is common to all men; private judgment is the special act of an individual. . . . In all matters of this sort there is a criterion of certainty beyond the individual, and evidence is adducible which ought to convince the reason of every man, and which, when adduced, does convince every man of ordinary understanding, unless through his own fault. Private judgment is not so called . . . because it is a judgment of an individual, but because it is a judgment rendered by virtue of a private rule of principle of judgment. . . . The distinction here is sufficiently obvious, and from it we may conclude that nothing is to be termed ‘private judgment’ which is demonstrable from reason or provable from testimony” (*Brownson’s Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1852).

³⁸ *Brownson’s Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1852. “Catholics establish with certainty, by objective criteria, the fact that the Church is infallible and then listen in docility to her teachings and at no point does mere opinion play any part in the procedure; whereas Protestants *opine* that Holy Scripture is Divinely revealed (this cannot be proved without the Church); they *opine* that it is to be interpreted by each individual for himself; they *opine* that their opinion as to its meaning will be sufficient for their salvation; and each and every interpretation they make of its meaning (except where no conceivable doubt exists from the text) is no more than an *opinion*” (John Daly, *Michael Davies: An Evaluation* [Britons Catholic Library, 1989]). I am grateful to this author for his suggestions and corrections in this part of the text.

³⁹ Fr. Smarius, S.J., puts it thus: “The chief cause of this moral degeneracy may be traced to the principle of private judgment introduced by Luther and Calvin, as the highest and only authority in religion and morality. Since the time of these Reformers, religion ceased to be the mistress, and became the slave of man. He was no longer bound to obey her, but she was bound to obey him. His reason was no longer subject to her divine authority, but she became the subject of his prejudices and passions. The Scriptures although cried up as the supreme authority, lost their objective value, and men no longer listened to the words ‘Thus saith the Lord,’ but gave ear to the freaks and fancies of every upstart prophet and doctor, whose best reason for the faith was, ‘I believe so,’ ‘it is my impression,’ ‘it is my opinion.’ Reason itself was dethroned, and feeling became the exponent of truth. Men judged of religion as they did of their breakfasts and dinner. . . . New fashions of belief became as numerous as new fashions of dress” (*Points of Controversy* [O’Shea: N.Y., 1873]).

⁴⁰ Plato, *Republic*, IV, 506C.

⁴¹ The current expression of this error is the Protestant claim to be “saved.” Those who are certain of their salvation would do well to consider the words of St. Paul: “I fight, not as one beating the air: but I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection, lest perhaps when I have preached to others, I myself should become a castaway” (1 Cor. 10:1-5). The Church has always taught that as long as man has the use of his faculties, he is capable of denying God and falling from grace.

⁴² Appendix to his work on the Council of Trent.

⁴³ This paragraph is not intended to exhaust the meaning of this term in the Creed. The Church is holy, not only because she admits no errors against the revealed word of God, but also because she is holy in her sacraments and morals; because her children, as long as they are preserved in their baptismal innocence or restored to it, are holy, and because of the communion of saints. The Apostolic Succession is the “initiatic chain” which conveys the power of confecting the sacraments from one generation to the next. This “succession”

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

pertains to the order of bishops who in this manner preserve the “Apostolic function” down through the ages.

⁴⁴ That “Head” is Jesus Christ whose representative, or “Vicar,” on earth is the Pope. Hence it follows that to refuse to obey a Pope who commands us to do what is against the laws of God is never to “attack” the papacy, but rather to defend it.

⁴⁵ *The Remnant*, Feb. 15, 1984. As the Documents of Vatican II state: “All those justified by faith through baptism are incorporated with Christ. They therefore have a right to be honored with the title of Christian, and are properly regarded as brothers in the Lord by the sons of the Catholic Church. . . . From her very beginnings there arose in this one and only Church of God certain rifts which the Apostle strongly censures as damnable. But in subsequent centuries more widespread disagreements appeared and quite large Communities became separated from full communion with the Catholic Church—developments for which, at times, men of both sides were to blame. However, none cannot impute the sin of separation to those who at present are born into these communities and are instilled therein with Christ’s faith. The Catholic Church accepts them with respect and affection as brothers. For men who believe in Christ and who have been properly baptized are brought into a certain though imperfect communion with the Catholic Church.” Elsewhere the Document states: “The brethren divided from us also carry out many of the sacred actions of the Christian religion. Undoubtedly, in ways that vary according to the condition of each Church or Community, these actions can truly engender a life of grace and can be rightly described as capable of providing access to the community of salvation” (*Decree on Ecumenism*). The Anglican minister James Atkinson makes the following comment on such passages: “The council Fathers made a valuable concession, the significance of which has not been sufficiently grasped, when they conceded a unity in baptism, an insight of Luther himself, and a frequent emphasis of the late Cardinal Bea when he headed the ecumenical commissariat” (“Rome and Reformation Today,” *Latimer Studies* No. 12, Oxford). He quotes Luther as saying: “A Christian or baptized man cannot lose his salvation, even if he would, by sins, however numerous; unless he refuses to believe” (*The Babylonian Captivity*). Now the idea that unity of any kind rests on baptism alone, or that we are “justified through faith in Baptism” is clearly false. These teachings violate a whole host of traditional Catholic doctrines such as “there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church.” There is no such thing as being a partial Catholic; nor can the Church admit that the rites of non-Catholics are a source of grace. How different is the statement of Pius XII: “Only those are to be included as real members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith and have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the body or been excluded from it by legitimate authority for serious faults.” St. Fulgentius teaches: “For neither baptism, nor liberal alms, nor death itself for the profession of Christ, can avail a man anything in the order to salvation if he does not hold the unity of the Catholic Church” (*ad Petrum Diaconum*, C. 39).

⁴⁶ If not, the “gates of hell” would have prevailed. Actually, if only one true Catholic were to be left alive on earth, unity would reside in him.

⁴⁷ Quoted in Archbishop Henry Manning, *The Reunion of Christendom, A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy* (Appleton: N.Y., 1866).

⁴⁸ Canon George Smith, *The Teaching of the Catholic Church* (Macmillan, N.Y., 1949).

⁴⁹ Cardinal Henry Manning, *Miscellanies, Independence of the Holy See* (Catholic Publication Society: New York, 1877).

⁵⁰ Cardinal Henry Manning, *Miscellanies, Independence of the Holy See*.

⁵¹ Lutherans and Anglicans also use the Nicene Creed in which this phrase is found. They of course hold that Catholics teach a false religion, and that as such they have no right to

The Magisterium of the Church and Related Issues

use the phrase. John Paul II did not hesitate to repeat the Nicene Creed with the Lutherans when he joined them in their service in Rome in 1983. One wonders whether he understood the phrase in the Lutheran or the Catholic sense.

⁵² Quotations in this paragraph are respectively from *Strom. lib.* vii, *Advers. haeres. lib.* 1. 10, and *Cont. Jul. lib.* 1, cap. 3. The quote from Augustine is given in Cardinal Joannes Franzelin's *Tractatus de Divina Traditione et Scriptura* (De Prop. Fide: Rome, 1870).

⁵³ An excellent summary with documentation from over 50 recognized theologians dealing with "The Infallibility of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium of the Church" by Fr. Bernard Lucien (in English) is available from the author for \$20.00 (Request by e-mail: Coomaraswamy@worldnet.att.net).

⁵⁴ Fr. Noel Barbara has stated: "As soon as we accept the Magisterium as the proximate rule of faith, we should make a firm determination to never in any way depart from her official teaching, and this not only with regard to matters of faith, but also with regard to matters of discipline. With regard to the authentic teachings we should forbid ourselves to make any distinctions between those things that we like while rejecting those we find difficult to accept. When I speak of the Magisterium it should be clear that I am thinking of the authentic Magisterium of the Church and not that of the Popes of Vatican II. The teaching of the infallible Magisterium and her disciplinary decisions are to be found in the authentic documents which are available for us to consult" (Letter).

⁵⁵ There can be no doubt but that the post-Conciliar "Popes" have rejected the authority of the Magisterium and would lead us to do the same. They have thus lost their authority because it cannot be said of them that he who hears them is hearing Christ. This is not a matter of "theological opinion." However, when it comes to describing or designating what these "Popes" should be called, or to explaining how this happened (*materialiter/formaliter, sede vacante, etc.*), we are forced by circumstance into the realm of theological opinion.

⁵⁶ Despite repeated statements from Rome, there are those that argue that this document is not part of the Magisterium.

⁵⁷ Despite disclaimers that Vatican II is a "pastoral council" it should be clear that John XXIII claimed it was guided by the Holy Spirit. Paul VI, in closing the Council, stated that "the teaching authority of the Church, even though not wishing to issue extraordinary dogmatic pronouncements, has made thoroughly known its authoritative teaching." Still later he stated that the Council "avoided proclaiming in an extraordinary manner dogmas endowed with the note of infallibility," and added that it conferred on its teachings "the value of the supreme ordinary Magisterium" (Speech of Jan. 12, 1966), and that, "it had as much authority and far greater importance than the Council of Nicaea." Elsewhere he has called it "the greatest of Councils" and "even greater than the Council of Trent." Perhaps the most clear-cut statement is to be found in a letter to Archbishop Lefebvre demanding his submission to the post-Conciliar Church: "You have no right any more to bring out the distinction between the doctrinal and pastoral that you use to support your acceptance of certain texts of Vatican Council II and your rejection of others. It is true that the matters decided in any Council do not all call for an assent of the same quality; only what the Council affirms in its "definitions" as a truth of faith or as bound up with faith requires the assent of faith. Nevertheless, the rest also form a part of the solemn Magisterium of the Church to be trustingly accepted and sincerely put into practice by every Catholic." John Paul II has expressed his full agreement with Paul VI, whom he considers as his "spiritual father" and has further stated that the Council was "inspired by the Holy Spirit" and that "obedience to the Council is obedience to the Holy Spirit." Still elsewhere he has stated that the Council is "the authentic teaching of the Church" (Sources given in Chapter 11 on Vatican II).

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

⁵⁸ Documented in the *Canon Law Digest*, Vol. V, p. 20 by T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., and James I. O'Connor, S.J. (Bruce: Milwaukee, 1963). As to his Freemasonic connections, these are documented by the Sûreté of Police in Paris when he was papal nuncio there. (Cf. *Labomination de la désolation* by Professeur Gabriel Chabot and Commandant Rouchette, available from the latter at B.P. 151, 16105 Cognac, Cedex, France).

⁵⁹ This issue is complex. One must remember that the grace of God floweth where it will. Cults have to be looked at objectively in terms of the degree to which they limit the flow of grace—do they for instance retain sacramental validity and to what extent do they enforce deviation? They must also be evaluated subjectively in the sense that the person participating may be able to ignore the deviation or bypass it. But once again it is the authentic Magisterium that makes possible the proper use of judgment.

⁶⁰ St. Catherine of Siena once told the Pope that if he acted in a certain way he would go to hell, and those that obeyed him would go to hell with him (*Letters*).

⁶¹ There is considerable debate as to whether the traditional Mass has been formerly forbidden. Many theologians hold that it has, while others disagree. Certainly, in the practical order, it is forbidden. Ask any priest attached to the new Church what happens when he attempts to say it. More recently modernist Rome has talked of allowing it to be said, but by priests presumably ordained by the new and false ordination rites.

⁶² Cf. Rama P. Coomaraswamy, M.D., *The Problems with the New Mass* (TAN: Rockford Ill., 1990). See also “A History of the Traditional or Tridentine Mass,” *Sophia*, Vol. No. 2 & 3, 1995-1996 (Foundation for Traditional Studies, POB 370, Oakton, VA 22124).

⁶³ Cf. *The Problem with the Other Sacraments* available on my web page: Coomaraswamy-catholic-writings.com.

⁶⁴ “By following a right conscience you not only do not incur sin, but are also immune from sin, whatever superiors may say to the contrary. For conscience obliges in virtue of divine command whether written down or in a code or instilled by natural law. To weigh conscience in the scales against obedience to legal authority is to compare the weight of divine and human decrees. The first obliges more than the second and sometimes against the second” (St. Thomas Aquinas, *Disputations Concerning Truth*, 17, 5). There is however the problem of a badly formed conscience, and even more the claim of many who do evil things to be following their conscience.

CHAPTER 3

THE NATURE OF REVELATION—SCRIPTURE

The Church does not come out of Scripture, but rather,
Scripture comes out of the Church.

Fr. Urquart¹

Having considered the Church's Magisterium, its infallible character, the alternative "sources" of truth in private judgment, and the nature of "unity," we shall in the next two chapters consider the sources of the Church's teaching—namely that which for the sake of convenience is divided into Scripture and Tradition.

It would be true in a sense, to say that there is but one source of Revelation (apart from God Himself), namely, divine Tradition—understanding thereby the body of Revealed Truth handed down from the Apostles. . . . Nevertheless, since a great and important part of that tradition was committed to writing and is contained in the inspired books of Holy Scripture, it is the custom of the Church to distinguish two sources of Revelation: Tradition and Scripture.²

Strictly speaking, Scripture is part of Tradition. The primacy of Tradition has been a constant teaching of the Church, and is indeed, as Tanqueray states, the "principal source of Revelation." He summarizes this teaching by saying:

Tradition is more extensive than Scripture, and embraces truths which are not at all contained in Scripture or are contained there only obscurely; also, Tradition is more essential to the Church than is sacred Scripture, for revealed truth was at first handed down orally by the Apostles, it was always proclaimed orally, always and everywhere it is to be proclaimed.³

It is only just that such should be the case, for the Church existed long before the Scriptures were written. As far as we know, Our Blessed Lord Himself never wrote a line of Scripture; nor did he instruct his Apostles to do so. Indeed, the Apostles would have been surprised to note our dependence upon their writings, for when they portioned out the known world among themselves for purposes of evangelization, they carried no written word and handed out no Bible tracts to the thousands upon

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

thousands of converts they made. The books of the New Testament were produced and called forth by special circumstances—and only five of the twelve left us anything in writing.⁴ (St. Matthew’s Gospel, the earliest, was written eight to ten years after the death of Our Lord; the Apocalypse, many years later.) Moreover, as the Apostle John himself tells us, it was neither reasonable nor possible for every last word and action of Our Savior to be committed to writing. Cardinal Manning puts it well in saying:

We neither derive our religion from the Scriptures, nor does it depend upon them. Our faith was in the world before the New Testament was written.⁵

Indeed, the fact that the books of the Old and New Testament are “inspired” at all, cannot be demonstrated from the Bible, and is entirely based on Tradition.⁶ The contents of the “canon” or list of books admitted as Scripture (as opposed to the Apocrypha), has been handed down to us as a result of the decisions made by the Church (under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost) at the Council of Carthage in 379. As St. Augustine said,

I should not believe the Gospel, unless I were impelled thereto by the authority of the Catholic Church.⁷

To stress Tradition is in no way to decry Scripture which is a major part of it, and as such remains one of the primary sources from which we come to know the Catholic Faith. And who can deny but that the Church has throughout the ages given the greatest possible veneration to what is called “Holy Writ?”⁸

The Council of Trent taught that “following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, [the Council of Trent] receives and venerates with equal affection of piety and reverence all the books both of the Old and the New Testament,—seeing that one God is the author of both. . . . But if anyone receive not, as sacred and canonical, the said books entire with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church . . . let him be anathema” (Session IV).

Pope Leo XIII taught that they “in their entirety, and together with all their parts, were written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.” He further added that “it is utterly impossible for the least error to be divinely inspired” (*Providentissimus Deus*). Whenever the Gospels are read at Mass, the faithful stand and make the Sign of the Cross over their foreheads, their mouths, and their heart, thus symbolizing that what they believe in their minds, they confess on their lips, and love in their heart. Anyone who has attended a traditional High Mass knows how the Gospel is carried

in procession, incensed, and venerated. If the great hand-written and illuminated Bibles of mediaeval times were “chained” in the Churches, this is but similar to the practice today in any rare-book library. If they were preserved in the Latin (Vulgate), this was but to prevent the introduction of error into the established text. They were from the earliest days read in both the liturgical language and the vernacular—this we know from the history of St. Procarp who was martyred in the year 303, and whose function it was at Mass to translate the sacred text into the spoken tongue—a custom that prevails to this day wherever the traditional Mass is said. Nor is it true, as Luther and the Protestants claim, that the Church “kept the Bible from the laity.” For example, there were at least nine editions of the Bible published in the German tongue prior to Luther’s birth, and he himself used one of these as the basis of his own work; there were many more—perhaps as many as a hundred different editions published in Latin. It should be noted that prior to 1500 any literate man could handle Latin with ease. Multiple editions were also printed in the other countries.⁹ And this is to say nothing of the mediaeval sermons that were often little more than strings of biblical quotations pieced together.

Again, the Church has not, as Protestant historians claim, ever forbidden the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular. As the preface to the *King James Version* indicates, and as Cranmer himself admitted, there were a host of pre-Reformation translations into the Anglo-Saxon and English tongues. The issue only came under discussion when false translations produced by heretics made their appearance. And when they did, the Church, with her usual concern for preserving the integrity of the Scriptures, imposed and promulgated certain legitimate and necessary limitations. Thus in England, it was the Lollard (the followers of Wycliffe) cry, “An open Bible for all!”—meaning the incorrect and mischievous translations being spread abroad and the free interpretation of Scripture. This led Bishop Arundel to promulgate the following article at a Diocesan Council held in Oxford in 1408:

We therefore command and ordain that henceforth no one *on his own authority* translate any passage of Holy Scripture into English in a book, booklet, or tract, and that no one read, wholly or in part, publicly or secretly, any such book, booklet, or tract lately written in the time of said John Wycliffe or since, or that may hereafter be made, under pain of excommunication until such translation has been approved and allowed by the diocesan of the place (emphasis mine).¹⁰

Let the meaning of the article be clear. There is no prohibition against translations as such, but against unauthorized translations. And indeed,

such was both legitimate and necessary, for as the historian Hilaire Belloc points out, the Reformers used the Scriptures against the Church in three ways: 1) They appealed to the sacred books against the Church as if Scripture could be used to negate tradition; 2) If the authority of the clergy was to be removed or undermined, an alternative authority had to be found, and indeed the Scriptures proved most useful insofar as no Catholic was willing to deny but that they had a certain authority—hence the cry of the Reformers: “*Sola Scriptura*”; and 3) Scripture could be translated in such a manner as to distort the original meaning by simply changing a few key words—to say nothing of the heretical commentaries that could lead the reader of even orthodox translations to understand their content in an incorrect sense.¹¹

What are some of these key words? According to Thomas Ward’s *Errata of the Protestant Bible*, they were above all the words that specified the sacrificial nature of the Mass and the Priesthood. Altar became “table,” priest became “elder,” church became “congregation,” and grace became “favor.” St. Thomas More lists yet others, such as Penance changed to “repentance,” confession to “knowledge,” and contrite to “troubled.” The Reformers also had a penchant for adding and deleting phrases they objected to. A classic example of this is Luther translating Romans 3:29 as “justified by faith *only*.” There is absolutely nothing in the Vulgate to justify the addition of the word *only*. When Luther was taken to task for this he responded: “You tell me what a great fuss the Papists are making because the word ‘alone’ is not in the text of Paul. If your Papist makes such an unnecessary row about the word ‘alone,’ say right out to him: Dr. Martin Luther will have it so, and say: Papists and asses are one and the same thing. I will have it so, and I order it to be so, and my will is reason enough. I know very well that the word ‘alone’ is not in the Latin and Greek text, and it is not necessary for the Papists to teach me that. . . . It shall remain in my New Testament, and if all the Popish donkeys were to get mad and beside themselves, they will not get it out.”¹² In parallel manner they deleted important portions (those referring to the need for good works or Purgatory) of both the New and the Old Testament.

The Church is not only concerned with the proper translations of the sacred text; she is also concerned that the obscure passages in Scripture be understood correctly—that is, after the manner of the Fathers, the Doctors, and the Saints.¹³ How could she do otherwise? For centuries she had taken an almost excessive care to preserve the Scriptures intact—no one has ever accused her of falsifying them—and if she took such care to preserve them in the exact form that they were given to her, how could she not be concerned with their proper interpretation? Where after all did the

Protestants get their Scriptures that they so freely interpret? And how else can we expect a loving mother to act?¹⁴

THE POST-CONCILIAR TRANSLATIONS OF SCRIPTURE

A man is said to expound Holy Writ in another sense than that required by the Holy Ghost, when he so distorts the meaning of Holy Writ, that it is contrary to what the Holy Ghost has revealed. . . . Such are false prophets.
St. Thomas Aquinas¹⁵

The post-Conciliar “Popes” have approved a variety of new translations, and while not overtly condemning the *Douay-Rheims* version, have all but consigned it to oblivion.¹⁶ The one in most common use is *The New American Bible*, approved for use with the *Novus Ordo Missae*, or new mass. It carries an introduction by Paul VI in which he states that it was “produced in cooperation with our separated brethren” so that “all Christians may be able to use it.” What this means is that the translation is one the Protestants approve of. Yet another is the *Jerusalem Bible*. (Approved, but not specifically recommended, for use during liturgical services. And far better than those that are.) It informs us in the introduction that it was created with *aggiornamento*, or “keeping abreast of the times,” and *approfondimento*, or “deepening of theological thought,” in mind. It also provides notes “which are neither sectarian nor superficial.” Still another is *The Way, the Living Bible, complete Catholic Edition*, which one writer of *The Remnant* has described as “the killing Bible, complete satanic edition.”¹⁷

It is not surprising, when we turn to these new ecumenical editions, to find that the same key words that the enemies of the Church in a previous era used so effectively to attack the deposit of the faith, have now been adopted and approved by the post-Conciliar Church. Consider I Corinthians 11:27, where the Latin “*calicem*” is translated as a “cup” rather than as a “chalice.” Such is by no means innocent when one finds altar translated as “table” and sacrifice as “meal.”¹⁸

In some ways these new versions are even worse than their Protestant prototypes. For example, those responsible for these translations seem to have a positive aversion for the term “soul.” Consider the *Magnificat*: Where Mary says, “My soul doth magnify the Lord,” we now read, “My being proclaims the greatness of God” (Luke 2:46). Where Luke quotes Simeon as saying, “and thine own soul a sword shall pierce,” we now read: “and you yourself shall be pierced with a sword” (Luke 2:35). Again, where Matthew asks: “what doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his soul,” we find the following: “what profit would a man show if

he were to gain the whole world and destroy himself in the process” (Matt. 16:26; Mark 8:36)? Even Christ does not escape! His words uttered during the Agony in the Garden are changed from, “my soul is sorrowful even unto death,” to: “my heart is nearly broken with sorrow” (Matt. 26:36).

“Hell” has also been all but abolished. It is only mentioned once in the *New American Bible*, while it is mentioned over 120 times in the *Douay-Rheims* translation and over 50 times in the Anglo-Episcopalian *King James Version*. Moreover, in the various cycles that are read to the People of God each Sunday, the pertinent passage is not included. No wonder that belief in Hell has greatly diminished among the faithful.¹⁹

Another favorite distortion is to change the word “charity” to “love.” St. Thomas More addresses this falsification and shows the Protestants used it with the deliberate intention of discrediting the teaching of the Church. “For although charity,” he says, “be always love, yet is not, ye wot well, love always charity.” He discusses the differences between the two words as commonly understood. “But now, whereas charity signifieth in Englishmen’s ears not every common love, but a good virtuous and well-ordered love, he that will studiously flee from that name of good love, and always speak of ‘love’ and leave out the ‘good,’ I would surely say that he meaneth naughtily.” He concluded that Tyndale had altered the word “in order to minish the name of holy virtuous affection into the bare name of love, common to the virtuous love that man beareth to God and the lewd love that is between some worthless fellow and his mate.” Charity means to More, and to every other Catholic, that degree of supernatural love for God enjoyed by each particular soul in a state of grace. And this supernatural state is one to which a man by his own efforts can never attain, one which is entirely beyond his desserts, and in which he is raised to the dignity of an adopted son of God and is endowed by grace with the powers befitting his new status. Charity, then, is a key word of the Catholic faith. Tyndale’s object, as More points out (and Tyndale never denied), was to displace it by the commoner word “love,” and thus to make way for another Protestant key word, namely “faith,” which, as they believe, without works, without charity, and without grace, is sufficient in itself for salvation.²⁰

Again, the *New American Bible* constantly translates the phrase *resurrexit* and *surrexit* (active voice) as “Christ has been raised” (passive voice), rather than the correct, “Christ is risen.” The distinction may seem minor, but Christ was not raised by another. “If Christ be not risen (being God, in and of Himself) . . . then is our faith in vain” (1 Cor. 15).²¹ In Genesis we are told that a wide variety of animals were created by God “after their own kind,” etc. Such of course speaks to the fixity of the species and precludes the possibility of evolution. We are now told that instead of

herons, frogs, etc. reproduced “after their own kind,” that God created “all kinds of” herons, frogs, etc.

Still further and truly offensive to pious ears is the new translation of the Angelic Salutation. “Hail Mary full of grace” (*Ave Maria, gratia plena*). We now find it translated by the most awkward “Rejoice, O highly favored daughter”—hardly a phrase to use in the rosary, but one the Protestants of an earlier period had used to denigrate the Mother of God. Fr. Robert Burns’ comments on this passage are pertinent: “I’m sure that God had many highly favored daughters, but I know of only one who was informed by an angel from Heaven that she possessed the fullness of grace.” And indeed, when Pope Pius IX defined the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in 1854, he pointed to this very phrase as evidence that the soul of the Blessed Virgin could never, even from the moment of conception, have been stained by sin.²²

Allow me to conclude with one final passage. In Genesis 25, from whence comes the famous phrase of selling one’s soul for a “mess of pottage,” Esau is now quoted as saying to Jacob: “Let me gulp down some of that red stuff, I’m starving” How many parents would tolerate this type of language at the dinner table? Are we to assume the current crop of translators can’t speak English? Or is there perhaps some attempt in all this to turn Scripture itself into a “mess of pottage”?

POST-CONCILIAR EXEGESIS

Exegesis is the explanation of the meaning of Scripture. As alluded to above, heretics not only mistranslate Scripture, they also misinterpret it, distorting its meaning so as to make it reflect their own private opinions. In an earlier age Catholic exegetes followed traditional patterns and a text published by an identified Catholic author (usually carrying a *Nihil Obstat*—“nothing objectionable”) guaranteed its orthodoxy.²³ Prior to Vatican II authorized translations of the Bible carried annotated explanations of obtuse passages, such being required by canon law.

Today Catholic authors frequently fail to identify themselves as such (it would be unecumenical) and priests allow themselves to be illustrated on book covers dressed as laymen (What would we think of a surgeon who dressed like a garbage collector for the book cover of a medical text?). Moreover, when the *Nihil Obstat* is currently used, it guarantees absolutely nothing in terms of orthodoxy and functions only to seduce the unwary faithful.²⁴ Official translations of Scripture are still required to have annotated commentaries of obscure passages, but these modern

annotations are inspired by the same ecumenism as are the translations themselves.

“Traditions are necessary,” says St. Alphonsus Liguori, “that the Church may determine the true sense of the passages of Scripture.” Clear-cut norms are available for the use of exegetes. Above all, these are the Fathers such as Sts. Augustine, Chrysostom, and Jerome. Whenever they explain a given passage of Scripture pertaining to the teaching of faith and morals in a similar way, they have supreme authority (Denzinger, 1945). In addition, apart from the writings of the Church Fathers, there are excellent commentaries available. St. Thomas Aquinas’ *Catanea Aurea* or “Golden Chain,” which was translated into English by the Anglicans in the 1850s (using the *King James Version* of Scripture), provides a consensus of what the saints and Fathers said on all the pertinent passages of the Gospels. Further, he has left us commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul. Another famous compilation is that of the eighteenth century Jesuit Fr. Cornelius Lapidus running to some 35 large folio volumes. Unfortunately, only the commentary on the Psalms (that of St. Cardinal Bellarmine) and the New Testament are available in English.²⁵ No one claims that these authors have exhausted every interpretive possibility, for as the ancient Jews taught, Scripture is like an anvil—when struck with a hammer, a thousand sparks fly forth.²⁶ Clearly any given passage can have multiple meanings, but new insights, if such are developed, should fall within a traditional framework and be consistent with the entire corpus of the Church’s teaching. Certainly, no amount of “modern” or “scientific” insight can contradict Church doctrines if for no other reason than that Science is of a lower order of knowledge than Revelation.

The Church has traditionally taught that Scriptural passages can be understood on four levels. To quote Dante’s *Convivio*:

The first is called the *literal*, and it extends no farther than the letter as it stands; the second is called *allegorical* (some use the term *typical*), and is the one that hides itself under the mantle of these tales. . . . The third sense is called *moral* . . . [and] the fourth sense is called the *anagogical* (some say *mystical*), which is to say, “above the sense”; and this is when Scripture is spiritually expounded.

Such is no longer the case. Modern Catholic Scripture scholars, following in the footsteps of Protestant exegetes, neglect these venerable sources and principles, and would replace the understanding of the sacred with what they call “higher” and “lower criticism”—philology, historical criticism, psychological interpretations, to say nothing of merely socio-economic and political expositions—reducing the Bible to the level of modern profane

literature. It is on the basis of such a “scientific” approach that individuals like Fr. Brown have the audacity to attack the Virgin Birth, Christ’s miracles, the Resurrection, and a host of other doctrines. Those who do not accept these methods and conclusions are labeled “Fundamentalists.”²⁷

Traditional Catholics would do well to be familiar with the jargon and methodology of these wolves. The term “fundamentalist” was originally coined by the modernists to describe, not those who insisted on limiting our understanding to the merely literal, but rather to describe those who wished to profess and defend the “fundamentals” of the Catholic faith. As Stephen Clark tells us, it was used 1) to identify the early enemies of modernism; 2) to describe the conservative interpreters of Scripture; and 3) as a term of abuse for those considered more conservative than oneself.²⁸ As Fr. George Kelly notes: “the Catholic Church of Pius X would be considered fundamentalist on all three counts.”²⁹

According to the canons of “modern criticism,” Scriptural Revelation can only be understood by a study of the original intent of the authors and this in turn can only be ascertained by a study of the context or circumstances in which they wrote—as if the contents of the Bible can be encased in the relativity of history. Such of course conflicted with the principle that the authors of these texts wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, so revised concepts of inspiration had to be developed. Rather than truths handed down in immutable form, these pseudo-savants hold that the Scriptures relate the experience of the Apostles—their reactions to “inspirations” related in the idiom of their age. If such is the case, Scriptural passages can be seen as illustrations of God’s action or influence on the men of that age rather than as the immutable Word of God and the unique communication of God’s truth to mankind. As a result, the Bible becomes a record of the evolving religious consciousness of the human race. Needless to say, the modern exegete sees his function as reinterpreting this experience in such a manner as to make it applicable to the men “of our times.” As *The Cambridge History of the Bible* puts it, this process “makes Man the judge of revelation; Man becomes the Lord of Scriptures.”³⁰

It was Luther who first distinguished between the critical study of the text (lower criticism) and the critical study of the context (higher criticism). The critical movement sharpened in the eighteenth century, and developed most radically in the nineteenth. All this has culminated in the work of individuals like Rudolf Bultmann. His extreme historical skepticism, which showed in his work in the 1920s, subsequently developed into an insistence of the need to de-mythologize the whole New Testament. He argues that it is not only particular narratives and incidents (e.g., the Virgin Birth, the Ascension) which embody mythological elements, but that the

entire Gospel accounts are based on a mythical conception of the universe (e.g., a three-storied heaven, earth, and hell) which cannot be accepted. Stripped of all such myths, the New Testament will disclose, according to him, its real meaning. He separates history from faith and makes of the latter an existentialist decision: Christianity (his Christianity) is true, whether it happened or not. Bultmann has been the driving force in New Testament studies since that time, not only in Germany, but throughout the entire world. He is one of the darlings and heroes of the modern Catholic exegete.

“Lower” or “textual” criticism is used to “study” and attack the accuracy and historical validity of Scriptural texts under the guise of establishing the original text of the biblical documents. The Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome loses its authority and Scripture is looked on as a piece of literature open to the kind of textual analysis given to the works of Virgil or Homer. Now, clearly there is a place for such studies—Sts. Augustine and Jerome both engaged in it. However, their efforts were constructive, and despite mountains of effort, little of value has been added to their conclusions. The modernist uses this methodology, however, not to demonstrate the consistency of his material, nor to penetrate deeper into truth, but to attack the traditional teachings of the Church. An excellent example of this is the patently false contention that there was no word for “all” in Aramaic, and hence that when our Lord said “many” he really meant “all.” (To demonstrate the absurdity of this contention one has but to change all instances of “many” in Scripture to “all.”) We see the effects of this in the mistranslations of the consecratory formula used in the *Novus Ordo Missae*, the rite used in the post-Conciliar Church to replace the traditional Mass.

Examples of “historical criticism” are the conclusions drawn regarding Melchisedech, who is mentioned in the traditional Roman Canon of the Mass after the Consecration (God is asked to accept the sacrifice of the priest, as he accepted the sacrifice of Abel, that of Abraham, and that of Melchisedech—*sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam*). His name has been deleted from the *Novus Ordo Missae*. (It is also deleted from the new ordination rites.) According to an explanatory footnote in the approved *Anchor Bible*, Melchisedech is thought to have been a king of Jerusalem in the Middle Bronze Age and a priest of the pagan god el Elyon. The *New American Bible* calls him a “Canaanite priest” rather than an Israelite. He brings out offerings and invokes his god, while Abraham, no doubt in a spirit of ecumenical dialogue, gives him a tithe of everything. The reader is thus led to think that the Church prays (or prayed) in her most solemn rite that God would accept the sacrifice of Christ as he accepted the ministrations of a pagan hierodule, and that the Hebrew patriarch

apparently recognizes the spiritual authority of a non-Israelite. What the reader is not told in these various footnotes is that in Psalm 109 David is addressed as “a priest forever after the order of Melchisedech,” and that the “historical” Melchisedech of the commentator is a reconstruction based on pure conjecture—all the more so in that this mysterious individual had neither father nor mother. In the chapter on the nature of the traditional Mass it will become clear that the “perpetual sacrifice” is one of which Melchisedech, along with Abel and Isaac, represented a type.

Another aspect of historical criticism is the attempt to show that the Bible is a reworking of earlier “creation myths” such as the Chaldean or the Indian. No thought is given to the fact that we all derive from Adam (a *de fide* statement), and that other ancient peoples may have derived from him certain insights into the Creation of the world—what traditional exegetes have referred to as the remnant of some primordial revelation. And all this is to say nothing of the various attempts to explain away the miracles of the Old Testament as natural phenomena incompletely understood by those not as highly evolved as ourselves, or the attempt to show that Genesis is really two books, or that Moses could not have been the author of the first five books of the Bible.³¹

Even more devastating is “higher” criticism. This in turn is subdivided into 1) “Form criticism,” which supposedly studies the literary form the author used to convey his meaning—is it poetry, fable, drama, or history? Now, of course, Scripture is all of these things, but not in the sense that the modern understands them. To reduce the sacrifice of the Cross to mere history is to deprive it of all metaphysical impact; to see the Canticle of Canticles as mere poetry is to place it on a level with the writings of Longfellow and Robert Burns—cute and pleasing, but void of intellectual content. (In his general Audiences of May 1984 John Paul II actually discussed the “body language” of the Song of Songs!); 2) “Redaction criticism,” which attempts to delineate and reassemble the original source material that the New Testament author used in fashioning his particular Gospel or Epistle—asking such questions as what needs and purposes led the authors to write as they did, and where the original sources of their material lay. As a result of these techniques—essentially conjectural in nature—Scripture is divorced from the rest of tradition so necessary to its proper understanding, and is reduced to a collection of poetic myths, often borrowed from pagan sources. Individuals like Fr. Brown—their name is legion—have the impudence to raise such questions as: “Was Jesus really conceived by the Holy Ghost, or was he conceived by sexual intercourse? Are the stories on which the Church’s understanding of Mary’s conception of Jesus really true? Are they based on historical fact or are they legends

drafted after the ‘resurrection’ to enhance Jesus’ importance in the early Christian community?” As Pius XII said of this methodology, it leads “to the elimination from the sacred writings of all prophecy and miracles, and of everything else that is outside the natural order” (*Providentissimus Deus*).

Conservative defenders of the post-Conciliar church will immediately claim that Fr. Brown, Hans Küng, Schillebeeckx and individuals of similar ilk—individuals in full communion with the post-Conciliar Church—are examples of “abuses” and that they do not represent real Catholicism. They are of course correct in this—they are indeed abuses that do not represent the true Church. But what is one to say when, for example, these individuals are given the full support of the hierarchy and are given free reign to spread their errors in post-Conciliar seminaries and priestly “Renewal Programs.” Fr. Brown, despite innumerable complaints on the part of the Catholic laity, is repeatedly defended by such eminent post-Conciliar “bishops” as James Rausch (General Secretary of the U.S. Catholic Conference), Archbishop Whealon of Hartford, Cardinal Humberto Medeiros of Boston, and Cardinal Timothy Manning of Los Angeles—all men with the false reputation of acting to restore the traditional Church. Despite all the talk of a “return to orthodoxy” none of the post-Conciliar “Popes” has taken any effective action against these “creeps,” and some have even been raised to the rank of Cardinals! It is an old story. These wolves that would, to use a phrase of St. Gregory of Nyssa, “break the bones of Scripture,” are given full freedom to attack the sheep—the shepherds, if not actively encouraging the resulting devastation, stand idly by “like dogs who cannot bark.”³²

It is impossible to understand how anyone with a love of Scripture and Holy Mother Church can tolerate such abuses or ignore the terrible curse pronounced against those who add to, detract from, or pervert the holy words of Scripture (Apoc. 22:18-19). St. Augustine teaches that “heresy is derived from the Greek word for election, because each person chooses for himself that doctrine which he likes best. Wherefore, whosoever understands the Scriptures contrary to the sense of the Holy Ghost, by whom they were written, and though he secedes not from the Church, he can be called a heretic.” He further tells the story of an African bishop who in preaching to his subjects desired to substitute for a single word of the Gospel, another which seemed to him more appropriate. The people revolted. Affairs came to such a pass that the bishop was obliged to retract what he had said, and to restore the ancient word, failing which the people would have abandoned him.³³ By constantly changing the translations of Scripture read from the pulpit along with the introduction of the

The Nature of Revelation—Scripture

Lutheran-inspired “three year cycle,” the faithful lose all their familiarity with Scriptural phrases. Surely Augustine’s story provides an example for our times.

In the face of all this sloppy ecumenical compromise—the phrase is gentle, for in an earlier age it would have correctly been described as depraved innovation and heresy—on the part of the post-Conciliar hierarchy, one wonders just how they understand and explain away the instruction of St. Paul:

Hold the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me in faith and in love, which is in Christ Jesus (2 Tim. 1:13).³⁴

But our study carries us beyond the issues of Scripture. The Bible is by no means the only channel through which Tradition is preserved and handed down. Other organs of the Magisterium also subserve this function—above all the liturgy (the traditional Mass, the Breviary, the sacramental rites, and traditional prayers), the Councils, the writings of the sub-Apostolic Fathers and the historical documents of the Church. It is these “traditions” of the Church, as much as Scripture, which function to preserve the original deposit. St. Francis de Sales tells us that “the orthodox Fathers received and honor with an equal affectionate piety and reverence, all the books as well of the Old Testament as the New, since the one God is the author of both, and also these Traditions, which as it were, were orally dictated by Christ or the Holy Ghost and preserved in the Catholic Church by perpetual succession.” He further states that “the Scripture is the Gospel, but it is not the whole Gospel, for traditions form the other part. . . . He then who shall teach against what the Apostles have taught, let him be accursed; but the Apostles have taught by writing and by Tradition, and the whole is the Gospel.” Hence it follows that, as St. John of Damascus said: “He who believeth not according to the Tradition of the Catholic Church . . . is an unbeliever;” and St. Augustine says: “It is madness to quit the traditions of the Church.” How could these saints say otherwise when the Apostle himself instructs us:

Stand fast, and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle (2 Thes. 2:14).

It is the nature of Tradition that we shall discuss in the next chapter.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Notes

¹ Fr. Urquart, a parish priest trained at Valladolid in Spain long before the changes. This seminary dates back to the time of the English Reformation and was established for English refugees who wished to become priests.

² Canon George D. Smith, *The Teaching of the Catholic Church*. Yves Congar tells us “this expression, ‘two sources of Revelation,’ was rejected by a nearly two thirds majority at the Second Vatican Council. This decision is of considerable importance for the future of the dialogue recently reopened on this question between the Protestants and ourselves. As a well informed commentator noted on this subject: ‘With this vote of November 20th (1962), it may be said that the period of the Counter-Reformation is at an end, and that Christianity is entering a new era whose consequences are as yet unpredictable’” (“The Meaning of Tradition,” *The Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism* [Hawthorn: N.Y., 1964]). Hardly unpredictable!

³ Tanquerey, *A Manual of Dogmatic Theology*. It has been argued by some that Tradition is a “post-Tridentine” phenomenon. Listen to the words of St. Epiphanius (c. 370): “We must also call in the aid of Tradition, for it is impossible to find everything in Scripture; for the holy Apostles delivered to us some things in writing and others by Tradition” (*Adv. Haeres*). St. Basil similarly speaks of dogmas being found—“some in doctrinal writings, others handed down from the Apostles . . . both of which have the same religious force” (*De S. Sanc.*).

⁴ “But there are also many other things which Jesus did; which if they were written, every one, the world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written” (John 21:25).

⁵ Cardinal Henry Manning, *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*. Indeed, Joseph Wilhelm and Thomas Scannell point out in their *Manual of Catholic Theology* (Kegan Paul: London, 1910) that “the reading of the Bible is not necessary for salvation, or even advisable for everyone under all circumstances.” The fact that the Revelation of Christianity was given intact prior to the writing of the Scriptures makes the Protestant rule of faith—“*sola Scriptura*”—absurd.

⁶ *Exposition of Christian Doctrine*.

⁷ *Contra ep. Fundament.*, c. 5: Prior to 379 a variety of texts were read during Mass, including some which were not written by the Apostles. The Council Fathers decided which texts were spurious and which were authentic. There were, for example, 13 Epistles of St. Paul. This council drew up the “canon” of the New Testament, and their decision was confirmed by the Holy See. The Church has with great care preserved this body of writing intact and has never admitted any changes. She has moreover renewed her anathemas against all who should deny or dispute this collection at the Council of Florence, the Council of Trent, and Vatican I (Rev. Henry Graham, *Where We Got the Bible* [Herder: N.Y., 1911]). Protestants derive their Bible from this source, though they eliminate certain passages that stress Purgatory or the need for works.

⁸ Witnesses to the importance of this principle are the almost countless English translations of the Scriptures currently available. Many different translations are approved by the post-Conciliar Church. *The New American Bible* produced by the Catholic Biblical Association of America and the Bishops’ Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, and carrying the specific approval of Paul VI contains innumerable errors, while the English is in many places crude and inelegant.

⁹ Cf. *Catalogue of Bibles in the Caxton Exhibition at South Kensington in London* in 1877. The subject of Luther’s translation is discussed in Fr. O’Hare’s *The Facts About Luther* (Pusket:

The Nature of Revelation—Scripture

N.Y., 1916; also available from TAN). There were nine German Bible editions available before Luther started his translation, and 27 in print before Luther's was published. In Italy there were 40 editions in the Vernacular before the first Italian Protestant version saw the light. These editions were authorized by the Church. In considering these issues one should remember that the printing press had just been invented.

¹⁰ Graham, *Where We Got the Bible*. Anglo-Saxon translations obviously pre-dated Wycliffe; and why not if King Alfred saw fit to translate such texts as Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy* for his subjects?

¹¹ Hilaire Belloc, *Cranmer* (Lippencot: Phil., 1931). W. Walker, an individual hardly friendly to the Church, calls Luther's translation "very free . . . judged by modern canons of accuracy" (*The Reformation*). Zwingli was even more critical: "Thou corruptist, O Luther, the Word of God. How much we are ashamed of thee whom we had once so much respected" (*De Sacramentis*, Vol. II; quoted by Galitzin in *Galitzin's Letters* [The Angelmodde Press: Loretto, Penn., 1940]).

¹² Thomas J. Ward, Esq., *Errata of the Protestant Bible* (Sadler: Boston, 1841, many editions). The quote from Luther is obtained in Bakewell Morrison, S.J., *The Catholic Church and the Modern Mind* (Bruce: N.Y., 1933).

¹³ "The reading of Holy Scripture is permitted to Catholics, and is very profitable to them; but the text used by them must have been authorized by the Pope, and must be provided with explanatory notes" (Rev. Francis Spirago, *The Catechism Explained* [Benzinger: N.Y., 1899]). The Church has always encouraged the study of Scripture. "This fancy," says St. Chrysostom, "that only monks should read the Scriptures is a pest that corrupts all things; for the fact is that such reading is more necessary for you [the laity] than it is for them" (*In Matt. Hom. 2*). The Church however also taught: "Let the reader beware how he makes the Scriptures bend to his sense, instead of making his sense bend to Scripture" (*Regula cujusdem Patris, ap. Luc. Hols. Cod. Reg.*).

¹⁴ Mistranslations are nothing other than the application of private judgment to the sacred writings.

¹⁵ *Summa*, II-II, Q. II, *On Heresy*.

¹⁶ Available through TAN: Rockford, Ill. This translation was for centuries the Catholic standard. It remains such to this day.

¹⁷ *The Remnant*, Dec. 17, 1981. Space does not allow us to review or even list innumerable other translations being used by post-Conciliar Catholics. Mention should, however, be made of the translation of Msgr. Reginald Knox, whose many defects are exposed in a publication previously available from Britain's Catholic Library, Killanne, Enniscorthy, Co. Wexford, Republic of Ireland. Currently the feminists are pushing to have a "gender-neutral" translation.

¹⁸ Similar distortions are to be found in all the sacraments which are detailed in my book *The Problem with the Other Sacraments* which is currently available on my web site: <http://www.Coomaraswamy-catholic-writings.com>. Also available on this site are in-depth discussions of Holy Orders and Extreme Unction.

¹⁹ I am grateful to Ms. R. Cowles for pointing this out. *The Remnant*, Oct. 15, 1983. John Paul II believes and preaches that all men are saved, which would obviate the need for Hell.

²⁰ St. Thomas More, *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies and Matters of Religion* (Yale: New Haven, CT., 1982). Also quoted in W.E. Cambell's *Erasmus, Tyndale, and More* (Bruce: Milwaukee, 1978). The commentary in this paragraph is essentially that of Professor Cambell.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

²¹ It is to be admitted that St. Paul uses the passive form in at least one place. The defect in the new translations lies not in saying Christ was raised, but in suppressing the texts that say He rose by His own power. For He was as much raised by His own power as by the Father with whom He is one Person. Many other examples could be given, such as: “He groaned in the spirit and troubled Himself” (John 11:33) being changed to: “He shuddered with the emotions that flared up within Him”—the latter clearly suggesting that Christ was not in control of his passionate nature.

²² One finds the phrase “favored” in the *Authorized King James Version* and in the *Gideon Bible*. I suppose we should be grateful that it wasn’t translated “Hi ya’ babe!”

²³ Many supposedly Catholic texts today no longer carry the *Nihil Obstat* and authors are frequently not identified as priests.

²⁴ One can document case after case where errors are given such approval.

²⁵ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Catanea Aurea* (Oxford, 1845, and recently republished by Preserving Christian Publications, Inc. Albany, N.Y.). St. Thomas’ commentaries on the Pauline epistles are available in English from Magi Books: Albany, N.Y., 1966. Cornelius Lapidé’s *Commentary on the New Testament* was published in English (John Grant: Edinborough, 1908). If the post-Conciliar Church is truly interested in the salvation of souls, it could spend its money on republishing and translating such great works rather than in tearing Tabernacles out of Altars.

²⁶ *The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers (Pirke Aboth)*, translated by W.O.E. Oesterley (S.P.C.K.: London, 1919).

²⁷ Fr. Brown remains a priest in good standing. He is currently teaching at Union Theological Seminary in New York and is called by Fr. George A. Kelly “the Catholic Church’s premier ecumenical *Biblicist*” (*The New Biblical Theorists* [Servant: Ann Arbor, Mich., 1983]).

²⁸ Stephen B. Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*. Quoted in Fr. George A. Kelly, *The New Biblical Theorists* (Servant Books: Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1983).

²⁹ Fr. Kelly, *The New Biblical Theorists*. Fr. Kelly exposes the new exegetes for the frauds that they are, and argues that they are examples of the “abuses” of the post-Conciliar era. His argument falls short however in that they are not condemned (one knows what Pius X would have done), and in that he has nothing to say about the new false translations of Scripture that clearly have post-Conciliar approval at the highest level.

³⁰ The nefarious origin of this type of scholarship in the “Bible Destructive Group” established around the time of the French Revolution is well described by Dr. Ratibor-Ray M. Jurevich in *The Contemporary Faces of Satan* (Ichthys Books: Denver, CO., 1985).

³¹ Those confused by the seeming contradiction of the Genesis explanation of the Creation and that offered in Ecclesiastes are referred to Wolfgang Smith, *Teilhardism and the New Religion* (TAN: Ill., 1988). Some will argue that Teilhard is no longer of much interest; however, his ideas are still very much abroad in the post-Conciliar Church. A more recent and important book by Dr. Smith is entitled *The Wisdom of Ancient Cosmology* (Foundation of Traditional Studies: Oakton, Va., 2004) that deals with this issue in greater detail.

³² St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of Moses* (Paulist Press: N.Y., 1978).

³³ The first quote from his *Commentary on Gal. V*, the second is quoted in *The Catechism of Perseverance* by Monsignor Gaume (Benzinger: Dublin, 1888), Vol. I.

³⁴ This is now translated as: “Take as a model of sound teaching what you have heard me say. . . .” The other pertinent passage from 1 Tim. 6:20: “Keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane novelties and words,” is now translated as: “Guard what has been committed to you. Stay clear of worldly, idle talk.” Other excellent references to the problem

The Nature of Revelation—Scripture

of bad translations are Ronald D. Lambert's *Experiment in Heresy* and Gary K. Potter's *The Liturgy Club* (both in *Triumph*, Wash. D.C., March and May, 1968). A similar pattern is to be found in the French translations. Cf. Gérard Garitte, "A propos d'une falsification de l'Écriture," *Itinieres*, Nov. 1977. An excellent discussion by a non-Christian is to be found in *The Survival of English* by Ian Robinson, (Cambridge, 1977).

CHAPTER 4

JUST WHAT IS MEANT BY THE WORD “TRADITION”?

Etymologically “tradition” simply means “that which is transmitted,” or “handed on.” According to the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908), “traditional truth was confided to the Church as a deposit which it would guard and carefully transmit as it had received it without adding to it or taking anything away.” As to the hierarchy, as Cardinal Franzelin puts it in his work *De Divina Traditione et Scriptura*: “The Lord chose a body of men to whom he entrusted His Revelation. He sent them to preach this truth and He threatened punishment on those who would not listen to them. . . . Entrusted with this mission, the Apostles and their appointed successors have taught all generations the revealed truth which comes from Christ.”¹

It should of course be abundantly clear that the Christian Revelation was complete with the death of the last Apostle. There is no such thing as “ongoing revelation.” The Teaching of the Magisterium is quite clear on this issue:

The Revelation made to the Apostles by Christ and by the Holy Spirit whom He sent to teach them all truth was final, definitive. To that body of revealed truth nothing has been, or ever will be, added.²

It should also be clear that this restriction on the hierarchy applies as much to the Pope as it does to any other member of the body of the faithful. As Cardinal Hergenrother notes (in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*): “He is circumscribed by the consciousness of the necessity of making a righteous and beneficent use of the duties attached to his privileges. . . . He is also circumscribed by the spirit and practice of the Church, by the respect due to General Councils, and to the ancient statutes and customs.”³ Now, this Revelation is given to us in Scripture and Tradition, and is preserved for us in the writings of the “Fathers,” and the “traditions” of the Church. It is passed on to us through the various “organs” of the Magisterium, of which the Pope himself is but one.

We have already discussed Scripture and shown that in fact, it is but a part of Tradition. In the present chapter we will consider in greater detail this broader concept. And in doing so, we shall follow the pattern

Just What Is Meant by the Word “Tradition”?

of theological texts by initiating the discussion with the following *de fide* statement taken from Session IV of the Council of Trent:

Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first promulgated with His own mouth, and then commanded to be preached by His Apostles to every creature, as the fountain of all, both saving truth and moral discipline; and seeing clearly that the truth and discipline are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand; (the synod), following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence all the books of both the Old and the New Testament—seeing that one God is the author of both; —as also the said traditions, those appertaining to faith as well as to morals, as dictated either by Christ’s own word of mouth or by the Holy Ghost and preserved in the Catholic Church. . . . But if anyone receive not, as sacred and canonical, the said books entire with all their parts as they have been used to be read in the Catholic church, and as they are contained in the old Latin Vulgate edition; and knowingly and deliberately condemn the traditions aforesaid: let him be anathema. (Luther repudiated both the Epistle of St. James and the Book of Esther.)

Despite the distortions that mistranslations and private interpretation leave Scripture open to, and despite the fact that the various Protestant sects reject certain of the Biblical books of the Catholic Canon, the meaning of the term remains relatively clear. Such however is not true of the term “tradition,” which has been used in such a wide variety of contexts, and with reference to different aspects of the divine *depositum*. Some would limit its use to the divinely revealed dogmas not contained in Scripture, while others apply the term to cover the whole spectrum of Catholic teaching and practice. In order to clarify the issue theologians have defined Tradition as *dogmatic* or *disciplinary* from the point of view of its subject matter; and as *divine* or *divine-Apostolic* from the point of view of its origin. It is divine or divine-Apostolic to distinguish it, on the one hand from *Ecclesiastical Traditions*, which are the precepts and customs long observed in the Church, and which, even if they might have been revealed, can only be traced back to post-Apostolic times, and on the other hand, from *human-Apostolic* traditions which trace their origin to the Apostles indeed, but not in their capacities as channels of Revelation. Normally such distinctions are important only to theologians and historians. In the current situation, where the post-Conciliar Church is abandoning many of its ancient practices faster than it can invent new ones, the defense of the Faith requires that we be familiar with these concepts.⁴

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Several points can now be made: 1) Tradition (with a capital “T”) as a source of Revelation refers to immutable things which cannot be rejected or changed regardless of whether they have been defined in a *de fide* manner or solemnly proclaimed as such.⁵ 2) Such Traditions include both Truths and Disciplines which have as their source Christ and the Apostles.⁶ 3) It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, at this point in time, to distinguish between what is “sub-Apostolic,” what is truly “divine-Apostolic” and what is of “human-Apostolic” origins. Thus for example, in the Canon of the traditional Mass, apart from the Words of Consecration, we are by no means sure which parts are of divine-Apostolic as opposed to Ecclesiastical Tradition. It must be remembered that, as Cardinal Bellarmine states in his *De Verbo Dei*, Tradition is called “unwritten,” not because it was never written down, but because it was not written down by the first author. It may be reasonably assumed that the sub-Apostolic authors to whom “innovation” was anathema, codified many “customs, precepts, disciplines, and practices” that were truly of Apostolic origin.⁷ Further, it must be stated that ecclesiastical traditions, while not carrying the same weight as Apostolic ones, certainly deserve our greatest veneration, and to reject them on the grounds that they are not “divine,” is as absurd as to reject the canons of the Ecumenical Councils because they did not derive from Christ Himself. As St. Augustine says with regard to the early bishops: “What they found in the Church, they held: what they had learned, they taught; what they had received from the Fathers, this they delivered to the children.”⁸

Hence it follows that as St. Peter Canisius states in his *Summa Doctrinae Christianae*, “it behooves us unanimously and inviolably to observe the Ecclesiastical Traditions, whether codified or simply retained by the customary practice of the Church.” All these points are summed up in the following, taken from a standard theological text:

These regulations having been completed, the private congregations proceeded to consider divine and Apostolic Traditions—such doctrines that is, and practices, as taught by Jesus Christ and His Apostles, have not been recorded in the sacred writings, but have been transmitted in various ways from age to age. Numerous congregations, both particular and general were held on this subject. On the existence of such traditions all were agreed; but whilst some insisted that the received traditions should be distinctly specified, others were as urgent that they should be approved of in the most general manner possible, even to the exclusion of the distinctive term Apostolic, for fear of seeming to repudiate such usages and rites as could not be traced to that source. . . . In the general congregation of the 5th of April, the Bishop of Chioggia raised a more intemperate opposition; regarding the traditions as laws, not as revelations; and pronouncing it impious to declare them as of equal authority with the written word.

Just What Is Meant by the Word “Tradition”?

This sentiment had no approvers, but excited the indignation of the whole assembly.⁹

Tertullian, in the following passage, shows that the practices of the Church fall within the category of Tradition.

If for these [the practices of the Church] and other such rules, you insist upon having positive Scriptural injunction, you will find none. Tradition will be held forth to you as the originator of them, custom as their strengthener, and faith as their observer. That reason will support Tradition and custom, and faith you will either yourself perceive, or learn from someone who has.

Discussing the practice of women veiling their hair at Church, he continues:

This instance, therefore, will make it sufficiently plain that you can vindicate the keeping of even unwritten Tradition established by custom; the proper witness for tradition when demonstrated by long-continued observance (*e Corona*, Chap. IV). . . . There are many regulations that have been handed down with Apostolic authority, but not as revealed by God. They are merely Apostolic Traditions, in contra-distinction to divine-Apostolic Traditions. This distinction, though clear enough in itself, is not easy of application, except in matters strictly dogmatic or strictly moral. In other matters, such as Ecclesiastical institutions, and disciplines, there are various criteria to guide us; for example, 1) the distinct testimony of the teaching Apostolate or of Ecclesiastical documents that some institution is of Divine origin. . . ; 2) the nature of the institution itself—for instance the essential parts of the sacraments. . . . Where these criteria cannot be applied and the practice of the Church does not decide the point, it remains an open question whether a given institution is of Divine right and belongs to the Deposit of the Faith. In any case, we are bound to respect such traditions, and also those which are merely Ecclesiastical. Thus in the Creed of Pius IV [Creeds are part of the Solemn Magisterium] we say, “I most steadfastly admit and embrace Apostolic and Ecclesiastical Traditions and all other observances and institutions of the said Church. . . . I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church used in the solemn administration of all the sacraments.”¹⁰

Among the Traditions which are clearly of Apostolic origin are included “the inspiration of the books of the Old and the New Testament, the power of the Sign of the Cross, the determination of the precise number of the sacraments, the baptism of infants, the validity of baptism administered by heretics, the substitution of Sunday for the Sabbath, the Assumption of the

most Blessed Virgin, etc.”¹¹ One can add to this list the “form” and “matter” of the sacraments, especially that of the Holy Mass, and the establishment of the Episcopate as the legitimate descendants of the Apostles. It is this latter act that carries with it the concept of tradition (with a small “t”), for the legitimate pastors of the early Church established the Ecclesiastical Traditions—the “precepts, customs, disciplines, and practices,” not as men establishing human customs, but either as codifying those they had received or learnt from the Apostles, or as members of that one body fashioned by God Himself and animated and directed by His Holy Spirit. “Hence their testimony is not the testimony of men, but of the Holy Ghost.”¹² As it states in the Epistle of Diognetus, Christians “have no earthly discovery transmitted to them, and are not careful to guard any mortal invention.”

One is hardly surprised to find the majority of Church Fathers failing to make any clear distinction between Apostolic and Ecclesiastical Traditions. Cardinal Tixeront in his *History of Dogmas* states: “St. Leo uses the word Tradition in its primitive sense of teaching and custom transmitted by word of mouth or practice.” He states elsewhere in the same text that St. John Damascene, “like St. Basil . . . admits as a rule of faith, besides Scripture, certain unwritten traditions that have come down from the Apostles, and certain Ecclesiastical customs that must be accepted as authoritative.”¹³ St. Jerome also conceives of Tradition in this broader context: “The traditions and customs of the Church can make up for the silence of Scripture [on many points] as may be seen in many of her practices.”¹⁴ Such an understanding is also reflected by Fr. Barry writing as recently as 1906: “Catholics assuredly mean by Tradition the whole system of Faith and ordinances which they have received from the generations before them . . . so back to the Apostles of Christ.”¹⁵ Finally, as St. Basil points out, it is always the heretics that reject Tradition.¹⁶

The Councils also reflect the mind of the Church on this issue. Thus Canon III of the Council of Carthage and Cannon XXI of the Council of Gangra state that it is “insisted that the unwritten traditions shall have sway.” The Seventh Ecumenical Council states that “if anyone disregards any Ecclesiastical Tradition, written or unwritten, let him be anathema,” and “let everything that conflicts with Ecclesiastical Tradition and teaching, and that has been innovated and done contrary to the examples outlined by the Saints and the venerable Fathers, or that shall hereafter at any time be done in such a fashion, be anathema.”¹⁷ The Second Council of Nicaea also condemned “those, who dare, after the impious fashion of heretics, to deride the Ecclesiastical Traditions and to invent novelties of some kind.” Such also is the attitude of the Saints and the Popes. St. Peter Damian (a “doctor” of the Church) writes that “it is unlawful to alter the established

Just What Is Meant by the Word “Tradition”?

customs of the Church. . . . Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy Fathers have set.”¹⁸ St. John Chrysostom states: “Is it Tradition, [if so] ask nothing more.”¹⁹ As Pope Benedict XV said, repeating almost verbatim one who held the Chair of Peter almost a thousand years before (Pope Sylvester), “Do not innovate anything. Rest content with the Tradition.”²⁰ Not one Church Father, not one saint or Doctor of the Church, and not one Pope (prior to the present era) has ever decried or attempted to change the Ecclesiastical Traditions.

All this is a far cry from the teaching of the New and post-Conciliar Church whose erstwhile leader, Paul VI tells us “it is necessary to know how to welcome with humility and an interior freedom what is innovative; one must break with the habitual attachment to what we used to designate as the unchangeable traditions of the Church.” Judas could not have said it better.²¹

In order to better understand the relationship between Divine Tradition and Ecclesiastical Tradition, we may draw a parallel between what is termed *de fide definita* or *fide Catholica* (truths divinely revealed by Christ or the Apostles and declared by the Church to be such), and what is termed *de fide ecclesiastica (divina)* or *proxima fidei* (revealed truths not as yet formally so declared by the Church). As Fr. Faber has said:

There are three kinds of Faith: *Human*, which rests on human authority, and as such is uncertain and open to error; *Divine*, which rests on divine authority, and *Ecclesiastical* Faith, which rests on the authority of the Church defining anything with the assistance of the Holy Ghost, through which she is preserved from the possibility of error; and this Faith is infallible with a participated and borrowed infallibility, inferior in degree to Divine Faith, but with a certitude raising it far above Human Faith. If therefore anything be shown to be *de fide ecclesiastica* it is not only entitled to our acceptance, but it even overrules all opposition, as a man, though not formally a heretic, would, to use the common phrases, be rash, scandalous, and impious if he asserted the contrary.²²

Yet there is one difference between Divine and Ecclesiastical Traditions. The former are immutable but the latter can be modified by appropriate authority. Such of course assumes that they can clearly distinguish—as in the various parts of the Mass—between these two. But “modification” is a vastly different thing from the abrogations and changes that have been introduced by the post-Conciliar Church. How then do such legitimate modifications come about? The answer lies in the following principle. The true Church and Faith are characterized as “Living,” and the vine Christ established can always sprout forth new branches. It is not the newness of

the leaf, but the “sap” that runs in its veins, that maintains both spiritual health and traditional integrity. The fact that the feast of Corpus Christi with public processions may have been introduced in the late Middle Ages (such was hardly a possibility in the times of Nero) changed nothing in the Revelation Christ gave us. It destroyed no pre-existing tradition, and indeed functioned to make teachings of the Church more explicit. Our ways of showing respect and honor to the Sacred Species may be modified, but this in no way changes our traditional reverence for the Body of Christ. Such an “introduction” is in no way to be compared to the distribution of the Eucharist by unconsecrated hands under modern circumstances, or to the removal of tabernacles from our altars.²³ And most certainly they have nothing in common with the promulgation of rites that allow for a Protestant understanding of the sacrifice of the Mass. Such acts represent no “flowering forth” of the vine, but rather desecrations and clear-cut breaks with Tradition. Again, “new” customs can be introduced into the practice of the Church which are “traditional,” such as the Feast of the Sacred Heart or the Rosary, but they are in no way “innovations,” for they have their roots in sound doctrine, and are as it were, reverberations of the original deposit which can be likened to the ripples that a stone cast into a quiet pond inevitably send forth.²⁴

A further extension of the concept of “tradition” is to be found in the various “organs” that are used to transmit the “customs, precepts, institutions, disciplines, and practices” of the Church to our generation. Thus Franzelin, a Papal theologian at Vatican I, describes what is handed down as “objective tradition,” and the process of handing it down as “active tradition.”²⁵ Primary among these “organs” are the Solemn Magisterium (dogmatic definitions of the Roman Pontiffs or Ecumenical Councils, Professions of the Faith and theological censures, etc.); and the Ordinary or Universal Magisterium—which includes among other things the universal customs or practices associated with dogma and above all the traditional Roman liturgy.²⁶

Clearly the traditional Mass combines all these aspects of Tradition. Indeed, as Pope Pius XI said, “It is the most important organ of the Ordinary Magisterium of the Church,”²⁷ and of “the teaching of the Church.” It is, as A.M. Henry, O.P. states: “A theological locus of the first importance in knowing the living Tradition of the Church.”²⁸ Its content is partially of Divine origin, partially of Apostolic origin, and partially of Ecclesiastical derivation, though as regards the Canon (the fixed and central core of the Mass), with the exception of a few phrases, we are not sure which part belongs to which category—for as the Council of Trent teaches, the Canon is “composed out of the very words of the Lord, the traditions of

Just What Is Meant by the Word “Tradition”?

the Apostles, and the pious institutions of the Holy Pontiffs.” Though it has undergone various modifications throughout the ages, its essential nature has remained immutable and none of the parts known to be in its original form have ever been—prior to 1969—deleted. As one theologian put it: “Were any of the early Christians to rise from their tombs in the catacombs, they would recognize in the Catholic worship of our times [needless to say, one is referring to the traditional Mass, and not the *Novus Ordo Missae*], not merely the elements, but also some details in the form of worship to which they were accustomed.”²⁹ To quote Nicholas Gihir:

Christ’s example was the norm for the Apostles at the celebration of the sacrifice. They did, first, only that which Christ had done before. According to His directions and under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they observed other things besides, namely, according to circumstances, they added various prayers and observances in order to celebrate the Holy Mysteries as worthily and in as edifying a manner as possible. Those constituent portions of the sacrificial rite, which are found in all the ancient liturgies, incontestably have their origin from Apostolic times and Tradition; the essential and fundamental features of the Sacrificial rite, introduced and enlarged upon by the Apostles, were preserved with fidelity and reverence in the Churches founded by them. . . . Certain ceremonies, for instance, the mystical blessings, the use of lights, incense, vestments, and many things of that nature, she [the Church] employs by Apostolic prescription and Tradition.³⁰

No wonder then that the Abbé Guéranger states:

It is to the Apostles that those ceremonies go back that accompany the administration of the sacraments, the establishment of the sacramentals, the principal feasts. . . . The Apostolic liturgy is found entirely outside of Scripture; it belongs to the domain of Tradition.³¹

We must conclude then that the traditional Mass (as well as the other sacraments) is part of the Catholic Tradition. One cannot divorce the Magisterium from Tradition for the Magisterium is, as the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908) states, “the official organ of Tradition.” Our Faith then is totally dependent upon Tradition and cannot under any guise depart from it. It is, as the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* puts it, “The Faith that the Church (i.e., the Magisterium) teaches, for she has received it from the Apostles, and it is the norm of Truth.”³² And how could it be otherwise, for as Cardinal St. Bellarmine says in his *De Verbo Dei*, one of the characteristics of Tradition is that it is “perpetual—for it was instituted that it might be continuously used till the consummation of the world.”

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Among the customs of the Church that he lists as examples of “continuous usage” from the time of Christ to his day are “the rites of administering the sacraments, the feast days (Easter, etc.), the times of fasting, the celebration of the Mass, the divine office, *et alia generis ejusdem* (and things of a similar nature).” Admittedly, Bellarmine takes little pains to distinguish between what is “Divine” and what is “Ecclesiastical” in Tradition; rather he describes it as an integral whole in which the distinctions are between the various parts.³³ And, indeed, the distinctions that we are forced to make have about them a certain air of artificiality. One suspects that modern theologians have created such distinctions primarily to enable them to whittle away at the content of the Faith. Thus it is that Boussuet defines Tradition as the “interpreter of God’s law,” and the “unwritten doctrine coming from God and preserved in the feelings and universal practices of the Church.”³⁴

The “traditions”—that is to say, the customs and practices of the Church which are not clearly Apostolic or sub-Apostolic—are not opposed to Tradition, but the legitimate offspring of it; like Christ, the son is father to the parent. Thus it follows that one can speak of Tradition in a still broader sense as the total influence of a Catholic society and culture upon the souls of its members. For example, however offensive it may be to modern eyes, the crawling of the Mexican peasant on her knees to venerate Our Lady of Guadeloupe can be called “traditional” with complete legitimacy.³⁵ The *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908) expresses this well: “This concept of Tradition,” it states,

is not always clear, but we endeavor to explain it to ourselves in the following manner: We are all conscious of an assemblage of ideas or opinions living in our mind . . . a common sentiment . . . a common spirit. . . . The existence of Tradition in the Church must be regarded as living in the spirit and the heart, thence translating itself into acts, and expressing itself in words and writings. . . . This sentiment of the Church is peculiar in this that it is itself under the influence of Grace. The thought of the Church is essentially traditional thought.

And why is this so? It is because those who are deeply steeped in the Faith, whose patterns of life conform to the established and formal “traditions,” find that their every act and thought is correspondingly influenced. Generosity, gentleness, courtesy, dignity, and a whole host of similar qualities that reflect the divine virtues become a normal part of living. Such are not the qualities of the modern world, for “the spirit of our times” is a rebellious spirit and has its origins in a very different source—one that can well be described as “anti-traditional.”

Just What Is Meant by the Word “Tradition”?

Tradition then is a term that can be applied to the entire Christian ethos, and as such can be envisaged as a stately tree. Its roots are divine, and are often not clearly seen. They blend into the trunk which is solid, firm, and clearly visible—conforming to its “Ecclesiastical” and “visible” nature. The branches can be likened to the various “organs” of the Magisterium through which the “sap” of the Holy Spirit constantly flows. The leaves, the flowers, and the fruit complete the analogy—a living organism always changing with the seasons, always growing, occasionally losing a branch or bough, and yet always remaining essentially the same.

* * *

Now, if we have treated the subject of Tradition at great length, it is because the present situation demands a deeper understanding of the concept. The New and “post-Conciliar” Church, despite its attempt to disguise the situation, represents a *rupture with tradition of apocalyptic proportions*. It is, to use the words of Pope St. Pius X, in his encyclical *Pascendi* against the modernists, “using all its ingenuity in an effort to weaken the force and falsify the character of Tradition, so as to rob it of all its weight and authority.” Insofar as the New Church teaches falsely (either by omission or commission) and replaces the “customs, institutions, precepts, disciplines, and practices” of the traditional Church, *not* with alternative Apostolic actions, but with “forms” of purely human origin, it follows the footsteps, *not* of Christ, but of the Protestant reformers such as Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer. As to its Magisterium, it can hardly be called the “official organ of Tradition” when it sets out to introduce among the faithful, entirely new rites modeled after the heretical forms of worship introduced by those who avowedly hate the true Church and deny her basic teachings. Nor can this “new” and “post-Conciliar” Magisterium proclaim as “true” what the traditional Magisterium has defined as “false” without in doing so denying the very possibility of truth, to say nothing of the inerrancy and indefectibility of the Church.³⁶ To deny the traditions is to deny the inspired character of the Scriptures, to deny the rites of the Church, to deny the wisdom of the Fathers, the Saints, and the Popes, to deny many of the sacraments, and indeed, to deny all that is truly cultured in the present world. It will be argued, and is to be admitted, that the post-Conciliar Church has retained many “traditions,” as indeed, in fact, the Protestants also did (such as going to Church on Sunday). In doing so, however, she has preserved only those which are acceptable to the modern world and our “separate brethren.” Listen to the words of Paul VI addressed to those Catholics who insisted on retaining the traditional Mass: “It is for the

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Pope, the College of Bishops (and), the Ecumenical Council (Vatican II) to decide which among the innumerable traditions must be considered the norm of Faith.”³⁷ Now, apart from the fact that he places the Mass among the “traditions” which can be changed, his statement is a reflection of that quality of “picking and choosing” that St. Thomas Aquinas characterizes as typical of the heretic—it is nothing else than the exercising of private judgment—the collective private judgment of the modernists who have “captured” the Church.³⁸

Surely we should accept and revere all the traditions, and not just those which the modern world or our “separate brethren” find acceptable. And such must be the case, for as Canon George Smith states: “The duty of the Apostles and their successors was clear: to guard jealously the precious thing committed to their care and to transmit it whole and entire to posterity.”³⁹ “Even,” as St. Athanasius stated many years ago,

if Catholics faithful to Tradition are reduced to a handful, they are the ones who are in the true Church of Jesus Christ.⁴⁰

In the present confusion it is to Tradition and the continuous teaching of the Magisterium that the faithful must turn for guidance. Tradition is what the Magisterium teaches and must for all times remain the “Rule of Faith.” When doubt arises, the Fathers and the Saints have always turned to this source for clarification. As St. Vincent of Lerins said:

I have often then enquired earnestly and attentively of very many men eminent for sanctity and learning, how and by what rule I may be able to distinguish the truth of the Catholic Faith from the falsehood of heretical depravity; and I have always and in almost every instance received an answer to this effect: That whether I or anyone else should wish to detect the frauds and avoid the snares of heretics as they arise, and to continue sound and complete in the Catholic Faith, we must, the Lord helping, fortify our own belief in two ways: first by the authority of the Divine law, and then, by the tradition of the Catholic Church.⁴¹

No one can deny but that the post-Conciliar Church has abandoned many of the traditions of the Catholic Church—some of them, as the liturgy and sacraments, of fundamental importance. It has gone further and replaced these sacred traditions with man-made creations which it demands that we accept under obedience. Those who have resisted have been placed under every form of psychological pressure to induce them to abandon their stand. (The use of physical force when it comes to religion is not the style of our age.) Faced as we are with innovation upon

Just What Is Meant by the Word “Tradition”?

innovation—one is reminded of the complaint of St. Basil during the Arian persecution: “Only one offence is now vigorously punished, an accurate observance of our Father’s traditions.”⁴²

To argue that we need only accept what in Tradition is clearly “divine,” is similar to arguing that Catholics need only believe what has been proclaimed by the Church as *de fide* by the Extraordinary Magisterium. It is to attack the “trunk” of the tree and to presume that the “roots” will survive in spite of this. To divorce Tradition from custom is to divorce Faith from practice; to separate Christ’s teaching from His actions, to consider the Apostles and their immediate spiritual descendants as inferior to ourselves in wisdom, and to refuse to Truth its legitimate manner of expression. To separate the Church from her traditions is to disrupt her “unity,” and to proclaim she is no longer to wear the “wedding garments” that characterize her as the “Spouse of Christ.” To claim that we are other than traditional Catholics is to state that we are not Catholics at all.⁴³

Unless the New Church can claim and proclaim with her founding Apostles, “*Ego enim accepi a Domino quod et traditi vobis*—For I have received of the Lord that which I have transmitted unto you,” it is not the Church that Christ founded. As Cardinal Cajetan has said: “Note well that God’s teaching alone is really the Rule of Faith. Although the universal Church cannot err in her Faith, she is, however, not herself the Rule of Faith: the divine teaching upon which she is founded alone is such.”⁴⁴ The faithful have every right to protect and preserve their faith and the only way they can effectively do so is to preserve intact the traditions of the Church of All Times. Beset as they are with every conceivable innovation, they have every right to ask with St. Chrysostom: “Is it Tradition?” and if not, to reject the change. Let us ask for nothing more.

And we charge you, brethren, in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, that you withdraw yourselves from every brother walking disorderly, and not according to the tradition which they have received of me (II Thes. 3:6).

It is the most insolent madness to dispute whether that ought to be done which the whole Church does . . . impious . . . scandalous . . . dishonoring the Church. . . . Not with those who invent and change, who propose and modify, who select and adjust, or who teach that men may change and modify, select and adjust, but with those who hold fast, who guard and follow what was once delivered.⁴⁵

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Notes

¹ *A Manual of Catholic Theology, Based on Scheeban's "Dogmatic"* by Joseph Wilhelm and Thomas Scannell (Kegan Paul: London, 1909).

² Canon Smith, *The Teaching of the Catholic Church*.

³ In a similar vein: Fr. Daniel Lyons, *Christianity and Infallibility* (Longmans Green: N.Y., 1892): "Neither the Church nor the Pope has power to add to it, or to take from, or to alter, in one jot or tittle, the contents of this Apostolic Revelation or Deposit of Faith."

⁴ Tradition is further classified as *objective* when referring to dogmatic truths, and active by some in reference to the "customs, precepts, disciplines, and practices," and by still others when referring to the various organs of transmission such as the rites of the Church and the teaching Magisterium. It is called *constitutive* if it is established by the Apostles and *continuative* if of later origin. With regard to its relationship with Scripture, it is termed *inherent* (if what is handed on is clearly stated in Scripture), *declarative* (only stated in an obscure manner in Scripture and needing the help of Tradition to be understood), and *constitutive* (if not to be found in Scripture).

⁵ "Every truth, every proposition of the deposit of Revelation is and has ever been implicitly of Catholic Faith; but that only those portions of it which have been authenticated by the infallible authority of the Church and by her proposed for belief of all the faithful, are explicitly of Catholic Faith" (Franzelin, *De Divina Traditione et Scriptura*, quoted from Daniel Lyons, *Christianity and Infallibility*, p. 214). The distinction is also discussed in Chapters 2 and 5.

⁶ Many assume that Revelation only comes from Christ. While it is ultimately true that all Revelation comes from God, it may also come to us through the medium of the Apostles. The Christian Revelation was complete with the death of the last Apostle.

⁷ St. Clement, fourth Bishop of Rome and traveling companion to St. Paul, is described by the early Fathers as "sometimes Apostolic, sometimes Apostle, sometimes almost Apostle."

⁸ *Contra Jul. Pelag.* The Fathers of the Council of Trent were quite specific that "truths and disciplines are contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions," but declined to specify these in an exact manner.

⁹ Rev. J. Waterworth's *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Burns Oates: London, 1848).

¹⁰ Wilhelm and Scannell, *A Manual of Catholic Theology*.

¹¹ *Exposition of Christian Doctrine*.

¹² J. Tixeront, *History of Dogmas* (Herder: London, 1926).

¹³ J. Tixeront, *History of Dogmas*.

¹⁴ *Dialogus contra Luciferanos*, 8.

¹⁵ John Barry, *Tradition and Scripture* (Longmans: London, 1906).

¹⁶ *De Spiritu Sancto*, 25, 66, 67, 71.

¹⁷ It is pertinent to note that "The Profession of the Catholic Faith for Converts" required by the traditional Church states: "I admit and embrace most firmly the Apostolic and Ecclesiastical Traditions and all the other constitutions and prescriptions of the Church" (*Collectio Rituum*, 1964). St. John Fisher taught that "Those Apostolic Traditions which are not recorded in Scriptures must none the less be observed. In addition to these traditions,

Just What Is Meant by the Word “Tradition”?

the customs received by the universal Church must not be rejected by any Christian” (Quoted by E.E. Reynolds, *St. John Fisher* [Kennedy: N.Y., 1955]).

¹⁸ *The Book of the Lord Be With You: Selected Writings on the Spiritual Life*, translated with an introduction by Patricia McNulty (Faber and Faber: London, 1959). There are some 35 or 40 theologians who have been declared Doctors of the Church, and whose writings therefore have weighty authority. Among them are St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Alphonsus Liguori, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome.

¹⁹ *Homily IV on Thessalonians*, available in translation from Eerdmans Publ. House: Michigan, 1969.

²⁰ Encyclical *Ad Beatissimi Apostolorum*, Nov. 1914.

²¹ *La Croix*, Sept. 4, 1970.

²² *Introduction to the Life of St. Alphonso Maria de Liguori* (Richardson: London, 1848).

²³ In times of persecution the Sacred Species was distributed to the faithful in the hand (and usually in a pure linen cloth), for transport to those who could not come to the catacombs because of age or illness. Such circumstances do not prevail today.

²⁴ In writing about the Feast of the Sacred Heart, Gerald Manley Hopkins, S.J. said: “This is what the Church does or the Holy Ghost who rules the Church: out of the store which Christ left behind him he brings forth from time to time as need requires some doctrine or some devotion which was indeed known to the Apostles and is old, but is unknown or little known at the time and comes upon the world as new. Such is the case with the worship of the Sacred Heart” (*Sermons and Devotional Writings of Gerald Manley Hopkins*, edited by Christopher Devlin [Oxford: London, 1959]).

²⁵ *Tractatus De Divina traditione et Scriptura* (Typis S.C. De Propag. Fide: Roma, 1870).

²⁶ Later theologians have labeled “objective” tradition as the “remote rule of faith”; and the Magisterium or “active” tradition as the “proximate rule of faith.” Still others have reversed the terms “remote” and “proximate.” Pius XII used the phrase “proximate and universal norm for every theologian” with regard to the Magisterium (*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLII, 1150, 567), but at the same time made it clear that the Magisterium is the “guardian and interpreter of revealed truth,” and not “a separate source of truth.”

²⁷ *Rev. Greg.*, 1937, p. 79.

²⁸ A.M. Henry, O.P., *An Introduction to Theology* (Fides: Ill., 1952).

²⁹ A.H. Mathew, *Ecclesia: The Church of Christ* (Burns Oates: London, 1906).

³⁰ Nicholas Gehr, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass* (Herder: London, 1929).

³¹ Abbé Guéranger, *Institutions Liturgiques* (Société Générale de Librairie Catholique: Bruxelles and Genève, 1885). He also notes that one of the characteristics of the various Protestant changes in the liturgical forms is “the hatred of all that is traditional in the formulas of Divine worship.”

³² *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* (Letouzey et Ane: Paris, 1911-1949). The well-known authority Deneffe states: “In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries many theologians say it quite clearly: Tradition is the Church teaching. . . . Indeed, some say, Tradition is the Church’s Magisterium” (Dar Traditionsbegriff, quoted by J.P. Mackey, *The Modern Theology of Tradition* [Herder: N.Y., 1963]). Such was the opinion of Fr. C. Pesch: “We understand by Tradition that organ by which revealed truths are handed on, and the organ in question is the Church Magisterium” (*Praelectiones Dogmaticae* [Freiburg: 1909]).

³³ The faithful Catholic finds no need to make these distinctions because he is prone, almost by the very nature of his soul, to accept what is divine, divine-Apostolic, and Ecclesiastical

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

with the same reverence and love. He would not more think of changing his rites than would a devout Moslem, Hindu, or Buddhist. Is the traditional Mass any less “Catholic” than Scripture? Surely it deserves at least the same respect.

³⁴ Cardinal Boussuet, *Défense de la tradition des saints Pères*, various editions.

³⁵ It may be added that the new Cathedral of Guadeloupe has virtually made this impossible by means of a conveyer belt that brings pilgrims through a side door beneath the picture rather than letting them approach it from the main aisle. Such a change is certainly “anti-traditional.” They have compounded this offense by claiming a new building was necessary because the old one was in danger of falling down, and then turning the old one into a museum!

³⁶ As might be expected, the modernist attack was directed primarily against the traditions of the Church. Under the guise of “historical criticism,” they attacked the Apostolicity of her practices as well as her doctrines. As Loisy said: “What disquiets the faithful as far as Tradition is concerned is the impossibility of reconciling the historical development of Christian doctrine with the claim made by theologians that it [Tradition] is immutable.” Let us have no illusions. The faithful were not disquieted; Loisy was, as are the modernists in control of the new Church. Then, as today, they claimed they were attacking tradition in the name of the “faithful.” Others such as Tyrrell attacked tradition on the grounds that it derived, “not from a deposit of doctrine committed to the care of the teaching Church” but from “the life of the collectivity of religious souls, or rather, of all men of good will who aspire to realize an ideal higher than the earthly aims of egoists” (Archbishop Mercier’s encyclical, 1908). The Protestants of course attack tradition, for it above all condemns them. Listen to Paul Tillich: “We must forget everything traditional we have learned about God, perhaps even the word itself” (Quoted by Thomas Molnar in *Utopia, the Perennial Heresy* [Funk and Wagnalls: N.Y., 1967]). Malachi Martin’s *The Jesuits* (Simon and Schuster: N.Y., 1987) documents the efforts of the modernists such as Tyrell to undermine the constant traditions of the Church.

³⁷ *L’Osservatore Romano*, June 3, 1976.

³⁸ St. Thomas Aquinas defines heresy as “a species of infidelity in men who, having professed the faith of Christ, corrupt its dogmas. . . . The right Christian faith consists of giving one’s voluntary assent to Christ in all that truly belongs to His teaching. There are, therefore, two ways of deviating from Christianity: the one by refusing to believe in Christ Himself, which is the way of infidelity of the pagans and Jews; the other by restricting belief in certain points of Christ’s doctrine selected and fashioned at pleasure, which is the way of heretics. The subject matter of both faith and heresy is, therefore, the Deposit of the Faith, that is, the sum total of truths revealed in Scripture and Tradition. . . . The believer accepts the whole deposit as proposed by the Church; the heretics accepts only such parts of it as commend themselves to his own approval” (*Summa* II-II, Q. 11, a. 1). It would be one thing—though still offensive—if Paul VI had abrogated only certain traditional pious practices, but it is quite another for him to have abrogated the Mass—especially as no one can say with certainty which parts are divine, Apostolic, and/or Ecclesiastical in origin.

³⁹ Canon Smith, *The Teaching of the Catholic Church*.

⁴⁰ *Discourses against the Arians*. He also said of the Arians: “They have the churches, but we have the faith.”

⁴¹ *The Commintoria, Chapter II, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Eerdmans: Mich., 1969).

⁴² *Ep.* 243.

Just What Is Meant by the Word “Tradition”?

⁴³ Traditional Catholics should avoid the terms “traditionalism” and “traditionalist” as these pertain to a condemned heresy. *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908) states: “According to Traditionalism, human reason is of itself radically unable to know with certainty any truth or, at least, the fundamental truths of the metaphysical, moral, and religious order. Hence our first act of knowledge must be an act of faith, based on the authority of Revelation. This Revelation is transmitted to us through society, and its truth is guaranteed by tradition or the general consent of mankind.” This was the error of Lamennais, who saw tradition as a reflection of the common beliefs and practices of society, and not the other way around—essentially a modernist position, tied to his ideas about a collective subconscious.

⁴⁴ *Commentarium*, IIa-IIae, Q. 2, Art. 6.

⁴⁵ St. Augustine, *Liber de Vera Religione*, 6.

CHAPTER 5

THE NATURE OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH

Without faith, it is impossible to please God.
(Heb. 11:6)

We have demonstrated that the Catholic “Rule of Faith” must be “the Bible and Divine Tradition,” and that the Magisterium can in no way depart from these primary sources. We have further demonstrated that the “Traditions” of the Church are part and parcel of the Magisterium, for it is through them, as well as through other organs, that “the teaching authority of the Church is manifest.” It behooves us now to consider the concept of Faith in greater detail. The topic is of considerable importance because the meaning conveyed by this term when used by traditional Catholics is quite different than that generally given to it by those outside the Faith, and/or by post-Conciliar Catholics.

According to the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908), Faith must be considered both objectively and subjectively. “Objectively” it stands for the sum of truths revealed by God in Scripture and Tradition (the “Rule of Faith”) and which the Church presents to us in a brief form in her creeds (and in her other Magisterial organs such as the liturgy and the famous *Catechism of the Council of Trent*).¹ “Subjectively” it stands for the habit or virtue by which we assent to these truths.” According to St. Thomas, “the principles of the doctrine of salvation are the articles of faith” (*Commentary on I Cor.* 12:10). As the Blessed John of Avila said, “the entire foundation of the spiritual life is the Faith. . . . By the Faith we listen to God Himself, for it is not a human, but a divine teaching.”² This Faith having been given to us by Christ and the Apostles in a total manner, to be preserved intact “till the end of time,” *cannot change, has never changed, and will never change.*

The Revelation made to the Apostles by Christ and by the Holy Spirit whom He sent to teach them all truth was final and definitive. To that body of revealed truth nothing has been, or ever will be added. The duty of the Apostles and their successors was clear; to guard jealously the precious thing committed to their care and to transmit it whole and entire to posterity.³

OBJECTIVE FAITH

If the Catholic Church is the one true Church, and not just one Church among others, then the Faith she teaches is the one true faith, and not just one faith among others. What then does a Catholic understand by “the Faith”? In what must he place his belief? The answer is made clear by the traditional “Act of Faith.”

O my God, I firmly believe in all that Your Holy Catholic Church approves and teaches, since it is You, the Infallible Truth, who has revealed it to Your Church.

ONE MUST BELIEVE EVERYTHING THAT THE CHURCH TEACHES

“Such is the nature of Catholicism that it does not admit of more or less, but must be held as a whole or as a whole rejected” (Pope Benedict XIV, *Ad beatissimi Apostolorum*). As Fr. Heleh explains, this means that “to believe rightly . . . everything without exception that God teaches us through the Catholic Church, be it written or Tradition, be it Holy Writ or not, must be believed. For Christ commissioned His Apostles to teach all nations and to teach them everything that He had told them. By that He has imposed upon everybody who hears His teachings, the duty to believe all of it. If anyone were to reject one simple truth of the Faith, though he accepted all others, he would come under the category of those of whom St. James says, ‘now whosoever shall keep the whole law, but offend in one point, is become guilty of all.’”⁴

This teaching of the Church is particularly important in our day. If we reject any of the truths of the Catholic Faith—even one—we can no longer call ourselves Catholic. If the acceptance of Vatican II (to which the post-Conciliar conscience is bound) involves a single change in the teaching of the Church Magisterium, this principle applies. Consider the statement of the Martyr St. Edmund Campion given to the Anglican Bishop Chaney during his “trial”: “What is the use of fighting for many articles of the Faith, and to perish for doubting a few? He believes no one article of the Faith who refuses to believe any single one. In vain do you defend the religion of Catholics, if you hug only that which you like, and cut off all that seems not right in your eyes. There is but one plain known road: not enclosed by your palings [fences] or mine, not by private judgment, but by the severe laws of humility and obedience.” As Pope Leo XIII said in his encyclical *Sapaentiae Christianae*: “To refuse to believe in any one of them is equivalent to

rejecting them all”; and as Pius XII taught in his address to the Bishops of the Sacred Congregation in 1949: “The Catholic doctrine must be set forth and taught completely and entirely. One cannot allow that anything should be omitted or veiled in ambiguous terms.”

There may of course be certain Truths that the Church teaches and that a given Catholic may be unaware of. His attitude, however, is that of a person who wishes to think correctly, rather than of one who wishes to think for himself. When faced with a doctrinal or a moral question, the Catholic hastens to ask, “What does the Church teach?” The Church in turn makes no demand that the faithful know all that she holds true (the average person might not know the application of moral principles to a highly technical medical situation). She considers certain truths to be necessary (*necessitate medii*) for salvation, and these must be believed by all men in an explicit manner.⁵ She insists that the faithful be instructed in their catechism in accord with their ability to understand, and it goes without saying that the Catholic has an obligation to know those truths necessary for him to live a Catholic life. Beyond this, however, there are still other truths that the Church teaches and which the ordinary Catholic may be unaware of without thereby endangering his soul—truths which he must nevertheless implicitly believe—that is to say, the Catholic must give assent to them because the Church proposes them for belief. A Catholic must believe them for the simple reason that he must believe the Church derives her truths from Christ and hence is incapable of teaching error.

This teaching should not be confused with the Protestant idea that there are certain “fundamental” and other “non-fundamental” truths—the former to be held by all, while the latter can be subject to individual choice. A Catholic must accept all the truths of the Church with the same faith and assent. (The Protestant sects had to make such distinctions if they were ever to cooperate with each other.)⁶ Yet Vatican II has introduced just such a concept in teaching that there is a “hierarchy” of truths in the Church’s teaching. To quote the documents directly: “When comparing doctrines, they [Catholics] should remember that in Catholic teaching there exists an order or ‘hierarchy’ of truths, since they vary in their relationship to the foundation of the Christian faith” (*de Oecumenismo*).

Dr. Oscar Cullmann, one of the Protestant “observers,” considered this one of the “most revolutionary” statements to come out of Vatican II, and Dr. McAfee Brown suggested that such truths as the Immaculate Conception and Assumption, —“stumbling blocks in ecumenical discussion”—should be placed well down on the scale of the “hierarchy of truths.”⁷

CAN DOCTRINE “EVOLVE” OR “DEVELOP”?

Modernists who believe that truth is but the expression of humankind’s “religious consciousness,” and who see this “consciousness” as constantly evolving, necessarily find themselves in conflict with the stance of the Church on the fixed nature of truth. The only way they can introduce their ideas into the bosom of the Church is by resorting to ambiguity and “double-speak.” Under the guise of interpreting the Faith in new ways to make it more acceptable to modern man, they proceed to apply the labels of “adaptation,” “development,” and even “evolution” to doctrine. Claiming that throughout the course of history God reveals Himself more fully, they managed to introduce such ideas into the documents of Vatican II: “As the centuries succeed one another, the Church constantly moves forward towards the fullness of divine truth until the words of God reach their complete fulfillment in her. . . . Thanks to the experience of past ages, the progress of the sciences, and the treasures hidden in the various forms of human culture, the nature of man himself is more clearly revealed and new roads to truth are opened.”⁸

It is of course quite true that we can explain our Faith to non-believers in terms that may be understandable to them; indeed, we have a certain obligation in charity to do so. It is, however, totally false to state that our Faith must adapt itself to modern man, and equally false to state that our Faith “evolves” in anything like the Darwinian process. There has been, since the days of Cardinal Newman, a great deal of loose talk about the “Development of Christian Doctrine.”⁹ The term “development” requires precise definition, for some of the faithful use this term to describe the “flowering” of the Faith, much as a tree grows and blooms that it might be “fruitful,” while others use this same term to disguise what is in fact radical change.

One must understand just what a given author means by “development,” for, as we have shown it is *de fide* that Christian Revelation ended with the death of the last Apostle. Dogmas implicit in this Revelation may become explicit and more clearly stated, but by definition cannot be altered, abrogated, or added on to. How then does dogma “develop?” Van Noort tells us it can do so in three ways: “In a more finished exposition of dogma the gist of which had always been taught explicitly; in an explicit proposal of dogmas which had formerly been taught implicitly; and in the clear-cut proposal of dogmas which formerly were proposed in a less obvious fashion.”¹⁰ St. Albert the Great, a Doctor of the Church, succinctly describes development as “the progress of the faithful in the Faith, rather than of the Faith within the faithful.”¹¹

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

In other words, the whole of revealed truth is contained in the sources of revelation, but in the course of ages it has undergone, and still undergoes, a process of “unfolding” whereby the faithful, under the infallible guidance of the Church, arrive at a fuller understanding of the truths which God has revealed. As St. Vincent of Lerins put it: “The development of Christian doctrine is the *perfectus fidei, non permutatio*—the perfection of the Faith and not its alteration” (*Commentaria*). Obviously, such a “development” in no way involves “adapting” the teaching of the Church to the modern world. Nor does it imply that the Church’s understanding of a given doctrine can change. Vatican I made this quite clear:

The doctrine of the Faith which God has revealed has not been proposed to human intelligence to be perfected by them as if it were a philosophical system, but as a divine deposit entrusted to the Spouse of Christ to be faithfully guarded and infallibly interpreted. . . . The meaning of the sacred dogmas must always be retained which Holy Mother Church has once taught, nor may it ever be departed from under the guise, or in the name of, deeper insight. . . . If anyone shall say that, because of scientific progress, it may be possible at some time to interpret the Church’s dogmas in a different sense from that which the Church understood and understands, let him be anathema! . . . *Therefore let there be growth . . . and all possible progress in understanding, knowledge, and wisdom, whether in single individuals or in the whole body, in each man as well as in the entire Church, according to the stage of their development; but only within proper limits, that is, in the same doctrine, in the same meaning, and in the same purport* (emphasis mine).

The idea that God reveals Himself more fully during the course of time may have been true prior to the Incarnation, but clearly it is not so since. There is no such thing as an “ongoing Revelation.”¹²

CAN WE ADAPT OUR FAITH TO THE MODERN WORLD?

Let them [the faithful] blend modern science and its theories and the understanding of the most recent discoverie with Christian morality and doctrine.

Vatican II¹³

Those who talk of *aggiornamento* or “adapting” the teachings of the Church so as to make them acceptable to the modern “world” forget that the so-called modern world is intrinsically opposed to the Church’s constituency, the “Kingdom of Heaven.” Indeed by its very nature the modern world represents a rupture with traditional values. It is founded on principles that

reflect a basic infidelity to Christ—it has replaced the fire of love with the arson of rebellion, and cries out with Rousseau *Écrase l'Infamie*. How can the Church, the Bride of Christ, adapt itself to this infidelity? Those who foster such ideas commit spiritual adultery and call down upon themselves the anathemas Jeremias laid upon the Jews of his day who had become a “generation of harlots.” How can one adapt truth to error? The absurdity of the adaptationist position, promulgated under the banner of *aggiornamento*, becomes even clearer when we consider the parable of the Prodigal Son. It was not for “the father” to join his son who had become a herder of swine, but for the son to return to his father’s home. In no other way can the “fatted lamb” be killed. It is modern man who must change and not the Church. The results of this apostasy are manifest. Revolution always results in devastation.

Hold firmly that our faith is identical with that of the ancients. Deny this and you dissolve the unity of the Church.¹⁴

IS OUR FAITH LIMITED TO ONLY WHAT IS TAUGHT BY THE EXTRAORDINARY MAGISTERIUM?

All those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic Faith which are contained in the Word of God or handed down, and which the Church, either by a solemn judgment or by her ordinary and universal teaching (Magisterium) proposes for belief as having been divinely revealed.

Vatican I

The authority of the Ordinary or Universal Magisterium, if not openly denied, is currently diminished in a variety of ways.¹⁵ The post-Conciliar Church, following in the footsteps of the “Inopportunist” of Vatican I, has further obscured this teaching by claiming that it changed nothing *de fide*. When Catholics protest against the new orientations being enforced, such as the teaching on religious liberty, or question the appropriateness of common worship with heretics (*Communicatio in sacris*), they are told *ad nauseum* that nothing *de fide* has been changed. Implicit in such a statement is that the contents of the Ordinary Magisterium are not *de fide*, or that the Ordinary Magisterium contains virtually nothing of a doctrinal nature. Thus, for example, Fr. Curren, who holds a variety of clearly heterodox positions (such as denying the Virgin Birth of Christ), loudly proclaims that his dissent is in matters outside the realm of the infallible teaching of the Church. Cardinal Ratzinger (now “Pope” Benedict XVI) in

turn demands that he give assent, not only to what the Cardinal calls the “infallible Magisterium,” but also to what he calls “the authentic but not infallible Magisterium.”¹⁶ The former is apostasy and the latter is nonsense. Fr. Curran remains a priest in good standing.

This claim that nothing *de fide* has been changed has a further consequence. Insofar as it obfuscates the limits of the Magisterium and implicitly declares that what comes under the heading of the Ordinary Magisterium is not *de fide*, it allows the faithful to ignore a wealth of documents wherein they would normally come to a deeper understanding of the Faith. Even if they do not embrace formal heresy, they are as a result constantly exposed to un-Catholic and anti-Catholic material that corrodes their faith. It is not in the least bit unusual to find them embracing views that are “savoring of heresy, suspect of heresy, close upon heresy, schismatical, Jewish, pagan, atheistical, blasphemous, impious, erroneous, close upon error, savoring or suspected of error, scandalous, temerarious, seditious, ill-sounding, offensive to pious ears, lax, likely insane” and still claiming to be Catholic.¹⁷

As Msgr. Van Noort points out, the belief that “one may reject or call into doubt any non-revealed truth one chooses, without committing sin or injuring the Catholic profession of faith” is an “extremely serious error.” He continues,

some truths are so necessarily intertwined with Revelation that to deny or doubt them would cause injury to Revelation itself. . . . Other truths are connected to Revelation as a necessary consequence (*conclusio theologica*). . . . Finally, some truths are necessarily connected with Revelation by reason of its goal (decisions relating to the universal discipline of the Church). Truths not formally revealed but bound up with Revelation in one of these three ways just pointed to, look directly to the guardianship and practical application of the Deposit of the Faith; thus indirectly they belong to the deposit itself and to Catholic Faith.¹⁸

It is important to once again point out that dogmas are declared *de fide* in a solemn or extraordinary manner only when they are brought into question. And truths so proclaimed have no greater claim on our assent than they had when they were considered part of the Ordinary Magisterium. Proclamations regarding the Immaculate Conception or the Assumption of Our Lady are not additions to our faith but rather formal, authoritative, and definitive declarations of what the Faith taught prior to Vatican II. No Council or Pope ever claimed or professed to be doing more than making explicit what was contained in the original Revelation and hence already of implicit faith.¹⁹ If this false concept that only what is declared *de fide* in an extraordinary manner were true, or only what is contained in the Solemn

The Nature of the Catholic Faith

Magisterium is true, then what would the Catholic of the first centuries have had to believe? Listen to the words of Pope Pius XI:

Not because the Church had defined and sanctioned truths by solemn decree of the Church at different times, and even in times near to us, are they therefore not equally certain and not equally to be believed. For has not God revealed them all? . . . The Church has the duty to proceed opportunely in defining points of Faith with solemn rites and decrees, when there is a need to declare them to resist more effectively the errors and the assaults of heretics or to impress upon the minds of the faithful clearer and more profound explanations of points of sacred doctrine. However, in this explanatory use of the teaching authority nothing is invented nor is anything new added to the sum of the truths that are, at least implicitly, contained in the deposit of Divine Revelation that was entrusted by God to the Church. Instead, points of faith are defined that could by chance still seem obscure to some, or truths are established as matters of Faith that for the first time are called into question (*Mortalium animos*).

One cannot limit the Faith of Catholics to what has been declared *de fide* by the Supreme or Extraordinary Magisterium. Catholics must believe in all the *ex cathedra* teachings contained in the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium, the extent of which is covered in Chapter 2. They must also believe those truths which are implicitly contained in Revelation, as well as those which are indirectly related to what has been revealed.

Such then in summary is the “objective” aspect of the Catholic Faith. It is to these truths that we must give our assent.

The Faith of the Church is not made by our faith, but by our assent, which assent cometh to us, and is the work of our soul.²⁰

SUBJECTIVE FAITH

The “subjective” nature of the Faith is “the habit or virtue by which we assent to these truths.”

St. John Fisher

FAITH IS A “GIFT”

Now, both the “facts” we believe and the graces we have to give our assent to are “gifts” from God. As Vatican I states:

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Faith itself and in itself, even if it does not work through charity, is a gift of God, and its act is a work pertaining to salvation; by it a man offers to God Himself a free obedience insofar as he consents and cooperates with His Grace which he could refuse.

That Faith is a “gift” in no way means that those who lack it are somehow excused and free of all responsibility. The Faith is a “gift” because it is freely given us by God, and, as with any “gift”—we must be willing to accept it—it cannot be forced upon us. God could not in charity (which is His very nature) hold back from any soul the necessary Grace required. As St. Augustine teaches in his commentary on the passage, “no one can come to me [by faith] unless the Father who sent me draw him,” says:

And yet no one comes [to the Faith] unless he wills to. He is drawn therefore, in marvelous ways to will by Him who knows how to work interiorly in the very hearts of men; not that men—something which is impossible—should believe unwillingly, but that from unwilling they should be rendered willing. . . . God acts with persuasions that we may will and believe; what is more, God Himself brings about in a man the very will to believe.

In similar manner, Msgr. Van Noort states that “the vocation to the faith . . . is a free gift of God, which, just as it is denied to no adult except through his own fault, cannot be merited by any natural work.”²¹ God is always calling us to give our assent to truth, and it is within our power to refuse this assent. Thus man is responsible for examining the claims of the Church while remaining free to accept or reject these claims.

FAITH IS NOT “BLIND”

Catholics are often accused of giving “blind” assent to the teachings of the Church. By “blind” is meant, “unreasoning” and “unthinking.” Now such an accusation is doubly false, for Catholics give no blind assent to the Church, and indeed, are forbidden to do so. As Vatican I teaches, “Faith is by no means a blind action of the mind,” but rather, by faith “man yields free obedience to God.” “Free obedience” can never be unreasoning or unthinking. The Church by infallible definition cannot teach anything as true which is manifestly against reason. To again quote Vatican I:

Although the faith is above reason, there can never be any real discrepancy between faith and reason since the same God who reveals mysteries and infuses faith has bestowed the light of reason on the human mind, and

The Nature of the Catholic Faith

God cannot deny himself, nor can truth ever contradict truth. The false appearance of such contradiction is mainly due, either to the dogmas of faith not having been understood and expounded according to the mind of the Church, or to the invention of opinion having been taken for the verdicts of reason.

The Catholic, then, gives his assent, in the words of this same Council, “by yielding to Him [God] the full homage of our intellect and will.” Hence, although the act of faith is an intellectual act, yet it is also an act of homage that is in the power of the will to withhold. It will be argued that a child accepts the Faith without any such refinements—and such is indeed true, for he accepts it on the testimony of his parents. (It is the same reason that leads a child not to play in the street.) Or more exactly, the Faith is infused into him by Baptism and the parents later teach him the material objects of the Faith. Thus Catholic parents have the obligation of teaching their children the truths of the Faith as soon as they reach the age of reason, and the child in turn has the obligation to study and “know” his Faith, and to freely give his assent to it.

The habit or virtue by which we give our assent to the teachings of the Church is never a “gut feeling” arising from some evolutionary subconscious. This, of course, in no way precludes our feeling strongly about the Faith.

POST-CONCILIAR CONCEPTS OF FAITH

69% of the bishops and only 45% of the priests agreed that “faith means essentially belief in the doctrines of the Catholic Church,” whereas 46% of the bishops and 69% of the clergy would agree that faith is “primarily an encounter with God and Jesus Christ” rather than an assent to a coherent set of defined truths.

Andrew Greeley, 1973²²

There has been no post-Conciliar concept of faith as such, and if questioned, most authorities would claim that there has been no change in the meaning of the term. Yet the word “faith” is used by members of this Church in such a wide variety of circumstances as to make its definition virtually impossible. What is fostered by this institution is an “open” attitude—if some Catholics want to believe in the traditional way, this is acceptable, providing they also tolerate the new “pluralism” and don’t insist upon participating in the traditional rites, and providing they don’t insist others maintain the same standards. Others are equally free to call themselves “Catholic”

while denying fundamental tenets of the Catholic Faith. As Cardinal Bernadine, formerly president of the U.S. Bishop's conference admitted, "many consider themselves good Catholics, even though their beliefs and practices seem to conflict with the official teaching of the Church." Of course he finds this in no way objectionable, for when he was asked how a person like Avery Dulles, S.J. (now a Cardinal!) could publicly deny the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption of Our Lady (thus declaring himself a "depraved heretic" and outside the Church), and continue to teach theology at the Catholic University of America, he responded by stating that it was his "belief that it was legitimate for those theologians to speculate about the removal of doctrines that had already been defined, and to request the Magisterium to remove such doctrines from the content of the Faith!"²³ Karl Rahner, a darling of the post-Conciliar Church, tells us that "the historicity of the creed, the opinions about the nature of the Church's unity . . . the difficulties created by a Christendom that has lost its self-evidence . . . has brought to the fore in a most distressing fashion, the problem of reformulation of the Creed." This priest—who remains in good standing—points out in the same article that "the pluriformity of philosophies must lead to a legitimate pluriformity in thinking about the Faith."²⁴ John McKenzie states:

Faith is a response to Revelation; doctrine, the product of theology, is an understanding and an application of the Faith. The Church uses theology and doctrine; indeed, these are the means by which the Church evolves with the world and with history. Faith never becomes antiquated; doctrine easily does.²⁵

An excellent example of this is provided by the statement of the entire French hierarchy which, after the publication of Paul VI's *Humanae vitae* forbidding artificial methods of birth control, stated that any couple could use contraceptive methods providing that to do so was in their conscience "a lesser evil." Now the idea that the faithful can choose a "lesser evil" that itself is in direct disobedience of God's laws, or that they can under any circumstances cooperate in an intrinsically evil act, violates the Catholic Faith. What is even more extraordinary is that Paul VI sent them a telegram thanking them for "so clearly interpreting his thinking" on the issue.²⁶

It will be argued that these examples are "abuses" and do not reflect the mind of the Church. Let us look to the hierarchy for a contrary stance. When Cardinal Suenens declared himself a Pentecostal, he stated (sometime later) that if the Pope were to ask him to deny the "Pentecostal creed," he would do so at once. Paul VI never made such a request, and indeed has given this movement his blessing and approval.²⁷ And what of John Paul II?

Consider his comments made to the seminarians at the Lateran university (Feb. 15, 1980): Loyalty to the Church, he said, is not to be defined “in a reduced sense, as maintaining standards, nor does it mean staying within the bounds of orthodoxy—avoiding positions that are in contrast to the pronouncements of the Apostolic See, the Ecumenical councils and the learned Doctors of the Church. . . . We must have a divergence of positions, although in the end, we must rely on the synthesis of them all.”

Typical of the modernist theologian is vagueness and ambiguity of expression. Faith is described as “man’s response to God’s Revelation,” as an “encounter with Christ,” as a “birth in the Spirit,” and as a “personal” or “religious experience.” Such phrases speak of a “visceral Christianity” in which the individual cannot be openly accused of heterodoxy and is at the same time free to believe anything he wants. The quotation from Fr. Andrew Greeley at the head of this section proves beyond doubt that such ideas are rampant in the post-Conciliar Church. To state that the Faith is an “encounter with God” might possibly allow for an orthodox interpretation, but to state along with this “rather than an assent to a coherent set of defined truths” can never be reconciled with the Catholic position. Our faith is “no simple sublimating aspiration,” no “experiential” sort of “encounter with Jesus” such as any Protestant can claim, no sort of “personal understanding,” “commitment,” or “feeling.” No indeed, it is, to use the words of St. Thomas Aquinas, “the act of the intellect assenting to a Divine Truth owing to the movement of the will, which is itself moved by the Grace of God” (*Summa* II-II, iv, a.2). Those who doubt this should consider the “Oath Against Modernism” which, as we have noted, is part of the Solemn Magisterium:

I hold with certainty and sincerely confess that faith is not a blind impulse of religion welling up from the depth of the unconscious under the impulse of the heart and the inclination of a morally conditioned will, but the genuine assent of the intellect to a truth which is received from outside.

CAN ONE HAVE DOUBTS ABOUT THE FAITH?

Faith is for doubting.
Paul VI²⁸

Finally, to believe rightly means not only to believe fully, but also to have no doubts about what one believes. One must believe what the Church teaches with such steadfastness that never should doubt, temptation, or persecution unsettle one’s soul. After all, that which the Church teaches and

charges us to believe, has been revealed to her by God. “He who doubts any revealed truth, seriously offends God. . . . He who allows himself willfully to doubt of any of the doctrines of the Church, commits a serious sin against faith.”²⁹ Sarah doubted God’s promise that she should bear a son in her old age and was reproved by God for incredulity. Zacharias doubted the announcement of an angel and lost the power of speech.

Yet doubts that come into our mind, if we do not willfully consent to them, involve no sin. A doubt is a temptation against the Faith. One does not sin by being tempted, but only by giving consent to temptation, or by “toying” with the idea of doing so. When doubts occur we have an obligation to 1) pray—“I believe Lord, help Thou my unbelief” and 2) to seek help from appropriate authority—that is to say, by study and inquiry so as to remove any ignorance and misunderstanding. One must not forget that faith, which as Vatican I teaches, “is the beginning of man’s salvation,” is “a supernatural virtue, whereby, inspired and assisted by God’s Grace, we believe.” Now if the Grace of God is essential, it is also true that it is never insufficient. We are never, as Scripture teaches, tried beyond our strength. (If we were, we would not be responsible for sin.) It is not the lack of Grace that man should fear, but rather his own power to resist and reject it.

A Catholic can never have a just reason for abandoning the Faith that he has once embraced.³⁰ (This is far truer for the clergy than for the laity, for with greater knowledge comes greater responsibility.) Such is so, not only because he has a sufficient motive of credibility in the divinely instituted Church, but also because Faith is the result of supernatural Grace and carries with it the additional Graces necessary to persevere in it. God’s providence will not allow the faithful to lack the helps that they need to protect their Faith. As St. Augustine says, “God does not abandon us until we first abandon him.”³¹

IS FAITH ENOUGH?

Important as having the Faith is, it is not enough to guarantee our salvation. According to Spirago and Clark’s *The Catechism Explained*, “Faith is like the root of the tree, without which it cannot exist; it is the first step on the road to Heaven; it is the key which opens the door;” but “it must be a living faith; that is, we must add to it good works and we must be ready to confess it openly.”³² It is a *de fide* teaching of the Church that “besides faith, further acts of disposition must be present.” Fr. Ott comments on this:

According to the teaching of the Reformers faith, in the sense of fiducial faith, is the sole cause of justification (*sola fides*). In opposition to this

The Nature of the Catholic Faith

teaching, the Council of Trent declares that, side by side with faith, other acts of disposition are demanded. As such are named: fear of Divine justice; hope in the mercy of God for the sake of the merits of Christ; the beginning of the love of God; hate and detestation of sin; and the purpose of receiving Baptism and of beginning a new life.³³

Fr. Ott continues: “When St. Paul teaches that we are saved by faith without works of the Law (Rom. 3:28), he understands by faith, a living faith, active through love; by the works of the law he means the works of the law of the Old Testament, for example, circumcision. . . . When St. James, in apparent contradiction to this, teaches that we are justified by works, not merely by faith . . . he understands by faith, dead faith; by works, good works proceeding from Christian Faith.” Hence it is clear that, as St. Augustine says:

Without love faith can indeed exist, but can be of no avail (*De Trin.* XV).

CONCLUSION

Our faith is essentially a belief in all the doctrines which the Catholic Church teaches, and is based on a Truth that is entirely independent of our personal feelings or emotional reactions, a truth given us by Christ and the Apostles and one constantly upheld and preserved by the traditional Church throughout her existence. Faith is never “blind,” for it involves the assent of the intellect to truths taught by the Church. The intellect is by its very nature a faculty which “sees” and hence does not operate in the “dark.” If our intellect *per accident* “sees through a glass darkly,” it is guided by Revelation and Revelation is safeguarded by the Church. Faith is never unreasonable, though it gives assent to what is beyond the grasp of reason.

Faith does not arise in our subconscious or any other “immanent” source. Our assent is never the result of “an impulse of the heart,” or of a “morally conditioned will.” One must utterly reject the teaching of Vatican II that in matters of faith “man is to be guided by his own judgment, and he is to enjoy freedom.” Rather, man is to be guided by the teachings of the Church, and his freedom exists in his ability to accept or reject this guidance. Faith is always free, for it cannot be coerced. In giving our assent to “the teaching Magisterium of the Church,” we give our assent to that Truth which Christ and the Apostles gave to the Church to preserve. It is in this act that the possibility of freedom lies, for it frees us from our own

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

subjectivity. Our refusal to give assent makes us slaves of our own “personal judgments,” and in the last analysis, to our own passionate natures.

For thus doth our faith teach, that is the true, the right Catholic Faith, gathered not by the opinion of private judgment, but by the witness of the Scriptures, not subject to the fluctuations of heretical rashness, but grounded upon Apostolic truth (St. Augustine, *Serm.* 34).

Notes

¹ This catechism is a most remarkable one. It is unlike any other summary of Christian doctrine, not only because it is intended for the use of priests in their preaching, but also because it enjoys a unique authority among manuals. In the first place, it was issued by the express command of the Ecumenical Council of Trent, which also ordered that it be translated into the vernacular of different nations to be used as a standard source of preaching. Moreover, it subsequently received the unqualified approval of many Sovereign Pontiffs, including Pius VI and Gregory XIII. Clement XIII recommended that every seminarian should possess it and considered it to be on a par with the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas. Of the several people responsible for compiling it, six subsequently became canonized saints of the Church, including St. Charles Borromeo. One could go on endlessly giving testimony to its authority and excellence. As Fr. Hogan (former rector of the Irish college in Rome) has stated: “At the very least it has the same authority as a dogmatic encyclical.”

² Blessed John of Avila, *Audi Filia*, translated from the French (Auger: Paris, 1254).

³ Canon Smith, *The Teaching of the Catholic Church*. St. John of the Cross states: “Since He has finished revealing the Faith through Christ, there is no more Faith to reveal nor will there ever be. . . . Since there are no more articles to be revealed to the Church about the substance of our Faith, a person must not merely reject new revelations about the faith, but he should out of caution, repudiate other kinds of knowledge mingled with them” (*Ascent of Mount Carmel*). St. Vincent of Lerins teaches: “To announce to Catholic Christians a doctrine other than that which they have received [from the Apostles] was never permitted, is no where permitted, and never will be permitted. It was ever necessary, is everywhere necessary, and ever will be necessary that those who announce a doctrine other than that which was received once and for all, be anathema” (*Commintoria*, XI).

⁴ Rev. P. Heleh, S.J., *Short Sermons on Catholic Dogma* (Wagner: N.Y., 1902).

⁵ There is some difference in theological opinion as to just what constitutes *necessitate medii*, though certainly all agree that a knowledge of the existence of God and of the fact that we will be judged for actions is essential. This is the basis of a priest asking a stranger in danger of death if he loves God and is sorry for his sins. Others also include a knowledge of the Incarnation and of the Blessed Trinity.

⁶ “In matters of faith it is not permitted to make a distinction between fundamental and so-called non-fundamental articles of Faith, as if the first ought to be held by all, and the second the faithful are free to accept or not. The supernatural virtue of faith has as its formal cause the authority of God, the revealer, which suffers not such a division” (Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*).

⁷ Footnote in the Abbott translation. The Conciliar statement is ambiguous, as is shown

The Nature of the Catholic Faith

by the manner in which the Protestants understood it. There are of course “degrees of certainty” about the revelatory nature of the Church’s teaching, but not to what must be believed and how firmly we must believe. For the sake of completeness, and following Fr. Parente’s *Theologica Fundamental* (Rome, 1954), these are:

1) Maximum certitude is to be found in formal dogma which is truth divinely and formally revealed and set forth as such by the Magisterium of the Church. Such truths are *de fide definita, divina et Catholica*. To reject such with obstinacy is formal heresy.

2) Following closely on this is revealed truth, not as yet so defined by the Church, and which is referred to as *proxima fidei* (proximately of faith), and to deny these is *proximum haeresi* (approximating heresy). Other theologians call these truths *de fide divina*, and state that to deny them with obstinacy is also formal heresy.

3) Third are those truths which are virtually revealed (*virtualiter revelata*), which is to say, derived from what is revealed with the help of reason (*conclusio theologica*) or a theological conclusion. Such truths carry theological certitude (*theologica certa*) and are said to pertain to the Faith (*ad fidem pertinens*). To deny these is a theological error or an error in Faith.

4) Next are the non-revealed truths, but truths nevertheless connected with Revelation which the opinion of the theologians (*sententia theologorum*) refer to as *communis* (commonly held). To deny these is considered *temerous*. These distinctions are of theological use, but not in themselves *de fide*. Many Popes have, for example, described heresies as “errors in faith.”

⁸ *The Church in the Modern World*. John Courtney Murray, S.J., tells us in his introduction to the Document on Religious Freedom that “the course of development between the *Syllabus of Errors* (1864) and *Dignitatis Humanae Personae* (1965) still remains to be explained by theologians. But the Council formally sanctioned the validity of the development itself; and this was a doctrinal event of high importance for theological thought in many other areas” (*The Documents of Vatican II*, Ed. Walter M. Abbott, S.J. [Guild: N.Y., 1966]).

⁹ Newman’s doctrinal views are ambiguous and open to a variety of interpretations. It is pertinent that he was the most quoted theologian in the debates of Vatican II (Christopher Hollis, *Newman and the Modern World* [Doubleday: N.Y., 1968]), and that his orthodoxy has been questioned by such individuals as Cardinal Manning. It has been said that he was a crypto-Catholic while an Anglican, and a crypto-Protestant when a Catholic. He distinguished between “the notional assent to truth,” the academic recognition of certain beliefs as valid, and the real assent inspired by personal experience. Despite the fact that he died in complete submission to the Church, he is not always a safe source of doctrine. Newman’s theological views are discussed by Harold L. Weatherby, *Cardinal Newman in His Age* (Vanderbilt Univ. Press: Tenn., 1973).

¹⁰ Msgr. G. Van Noort, *Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. III, Divine Faith (Newman: Maryland, 1960).

¹¹ Canon Smith, *The Teaching of the Catholic Church*.

¹² As Avery Dulles, S.J., one of the Conciliar *periti* states: “While stressing that God’s self-revelation reached its unsurpassable fullness in Christ, the Council left ample room for development in the Church’s assimilation of that fullness in new and unpredictable ways. Without using the term ‘continuing Revelation,’ Vatican II allowed for something of the kind. Echoing a favorite term of John XXIII, it spoke repeatedly of the need to discern ‘the signs of the times’ through which God continues to address his people” (*Doctrines do Grow*, ed. John T. McGinn [Paulist Press: N.Y., 1972]).

¹³ *The Church in the Modern World*, Para. 62.

¹⁴ St. Thomas Aquinas, *Disputations Concerning Truth*.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

¹⁵ Cf. Chapter 2.

¹⁶ *Catholica*, March 1987.

¹⁷ Fr. William Faber, *Introduction to the Life of St. Liguori* (Richardson: London, 1849).

¹⁸ Msgr. Van Noort, *Dogmatic Theology*.

¹⁹ For example, the Assumption of our Lady has always been believed by Catholics. It is one of the mysteries of the Rosary.

²⁰ St. John Fisher, quoted in E.E. Reynold's, *Biography of St. John Fisher* (Kennedy: N.Y., 1955).

²¹ Msgr. Van Noort, *Dogmatic Theology*.

²² Andrew Greeley, *Priests in the United States, Reflections on a Survey* (Doubleday: N.Y., 1973). A statistical survey carried out under Fr. Greeley's supervision.

²³ The first quote is from *Time*, May 24, 1976 and the second from *The Wanderer*, June 17, 1976. Archbishop Bernadine has also advocated that cake be used for the "matter" of the Eucharistic sacrament, and was rewarded for his loyalty to the Faith by being made a Cardinal! At his funeral he was given an honor guard by the Freemasons.

²⁴ Karl Rahner, *The Creed in the Melting Pot*, published "cum approbatione ecclesiastica" in *Concilium*, 1973.

²⁵ John McKenzie, *The Sword and the Spirit* (Paulist Press: N.Y., 1972). A more specific modernist exposition of faith would be hard to find. Fr. McKenzie remains a priest in good standing.

²⁶ Hubert Monteilhet, *Rome n'est plus dans Rome* (Pauvert: Paris, 1977). In such a statement the entire French hierarchy placed themselves outside the Church.

²⁷ Paul VI told the leaders of the Pentecostal Movement: "We are very interested in what you are doing. We have heard so much about what is happening among you. And we rejoice" (*L'Osservatore Romano*, Oct. 11, 1975). (For a full discussion of Pentecostalism, see *The Roman Catholic*, Vol. I, Nos. 3 and 4, 1979.) A classic example of post-Conciliar attitudes is provided by Bishop Milvaine of the Diocese of Pocahontas: "The Faith is not a collection of abstract propositions to be memorized. Faith is an encounter with Christ. It should be a deep experience. For several generations we have made a serious mistake in making catechesis mainly a matter of religious instruction [almost 2000 years] and religious instruction a watered-down theology course. We must be aware that the central goal of catechesis is to strengthen faith. To accomplish this we must build up vibrant faith communities" (*The Wanderer*, Jan. 26, 1978). The editor of *The Wanderer* then continues to describe the "faith community" of Pocahontas as "priests and nuns in rebellion against the Pope; heresy in the Catechisms; immorality passed off as virtue in the confessional; all apparently with the bishop's approval"! One may be permitted to ask what parishes in the United States are free of such "abuses"?

²⁸ *Veritas*, Feb. 1981.

²⁹ Rev. Francis Spirago, *The Catechism Explained* (Benzinger: N.Y., 1899).

³⁰ While it is true that a Catholic must "follow his conscience," conscience is itself nothing but the application of God's law to specific circumstances. Putting this in different terms, there is no possible reason apart from insanity for a Catholic to decide the teaching of the Church is false. Only a false Church can teach falsely.

³¹ *De natura et gratia*, c. 26. Canon Smith, *The Teaching of the Catholic Church*, makes the following statement: "It is clear, then, that in this matter the Catholic has serious duties. Not only must he avoid temptations against the Faith, not only must he pray for an increase

The Nature of the Catholic Faith

of faith, but he is bound to take care that his mental development in secular branches of study shall be accompanied by equal development in the knowledge of his religion. If he feels difficulties regarding fundamentals, it is his duty to inquire of those who are able to solve them; and here he needs humility of mind which recognizes that what he does not know is well known to many others. There can be little doubt that many defections from the Church are due to a culpable lack of knowledge—culpable because the ordinary means of information upon this important matter, whether they be Catholic books, sermons, or instructions, have been culpably neglected.”

³² “Good works” include not only acts of charity towards our neighbor, but also “acts of charity” towards God, namely “fasting and prayer.”

³³ Dr. Ludwigg Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma* (Cork: Mercier, 1955).

CHAPTER 6

THE ATTITUDE OF THE MAGISTERIUM TOWARDS INNOVATION

Webster's Dictionary defines "innovation" as a "change or novelty, especially in customs, manners, or rites," and reminds us that a more obsolete usage equates the term with "revolution and insurrection." The traditional Catholic Church has always been strongly opposed to all innovation. Even prior to the coming of Christ, we find Plato calling the innovator "the worst kind of pest" in society, and stating that it was "our own irrational impulses which yearned for innovation."¹ The same attitude prevailed in ancient Rome. Sallust described the innovator as an "unprincipled character, hating the established order of things . . . bent on general upheaval, turmoil, and rebellion," and Cicero said, "*sic est vulgus, ex veritate pauca, ex opinione multa estimant.*"²

Our Lord never presented himself as an "innovator." He clearly stated that, "My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me" (John 8:16) and further stated: "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill the law" (Matt. 5:17). The warning of St. Paul against those who would teach us a new kind of gospel ("even though an Angel") is quite clear, for as it says in Proverbs: "Add not a thing to His words lest thou be reprov'd and found a liar" (30:6). This attitude was preserved by the Saints with care. Thus St. Papias (whom St. Irenaeus describes as a "hearer of the Apostle John and friend of Polycarp"³) says, "I do not take pleasure as many do . . . in those who relate foreign precepts, but in those who relate the precepts which were given by the Lord to the faith and come down to us from truth itself,"⁴ and Tertullian said, "It is not lawful to introduce anything of our own choice. . . . We have for our authors the Apostles of the Lord who did not even themselves choose anything to be introduced of their own will, but faithfully delivered over to the nations the religion which they had received from Christ . . ." and "I do not accept what you introduce . . . on your own authority."⁵

The Church Fathers maintained this attitude with clarity. St. Simeon of Thessalonica begins his book on the Church with the following words: "With love, we pass on to you that which we have taken from the Fathers. For we offer nothing new, but only that which has been passed on to us, and we have changed nothing but we have retained everything, like a creed, in the state in which it has been given to us. We worship exactly as Christ

The Attitude of the Magisterium Towards Innovation

Himself did and as did the Apostles and the Fathers of the Church.”⁶ St. Isidore taught: “We have the Apostles of God as authorities who did not choose what they would believe but faithfully transmitted the teachings of Christ. So, even if an angel from Heaven should preach otherwise, he should be called anathema.”⁷ St. Vincent of Lerins said, “The more a man is under the influence of religion, the more prompt is he to oppose innovation.” He further noted that,

if there is a beginning of mixing the new with the old, foreign ideas with genuine, and profane elements with sacred, this habit will creep in everywhere, without check. In the end, nothing in the Church will be left untouched, unimpaired, unhurt, and unstained. Where formerly there was a sanctuary of chaste and uncorrupted truth, there will be a brothel of impious and filthy errors. It is, therefore, an indispensable obligation for all Catholics who are eager to prove that they are true sons of Holy Mother Church to adhere to the Holy Faith of the Holy Fathers, to preserve it, to die for it, and, on the other hand, to detest the profane novelties of profane men, to dread them, to harass and attack them. I cannot help wondering about such madness in certain people, the dreadful impiety of their blinded minds and their insatiable lust for error, such that they are not content with the traditional Rule of Faith as once and for all received from antiquity, but are driven to seek another novelty daily. They are possessed by a permanent desire to change religion, to add something and to take something away—as though the dogma were not divine, so that it has to be revealed only once. But they take it for a merely human institution, which cannot be perfected except by constant emendations, rather, by constant corrections.⁸

St. Augustine taught, “for thus doth our faith teach, that is the true, the right Catholic faith, gathered not by the opinion of private judgment, but by the witness of the Scriptures; not subject to the fluctuations of heretical rashness, but grounded upon Apostolic truth.” He further stated that “the heretic . . . is one who for some temporal advantage, especially for the sake of glory and preeminence, originates or follows false and new opinions.”⁹ St. Basil said, “We accept no new faith, written out for us by others, nor do we proclaim the results of our own cogitation, lest mere human wisdom should be accounted the Rule of Faith; we communicate to all who question us that which the Holy Fathers have taught us.”¹⁰ St. John Climacus in his famous *Ladder of Ascent*, states: “We should constantly be examining and comparing ourselves with the Holy Fathers and lights who lived before us,” and further adds, “this I ask, that you should not imagine that we are inventing what we write, for such a suspicion would detract from its value.” St. Bruno teaches that “we ought to relate not our own words, but those of the Saints; not those which we can draw from our own

heart, but those which we can derive from the fountains of Israel.”¹¹ St. Maximus the Confessor stated: “I have no private opinion, but only agree with the Catholic Church.”¹²

Coming down through the later centuries we find St. Bernard teaching that heretics “mix novelties of speech and meaning with heavenly words like poison with honey.” He describes what happens as a result: “Churches without people, people without priests, priests without reverence due to them, and Christians without Christ. The churches are regarded as synagogues, the holiness of God’s sanctuary is denied, the sacraments are not considered sacred, the holy days are deprived of their solemnities.”¹³ M. Olier, the founder of the Sulpicians says, “God forbid that I should ever innovate anything in religious matters.”¹⁴ St. Francis de Sales said, “I have said nothing which I have not learned from others,”¹⁵ and in doing so reflected the very words of Cassian: “I am not inventing this teaching, but simply passing on what I learned from others.”¹⁶ St. Vincent de Paul stated his fear “that God is allowing the Faith gradually to perish from among us on account of the depravity of manners, the novel opinions which are spreading more and more, and the generally evil stage of things,”¹⁷ and St. Alphonsus de Liguori cried out against those “who taught not the Gospel but their own inventions.” One could go on quoting the Saints in similar fashion *ad infinitum*. Suffice it to conclude with just two more—both of recent vintage. Alban Butler speaks to us of “pride . . . which often attends knowledge” and continues: “Of this there cannot be a more dangerous symptom in a scholar than a fondness for novelty and singularity, especially if joined with obstinacy and opinionatedness.”¹⁸ And finally the Abbé Guéranger in his Introduction to the Season of Advent states: “The reader will rightly infer, from what we have said, that the object we have in view is not in any way to publish some favorite or clever method of our own.”

Pope St. Gregory said with regard to his commands: “Know, my brother, that these orders are not of our own invention, but that we proclaim them as decrees of the ancient Fathers taught to them by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.”¹⁹ Pope St. Sylvester declared: “Let there be no innovations,” and about one thousand years later his statement was repeated by Pope Benedict XV in his encyclical *Ad Beatissimi Apostolorum*.

The great Councils also held to this attitude. The Seventh Ecumenical Council stated: “Let everything that conflicts with Ecclesiastical Tradition and teaching, and that has been innovated and done contrary to the examples outlined by the saints and the venerable Fathers, or that shall hereafter at any time be done in such a fashion, be anathema.” The Second Council of Nicaea also condemned “those, who dare, after the impious

The Attitude of the Magisterium Towards Innovation

fashion of heretics, to deride the Ecclesiastical Traditions and to invent novelties of some kind.”

And such has ever been the seemingly monotonous plainchant of the Church which sees her function as one of preserving the Truth which Christ entrusted to her. As Msgr. Van Noort states: “The point is hammered home more forcibly by Tradition which from the very earliest days was willing to follow only the doctrine of the Apostles, and always considered any innovation in matters of the Faith to be a clear hallmark of heresy.” Not one Saint, not one Pope from a previous era, no Council prior to Vatican II, and not one line of Holy Scripture can be brought forth in defense of innovation. And such is not surprising for the Law of the Church with regard to the canonization of Saints promulgated by Pope Urban VIII requires that:

A most diligent inquiry be made as to whether the servant of God whose canonization is sought wrote any books, tracts, meditations, or the like; for if any such have been written, no inquiry is to be carried on until such books are carefully examined by the Congregation to see whether they contain any errors contrary to faith or morals, or any novel doctrine opposed to the sound and pure teaching of the Church.

Such, however, is by no means the attitude of the post-Conciliar Church. On the contrary, Paul VI, despite the fact that he took a coronation oath in which he swore “to change nothing of the received Tradition, and nothing thereof that I have found before me guarded by my God-pleasing predecessors, to encroach upon and to alter nothing, nor to permit any innovation therein”²⁰ has done everything in his power to foster innovations of the most horrendous nature.

Thus in his General Audience of July 2, 1969 he said that:

We desire to make our own the important words used by the Council, the words which define its spirit, and in a dynamic synthesis form the spirit of all those who place their confidence in it, whether they be in or outside of the Church. The [key] word is *novelty* (*nouveauté*—change, innovation, newness), a simple word, in common usage, and most dear to the hearts of modern man. . . . This word . . . has been given to us as a command and as a program.

And further on in the same discourse:

Two terms characterize the Council: renovation and *aggiornamento*. We very much desire that the “spirit of renewal,” to use an expression sanctioned by the Council, should be understood and lived by everyone. It

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

is a response to one of the characteristics of our times, engaged as it is in an enormous and rapid transformation which creates change and innovation in all domains of modern life. How can one fail but to spontaneously reflect *that if the world change, should not religion also change?* . . . It is for this very reason that the Church has, especially after the Council, undertaken so many reforms. . . . The religious orders reforming their statutes. . . . The liturgy undergoing a reform the extent of which is clear to everyone. . . . And we are about to reform the whole of Canon Law. . . . And how many other consoling and promising *innovations?* . . . We can say . . . of the Council that it marks the opening of a *new era* in which no one will be able to deny the *new points of view* which we have indicated (emphasis mine).

Not everyone was entirely happy with the “new era” and these “new points of view.” Hence it became necessary for Paul VI to once again discuss the subject. In his General Audience of August 4, 1971 he stated that “it is necessary to know how to welcome with humility and an interior freedom what is innovative.” He proceeded to explain to the faithful that the “renewal” achieved since Vatican II was,

that of a renewal conceived in correct terms, and according to the “good spirit” promised by the heavenly Father. . . . We could by the Grace of the Lord, give many proofs, and not trivial ones either, that seem to us convincing. . . . If we think of the sum total of innovating measures that have been put into effect in this period, particularly if we consider the liturgical reform—a great innovation indeed!

And indeed, as he states elsewhere that the “chief innovation affects the Eucharistic Prayer,” which is to say the Canon and especially in the Words of Consecration in the Mass itself.

Some will ask, what is wrong with innovations? The answer is that they essentially deny and disrupt the integrity of Revelation as handed down to us by Tradition. Hence they are intimately associated with heresy, and indeed, the Church Fathers frequently join the two terms in a single phrase—the terms being virtually synonymous. As St. Augustine said with regard to the teaching of the Church on original sin: “It is not I who devised the teaching of the Church which the Catholic Faith holds from ancient times, but you who deny it are undoubtedly an innovating heretic.”²¹ If the Church functions to preserve the Deposit of the Faith, she has an absolute obligation to speak out and expose those who would dilute or distort this deposit, and she has an absolute obligation to do everything in her power to prevent such heretics from misleading the faithful. The *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908) states that “heresy is a deadly poison generated within

the organism of the Church.” As Fr. Faber says, “there is no possibility of measuring the harm done to a man’s religious habits by the admission and temporary entertainment of error, however ignorance might seem to excuse such an admission.”²² St. John Fisher (who did not die in vain) tells us that “the sinner remains joined to the Mystical Body by Faith,” but “the heretic cuts himself off from the body and its vivifying spirit.”²³ Pope Pius X taught in his encyclical *Editae Saepe*—himself quoting the words of St. Charles Borromeo: “It is a certain well-established fact that no other crime so seriously offends God and provokes His greatest wrath as the vice of heresy.”

The idea that it is not necessary for those in authority to condemn heretics was labeled as “scandalous” by Pope Alexander VII in 1665 (Denzinger, 1105). The very first Council of the Apostles in Jerusalem was convened to put an end to the Judaizing tendencies of the first Christians. Pope Leo confirmed the conciliar condemnation of Pope Honorius I on the grounds that “he was wanting the vigilance expected from him in his Apostolic office and thereby allowed heresy to make headway which he should have crushed in its beginnings.” During the traditional rite for the Ordination of bishops, the following words are read: “I have made thee a watchman to the house of Israel” (Ezech. 3:17). And the very next sentence continues: “If thou declare not to the wicked his iniquity, I will require his blood at thy hand.” (Needless to say, these phrases, to accommodate Protestant prejudices, have been dropped from the post-Conciliar consecration rite. The Conciliar “bishops” are “consecrated” to “loose,” but not to “bind”! Cf. Chapter 14 on Ordination Rites.) Canon Law—1917 (#2396) states that “he is suspect of heresy who spontaneously and consciously helps in any way with the propagation of heresy.” Pope Felix III stated: “Not to oppose error is to approve of it, and not to defend truth is to suppress it, and indeed, to neglect to confound evil men, when we can do it, is no less a sin than to encourage them.”²⁴

It should not be thought that such “anti-heretical” attitudes on the part of the traditional Church are not Scriptural. Christ Himself warned us that “many false prophets shall arise, and shall seduce many.” He further stated that “he who is not with me is against me . . . and he who will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican.” He was not ambiguous when He said, “he who believeth not shall be condemned.” The Apostles spoke in a similar vein. St. Paul warned us against those “who would teach a Gospel besides that which we had received of Him.” St. John calls the heretic “a seducer, an Antichrist, a man who dissolves Christ,” and instructs us “to receive him not into the house nor say to him God speed you.” St. Peter, with his characteristic ardor, calls the heretics “lying

teachers who shall bring in sects of perdition, and deny the Lord who bought them; bringing upon themselves swift destruction.” He called them “clouds without water and clouds tossed in whirlwinds, to whom the mist of darkness is reserved.” St. Jude speaks in a similar strain throughout his whole Epistle. And St. Paul tells us how to act with regard to heresy. He instructs Timothy to “war on them a good warfare, having faith and good conscience, which some rejecting have made a shipwreck concerning the Faith.” He exhorts the ancients of the Church at Ephesus to “take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops to rule the Church of God. . . . I know that, after my departure, ravening wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock . . . therefore watch.” “Beware of dogs,” he writes to the Philippians, the “dogs” being the same false teachers as the ravening wolves. Is it any wonder that St. Jerome calls the congregations of heretics “synagogues of Satan” and says that their communion is to be avoided “like that of vipers and scorpions”?²⁵ St. de Montfort warned his own father “not to touch pitch, for it would defile him; not to swallow earth, for it would choke him, not to inhale smoke, for it would stifle him.”²⁶ As St. Bernard warns, “it is not safe to sleep near serpents.”²⁷

And what do we have today in the New and post-Conciliar Church? As Frank Sheed has said: “Every week brings news of some revolutionary-sounding denial by some theologian somewhere—and not a sound out of the hierarchy! . . . There is hardly a doctrine or practice of the Church that I have not heard attacked by some priest.”²⁸ Now, who are the great theologians of the New Church? Surely no one will balk at the name of Bernard Haring, Karl Rahner, Hans Küng, Joseph Suenens, Edward Schillebeeckx, and Yves Congar, to give but a few names that are almost household words—and every one of these has denied one or another of the Church’s teachings. They are all well known to Paul VI and his successors—many as personal friends. All of them are “priests in good standing.” Not one of them has been declared heretical, much less excommunicated.²⁹ When Hans Küng was brought up on charges of heresy—he denies the doctrine of transubstantiation, that Christ established a hierarchy or even a priesthood, the reality of all the miracles in the Gospel, and even the Resurrection—even the Lutherans object to his Christology—it was declared that “he was not a Catholic theologian” but was in no way deprived of his priestly function or his power to influence the Catholic faithful. As Michael Novak commented, “neither Küng nor those theologians who have leaped to his defense argue that the Vatican has misunderstood or misrepresented him. . . . The Vatican has not, however, limited his freedom; it has only revoked his authority to speak in its name. Nor has the Vatican accused him of

heresy—defined as deviation from the teachings of Christ, accompanied by deliberate scorn for orthodoxy—or impugned his person, motives, or good will. The Vatican recognizes Küng’s intention to remain a Catholic.”³⁰ Fr. Schillebeeckx, one of those responsible for the “Dutch Catechism,” and a man who has denied as many teachings of the Church as has Hans Küng, after a thorough investigation was declared “a priest in good standing” both by his order and the Vatican. These investigations were instituted during the reign of Paul VI and carried to completion during that of John Paul II.

Paul VI recognized that the “smoke of Satan” was rising within the Vatican itself. But what of his actions? He has never condemned heresy, but rather stated that “you will have noticed my dear friends to what extent the style of our government of the Church seeks to be pastoral, fraternal, humble in spirit and form. It is on this account that, with the help of God, we hoped to be loved.”³¹ And to be loved by the world, he abolished the Index, and effectively abolished the Holy Office,³² one of the primary functions of which was to prevent heretics from doing harm, and then openly declared that:

We are going to have a period of greater liberty in the life of the Church, and hence for each of her sons. . . . Formal discipline will be reduced, all arbitrary judgment will be abolished, as well as all intolerance and absolutism.³³

Now such a statement from a person who claimed to be a reigning Pontiff—Christ’s representative on earth—can only be termed extraordinary. First of all, the judgments of the Church have never been “arbitrary,” but based on sound doctrine, and often taken after years of careful study. Secondly, the Church must be intolerant of error. After all, she is here to proclaim Christ’s truth. Now either she is the Church that Christ founded, and therefore has the obligation of speaking the truth, or she is traitorous to her charge. This is true, whether the world gives her recognition and whether or not the world accords her special rights and privileges. Either she teaches the absolute Truth, or there is in her eyes, no absolute truth. What father would ever fail to censor the reading and activities of his children or those entrusted to his care? What government in power has ever allowed seditious organizations the freedom to undermine its structures? And heresy for the Church of Christ is sedition. What physician would ever allow the disease to play havoc with his patient when he was in a position to prevent it?

It should by now be quite clear to the reader that the New and post-Conciliar Church has departed from unity with the traditional Church, the “Church of All Times,” the Church that Christ founded, the Roman

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Catholic Church as she exists now and will continue to exist till the end of time. To those who argue that all such departures are in the nature of “abuses,” let it be stressed that throughout this book, almost all examples of the *rupture with Tradition* are taken either from statements of the post-Conciliar “Popes,” the documents of Vatican II, or illustrated from the new sacramental rites as they are officially promulgated. No post-Conciliar Catholic can refuse to accept these three sources without defeating his own argument. He cannot “pick and choose” just what he will accept in the New Church without declaring that it is in fact his own “private opinion” that is the basic authority for his decision. The “post-Conciliar Catholic,” no matter how “sincere,” is plainly and simply, *no longer a Roman Catholic*.

To use the words of the Fathers of Trent, it is certain that the Church “was instructed by Jesus Christ and His apostles and that all truth was daily taught it by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.” Therefore, it is obviously absurd and injurious to propose a certain “restoration and regeneration” for her as though necessary for her safety and growth, as if she could be considered subject to defect or obscurity or other misfortune. Indeed these authors of novelties consider that a “foundation may be laid for a new human institution,” and what Cyprian detested may come to pass, that what was a divine thing “may become a human church” (Pope Gregory XVI, *Mirari vos*).

Notes

¹ Plato, *Laws*, VII: 797. Reference to the Loeb Classical Library edition index under “innovation” will give several statements along parallel lines. Plato especially speaks out against those who would innovate in musical and ritual matters.

² Sallust, *Histories*. Cicero, *Lat. Dict.* 521. We are of course not speaking of those who would make a “better mouse trap,” but about those who would replace what is traditional with “novelties.” One must be aware of the Platonic distinction between “new songs” and “a new kind of music.”

³ Papias was Bishop of Hieropolis during the post-Apostolic period—there is some debate as to whether he was a disciple of John the Apostle or of John the Elder. Cf. *The Oracles of Papias* (Longmans Green: London, 1894).

⁴ *The Anti-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I (Eerdmans: Mich., 1968).

⁵ *Ad Praxeam*, quoted in *The Faith of Catholics*, Rev. James Waterworth (Dolman: London, 1896); and *Flesh of Christ*, quoted in William Jurgens, *Faith of the Early Fathers* (Liturgical Press: Collegeville, Minn., 1970).

⁶ PG 155:701 a-b.

⁷ *Etymologies*.

⁸ *Commintoria*, quoted from *The Anti-Nicene Fathers*.

The Attitude of the Magisterium Towards Innovation

⁹ Sermon 34, and *De utilitate credendi*.

¹⁰ Quoted by J. Tixeront, *History of Dogmas*.

¹¹ St. Brunonis, *de Ornatu Eccles*.

¹² Quoted in *From the Housetops*, No. 22 (St. Benedict Center: Still River, Mass., 1982).

¹³ *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux* (No. 318), edited and translated by B. S. James (Regnery: Chicago, 1953).

¹⁴ *Catéchisme Chrétien*, Part II, Chap. 14.

¹⁵ Preface to his *The Love of God* (several editions).

¹⁶ *Conferences*.

¹⁷ Letter to Mr. d'Horgny.

¹⁸ Alban Butler, *The Lives of the Saints* (several editions).

¹⁹ Rev. Van Noort, *Dogmatic Theology*.

²⁰ Taken from the *Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*, PL 105, S. 54. This oath was also taken by John XXIII, but refused by both John Paul I and II.

²¹ *De Nupt.*, II.

²² *Life and Letters*, p. 72.

²³ Quoted in E. Sturtz, S.J., *Works and Days of John Fisher* (Yale: New Haven, 1981).

²⁴ Vatican II, under the heading of “religious liberty,” would concede to all religious sects, and to non-religious organizations, the right to propagate their views, no matter how heretical, and even in situations where the Church could prevent it. This is, the Council teaches, to be “guaranteed” as a “civil right.” What father would ever allow such in his family? In passing, the accusation that the Church “burned” heretics is false. Heretics, especially anarchists and Satanists, were considered enemies of the State. The Albigensians (in France) denied all civil as well as all spiritual authority. The Church and her “inquisition” functioned to determine whether or not they were in fact heretics, and always insisted that they be given a chance to “recant.” Our modern “jury” system is an outgrowth of the Inquisition as all evidence had to be presented, not to a jury of peers, but to one of experts. In many situations the Inquisition functioned to “protect” the faithful from the State. It was those who clearly were attempting to destroy the civil order that were turned over to the State for punishment. That abuses occurred is unfortunately true, but these were surprisingly few in number. Those who are interested in an unbiased view of this institution are referred to William Thomas Walsh’s *Characters of the Inquisition* (available from TAN), and to a most remarkable study by Professor Jean Dumont of the Sorbonne in Paris entitled *L’Eglise au risque de l’Histoire* (Criterion: Limoges, 1985). Professor Dumont is a non-Catholic and hence cannot be accused of historical bias. The Church has always taken the position that error can under certain circumstances be “tolerated,” but never one that gives it approval or treats it on an “equal footing” (to use a phrase culled from Vatican II). Thus, while forced conversions are clearly forbidden by Canon Law, she has always done all in her power to prevent the faithful from being seduced by heretical teachings. Convinced of her sacred function and duty, how else should she behave?

²⁵ Quoted by Msgr. John Vaughan in *Dangers of the Day* (Ave Maria Press, 1909).

²⁶ Letter to his father quoted by George Rigault, *St. Louis de Montfort, His Life and Work* (The Montfort Fathers: N.Y., 1947).

²⁷ Letter 318, *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*.

²⁸ Frank Sheed, *The Church and I* (Doubleday: N.Y., 1974).

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

²⁹ One or two theologians have in fact been reprimanded in recent years—men like Jacques Pohier, whose names are completely unknown. One or two like Fr. Boff in Brazil were “silenced” for a period of one year (with no retractions required). One or two others have been removed from their teaching positions. Such of course is mere “tokenism.”

³⁰ *New York Times Magazine Section*, March 23, 1980.

³¹ Quoted by the Abbé Georges of Nantes in his *Liber Accusationis in Paulum Sextum*, available from Ligue de la contre-Réforme Catholique, Maison Saint-Joseph, 10260 Saint-Parres-Les-Vaudes (France).

³² July 15, 1966. The Index dates back to the Council of Nicaea in 325 when the works of Arius (specifically, his book *Thalia*) were condemned because of the author’s views that the Word of God was a creature “set forth in a loose, free style, reminding one of the works of Sotades.” The “loose, free style” was not invented by the *periti* of Vatican II. It should be noted in passing that any Catholic who has an adequate reason and the requisite intellectual background can get permission from his pastor to read books on the Index. The name of the Holy Office of the Inquisition has been changed to “The Congregation for the Defense of Doctrine.” Paul VI diminished its role by eliminating its office for censorship of books and eliminating the Roman Index of Prohibited Books (Cf. *The Remnant*, Dec. 15, 1979).

³³ Quoted by the Abbé of Nantes in his *Liber Accusationis*.

CHAPTER 7

CAN A POPE DEPART FROM UNITY OF FAITH AND WORSHIP?

THE POPE IS HELD IN THE HIGHEST AUTHORITY BY CATHOLICS

Catholics hold the Papacy in such veneration that it is almost inconceivable that anyone would presume to criticize the individual who sits on the Chair of Peter. The Pope is the Visible Head of the Church. He is the Head because he is the Vicar of Christ and clothed with Christ's authority. He is said to be visible not only because he is the one that is seen, but also because one sees through him with the eyes of the Faith, the invisible Head (Christ). He is called the Pastor of Pastors (from the Latin *pasco*, to feed) because he “feeds and confirms” all the other Pastors (bishops). He is also in like manner called the “Doctor of Doctors” (from *docere*, to teach), for he is the “universal” or “supreme” Doctor. And he is also called the “Vicar” (from the Latin *vicarius*, to take the place of) because he stands in the place of Christ.

A Pope then stands above all other men. Yet he stands below Christ. His authority, as all authority, comes from God, and no one who stands beneath him has the authority to command, confirm, or teach him. His power is so great that he can dispense the faithful from any Ecclesiastical law,¹ but not great enough to dispense anyone from the natural or divine law. He cannot be removed from his office even by an Ecumenical Council, though such a Council can declare him a formal heretic, which if true, puts him in the situation of removing himself from office. But despite the power he wields and despite the authority he holds, he is limited by one important factor—even though he is Christ's Viceroy (which literally means “Voice-King”) on earth—he is not himself Christ. He can overrule others, but never overrule his divine Master. This is why he cannot dispense anyone from Divine law. This is why he can no more change our Faith than he cannot “unmake” the Truth. As St. Cyprian said:

God is one, and Christ is one, and the Church is one, and the chair is one, founded by the Lord's word upon a rock. Another altar or a new priesthood, besides the one altar and the one priesthood, cannot be set up. Whosoever gathereth elsewhere scattereth.²

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

It is because the Pope is Christ's highest representative on earth that he is given governance over the faithful. The reason we owe him obedience is that, as St. Norbert of Magdeburg says, "obedience to the Pope is obedience to Christ."³ As Msgr. Grou explains, the Pope "is one hierarchical person with Our Lord." Because of this he is endowed with the charism of infallibility. Just as he is clothed with Christ's authority, so also he is clothed with Christ's infallibility, and it goes without saying that our Divine Lord could not teach anything but the absolute truth.

The Pope is infallible when he functions as Pope, when he speaks from the Chair of Peter (*ex cathedra*, as explained in Chapter 2). This infallibility does not extend to him as a private person or even as a private theologian. There is no limit to the Pope's infallibility in his role as Pope, except that of teaching error, for error can never be infallibly true. The Pope is unlimited in his function of preserving the Deposit of the Faith, but he is limited by this function, for he cannot teach anything contrary to this deposit.

The Holy Spirit is not promised to the successors of Peter so that, through His revelation, they may bring new doctrines to light, but that, with His help, they may keep inviolate and faithfully expound the revelation handed down through the Apostles, the Deposit of Faith (Denzinger, 1836).

The Church has always recognized the limitations under which the Pope rules. As St. Bernard wrote to Pope Eugene in his *Five Books on Consideration* (otherwise known as *Advice to a Pope*):

You have been entrusted with stewardship over the world, not given possession of it. Leave possession and rule to Him; you take care of it. This is your portion: beyond it do not stretch your hand. You should not think that you are excluded from those about whom God complains (when He says in Hos. 8:4), "They have reigned, but not by Me; princes have arisen, but I do not recognize them."⁴

It should be clearly understood that the charism of infallibility does not deprive the Pope of his free will. He is not turned into a robot. If he were, every Pope would be a canonized Saint. A Pope, like every man, can be a sinner—*omnis homo mendax*—and indeed some were. But even though he sin, he still retains his function as Pope.⁵ It is one thing to sin against the flesh, for all men are weak;⁶ it is quite another to deny the truth with obstinacy, which is a "sin against the Holy Ghost."

CAN A NON-CATHOLIC BE ELECTED TO THE PAPACY?

Non-Catholics include those who have never been Catholic, and those who once were Catholic but who either apostatized or were excluded from the Body of Christ by legitimate disciplinary action. Those who are not Catholic are not and cannot be suitable candidates for the papacy. Pope Paul IV made this clear in his Apostolic Bull *Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio* (1559):⁷

Should it happen that a bishop, cardinal, legate, or even the Roman Pontiff had deviated from the Catholic Faith before his nomination as bishop, cardinal, or Pope, the following dispositions are compulsory. The promotion or election, even if the cardinals have consented to this of common accord [i.e., all of them], is null and void. They cannot acquire validity by the fact of the subject's entry into function or by the fact of consecration or subsequent exercise of authority—in the case of a Pope—by the fact of enthronement, or the act of veneration, or subsequent general obedience. . . . Nor can they confer upon such persons . . . any power to command either in the spiritual or temporal domain. . . . Whoever does not refuse his fidelity and obedience to such persons thus promoted or called is tearing the Lord's robe.

CAN A POPE LOSE HIS AUTHORITY?

A Pope may lose his authority in several ways. He may lose it by death, by insanity, by schism (separating himself from the Church), and by apostasy (which is spiritual death). There is no difficulty in understanding the principle behind death or insanity. Hence the question can be rephrased thus: Can the Pope separate himself from the Church (schism) and can he fall into heresy?

A) CAN A POPE BECOME SCHISMATIC?

Schism is defined as the rupture of ecclesiastical unity. St. Augustine tells us that “by false doctrines concerning God heretics wound faith; by iniquitous dissensions schismatics deviate from fraternal charity, although they believe what we believe.”⁸ The Church has always held that a Pope can become schismatic.

[A Pope] falls into schism if he himself departs from the body of the Church by refusing to be in communion with her by participating in the sacraments. . . . The Pope can become schismatic in this manner if he does not wish to be in proper communion with the body of the Church [i.e., the Church of

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

All Times], a situation which would arise if he tried to excommunicate the entire Church, or, as both Cajetan and Torquemada observe, *if he wished to change all the ecclesiastical ceremonies, founded as they are on Apostolic Tradition* (Francis Suarez, S.J.).

And indeed, what Ecclesiastical Ceremonies have the post-Conciliar “Popes” left unaltered?

By disobedience the Pope can separate himself from Christ despite the fact that he is head of the Church, for above all, the unity of the Church is dependent on its relationship with Christ. The Pope can separate himself from Christ by either disobeying the laws of Christ, or by commanding something that is against the divine or natural law; by so doing, the Pope separates himself from the body of the Church because this body is itself linked to Christ by obedience. In this way, the Pope could without doubt fall into schism.

The Pope can also separate himself from the Church and her priests if he so wishes to do and without any specific reason [i.e., by the exercising of his free will]. He also does this if he refuses to do what the Universal Church [i.e., the Church of All Times] does, based as these things are, on the Tradition of the Apostles; or again, if he does not observe those precepts which the Holy and Ecumenical Councils or the Holy See have determined to be of universal application. Especially is this true with regard to the Divine liturgy, as for example, if he did not wish personally to follow the universal customs and rites of the Church. Such would be the case if he did not wish to celebrate Mass with the sacred vestments or with candles, or if he refused to make the Sign of the Cross in the same manner as other priests do. The same holds true for other aspects of the liturgy in a very general fashion, and for anything that might go against the perpetual customs of the Church as incorporated in the Canons *Quae ad perpetuum, violatores, Sunt Quidem, and Contra Statua*. By separating himself from the observance of the universal customs of the Church, and by doing so with obstinacy, the Pope is able to fall into schism. Such a conclusion is only just because the premises on which it is based are beyond doubt. For, just as the Pope can become a heretic, so also is he able to do so with the sin of obstinacy. Thus it is that Pope Innocent states (*De Consuetudine*) that, it is necessary to obey a Pope in all things as long as he does not himself go against the universal customs of the Church, but should he go against the universal customs of the Church, he need not be followed (Jean de Torquemada).

B) CAN A POPE FALL INTO HERESY?

Heresy is the sin of denying a revealed truth with obstinacy. Properly speaking, obstinacy does not constitute the sin of heresy, but rather manifests

Can a Pope Depart From Unity of Faith and Worship?

it and permits one to distinguish the heretic who wishes to deny a truth of the Faith, from a person who is in error from ignorance and without any desire to deny a truth of the Faith. This is the distinction between material and formal heresy. Anyone who holds to an erroneous belief in ignorance of the teaching of the Church is materially wrong, but insofar as he has no desire to be in error, he is not formally wrong. However, a person who is a material heretic, and who once having been corrected, persists in his error, adds obstinacy to his attitude and becomes a formal heretic.⁹ Such “willful error” is a mortal sin.

Every mortal sin results in the loss of the state of Grace, but even when deprived of this divine Grace, the sinner remains a member of the Church. He is like a branch of the vine in which the sap of Grace no longer flows, but a branch not cut off, and hence one that can be brought back to life. Even though such a person is “spiritually dead,” he remains within the Church. As Pius XII pointed out, “sinners are in the Church of which they are always members” (*Mystici corporis*).

However, the sins of schism and heresy not only cause spiritual death, they also separate those who are guilty of such from the Mystical Body of Christ which is the Church. Unlike a sinner, a heretic is no longer a member of the Church. Should the heretic be in Holy Orders (a deacon, priest, or bishop), he retains the powers inherent in the order received, but loses the right to use them. In addition, he loses all jurisdiction or authority.

The principle involved is enshrined in Canon Law (1917). Canon 138 states:

Through tacit resignation, accepted by the Law itself, all offices become vacant by the very fact (*ipso facto*) and without any declaration, if a cleric . . . has publicly defected from the Catholic Church.¹⁰

It should be clear that the Pope, like anyone else, is free and hence perfectly capable of apostatizing from the Faith. This he does by becoming a “formal” heretic. As some would deny it is possible for a Pope to apostatize from the Faith, let it be noted that Dante has never been criticized by the Church for placing several Popes in Hell. The promise of Christ—“I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not” (Luke 22:31) in no way guarantees papal indefectibility. It is the Church that is indefectible, and not the Pope.

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN A POPE BECOMES A HERETIC?

It is of course true that a Pope cannot be deposed, even by a Council (for no act of a Council has authority until it receives papal approval), but should

a Pope fall into notorious or formal heresy, he automatically falls from his high station and loses all his authority. Let the teaching of the Church be clear:

There is no doubt but that a Pope, even if he should be a notorious heretic—if for example, he taught a doctrine contrary to the Divine Faith—could not be deposed by a Council; the Council would simply declare that he was a heretic and as a result that he had fallen from his pontificate (St. Alphonsus de Liguori).

[A Pope] who is a notorious heretic automatically ceases to be the Pope and chief, just as he automatically ceases to be a Christian and a member of the Church (Cardinal St. Robert Bellarmine).

A Pope who makes himself the mouthpiece of heresy is no longer a Pope, and when he is mistaken, he is not the less mistaken because he is a Pope. In such a situation, it is not the Church which errs, for she can always elect another Pope (Francis Suarez, S.J.).

A Pope, by the simple fact that he is guilty of heresy, places himself outside the Church, and he is relieved of his function by God himself (Thyrus Gonzales, S.J.).

In the situation where the Pope becomes a heretic, he finds himself by that sole fact and without any other sentence, separated from the Church. In effect, a head separated from the body can no longer, as long as it is separated, be the head of that body from which it is separated. Thus, a Pope who becomes separated from the Church by heresy, ceases by that fact to be head of the Church. He cannot be a heretic and remain Pope because one who is outside the Church cannot hold the keys of the Church (St. Antoninus of Florence).¹¹

If the Pope is a heretic, by that very fact (*ipso facto*) he falls out of the Church (St. Francis de Sales).

**CAN ONE PRESUME THE GOOD WILL OF A POPE WHO
OFFICIALLY TEACHES ERROR WITH REGARD TO
DOCTRINAL MATTERS?**

The Pope can fall into heresy as a private doctor. (He is prevented from doing so in his capacity of Universal Doctor—that is, in his official capacity as Pope.) He can manifest this doctrinal error in two ways.

Can a Pope Depart From Unity of Faith and Worship?

As a private doctor: In such a case, as would be the situation with any of the faithful who made a mistake, one not only can, but one should, presume good faith, especially if he retracts as soon as he is made aware of his error. Such was the situation with St. Peter, and Pope Paschal II.

In an official manner: In this situation his good faith cannot even be presumed. In effect, it is a dogma of our Faith that in the exercise of his function of Pope, he cannot teach error. Hence it follows that if a Pope should teach error in his official capacity, by that very fact he makes it manifestly clear that prior to this he had fallen into error and lost the Papacy.¹² To refuse to accept this statement is to either deny the dogma of infallibility, or *quod absit*, to accuse Christ of teaching falsehood.

As Leo XIII stated:

If, which is impossible, the official teaching of a Pope should be erroneous, it would follow that God Himself would be the author of error among men. O Lord, if we are in error, it is You Yourself who have deceived us (*Satis cognitum*).

THE PROBLEM OF A DOUBTFUL POPE

There are three ways in which doubts can arise as to whether a given individual is truly the Pope. The first is as to whether he was a Catholic prior to his election. Section 2 above points out that it is impossible for a non-Catholic to be elected to the Papacy. Doubt about a person's orthodoxy prior to election can lead to doubt about the validity of his election.

Secondly, one can question the election process itself. Here the laws of the Church (The Apostolic Constitution *Vacante sede*, Dec. 25, 1904) must be clearly followed—laws set up precisely to prevent undue influence by the powers of this world in the final result. The rules to be followed in this situation are given below.

The third area relates to the status of a given Pope after his election and acceptance of the papacy. An individual who is unquestionably Pope can still defect from the Faith and place himself outside the Church. Should such be the case, he would, as shown above, lose all authority and jurisdiction.

Where the issue is uncertain, the principle that "a doubtful Pope is no Pope at all" applies. Such is the statement of Fr. Wilmers:

In the case where the election of a Pope has become so doubtful that it is impossible to know with certitude whether or not he is a true pontiff, he whose election is doubtful should, according to most authors, step down in order to allow a new election to take place. If he refuses to do so, the Church

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

and the bishops can declare that he is not a Pope because his election is in doubt. This follows from the principle that “a doubtful Pope is no Pope at all.” In effect, he whose authority is uncertain is unable to oblige anyone to obey him, in the same fashion that one is not obliged to obey a law before it is promulgated.¹³

In view of what has been said in previous sections, the ability of a Council to declare a doubtful Pope as without authority may be questioned. Consider the words of Cardinal St. Robert Bellarmine:

A doubtful Pope should not be considered as a Pope, and hence to exercise authority over him is not to exercise authority over a Pope. . . . Even though a Council cannot convene in the absence of a Pope in order to define new dogmas, it nevertheless can convene, during a period of schism [as when there are several claimants to the papal throne], to determine who is the true Pope and, if the first [shown to be either] null or doubtful, to furnish the Church with another pastor.

THE PROBLEM FOR THE FAITHFUL

It is not for the faithful to declare that a given individual is or is not the Pope. This decision resides with the Magisterium of the Church.¹⁴ What, however, the faithful can and must do, is to decide whether a given person sitting in the Chair of Peter is Catholic or not. To argue that no member of the Church has the right to judge the Pope’s orthodoxy is to argue that the faithful have no right and hence no obligation, to distinguish truth from error. If such be the case, then none of us can be held responsible for being Catholic.¹⁵ Once one determines that a given Pope teaches error “with the appearances of and the solemnity of an *ex cathedra* pronouncement,” one can decide that he is not Catholic and that the rules of the Church apply. This may seem to beg the issue, but in point of fact functions to protect both Pope and laity from rash judgments. At issue is not what one thinks or feels, but what is fact. If a given Pope teaches error in an *ex cathedra* manner, it is *prima facie* evidence that he has lost the Faith.

Lest there be any doubt about this the following quotations are offered:

When the shepherd turns into a wolf, the first duty of the flock is to defend itself. As a general rule, doctrine comes from the bishops to the faithful, and it is not for the faithful, who are subjects in the order of Faith, to pass judgment on their superiors. But every Christian by the virtue of his title to the name Christian, has not only the necessary knowledge of the essentials of the treasure of Revelation, but also the duty of safeguarding them. The

Can a Pope Depart From Unity of Faith and Worship?

principle is the same, whether it is a matter of belief or conduct, that is of dogma or morals (Dom Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year*).

All this is incorporated in Canon Law:

Any member of the faithful may at all times denounce the offence of another . . . and the obligation of denouncing another becomes urgent . . . when one is obliged to do so in virtue of the natural law where there is a danger to Faith or religion or other imminent public evil (Canon 1935 [1917]).

Finally, the importance of all this becomes clear in that obedience does not excuse one or abolish the responsibility for sin. Listen to the words of St. Catherine of Siena as addressed to Pope Gregory XI:

Alas, Alas, my most sweet Father . . . those who obey [an evil pastor] fall into disorder and iniquity. Alas, I say this with sorrow. How dangerous is the consuming road of self-love [on the part of a pastor], not only because it destroys his own soul, but also because it leads so many others to Hell.¹⁶

DOES ONE ALWAYS HAVE TO OBEY THE POPE?

While the next chapter will provide an in-depth study of obedience, the subject will be briefly discussed at this point. A good rule of thumb to keep in mind is that obedience is a moral virtue while Faith, Hope, and Charity are theological virtues and, hence, of a higher order. It follows that to obey a command that goes contrary to the Faith is obviously wrong. Many doubts have been raised about the validity and appropriateness of the commands of the post-Conciliar “Popes.” Strictly speaking, if they are true Popes, they are to be obeyed as one would obey Christ. Their teachings are to be accepted as if they came from Christ Himself. Logically speaking, in order to disobey them one would have to come to the conclusion that they had lost their authority in one of the ways discussed above.

But it is to be admitted that many are confused by current events. They see the evil fruits of Vatican II and hear the voice of a stranger (the sheep know their Master’s voice) coming from Rome. They are asked in the name of obedience to discard all that they once were taught to hold sacred, the liturgy and practice of the Church. Yet they find it difficult to conclude that those sitting in the Chair of Peter lack valid authority. For those in doubt about whether one should be in doubt about the validity of these “Popes,” and until the issue has been resolved, there are still principles of behavior that apply. Such is the care with which the Church protects the faithful.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Although it clearly follows from the circumstances that the Pope can err at times, and command things which must not be done, that we are not to be simply obedient to him in all things, that does not show that he must not be obeyed by all when his commands are good. To know in what cases he is to be obeyed and in what not . . . it is said in the Acts of the Apostles: "One ought to obey God rather than man." Therefore, were the Pope to command anything against Holy Scripture, or the articles of Faith, or the truth of the sacraments, or the commands of the natural or divine law, he ought not to be obeyed, but in such commands, to be passed over (*despiciendus*) (Cardinal Turrencremata, *Summa de Eccl.*).

It is lawful to resist him [the Pope] if he assaulted souls, or troubled the State, and much more if he strove to destroy the Church. It is lawful, I say, to resist him by not doing what he commands and hindering the execution of his will (Cardinal St. Bellarmine, *De rom. Pont.*).

If the Pope, by his orders and his acts, destroys the Church, one can resist him and impede the execution of his commands (Francisco de Vitoria).

If the Pope lays down an order contrary to right customs, one does not have to obey him (Francis Suarez, S.J.).

All this is well summed up by Bishop Robert Grosseteste, himself a man who found it necessary to disobey the Pope.

Those who preside in this most Holy See are most principally among mortals clothed with the person of Christ, and therefore it is necessary that in them especially the works of Christ should shine, and that there should be nothing contrary to Christ's works in them. And for the same reason, just as the Lord Jesus Christ must be obeyed in all things, so also those who preside in this see, insofar as they are clothed with Christ and are as such truly presiding, must be obeyed in all things. But if anyone of them (which God forbid!), should put on the clothing of kingship and the flesh of the world or anything else except Christ, and for love of such things should command anything contrary to Christ's precepts and will, anyone who obeys him in such things manifestly separates himself from Christ and from His Body which is the Church.

A CONSTANT TEACHING OF THE CHURCH

Traditional Catholics vary in their attitude towards the post-Conciliar pontiffs. Some reject their validity outright; others see them as material,

Can a Pope Depart From Unity of Faith and Worship?

but not formal “Popes”—as individuals sitting in the Chair of Peter but void of all spiritual authority; still others consider them legitimate pontiffs who are “tainted with error,” or as material, but not formal heretics, and hence as individuals who have not lost their high estate. The latter group tends to disobey them when they command the faithful to act against the Traditions of the Church but are inevitably forced into the position of picking and choosing just what they accept and what they reject.

The principles involved in such decisions have always been with the Church. I quote below the statement of William of Ockham (c. 1324) on which he founded his opposition to John XXII. In doing so the author of this book in no way intends to defend the Nominalist position, but only to show the theological principles involved.

Because of the errors and the heresies mentioned above and countless others, I turned away from the obedience of the false Pope and all who were his friends to the prejudice of the orthodox faith. For men of great learning showed me that because of his errors and heresies the same pseudo-Pope is heretical, deprived of his papacy, and excommunicated by Canon Law itself, without need of further sentence. . . . In proof thereof several volumes have been published. . . . For against the errors of this pseudo-Pope I have turned my face like the hardest rock, so that neither lies nor calumnies nor any persecution (which cannot touch my innermost self in any bodily fashion), nor great numbers of men who believe in him or favor him or even defend him, shall be able to prevent me from attacking or reproving his errors, as long as I shall have hand, paper, pen, and ink. . . .

If anyone should like to recall me or anyone else who has turned away from the obedience of the false Pope and his friends, let him try to defend his Constitutions and sermons, and show that they agree with Holy Scripture, or that a Pope cannot fall into the wickedness of heresy, or let him show by holy authorities or manifest reasons that one who knows the Pope to be a notorious heretic is obliged to obey him. Let him not, however, adduce the great number of his adherents, nor base his arguments on reproaches, because those who try to arm themselves with great numbers of lies, reproaches, threats, and false calumnies, show that they are void of truth and reason. Therefore let none believe that I mean to turn away from the recognized truth because of the great number of those in favor of the pseudo-Pope, or because of proofs that are common to heretics and to orthodox men, because I prefer Holy Scripture to a man unlearned in holy science, and I have a higher esteem for the doctrine of the Fathers who reign with Christ than for the tradition of men dwelling in this mortal life.¹⁷

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Notes

¹ Ecclesiastical law refers to those laws established by the Church.

² St. Cyprian, Ex. xl., *Ad Plebem, De Quinque Presch.*, n. 5 and *De Unitate*. “Adoration is necessary, but adoration which is not out of the Church, only that ordered in the very court of God. Invent not, He saith, your own courts and synagogues for Me. One is the holy court of God” (St. Basil, *Hom. in Ps. xxviii.* n. 3).

³ St. Norbert, founder of the Canons regular Premonstratensians, told Pope Innocent II that “the seat of Peter exercises the office of Peter. Because of the promise of Christ, he who obeys Peter obeys Christ. But if you command obedience to this proposition (regarding the power of investiture which the Pope had granted to secular rulers), you place yourself in opposition to the entire Church” (*Vita A. de San Norberto*, cited by R.P.J. Campos in *Un defensor energico del Papa*, No. 36, [Roma], p. 63). The problem of “Obedience” is discussed in the next chapter.

⁴ Eugene IV was formerly a monk in St. Bernard’s community. This famous text, described as “both a treatise on the politics of theocracy and a paternal admonition to a spiritual son whose very soul, Bernard believed, was imperiled by his high office,” subsequently became a standard text on papal behavior (Cistercian Publications: Kalamazoo, Mich., 1976).

⁵ It is a principle of theology that a priest’s sacraments are valid even though he himself is in a state of mortal sin. The reason is that the sacramental act is Christ’s and not the priest’s.

⁶ The Pope, like every Catholic, goes to Confession. Sins against the flesh are not limited to the sexual domain. They also include such things as anger, gluttony, and sloth. Sins against the intellect are of a different order for one is not led into them by pleasure.

⁷ It is presumed the reader has read Chapter 5 on the Nature of the Catholic Faith. In essence, to be Catholic, one has to believe all that the Church teaches. If one believes something that goes against what the Church teaches, one is a material heretic. If one persists for six months after being corrected, in holding to such an opinion, one adds obstinacy to the material error and becomes a formal heretic. A formal heretic automatically places himself outside the Church.

⁸ *De fide et symbolo*, ix. In point of fact, as St. Jerome indicates, schism rarely exists apart from heresy.

⁹ The Church allows a period of six months for this to become evident.

¹⁰ “A manifest heretic cannot be a Christian,” as states St. Cyprian in Book IV, Epistle 2; St. Athanasius, in his second sermon against the Arians; St. Augustine, in his book *De gratia Christi*, Ch. 20; St. Jerome (*Contra Lucifer*), and many others. “It follows that a manifest heretic cannot be Pope.” Those interested in a fuller discussion are referred to Fr. Arriaga’s *Sede Vacante*.

¹¹ The quotation of St. Antoninus is available in *Actes et histoire du Concile Oecumenique de Rome*, 1er du Vatican (1960), Vol I., Histoire des Councils, Premier partie: Traite theologique. Ch. III. Published by Victor Frond, and a work given the approval of Pope Pius IX. Charles Journet also gives a similar opinion from the writings of Savonarola along with an excellent discussion in his *The Church of the Word Incarnate*, Vol. I (Sheed and Ward: N.Y., 1954).

¹² We do not say “to teach error *ex cathedra*” for, with regard to the Faith, such a supposition would be absurd; we say “in the form *ex cathedra*” by which we mean, “with the appearances of and the solemnity of an *ex cathedra* pronouncement.”

Can a Pope Depart From Unity of Faith and Worship?

¹³ Quoted by Arnaldo Xavier de Silveira, *L'Ordo Missae de Paul VI: Qu'en penser?* (Diffusion de la Pensée Française: Paris, 1980).

¹⁴ According to Wernz-Vidal—and almost all theologians agree with him—the peaceful acceptance of a Pope by the entire Church is “the sign and the infallible effect of a valid election.” As St. Alphonsus Liguori says: “It matters little if in previous centuries a given Pontiff was elected in an illegitimate fashion, or took possession of the pontificate by means of fraud: it suffices that he was subsequently accepted as Pope by the entire Church, because from this alone, he becomes a true pontiff. But if during a certain time he was not accepted truly and universally by the Church, the Apostolic see was vacant, just as it would be vacant at the death of a Pope.” The legitimacy of the post-Conciliar pontiffs has been disputed by significant numbers of Catholics—and orthodox Catholics—in every nation of the world.

¹⁵ To judge a person's Catholicity is not to judge his soul. The Church has always taught that a person's external intention can be judged by his acts and statements, but that it is not possible to judge a person's internal intention.

¹⁶ *Lettres de Sainte Catherine de Sienne* (Éditions P. Tequi : Paris, 1976), Letter I.

¹⁷ The *Tractatus de Successivis*, attributed to William Ockham (Franciscan Institute Publications, St. Bonaventure College: N.Y., 1944).

CHAPTER 8

THE PROBLEM OF OBEDIENCE

The Church is destroying herself by the path of obedience. . . . The masterstroke of Satan is thus to spread the principles of revolution from within the Church, and under the authority of the Church itself . . . he has succeeded in getting those whose duty it is to defend and propagate the Church, to condemn those who are defending the Catholic Faith.

Archbishop Lefebvre

Those who deny that the post-Conciliar “Popes” and “the bishops in union with them” are Catholic, have no problem with rejecting their authority. However, for those who believe these men are true Popes, true Vicars of Christ, the problem becomes more difficult. Be this as it may, there is no question but that the majority of those born to the Faith are being asked to follow the directions laid down by the post-Conciliar “Pontiffs,” and to accept the changes in doctrine, worship, and governance that have been initiated since Vatican II, in the name of “obedience.” It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that Catholics understand the nature of their obligations with regard to this virtue.

According to Tanqueray:

Obedience is a supernatural, moral virtue which inclines us to submit our will to that of our lawful superiors, insofar as they are the representatives of God. . . . It is evident that it is neither obligatory nor permissible to obey a superior who would give a command manifestly opposed to divine or Ecclesiastical laws. In this case, we should have to repeat the words of St. Peter: “We ought to obey God rather than man” (Acts 5:29).¹

Let us consider the triple denial of Peter. This occurred just before our Lord’s Crucifixion, but long after Christ had established him as head of the Church. No one has ever suggested that we follow the Apostle’s example in this matter. And even after the Resurrection, after the Descent of the Holy Spirit, Scripture gives us yet another example where one is not forced to absolutely agree with Peter’s opinion. In Galatians 2 we read how Paul rebuked Peter on the issue of circumcising the Gentiles. With regard to this episode St. Cyprian says, “Nor did Peter whom the Lord made the first, and on whom He built His Church, act insolently and arrogantly when Paul

The Problem of Obedience

afterwards disputed with him about circumcision; he did not say that he held the primacy, and was to be obeyed” (*Epist. lxxi*, n.3). St. Augustine, quoting this passage of St. Cyprian, adds: “The Apostle Peter, in whom the primacy of the Apostles is pre-eminent by so singular a grace, when acting about the circumcision differently from what truth required, was corrected by the Apostle Paul.” And so we see from Scripture that we are not to follow those who have Peter’s authority either blindly or absolutely.

Since Vatican II the faithful have found themselves in the difficult position of choosing between the centuries-old teaching and discipline of the Church and the commands of the post-Conciliar hierarchy. When such a conflict occurs, the faithful have the constant teaching of the Church to warrant their adherence to the former. To demonstrate that such is the case, let us consider the words of St. Vincent of Lerins (d. 434). According to the summary found in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908), he taught that:

Should some new doctrine arise in one part of the Church . . . firm adherence must be given to the belief of the Universal Church, and supposing the new doctrine to be of such nature as to contaminate almost the entirety of the latter, as did Arianism, then it is to antiquity one must cling; if even here some error is encountered, one must stand by the General Councils and, in default of these, by the consent of those who at diverse times and in different places remained steadfast in the unanimity of the Catholic Faith.

He continues:

He is a true and genuine Catholic who loves the truth of God, and the Church and the Body of Christ; who prefers not anything before the religion of God, nothing before the Catholic Faith, not any man’s authority, not love, not wit, not eloquence, not philosophy, but despising all these, and in Faith abiding fixed and stable, whatsoever he knoweth that the Catholic Church held universally of old, that alone he decideth is to be held and believed by him; but whosoever he shall perceive to be introduced later, new and not before heard of, by some one man, besides all, or contrary to all the Saints, let him know that it pertains, not to religion, but to temptation (*Haeres*, xiv).

Nor should one assume this attitude is an isolated one. Pope St. Gregory the Great taught in his *Moralium*:²

Know that evil ought never to be done by way of obedience, though sometimes something good, which is being done, ought to be discontinued out of obedience.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Scholastic philosophy taught that “true obedience is a virtuous decision of the spirit, the execution of a right command with discretion.” Alan Lille, a well-known Scholastic theologian of the 12th century expounded on this passage:

You must beware lest you err in obeying. Mark the companions obedience should have: that is, righteousness, that what is commanded may be right. For this reason it is said: “the execution of a right command with discretion.” Secondly, what is decided should be honest: as it is said, “a virtuous decision.” Thirdly, it should proceed from discretion; for this reason is added: “with discretion.” That obedience which is without discretion is therefore hollow. That which is without honesty, is retrograde, for he who obeys honestly but out of an excess of obedience, shows spiritual pride. If indeed obedience is without righteousness, it is without law or principle. . . . We know that evil should never be brought about through obedience.³

The same principles were taught by St. Bernard in his treatise *On Precept and Dispensation*. Discussing the role of the superior, he notes that:

The abbot is not above the Rule, for he himself once freely placed himself beneath it. There is only one power above the Rule . . . which we must admit, and that is God’s rule. . . . He who has been chosen abbot is placed as judge, not over the traditions of the Fathers, but over the transgressions of his brethren, that he may uphold the rules and punish offences. Indeed, I consider that those holy observances are rather entrusted to the prudence and faithfulness of the superiors than subjected to their will.⁴

Since all authority in the last analysis comes from God, all obedience in the last analysis is given to God. As St. Thomas Aquinas teaches: “It sometimes happens that the commands issued by prelates are against God. Therefore not in all things are prelates to be obeyed. For those under them are bound to do so only in those matters in which they are subject to their superiors, and, in which those same superiors do not oppose the command of a Power higher than themselves” (*Summa* II-II, Q. 104, Art. 5). Elsewhere he teaches that obedience to superiors only obliges when “they proclaim to us those things which the Apostles left behind” (*De Veritate*, Q. 14, Art. 10). He explains:

Anyone would be subject to a lower power only insofar as it preserves the order established by a power higher than itself; but if it [the lower power] departs from the order of the higher power, then it is not right for anyone to be subjected to that lower power—for example—if a proconsul ordered

The Problem of Obedience

something to be done when the emperor above commanded the contrary (*Summa*, II-II, Q. 69, Art.3).

Even more specific is the statement to be found in the famous Dialogue between a Cluniac and a Cistercian:

We must heed our superiors with complete obedience, even though they lead improper lives, so long as they rule over us and instruct us in accordance with the authority of divine law. If, however, they are so completely perverted towards moral ruin that they do not follow the authority of divine law in ruling over their subjects but follow instead their own willful impulses and fancies, then let us, as scandalized and displeased subjects heedful of the dictates of divine law, flee from them as we would from blind leaders, lest together with them we fall into the pit of eternal damnation. . . . Irrational service is not acceptable to God, as the Apostle tells us in commanding “reasonable service” (Rom. 12:1).⁵

Now, it would be irrational to expect the teaching of the Church to be other than this, for in obedience, as the Angelic Doctor states, “not only is promptitude required, but also discernment” (*Commentary on the Epistle to Titus*, 3:1). Blind obedience is as foreign to the Magisterium as is blind faith.

Pope Benedict XIV, in his treatise on Heroic Virtue clearly states:

A superior is not to be obeyed when he commands anything contrary to the divine law. Nor is an abbot to be obeyed when he commands anything contrary to the rule, according to the well-known letter of St. Bernard to the monk Adam. A blind obedience excludes the prudence of the flesh, not the prudence of the spirit as is shown at length by Suarez.

These principles are well summarized by a modern author, Fr. Vincent McNabb. Writing in the early part of the 20th century he stated:

Some higher person or law must authorize and control all created authority whether individual or collective. . . . From this follows the momentous principle, which we may enunciate thus: *No authority has the right to command unless in commanding it is itself obeying.* In other words, authority can command obedience only when its act or command is an act of obedience.⁶

**HOLY “DISOBEDIENCE”—HISTORICAL EXAMPLES OF
“DISOBEDIENCE” FROM THE LIVES OF THE SAINTS**

Throughout history situations have arisen where the Saints were obliged to disobey their superiors. One of the earliest of these is to be found in the old Roman Breviary and concerns Pope St. Marcellinus whose feast day is celebrated on January 19th. According to Pope Nicholas I, “in the reign of the sovereigns Diocletian and Maximian, Marcellinus, the Bishop of Rome, who afterwards became an illustrious martyr, was so persecuted by the pagans that he entered one of their temples and there offered incense. Because of this act an inquiry was held by a number of bishops in Council, and the Pontiff confessed his fall” (Letter to Emperor Michael, 365).

Another writer named Platine gives us more details:

When Pope Marcellinus was threatened by the executioners, he yielded to fear, offered incense to the idols, and adored them. But when, soon afterward, a Council of 180 bishops met in Sinuessa, Marcellinus appeared in the assembly clothed in sackcloth and begged the synodals to impose upon him a penance because of his infidelity. But no member of the Council would condemn him; all declaring that St. Peter had sinned similarly, and had merited pardon by his tears.

The fact that scholars dispute the accuracy of the story is beside the point. It is to be found in the older breviaries of the Church which aimed at teaching principles by example rather than in satisfying the demands of modernist historians. The story is, however, accepted as true by St. Robert Bellarmine and the great Catholic historian Baronius. And hence it was a common mediaeval saying that “because Pope Marcellus offered incense to Jove does not mean that all the bishops should do likewise.”

Yet another example is provided by the case of Pope Paschal II who reigned between 1099 and 1118. It was a period when the battles between Church and State were fiercely raging. The issue in question was that of “investiture.” In essence, who should appoint the members of the hierarchy (bishops): the Church or the Emperor? It was a particularly touchy matter, as the bishops of the Church in that era controlled large tracts of land which were obliged to provide the State with soldiers and support in the event of war. The issue had been settled in an Ecumenical Council during the reign of Pope Paschal’s predecessor Gregory VII, and this after great struggles. The Church was to retain control of their appointment, but the traditional feudal obligations of landowners towards the temporal authority were to be preserved.

The Problem of Obedience

Despite this the issue was of such great importance that Henry V, Emperor of Germany, actually invaded Italy and made the Pope a prisoner. For two months Paschal II was subjected to the most fearful threats and cruel treatment. Finally, under pressure from his own fellow-captive bishops, he signed a treaty with the King allowing him to invest by “ring and crozier”—spiritual symbols—[both lay and cleric] and further signed away to the Emperor the right of deciding between rival claimants in contested elections and the privilege of rejecting papal appointments. He also surrendered to the King monastic lands and possessions. This treaty in essence gave the King complete control of the Church’s hierarchy in over half the territory of Europe. Further, the Pope swore not to avenge himself on the Emperor for his actions and never to revoke the treaty if he was released.

When he was released the Pope felt bound by his oath and hesitated to repudiate this treaty. Godfrey, the zealous Abbot of Vendôme, contrasted his actions with the heroic resolution of the martyrs of old, and particularly with the examples of Sts. Peter and Paul. He wrote to the Pope that “if the successor of the Apostles has disregarded their example, he should hasten, if he would not forfeit their glorious crown, to undo and repair what he had done, and like a second Peter, expiate his fault with tears of repentance.” Lay investiture, he added, whereby power was granted to laymen to convey possessions, and therewith jurisdiction in spiritual matters, was equivalent to the denial of the Faith, destructive of the liberty of the Church, and out-and-out heresy. The Abbot of Monte Cassino, when ordered to surrender the monastic lands, refused. “I love you,” he wrote to the Pope, “as my lord and as my father, and I have no desire for another as Pope. But the Lord has said, ‘whosoever loves father and mother more than me is not worthy of me. . . .’ As for this outrageous treaty, wrung from you by violence and treachery, how can I praise it? Or indeed, how can you? . . . Your own laws have condemned and excommunicated the cleric who submits to lay investiture.” Another prelate, the Archbishop of Lyons, urged the Pope in still stronger terms: “Detestable Pilate that you are, in times of peace a bully, and before the storm a coward.” The Archbishop of Vienne, Paschal’s own legate in France, called a Council and declared lay investiture to be heretical, and proceeded to excommunicate Henry V. At this Council, three subsequently canonized Saints—Bruno, Hugh of Grenoble, and Godfrey of Amiens, as well as a future Pope, Callistus II—all stated that unless he revoked his agreement with the Emperor, “we should be obliged to withdraw our allegiance from you.” The Pope admitted he was wrong and rectified his error. At still another Council he said: “I confess that I failed and ask you to pray to God to pardon me.”

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

One final example is that of Robert Grosseteste. He was a doctor of Theology at Oxford when it was a center of Catholic learning. Now he was one of the staunchest defenders of the Papacy, comparing the Pontiff to the Sun that illuminates the visible world. After he reluctantly accepted the bishopric of Lincoln, he was asked by the Pope to appoint an absentee priest (the Pope's new nephew) to one of the prebends of the diocese, a situation in which the priest received the income from a parish while he lived in Rome. Here is his response:

It is not possible that the most Holy Apostolic See to which has been handed down by the Holy of Holies, the Lord Jesus Christ, all manner of power, according to the Apostle, for edification and not for destruction, or command or in any way attempt anything verging upon this kind of sin, which is so hateful to Jesus Christ, detestable, abominable and pernicious to the human race. For this would be evidently a falling off and corruption and abuse of its most holy and plenary power. . . . No faithful subject of the Holy See, no man who is not cut away by schism from the Body of Christ and the same Holy See, can submit to mandates, precepts, or any other demonstrations of this kind, no, not even if the author were the most high body of angels. He must needs repudiate them and rebel against them with all his strength. *Because of the obedience by which I am bound to the Holy See, as to my parents, and out of my love of union with the Holy See in the Body of Christ as an obedient son, I disobey, I contradict, I rebel.* You cannot take action against me, for my every word and act is not rebellion, but the filial honor due to God's command to father and mother. As I have said, the Apostolic See in its holiness cannot destroy, it can only build. This is what the plenitude of power means; it can do all things to edification. But these so-called provisions do not build up, they destroy (emphasis mine).⁷

When the Pope received this letter, we are told that he was beside himself with rage and threatened to have Bishop Grosseteste imprisoned by his vassal, the King of England. However, he was restrained by Cardinal Gil de Torres who said, "You must do nothing. It is true. We cannot condemn him. He is a Catholic and a holy man, a better man than we are. He has not his equal among the prelates. All the French and English clergy know this and our contradiction would be of no avail." Bishop Grosseteste prevailed and according to the traditions, when he died all the church bells in England rang spontaneously. He was considered by his contemporaries as a saint.

**UNHOLY “OBEDIENCE”—AN EXAMPLE TAKEN FROM
THE FREEMASONS**

In concluding this chapter, it is of great interest to consider some of the statements of the Freemasons on obedience. According to the Permanent Instruction drawn up by the Grand Masters of Freemasonry (*Alta Vendita*) in 1819-20, and which fell into the hands of the Church and were published by Pope Pius IX: “We must turn our attention to an ideal that has always been of great concern to man aspiring to the regeneration of all mankind. This ideal is the liberation of Italy, whence is to come the liberation of the entire world and the establishment of a republic of brotherhood and world peace.” The document continues:

Among the many remedies that have been suggested by the more energetic members of our organization, there is one which we must never forget. . . . The Papacy has always exerted a decisive influence on Italian destinies. Everywhere with the arms, voice, pen, and heart of its countless bishops, monks, nuns, and the faithful, the Papacy as always found people enthusiastically ready for sacrifice and martyrdom. . . . At the present time we do not intend to rebuild, even for our advantage, this power which has been temporarily weakened [due to the overthrow of the Papal States]. Our ultimate purpose is identical with that of Voltaire and the French Revolution: that is, the total annihilation of Catholicism and even of Christianity. . . .

For seventeen hundred years the Papacy has been an essential part of Italian history. . . . We cannot endure such a state of affairs; we must find a remedy for this situation. And here it is! Whoever he may be, the Pope will never join the secret societies: therefore, the secret societies must take the first step toward the Church and the Pope, for the purpose of vanquishing them both. . . .

The task we undertake will not be completed in a day, a month, or a year. It may require many years, perhaps even a century. . . . We do not intend to win the Pope over to our cause by converting him to our principles or making him their propagator. . . . *What we must do is wait for*, like the Jews awaiting the Messiah, *a Pope suitable for our purposes*. Such a Pope alone, will be of greater help to us in our assault on the Church than the little pamphlets of our French brothers or even the gold of England. And why? Because with such a Pope we could effectively crush the rock upon which God built His Church. . . . The little finger of Peter’s successor would be caught in the plot, and this little finger would be more effective in this crusade than all the Urban II’s and all the St. Bernard’s of Christianity. . . . We have no doubt that we shall achieve this ultimate goal of our efforts. . . . Before we can produce a Pope according to our desires, we must produce an entire generation worthy of the kingdom we hope for. We must ignore old men and those of middle age. We must seek the young, and if possible,

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

even the very young. . . . Once your good reputation has been established in boarding schools, high schools, universities and seminaries, once you have won the trust of teachers and pupils alike, foster especially in those who are embracing the ecclesiastical state, a desire to associate with you. . . . This reputation of yours will make the younger secular clergy and even the religious receptive to our doctrines. Within a few years, this same younger clergy will, of necessity, occupy responsible positions. They will govern, administrate, judge, and form the council of the Sovereign Pontiff; some will be called upon to elect a future Pope. This Pope, like most of his contemporaries, will be to a greater or lesser degree influenced by those Italian and humanitarian principles which we are now circulating. It is a small grain of mustard seed which we entrust to the soil. . . .

Along this path which we now outline for our brethren there are major obstacles to surmount and difficulties of all kinds to overcome. With experience and wisdom, we shall triumph over them. The objective is so glorious that, to reach it, all sails must be unfurled. Do you want to revolutionize Italy? Seek a Pope fitting our description. Do you want to establish the kingdom of the elect [i.e., the Masons] on the throne of the Babylonian whore? Then *induce the clergy to march under your banner, in the belief that they are marching under the Papal banner*. Do you want to make the last trace of tyranny and oppression disappear? Lower your nets like Simon bar Jona; lower them into the sacristies, the seminaries, and the monasteries, instead of into the sea. If you do not precipitate events, we promise you a catch of fish even greater than St. Peter's. The fisher of fish became a fisher of men; you will fish for friends at the very feet of St. Peter's Chair. *By so doing you will net a revolution clothed in tiara and mantle, preceded by the Cross and papal ensign; a revolution that will require but little help to set fire to the four corners of the world. . . . In a hundred years time . . . the bishops and priests will think they are marching behind the banner of the keys of Peter when in fact they will be following our flag. . . . The reforms will have to be brought about in the name of obedience* (emphasis mine).⁸

All this may seem farfetched to the average reader. But what is one to say when a leading Freemason, Yves Marsaudon (State Master, Supreme Council of France, Scottish Rite) tells us:

The sense of universalism that is rampant in Rome these days is very close to our purpose of existence. . . . With all our hearts we support the "Revolution of John XXIII."

Not satisfied with this, Yves Marsaudon dedicated his book *Ecumenism as seen by a Traditionalist Freemason* to the Pope in the following words:

The Problem of Obedience

To the Memory of Angelo Roncalli, Priest, Archbishop of Messembria, Apostolic Nuncio in Paris, Cardinal of the Roman Church, Patriarch of Venice, *Pope* under the name of John XXIII, *who has deigned to give us his benediction, his understanding, and his protection.*

He has further dedicated it to:

The Pope of Peace, to the Father of all Christians, to the Friend of All Men, to His August Continuer, *His Holiness Pope Paul VI.*⁹

A NOTE ON THE PRESENT SITUATION IN THE CHURCH

Present-day Catholics are faced with a terrible dilemma. If they obey the post-Conciliar “Popes,” they must apostatize from the Catholic Faith as it has existed since the time of Christ and the Apostles.

It is clear from what has already been stated in previous chapters that Catholics must give their intellectual assent to everything in the Ordinary Magisterium. Vatican II has been repeatedly declared to be the “supreme form of the Ordinary Magisterium.” Encyclicals and other statements dealing with Faith and morals (which includes liturgical changes and changes in the form of the sacraments) that are promulgated under the aegis of Papal authority (the “Popes” speaking within their function as Popes) also require our intellectual assent. To speak of intellectual assent is to speak of obedience, for virtue requires that our wills act in conformity with our intelligence.

Now these documents (Vatican II, encyclicals, etc.) clearly teach doctrines contrary to what has always been magisterially taught prior to the demise of Pope Pius XII. This being so, the Catholic must accept the fact that either the Holy Ghost taught error in the past, is teaching error at the present time, or is free to change His mind about the truth of matters dealing with Faith and morals. If the post-Conciliar “Popes” are responsible for teaching even one error with presumed Apostolic authority, then we must either hold that Christ Himself is teaching error (*quod absit*), or that the post-Conciliar “Popes” are usurpers that lack authority.

Catholics who take their faith seriously have long recognized this dilemma. They have come up with a variety of solutions aimed at maintaining “obedience to papal authority” (our salvation depends upon it) and not apostatizing from the Faith. Some have declared that they can pick and choose what they like from the documents of Vatican II and other Papal statements—accepting those “in conformity with Tradition” and rejecting innovations (The Society of Pius X). But such violates the Catholic

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

requirement of giving intellectual assent and obedience to those they recognize as being “one hierarchical person with Christ.” Others attempt to deny the magisterial status of the documents of Vatican II (and encyclicals, etc.) or teach falsely that the Ordinary Magisterium can contain error (Michael Davies). Still others claim that their organizations are exempt from obedience because of historical reasons (Order of St. John). Some have gone to Rome and obtained permission to say the traditional Mass and choose to ignore the fact that such permission is always dependent upon their accepting the teachings of Vatican II and the equal validity of the *Novus Ordo Missae* (The Society of St. Peter and various individual priests). Innumerable minor variations on these themes abound.

Recognizing that no one can teach error with the authority of Christ, many Catholics have openly declared that the post-Conciliar “Popes” have no authority. Some hold that the Apostolic See is vacant—usually referred to as *sede vacantism*. Such a position is not anti-papal, but rather strongly pro-papal. It is because of its great respect for Papal authority that it immediately rejects anyone who uses the Papal Chair to teach error with obstinacy. Others, recognizing that the post-Conciliar “Popes” are actually sitting in the chair of Peter, adhere to the materialiter/formaliter theory which declares that they are material Popes but not formally Popes; that despite their sitting in the chair of Peter, they have no authority, but that should they suddenly become Catholic and teach true doctrine, they would have authority. Those who deny the authority of the post-Conciliar “Popes” are, of course, bound to obey the magisterial teaching of the Church up to the time of their usurpation.

Let us conclude with a doctrinal note. Obedience is a moral virtue. Faith, Hope, and Charity are theological virtues. As such they are of a higher value than obedience. This is of course logical, for obedience is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. The purpose of obedience is to “encourage” us to obey the Faith and not the other way around. To give our obedience to error or a false faith is apostasy. Faith, as pointed out earlier, has two aspects: one is the dogmas and teaching of the Church, and the other is our assent to them.

Notes

¹ Tanquerey, *Dogmatic Theology*.

² *Lib.* V, c. 10.

³ Alan Lille, *The Art of Preaching* (Cistercian Publications: Spencer, Mass., 1978).

⁴ St. Bernard, *Treatise On Precept and Dispensation*, Treatises, I (Cistercian Publications: Spencer, Mass., 1970).

The Problem of Obedience

⁵ Idung of Prufening, *Cistercians and Cluniacs* (Cistercian Publications: Kalamazoo, Mich., 1977).

⁶ *The Game*, Vol. II (Advent: London, 1918).

⁷ Some have used Grosseteste's disobedience as grounds for their disobeying the post-Conciliar "Popes." It should be clear that there was no issue of faith and morals involved here. The Pope was not demanding assent to error or obedience to liturgical change. It was an example of the Pope misusing his power of governance.

⁸ A more complete text is to be found in Chapter I, Vol. II, *The Biographical Memoirs of St. John Bosco*, under the title of *Freemasonry in the Piedmont* (Silesiana Publishers: New Rochelle, N.Y., 1967).

⁹ Quoted in *World Trends*, ed. Yves Dupont (Hawthorn: Vic., Australia). This same Yves Marsaudon considered Pope St. Pius X as "pharisaical, hypercritical, and hate filled" and characterized Pius XII as attached to "outdated disciplines and sclerotic dogmas." He also quotes Francois Mitterrand, another prominent Mason, to the effect that, "Those informed Catholics [i.e., the Progressives] . . . are of the insufficiencies and omissions of the Council, but they avail themselves of the climate which it helped to create in order to demand the authentic renovation of the Church. The liberating character of their contestation cannot but draw the sympathy of Freemasons."

CHAPTER 9

THE POST-CONCILIAR “POPES”—PART I¹

I have observed that the devil of rebellion does not commonly turn into an angel of reformation, and the old serpent can pretend new lights. . . . You may hear from them Jacob’s voice, but you shall feel they have Esau’s hands.²

We shall march shoulder to shoulder with the priest to further the revolution.

Lenin

THE CORONATION OATH OF THE POPES

I vow:

To change nothing of the received tradition and nothing thereof that I have found before me guarded by my God-pleasing predecessors, not to encroach, to alter, to permit any innovation therein.

To the contrary: with glowing affection as her truly faithful student and successor, to reverently safeguard the passed on good, with my whole strength and utmost effort.

To guard the holy canons and decrees of our Popes likewise as Divine Ordinances from Heaven, because I am conscious of Thee, Whose place I take through the grace of God, Whose Vicarship I possess with Thy support, being subject to the severest accounting before Thy divine tribunal over all that I possess.

If I should undertake to act in anything of contrary sense, or should permit that it will be executed, Thou wilt not be merciful to me on the dreadful day of Divine Justice.

Accordingly, without exclusion, we subject to severest excommunication anyone—be it ourself or be it another—who would dare to undertake anything new in contradiction to this constituted Evangelic tradition and the purity of the Orthodox Faith and the Christian religion, or would seek to change anything by his opposing efforts, or would concur with those who undertake such a blasphemous venture.³

* * *

The story is told that the following events took place in 1884, just after Leo XIII (1873-1903) finished saying Mass at High Altar of St. Peter’s. As he turned away from the altar he heard voices speaking to one another. One voice was deep and guttural, the other gentle and mild. The first to speak was the guttural voice which said: “I can destroy your Church.” The gentle voice replied: “You can? Then go ahead and do so.” Satan then said: “I need more time and more power.” The gentle voice asked: “How much time? How much power?” The answer was: “75 to 100 years, and a greater power over those who will give themselves over to my service.” The gentle voice replied: “You have the time, you will have the power, do with them what you will.” It was after this event that the Pope established the so-called “Leonine Prayers” said (or used to be said) at the foot of the altar after Mass—prayers which included the one to St. Michael (“St. Michael, defend us in the day of battle, Cast into hell Satan and all his evil angels who prowl about the world seeking the ruin of souls”).⁴

Leo XIII was followed by Pius X (1903-14) of hallowed memory and one of the only two Popes to be canonized in the last 500 years. (The other was Pius V who “codified” the Mass and is therefore the “patron saint” of the liturgy.) He is perhaps most famous for his encyclical *Pascendi* on the doctrines of the modernists to which was appended his Decree *Lamentabili*.⁵

The reigns of Benedict XV (1914-1922) and Pius XI (1922-39), while in no way contradicting that of their predecessors, were characterized by a more liberal stance towards these errors. This allowed the modernists the opportunity to spread their ideas with greater ease—though still with caution. For example, it was during this period that individuals like Teilhard de Chardin were passing around their mimeographed manuscripts while pretending to be loyal sons of the Church.⁶

JOHN XXIII

Pope Pius XII who came to the papal throne in 1939 was certainly aware of the threat that modernism posed to the Church; not only did he complain about it being taught covertly in seminaries, he more than once was known to have stated that, even though he was the last Pontiff to hold the line on innovation, he would hold it firmly. To quote him directly, “*après moi, le déluge*.”⁷ How prophetic such a stance was is only now obvious. Yet, surrounded as he was by men committed to “the revolution,” even he was often lacking in vigilance. He allowed men of dubious quality to rise to the top and gave his approval to liturgical changes of a most questionable

nature—such as the new rites for Holy Week. (This occurred in November 1955—when he was very ill, and one suspects, easily put upon.⁸) He was followed in 1958 by Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli who took the name of John XXIII.⁹

Something new now happened. For the first time we had a Pope that was welcomed by the liberal press, a man characterized as a “simple peasant,” and a “man of the people.” He was neither. Far more accurate is the evaluation of Robert Kaiser, the correspondent for *Time Magazine* accredited to Vatican II and an intimate of John XXIII. Kaiser describes him as “a political genius,” and a “quiet and cunning revolutionary.”¹⁰

Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli was born in 1881 in the province and diocese of Bergamo. Though frequently described as the son of “poor and landless peasants,” his parents are more accurately described as small farmers, “bound to the soil, raising a large and healthy family, educating them to observe the Christian virtues, serenely content with their lot.” The family owned and lived on the same land for some 500 years.¹¹ He was ordained in 1904, and embraced liberal and modernist views from the start. His first spiritual director was a Fr. Parrechi known for his “exceptionally liberal views.”¹² He taught history at the seminary in Bergamo and was strongly influenced by writers like Loisy and Duschene.¹³ He was also involved in the youth organization *Opera Dei Congressi* which was dissolved by Pius X for its modernist orientations. After a brief stay in Rome he joined Radini Tedeschi, a career Vatican diplomat who was sponsored by Cardinal Rompolla,¹⁴ and who was exiled to Bergamo for his modernist views.

Bishop Tedeschi was to be a major influence on Roncalli—the future John XXIII was his private secretary for nine years and also his admiring biographer. Roncalli had a positive proclivity for making modernist friends—Peter Hebblethwaite, who documents his early life during this period, can hardly name a close associate who was not one. Among these were Bishop Carlo Ferrara of Milan and Bishop Bonomello of Cremona, both notorious modernists, as well as Lamberdo Beauduin, the Benedictine advocate of liturgical “Renewal.” Several of his closest seminary friends, including his roommate in the seminary and the person who assisted at his ordination were to be excommunicated for modernism.¹⁵ Throughout this period he took great care—indeed was unquestionably duplicitous in hiding his views.¹⁶ Then in 1924, after the death of his beloved bishop, he was called back to Rome and given a minor post in the Association for the Propagation of the Faith. At this time he also became a part time Professor of Patristics at the Lateran University, only to be relieved of this post within months “on suspicion of modernism” and for “teaching the theories of Rudolf Steiner!”¹⁷ He was virtually exiled to Bulgaria and Turkey.

According to Giancarlo Zizola, “there was a very precise meaning contained in the accusation of modernism made against Roncalli. . . . It was intended to refer to his relations, real or presumed, with the modernistic milieu of the beginning of this century, as well as to his solidarity with a small reformist group that had emerged from the phenomenon of Italian modernism.” Among the themes dominant in this group Zizola lists “the primacy of conscience, the reconciliation of authority and freedom, the autonomy of science, liberation from superfluous ecclesiastical structure, the renewal of the faith, disengagement from politics, [and] a Catholicism less conditioned by traditional lines.”¹⁸ At this time Roncalli also developed his theory that Christ continuously worked through the historical process, and that it was possible to recognize and cooperate with this Christological process by recognizing the “signs of the times.”¹⁹

Roncalli’s many years in the Middle East, the creation of nuclear weapons, and his experience of two world wars, convinced him of the need to eliminate the factional conflicts of mankind in order to bring the various races, political groups, and religious creeds into some kind of working unity. Only in this way could the world be assured of any permanent peace. After the Second World War he was recalled and appointed as Apostolic Nuncio to France. While in Turkey he had cooperated with the De Gaulle government in exile and “despite the low esteem” in which he was held by Pius XII,²⁰ he was virtually the only papal representative acceptable to France.²¹ While there, he mixed freely in diplomatic and social circles as a “bonhomie” while associating himself with all the liberal and left-leaning movements prevalent in post-war France. His “new points of cultural reference . . . were Dom Lambertino Beauduin, Mauriac, Claudel, Gilson, Daniel-Rops, Raïssa and Jacques Maritain, and with *Études*, the innovative review of the French Jesuits as well as *Le Cerf* which published avant-garde books under Dominican auspices.”²²

He so indiscriminately mixed with representatives of various groups inimical to Rome (a local quip said his spiritual director was the socialist Edouard Herriot) that he once again came under suspicion. However, he had friends in high places (such as Montini, the future Paul VI) that protected him. He did everything he could to support and delay the condemnation of the worker-priests (heavily influenced by Marxist ideology) and indeed, one suspects his refusal to condemn them had something to do with his transfer to Venice. (His successor promptly condemned them.) With his transfer he was given the Cardinal’s red hat.

Mention has already been made of Roncalli’s interest in Rudolf Steiner. The Italian novelist Pier Carpi claims to have clear evidence that he became a Freemason during his stay in the Middle East. Maurice Bardet, a well-

known Freemason informs us in the Freemasonic publication *Les Échos du surnaturel*, that he was his advisor. While these statements may be debated, what is clear is that when he was Papal Nuncio in Paris, he would visit the Grand Lodge of that city in plainclothes every Thursday evening. This has been testified to by several members of the French sûreté, the police appointed to guard him during this period.²³

During his French stay, Roncalli was also responsible for the creation of “barbed-wire seminaries,” a project which was to bear important fruit in the forthcoming years. At the time there was a significant shortage of priests in those parts of Europe under Nazi control, as the Germans had inducted all seminarians into the armed forces. Priests during the war had either cooperated with the Germans or been placed in concentration camps. The former were discredited in the eyes of the faithful, and the latter—even when they survived—were too debilitated to function adequately. Montini’s solution to this problem was ingenious. He obtained lists of all the seminarians who were now prisoners of war and managed to persuade the allied forces to release these men into special training centers. Montini and Roncalli provided them with teachers and books—needless to say, teachers with the “correct” modernist orientation, and by the time the post-Conciliar Church came into power, many of the “middle clergy” in Germany and other parts of Europe were well trained and indoctrinated with the “*nouvelle théologie*.” (One easily forgets that there was a 17-year hiatus between the end of the war and Vatican II.) This explains why there was so little resistance to the changes introduced by Vatican II. To make matters worse, the American hierarchy took to sending their seminarians to Europe for advance training where they fell under the influence of modernists well ensconced in the European seminaries.²⁴

As Cardinal, he became the Patriarch of Venice and then five years later was elected to the See of Peter. One of his first acts after coming to the throne of Peter was to throw open a window of the Vatican to let in “some fresh air.” This much praised (and occasionally disputed) symbolic act recalls an interesting piece of history. When in 1908 Fr. George Tyrrell (a famous modernist Jesuit excommunicated for modernism) was the subject of a critical pastoral from Cardinal Mercier, he responded with the following arrogant letter: “Your Eminence, will you ever take heart of grace and boldly throw open the doors and windows of the darkest corners of your great mediaeval cathedral, and let the light of a new day strike into the darkest corners and the fresh winds of heaven [sic] blow through its moldy cloisters?” It seems clear that John XXIII set a pattern to be followed by all his post-Conciliar successors. Shortly after he became Pope he went to the Holy Office and demanded his dossier. Written on the cover was

“suspected of modernism” which comment he crossed out and replaced with the statement: “I was never a modernist.”²⁵

Roncalli also initiated the post-Conciliar policy of frequently breaking with Papal tradition—a process which has gone so far that when John Paul II came along, there were almost no Papal traditions left to break. Immediately upon election Roncalli refused to allow the cardinals to kiss the papal slipper (symbolizing their submission to the authority of Christ). He put aside his Papal Tiara (symbolic of “triumphalism”) on state occasions, had Peter’s throne lowered, and instructed those around him not to use his (really Peter’s) honorific titles. All these actions will of course appeal to modern man’s egalitarian prejudices, but the problem is that John XXIII was not an ordinary man; he was allegedly Christ’s representative on earth. To put such actions into a clearer perspective, one might try to imagine the Queen of England divesting herself of her royal robes to disco-dance with her subjects on state occasions. Hardly a dignified scene. Paul Johnson tells us about Roncalli’s attitude towards the Church he was commissioned to preserve, and towards his predecessors to whose stance he was indefectibly tied: “When necessary he simply contradicted previous Popes. He rejected in toto Gregory XVI’s *Mirari Vos* and *Singulari Nos*, and the *Quanta Cura* of Pius IX, to which was attached, as appendix, *The Syllabus of Errors*. John was ruthless in dismissing the views of his predecessors.” Finally, if any doubt remains, let me give you the response he is reported to have given a friend who asked him how he managed to follow in the footsteps of so great a man as Pius XII. “I try to imagine what my predecessor would have done, and then I do just the opposite.”²⁶

What of Roncalli’s personal views at this point in his life? It is clear that he was influenced by Teilhard de Chardin and the current belief in evolution and progress. As he himself said, “Divine providence is leading us to a new order of human relations, which by man’s own efforts even beyond their very expectations, are directed towards the fulfillment of God’s superior and inscrutable designs. Everything, even human differences, leads to the greater good of the Church. . . . All the discoveries of science will assist progress and help to make life on earth, which is already marked by so many other inevitable sufferings, ever more delightful.”²⁷

He was an admirer of Maritain who dreamed of joining the Feast day of St. Joan of Arc to the French national holiday celebrating the storming of the Bastille, and who held that the Church should recognize the actions of communists as being intrinsically Christian and cooperate with them on the social and economic planes.²⁸ Roncalli’s “sympathy for the ‘opening to the left’” was well known.²⁹ He felt that the prevailing East-West (capitalist-communist) division of the world could only lead to war and saw the mission

of the Church as one of uniting mankind in order to bring peace to the modern world. According to Meriol Kaiser, John XXIII saw Christian unity as but the first step in the direction of world unity. Christian ecumenism first, then world ecumenism, and finally world unity. Carlo Falconi tells us that John XXIII sought “new relationships between the Catholic Church and other Christian Confessions, and all the other religions, or ‘the ecumenism of the three states’ (unity among Catholics, among Christians, and among all religious spirits). In his view the unification of the world and its pacification, was the most vital problem of contemporary humanity; the need for their speedy solution to have the support and immediate stimulus of a single common denominator—*reason combined with natural religion*. Hence the real revolution, apparent even in his language, introduced by him through the media of his encyclicals and in the manner of conducting the dialogue between the Church and the World” (emphasis mine).³⁰

According to Zizola, he also believed there was “a real progress of humankind’s collective moral awareness through always deeper discovery of its dignity. . . . The revelation of God’s design for man strongly helps the believer discover what man is; and at the same time the advancement of the collective conscience, the judgment of an always more generalized value that men pronounce on the human phenomenon independently of religious referrals, are just as many other ‘signs of the times’ through which God ‘comes into’ history: what is more, the collective conscience clarifies revelation, helping to get to the bottom of the understanding of the mystery of man revealed by Christ.”³¹

John XXIII then brought an enormous amount of modernist baggage to the papacy. It was an era when such ideas were rampant among the middle clergy and acceptable to many members of the upper hierarchy. Ultimately they had a vision of changing the Church, of bringing it up to date by a process of *aggiornamento*, of establishing what Roncalli’s favorite author called a “new Pentecost.” The problem was how to do this. The answer was a Council.³²

There is considerable confusion as to how and when he decided to convene a Council. Actually, the idea was very much in the air. Both Freemasons and modernist Catholics had for decades dreamt of such an event with the avowed intent of introducing modernism into the bosom of the Church. In 1908 his modernist friend, Bishop Bonomelli of Cremona told him: “Perhaps a great ecumenical council, which would discuss rapidly, freely, and publicly the great problems of religious life, would draw the attention of the world to the Church, stimulate faith, and open up new ways for the future.” The possibility had also been discussed but rejected, by both Pius XI and Pius XII. Within two days of his election John XXIII

discussed the matter with close colleagues, but decided not to inform the Curia until he had fully thought out how to plan the event.³³ When he did mention it to Tardini, his pro-secretary of State, he found little enthusiasm, and when he broached it to the Cardinals he described their reaction to his “divine inspiration” (“suddenly my soul was illuminated with a great idea”) as a “devout and impressive silence.”³⁴ Realizing that he would never get his Council—Tardini called it his “toy”—if he antagonized the traditionally inclined Curia, who were fully aware of his modernist attitudes, he took great pains to keep his real intentions secret.

This he did by having them believe that they would be in total control of the Council. He further fostered this by promulgating a series of encyclicals such as *Ad Petri Cathedra* which were hyper-orthodox³⁵—so much so that his liberal supporters began to fear they had made a mistake in supporting his election. He called a Synod of Bishops to Rome and once again played the role of a hyper-orthodox Pope by promulgating regulations that were reminiscent of the time of Pius X. Finally, he suggested canonizing Pope Pius IX, author of the first *Syllabus* against modernist ideas. At the same time, however, he drafted Cardinal Bea to form the *Secretariat for Christian Unity*, stressing that it should not be entitled “Reunion,” but “Unity” (i.e., implying that Unity was absent and something to be achieved), and placing this organization outside of Curial control.³⁶ Cardinal Bea in turn organized the “liberal” forces, and attached to his Secretariat such individuals as Willebrands, Gregory Baum, and others of similar outlook. These individuals lectured widely, were responsible for sending representatives to the World Council of Churches, for inviting the non-Catholic observers to the Council, and for a variety of similar activities.³⁷ Whenever the Curia objected to their machinations, John XXIII came to their defense. He had in effect established his own private Curia. In addition, he called to Rome in a variety of other positions, ecclesiastics of similar persuasion. Thus Montini, once “banished” to Milan by Pius XII—the first individual in hundreds of years to hold this ancient See without a Cardinal’s hat, returned to be in effect, his personal assistant if not his guide.³⁸ These maneuvers were successful. The Curia was reassured and proceeded to arrange for the Council, while the Secretariat for Christian Unity allowed him to “outflank and bypass the curia.” Throughout this time John XXIII “lived entirely for the Council. He worked on it without interruption, often well into the night.”³⁹ Having set the stage, he patiently waited for his Council to open.

With the opening of Vatican II, John XXIII published the “rules and procedures” and invited those attending to feel free to express all shades of opinion. Ignoring the efforts and appointments of the Curia, he established another 10-member “Council Presidency” that balanced

liberal and conservative forces, and placed the direction of the conclave under their aegis. He created a new Secretariat “For Extraordinary Affairs” under his trusted lieutenant Cardinal Amleto Cicognani, consisting of nine progressives (including Montini) and one conservative. With these individuals in place he announced to the world his “progressive” program for *aggiornamento*. (Meanwhile Bea’s legions were in Moscow inviting the communists to come with promises that their ideology would not be condemned.) The events of the first day, reported as a spontaneous “revolt of the Bishops,” were a well orchestrated and papally-approved insurrection aimed at subverting the Council. Within minutes of its opening, Cardinal Lienart opposed the schemas prepared by the Curia over a two-year period, as well as the list of individuals they had appointed to the various commissions. He was seconded by Cardinal Frings.⁴⁰ A recess was called to allow the Council Fathers to nominate their own choices, and the following day they voted on lists prepared by the modernist conspirators. From this point on the Curia lost control and the innovators were in the driver’s seat. John XXIII followed events in the Council by closed circuit television, only intervening when necessary to keep the Council on the track he had established.

An example of this intervention is the following. When on November 20th the Council Fathers vote of 1368 to 822 in favor of rejecting Cardinal Ottaviani’s Schema on the “Sources of Revelation”—the motion falling narrowly short of the required two thirds majority—he directly intervened (at the expense of both orthodoxy and the Council rules) to save his “toy.” According to Lawrence Elliott, “after a night of anguish and prayer, he sent word to St. Peter’s that because so clear a majority . . . opposed the schema, he was withdrawing it despite the vote. A new commission would be appointed to redraft it. The reason given for this action was that the alternative was continued wrangling as the schema was debated section by section, dulling, scarring, and, in the end, perhaps destroying the fine spirit of ecumenism in which the Council had begun.”⁴¹

One of the first Schemas to be considered was the Constitution on the liturgy. In order to encourage the Council Fathers to accept innovations in this realm—one long considered virtually untouchable—he introduced the first change in the Canon of the traditional Mass in over 1,500 years. He further changed many aspects of the Mass outside the sacrosanct Canon and drastically altered the Breviary—that text which feeds the spiritual life of the clergy—and the Church calendar—thus making obsolete all the old missals and breviaries. As E.E.Y. Hales said, he gave the Bishops of the Council “the clearest and most positive guidance as to the way they should approach their task.”⁴²

Once things were underway, once the Council had been subverted along the lines he wished, he promulgated his most significant encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*. To get a better picture of John XXIII’s real thought, we shall turn to this revealing source.

Starting out by telling the faithful that “Peace on earth . . . can only be firmly established if the order laid down by God be dutifully observed” and that this order or law is written in the hearts of men (orthodox), he proceeds to tell us that we must look for these laws only in the hearts of man, “and nowhere else.” Now it is one thing to say that God has written his laws in the human heart and quite another to say that these laws are not to be sought for elsewhere. To do so is to forget the effects of original sin and the function of the Church—the former allowing us to deviate from the dictates of our heart and the latter as guide for our fallen nature. No wonder then that in the very first section of the encyclical John XXIII follows this up by advocating that “a world-wide community of nations be established” (Para. 6, 7). As he explains in the fourth section, this organization is none other than the United Nations.

The next two sections deal with the dignity of man and religious freedom, both themes that were to become basic to the documents of Vatican II and the post-Conciliar Church. With regard to the former, the encyclical states that “when we consider man’s personal dignity from the standpoint of divine revelation, inevitably our estimate of it is incomparably increased. Men have been ransomed by the blood of Jesus Christ. Grace has made them sons and friends of God, and heirs to eternal glory” (Para. 10). Now all this is true, but nothing is said of the fact that man can lose this dignity by sin. Instead, he immediately proceeds to discuss man’s rights that derive from this dignity, including “the right of being able to worship God in accordance with the just dictates of his own conscience (*ad rectam conscientiae suae normam*), and to profess his religion both in private and in public” (Para. 14).

It is of interest that the Italian translator of this sentence said “each has the right to honor God according to the dictates of a *just* conscience.” Giancarlo Zizola calls the transposition of the adjective *just* from “dictates” to “conscience” a “colossal reversal of perspective. . . . That adjective *just* [now] meant that the conscience was not the inviolable temple through which God spoke freely to each man, whether he be atheist or Confucian, Buddhist or agnostic, as John had so many times affirmed; now it was no longer the conscience that generated from its own secret intimacy a ‘just’ rule, or valid norm and scale of values for each honest man of good will whatsoever; on the contrary, in order to compose that norm, the conscience [itself] had to be ‘just,’ that is, it had to be authoritatively guided by external

rulings. . . . For John the conscience was the voice of God in every man"; for the mistranslator the conscience had to be guided by the teaching of the Church.

It follows from the innate dignity of man and the innate and independent authority of his conscience that all men are equal. John XXIII boldly declared that "the conviction that all men are equal by reason of their natural dignity has been generally accepted" (Para. 44). Later in the same document he states that "it is not true that some human beings are by nature superior and others inferior. All men are equal in their natural dignity. Consequently there are no political communities that are superior by nature and none that are inferior by nature. All political communities are of equal natural dignity, since they are bodies whose membership is made of these same human beings" (Para. 89). This statement is nothing other than a blanket acceptance of the legitimacy of communism, and it is no wonder that the communist weekly in Rome described his "open" attitude under the title of "No More Crusades." *Il Borghese*, a right wing Catholic journal put it into better perspective: "This policy will mean the end of *la chiesa cattolica romana*."⁴³ Should any doubt remain as to John XXIII's attitude towards communism, one has only to consider his agreement with Msgr. Nikodim that the Council would in no way be critical of communism. As Jean Madiran states, "all the hotchpotch . . . in 'Pacem and Terris' has never been applied by the ecclesiastical hierarchy except for the benefit of communism (and Marxist socialism)—never to fascism or liberalism. . . . It is nothing but a fabrication made to accommodate communism alone."⁴⁴

Having established the equality and dignity of man, his right to religious freedom, and the acceptability of socialism and communism, let us return to the nature of this new world community he envisioned. Again, the encyclical tells us it is to be established under "a public authority, having world-wide power and endowed with proper means for the efficacious pursuit of its objective, which is the universal common good." The organization he felt best suited to this end was none other than the United Nations! His endorsement of this organization (described by some as "a large cow fed by America and milked by Russia") included endorsing its Declaration of Human Rights which was "a clear proof of its farsightedness."⁴⁵ Let it be noted that the "Declaration of Human Rights" involved is none other than that advocated by the French Revolution, and which as Cardinal Pie stated, "is nothing else than the denial of the Rights of Christ."⁴⁶

One of the greatest obstacles to the creation of this "one world" utopia under the United Nations was "mutual distrust. . . . Unfortunately, the law of fear still reigns among peoples, and it forces them to spend fabulous sums for armament; not for aggression they affirm—and there is no reason

for not believing them” (Para. 128). He recommended, to counter this problem, a program of “mutual trust. . . True and solid peace of nations consists not in equality of arms, but in mutual trust alone” (Para. 113). Now this mutual trust was to be extended to both Freemasons and communists, as if their history and their own teachings have not provided more than ample evidence that allowing the wolf to live in the chicken-coop was an impossibility. The West was to disarm itself and embrace its communist brothers. War was to be abolished. And after this utopian dream is fulfilled, the harmony of the human family is to be secured “by means of science and technology.” Now, anyone familiar with James the Apostle knows that Scripture teaches wars come from our lusts and greeds—that is to say, from our sins. And anyone familiar with the Old Testament knows clearly that there are unjust rulers and therefore just wars. But John XXIII had a different vision of the world, one in which there was no possibility of an intrinsically evil social order, and one in which all men would be united and all differences would be resolved by “mutual trust.”⁴⁷

Despite the fact that this encyclical was rapidly bypassed by the still more revolutionary declarations of the Council, it remains highly significant. It clearly demonstrates that events in the Council, as some have contended, did not escape from John XXIII’s control, but rather, were engineered by him. Some of the principle modernist errors promulgated by the Council—the false concept of man’s dignity, the autonomy of man’s conscience, religious freedom, a false ecumenism, the acceptance of socialist and communist ideology, the fostering by the Church of a one-world community, and the need to alter the structures of the Church, were not only shared, but indeed, initiated by Roncalli himself. He was a modernist by any definition of the word, and was responsible for the subversion of an enormous part of the Catholic body.⁴⁸ Allow me to quote one last blasphemous statement by this individual elected to preserve and safeguard the Bride of Christ:

We now acknowledge that for many, many centuries the blindness has covered our eyes, so we no longer see the beauty of Thy chosen people and no longer recognize in its face the features of our first-born brother. We acknowledge that the mark of Cain is upon our brow.⁴⁹

How was this extraordinary individual assessed by others? Clearly, John XXIII was no peasant-pope, but rather, as Mariol Trevor said, “a quiet and cunning revolutionary.” As his formerly approving friend Malachi Martin says, “the surprising aspect of Pope John is that in a short five-year period he undid what every pope since the fourth century had sought and fought to maintain and foment.”⁵⁰ The Freemasons also thought highly of him. Yves Marsoudon, State Minister, Supreme Council of France (Scottish

Rite) said, “the sense of universalism that is rampant in Rome these days is very close to our purpose for existence. Thus, we are unable to ignore the Second Vatican Council and all its consequences. . . . With all our hearts we support the ‘Revolution of John XXIII.’ . . . This courageous concept of the Freedom of Thought that lies at the core of our Freemasonic lodges, has spread in a truly magnificent manner under the dome of St. Peter’s.”⁵¹ A contrary opinion is given by Avro Manhattan who said that when he died, instead of hanging a white and yellow papal flag from the balcony, they “should have hung the red flag, with the sickle and the cross displayed on it—the true symbol of the revolution which John XXIII had started within and outside the Roman Catholic Church.”⁵² Cardinal Siri, who prior to the election of his successor still hoped for a return to sanity, said before the election of Montini that “it will take forty years to undo the harm Pope John has done to the Church.”⁵³

In view of the anticipated “canonization” of John XXIII, mention should be made in passing about the preservation of his body—once considered a sign of divine approbation—by chemical means which has been well documented in the press. We are also informed through the press (unreliable as such may be) that at exhumation, his body had turned face down—no mean feat for a man of his size. Such of course would normally have immediately stopped the canonization process.

PAUL VI

Next to be “elected” to the Papal chair was Giovanni Battista Montini, a man who was said to have lived in the shadow of his predecessor. He had been born in Brescia in 1897, the son of a Catholic journalist and politician of strong liberal leanings.⁵⁴ During his seminary days, he had been allowed to live and study at home for reasons of health, which resulted in a very limited theological training and almost no spiritual formation.⁵⁵ It also allowed him to imbibe much of his father’s liberal philosophy. During this period he also associated himself with such organizations as the Student Association of Alessandro Manzoni, as well as other liberal political groups. After ordination he was appointed to the Vatican diplomatic corps and slowly rose in rank until he became Pro-Secretary of State, a position he held for many years. Needless to say such an appointment allowed him to both become acquainted with many members of the hierarchy and to foster the advancement of those who held similar views to his own.

Then in 1954 he was suddenly “dismissed” to Milan under circumstances which have never been entirely clear. Myra Davidoglou documents the

following facts: In July of 1944 Montini offered his services without the knowledge of Pius XII to the Soviet Union through the offices of his childhood friend Togliatti (then head of the communist Party in Italy). The details of this sinister affair were exposed to the Pope by the Archbishop Primate of the Protestant Church in Sweden who was a state official and as such had access to governmental intelligence reports. This information came as a shock to Pius XII. An enquiry was made and among other things it was found that Montini’s private secretary, the Jesuit Tondi, was a Russian agent and the man responsible for giving the Soviets the names of Catholic priests who were being sent into Russia. This explained why they were all being immediately caught and executed.⁵⁶ The upshot of this was that Montini was exiled to Milan without the traditional red hat.⁵⁷

Montini was responsible for the translation of Jacques Maritain’s *Integral Humanism* into Italian. This individual, despite his neo-Thomism, is by no means the orthodox Catholic that he is usually represented as being. In this text Maritain called for a basic shift in ecclesiology—in the way the Church looks at itself, its function, and its identity. He envisioned an integral humanism in which religions of every kind converged towards a single human ideal in a world civilization wherein all men would be reconciled in justice, love, and peace. As the French theologian M. Caron explained, “Integral humanism is a universal fraternity of men of good will belonging to different religions or none, including even those who reject the idea of a creator. It is within this fraternity that the Church should exercise her leavening influence without imposing itself and without demanding that it be recognized as the one, true Church. The cement of this fraternity is twofold: the virtue of doing good and an understanding grounded in respect for human dignity.”⁵⁸

Prior to his election to the papacy, Montini was well known to the liberal forces in and around the Vatican. Mark Winckler, an elderly interpreter working at the Vatican during these years, tells the story of his meeting with Msgr. Pignedoli (now Cardinal), one of the most liberal members of the Curia and a man strongly suspected of Freemasonic connections. Pignedoli told him in 1944 that the reversal of the Freemason’s plans by the failure of Cardinal Rampolla to be elected to the Papacy would soon be corrected, that in time the proper man would be elected Pope, a man who would bring the Church into the modern age. When Mark Winckler asked who this individual was, Pignedoli told him it was the priest whose Mass he served every Thursday—namely Fr. Battisto Montini. Montini was to state with regard to the Freemasons that “another generation will not pass before peace is established between these two religious societies [i.e., the Freemasons and the Church],” and after his death a Freemasonic review

stated in an obituary notice that “this is the first time that the leader of one of the greatest religious bodies in the West has passed away without considering the Masons as a hostile organization.”⁵⁹ Now, in the light of these facts, it is not surprising that Montini did everything he could to protect Roncalli, nor is it surprising that as soon as John XXIII was seated on the Chair of Peter, he returned the favor, giving Montini a red hat and calling him back to Rome as a “non-resident Cardinal.” He is reputed to have written most of John XXIII’s speeches and encyclicals, while himself keeping a low profile. John realized that he would be the man “most able to push through his ambitious program and realize his hopes for an open church and a united Christendom.” As for Paul VI, “it is possible that of all the Popes of modern times . . . he is the only one who actually desired the office.”⁶⁰ To guarantee his election John XXIII appointed 23 new cardinals, thus “stacking” the next conclave.

Long before his election Montini gave expression to beliefs that placed him outside the pale of the Church. “Our times, can they also not have an Epiphany which corresponds to its spirit, to its capacities? The marvelous scientific evolution of our days, can it not become this star, this sign that thrusts modern humanity towards a new quest for God, towards a new discovery of Christ?” (Milan, 1956, *Le Pape de l'Épiphanie*) “Modern man, will he not gradually come to the point where he will discover, as a result of scientific progress, the laws and hidden realities behind the mute face of matter and give ear to the marvelous voice of the spirit that vibrates in it? Will this not be the religion of our day? Einstein himself glimpsed this vision of a universal religion produced spontaneously [i.e., without revelation]. Is this not perhaps today my own religion?” (Conference in Turin, Mar. 27, 1960) “And is not [scientific] labor itself already engaged in a course that will eventually lead to religion?” (Doc. Cath. 133, 1960) No wonder he said that, “We must never forget that the fundamental attitude of Catholics who wish to convert the world must be, first of all, to love the world, to love our times, to love our [non-Catholic] civilization, our technical achievements, and above all, to love the world” (Bodart’s *La biologie et l’avenir de l’homme*). Such were the beliefs of the “*papabile*” selected by John XXIII.

At the beginning of his “pontificate” Montini was primarily concerned with bringing the Johannine Council to its full potential. A careful reading of Fr. Wiltgen’s book, *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber*, as well as Archbishop Lefebvre’s *J'accuse le concile* shows that he continued John XXIII’s policy of appearing neutral while strongly abetting the “progressive forces” of the innovators. He spoke much of “ecumenical dialogue,” “openness to the world,” “reforms,” and “changes” while at the same time speaking of

"Faith," "Tradition," and "the striving for spiritual perfection." While it is true that he made certain minor corrections in the Conciliar documents before promulgating them, it is also true that he gave papal approval to other items which were diametrically opposed to *de fide* teachings of the Church. His response to Archbishop Lefebvre's warnings (*J'accuse le concile*) clearly shows that he was on the side of the revolutionaries. Nor should we forget that he openly taught that "the Conciliar decrees are not so much a destination as a point of departure towards new goals. . . . The seeds of life planted by the Council in the soil of the Church must grow and achieve full maturity,"⁶¹ and that he used these very documents as the excuse for the creation of his new "mass" and the other atrocious changes in the sacraments.

This pattern of speaking out of both sides of his mouth—seemingly defending orthodoxy while in fact doing everything he could to undermine it—is seen throughout his "pontificate" and can be said to be a fundamental characteristic of the new Church. As a result, no matter where one stands, one can quote him and the documents he promulgated in support of one's viewpoint. Some may argue that this is a positive quality, but to do so is to forget the function of a true Pope. Conservative Catholics who defend him should remember that to be in "obedience" to him, and to accept him as a spokesman for "truth," demands that they accept his heterodox statements and actions with the same authority as his orthodox ones. In point of fact, it is totally impossible to be "in obedience" to this self-contradictory individual, for to do so is to embrace both truth and error simultaneously. Nevertheless, obedience was a favorite theme of his.

Actually, "obedience" is practically the only grounds on which the post-Conciliar Church can sustain the loyalty of erstwhile Catholics. It is this very "obedience" which is leading them down the wide and gently sloping "garden path." Knowing this, Paul VI taught "all men must obey him [the Pope] in whatever he orders if they wish to be associated with the new economy of the Gospel" (*Allocution*, June 29, 1970). And just what is the "new economy of the Gospel"? Just what are some of the teachings that Paul would foist on us in the name of the post-Conciliar Magisterium? Here is a fair sampling: That Paul VI should bend his every effort to change the Catholic Faith followed from his basic premises. "The order to which Christianity tends is not static, but an order in continual evolution towards a higher form. . . . If the world changes, should not religion also change?" (*Dialogues, Reflections on God and Man*); "We moderns, men of our own day, wish everything to be new. Our old people, the traditionalists, the conservatives, measured the value of things according to their enduring quality. We instead, are actualists, we want everything to be new all the

time, to be expressed in a continually improvised and dynamically unusual form” (*L’Osservatore Romano*, April 22, 1971); and hence it follows that “it is necessary to know how to welcome with humility and an interior freedom what is innovative; one must break with the habitual attachment to what we used to designate as the unchangeable traditions of the Church” (*La Croix*, Sept. 4, 1970). He is highly critical of those who refused to go along with the changes, especially in liturgical matters—they have what he calls “a sentimental attachment to habitual forms of worship,” and are guilty of “inconsistency and often of falsity of doctrinal positions” (quoted in O’Leary’s *The Tridentine Mass Today*⁶²). As for those who find such statements heterodox, he had stated while still in Milan that “the exigencies of charity frequently force us outside the bounds of orthodoxy.”⁶³

Paul VI also believed in vital immanence as a source of truth. During the General Audience of November 20, 1974 he stated: “To undertake the religious effort that the celebration of the Holy Year will ask of each of us, a certain spiritual certainty is necessary. Without it the teaching characteristic of this period would take little hold on us. In the preceding elementary talk we mentioned the state of subjective uncertainty, a doubt about our identity, which if not overcome by a logical, psychological, moral state of normal interior certainty, would make unavailing the effort towards explicit and progressive renewal of oneself. . . . Apologetics [i.e., the old way of defending truth] remains and does not refuse its indispensable and tacit service, even when it is not explicitly requested; but in the religious field today preference is given to experience rather than to reasoning. Charismatic spirituality is preferred to rational dogmatism.”

Leaving aside the issue of the Second Vatican Council which is discussed in detail later, we find in Paul VI all the themes elaborated by his predecessor. As early as 1965 we find him telling the United Nations that “it is your task here to proclaim the basic rights and duties of man, his dignity and liberty, and above all his religious liberty. We are conscious that you are the interpreters of all that is paramount in human wisdom. We would almost say: of its sacred character. For your concern is first and foremost with the life of man, and man’s life is sacred. No one may dare to interfere with it. . . . The people turn to the United Nations as their last hope for peace and concord. . . . [The goals of the UN] are the ideal that mankind has dreamed of in its journey through history. We would venture to call it the world’s greatest hope—for it is the reflection of God’s design—a design transcendent and full of love—for the progress of human society on earth; a reflection in which We can see the gospel message, something from heaven come down to earth.” And some of us were foolish enough to believe that

Christ was the hope of the world and that it was the function of the Church to "interpret all that is paramount in human wisdom."

Paul VI made it clear from the start that his manner of ruling the Church would be different. Having declared religious liberty to be the sacred and inalienable right of man and that salvation was available outside the Church, he proceeded to abrogate the "Oath Against Modernism," the Index against forbidden books, the obligation of the Church to decide on the validity of divine manifestations (such as Garabandal) and a host of other restrictions created to protect the faithful from error. In 1972 he stated that, "Perhaps the Lord has called me not to govern and save the Church, but to suffer for her and to make it clear that He and no one else guides and saves her." (Why then did Christ establish the papacy?) This is but the logical conclusion of his declaration in the encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam* that "the sort of relationship for the Church to establish with the world should be more in the nature of a dialogue." (Did Christ say, "go ye forth and dialogue with all nations 'on an equal footing'?" Let it be clear that the function of the Church is to teach, and not to dialogue with every theological Tom, Dick, or Harry that comes down the pike.) These are not isolated quotations. Thus on October 16, 1968 he told the Roman Clergy that "it would be easy, and even perhaps our duty to rectify" the serious disorders spreading within the Church, but that it would be better for "the good people of God to do it themselves." He continued: "You will have noticed my dear friends to what extent the style of Our government of the Church seeks to be pastoral, fraternal, humble in spirit and form. It is on this account that, with the help of God, We hope to be loved." (Was Christ "loved" by those that rejected and crucified him?) It is a common theme: As he said elsewhere of the Council: "From the start, the Council has propagated a wave of serenity and optimism, a Christianity that is exciting and positive, loving life, mankind and earthly values . . . an intention of making Christianity acceptable and lovable, indulgent and open, free of mediaeval rigorism and of the pessimistic understanding of man and his customs" (*Doc. Cath.* No. 1538). Yes indeed, his new manner of ruling, as he says in his *Ecclesiam Suam*, "avoids peremptory language and makes no demands."

Paul VI literally fell all over himself trying to make the Church lovable. "And what was the Church doing at that particular moment [i.e., at the time of the Council] the historians will be asking; and the reply will be: the Church was filled with love. . . . The Council puts before the Church, before us in particular, a panoramic vision of the world; how can the Church, how can we ourselves, do other than behold this world and love it. . . . The Council is a solemn act of love for mankind . . . love for men of today,

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

whoever and wherever they may be, love for all.” Believing that man is “intrinsically good,” he repeatedly expressed his confidence in him. “We have faith in Man. We believe in the good which lies deep within each heart, we know that underlying man’s wonderful efforts are the motives of justice, truth, renewal, progress, and brotherhood—even where they are accompanied by dissension or sometimes even unfortunately, by violence” (Address to the journalists in Sydney Australia, Dec. 1970). This confidence in man reached extraordinary heights with the moon landing. “There is no true riches but Man” (*L’Osservatore Romano*, Aug. 5, 1970). “Honor to Man, honor to thought, honor to science, honor to technique, honor to work, honor to the boldness of man, honor to the synthesis of scientific and organizing ability of man who unlike other animals, knows how to give his spirit and his manual dexterity these instruments of conquest. Honor to man, king of the earth, and today Prince of heaven” (*Doc. Cath.* No. 1580). No wonder he said that “a peace that is not the result of the true worship of man is not a true peace” (*Le Figaro*, Jan. 1, 1973). Lest there should be any doubt about Montini’s humanism and his cult of man, consider the following address given the Fathers gathered at the Council on December 7th, 1965:

The Catholic Church has also, it is true, been much concerned with man, with man as he really is today, with living man, with man totally taken up with himself, with man who not only makes himself the center of his own interests, but who dares to claim that he is the end and aim of all existence. . . . Secular, profane, humanism has finally revealed itself in its terrible shape and has, in a certain sense, challenged the Council. The religion of God made man has come up against the religion (for there is such a one) of man who makes himself God. And what happened: An impact, a battle, an anathema. That might have taken place, but it did not. It was the old story of the Samaritan that formed the model of the Council’s spirituality. It was filled only with an endless sympathy. Its attention was taken up with the discovery of human needs—which became greater as the son of the earth makes himself greater. . . . Do you at least recognize this its merit, you modern humanists who have no place for the transcendence of the things supreme, and come to know our new humanism: We also, we more than anyone else, have the cult of man.

We are, it would seem, to play the good Samaritan, even with the devil! As Paul said elsewhere, “Man is both giant and divine, in his origin and his destiny. Honor therefore to man, honor to his dignity, to his spirit and to his life.” It is not surprising then to find Paul VI returning once again to John XXIII’s theme of mutual understanding and the need for world unity. “Man must go out to meet man, and the nations come close to each other

as brothers and sisters, as the children of God. In such mutual friendship and understanding, in this sacred communion, we must all join together in working for the common future of humanity. . . . Mankind is undergoing profound changes and searching for guiding principles and new forces which will show it the way in the world of the future. . . ." (Speech in Bombay, 1964). So much confidence does he have in man's innate goodness and modern forms of government that he tells us:

You, the people, you have the right to make yourselves heard. . . . You have the lawful and sacred right to insist that your leaders arrange things so that you do not have to suffer. . . . We live under a system of democracy. . . . *That means that it is the people who command, that power is vested in numbers, in the people as a whole* (Discourse, Jan. 1, 1970) (emphasis mine).

Now this is an entirely un-Catholic concept of Democracy, and one reminiscent of the crowds that cried for the release of Barabbas and the Crucifixion of Christ. As against such an attitude the Church has always taught that authority, and hence power, derives, not from the people, but from God. The people may elect their leaders, but the leaders must rule in God's name and not in the name of the people. It is of interest however to consider from whence Paul VI thinks the people have this power. He told us in his discourse to the United Nations that it is "based on conscience. . . . Never so much as today, in a period when human progress has been so rapid, has it been necessary to appeal to the moral conscience of mankind."

Once again, we are brought back to the basic theme of man's innate dignity, from which he derives his conscience. Man is not to be guided by the Church, but rather the reverse—the world and the Church are to be guided by man's "moral conscience." This ties in closely with the new teaching on religious liberty which is granted to man as a right, and which it is the duty of the State to enforce. Along these lines Paul VI positively objected to the concept that the State had the obligation of establishing its laws on Catholic principles. And therefore it was only logical that Paul VI induced Catholic countries such as Spain, Columbia, and Italy to change their constitutions by deleting any and all privileges given to the Church. No longer could the Catholic religion be the sole religion recognized in their constitutions. No longer could the reign of Christ the King be proclaimed in these lands. Here we have Christ's representative saying that Christ's love demanded that Christ's religion be given no higher status than all the other religions that mankind has invented. How is it possible for Christ's representative not to desire that every nation and every government be Catholic?

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

We will note however the Paul VI's love of mankind was curtailed by the decision not to criticize communism at the Council, as it was in the new doors commissioned by this Pontiff for Saint Peter's—doors which depicted slavery throughout the world, but not of course in communist countries. These doors are symbolic, for in the face of the "moral conscience of mankind" we find Paul VI freely criticizing the abuse of human rights in Western nations, but never those in communist lands. Perhaps one of his most offensive statements to those who are aware of events in China—a land where, according to the American Congressional Record, between 30 and 60 million Chinese were "liquidated" by Mao Tse-Tung, and a land where abortion is forced on women whether they desire it or not—is the following:

The Church recognizes and favors the just expression of the historical phase of China and the transformation of ancient forms of aesthetic culture into the inevitable new forms that rise out of the social and industrial structure of the modern world. . . . We would like to enter into contact once again with China in order to show with how much interest and sympathy we look at their present and enthusiastic efforts for the ideals of a diligent, full, and peaceful life.⁶⁴

But then, what can one expect from an individual who believes "all discrimination is unjustified and inadmissible, whether it be ethnic, cultural, political, or religious" (encyclical *Populorum Progressio*)?

Paul VI also followed the lead of John XXIII in fostering ecumenism. Not only did he refer to the Anglican and Orthodox Communions as "sister Churches," but he invited the Anglicans to use Catholic altars in the Vatican for their services (a sacrilegious act), and placed his papal ring on the Anglican "archbishop" and invited him to bless the faithful in St. Peter's Square. On December 15, 1975, when receiving the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople in the Sistine Chapel, he suddenly knelt down before him and kissed his feet (The Metropolitan Melitone was astonished and flustered and tried to prevent Paul from doing so). No wonder he was able to say that "the pace of this movement [ecumenism] has quickened marvelously in recent years, so that these words of hope 'the Anglican Church united but not absorbed' are no longer a mere dream" (*L'Osservatore Romano*, May 5, 1977). And for the sake of ecumenism he did not hesitate to even desecrate the Sacred Body of Our Lord, as for example when he personally authorized giving communion to Barbara Olson, a Presbyterian, at her Nuptial Mass (Sept. 21, 1966) without her abjuring her Presbyterian views or her going to Confession. Not an isolated act by any means, for he also gave Communion under the same circumstances to the

Lutherans (*Forts dans la foi*, No. 47). As the Abbé of Nantes said, "No one in the world, bishop or cardinal, Angel or even the Pope himself, has any right whatever to give the Sacrament of the Living to those who are spiritually dead."⁶⁵ But then, what else can one expect from a man who believed that "the truth is that the world's inability to achieve unity of thought and to end spiritual divisions is the real reason why society is so deeply unhappy, so poor in ideas and enthusiasm."⁶⁶

Following in the footsteps of John XXIII, Paul VI broke with many papal traditions. One of his first acts was to give up the Papal Tiara (John XXIII had only refused to wear it on State occasions), symbolic of giving up the rights of Christ's representative to have precedence over the Kings and Princes of this world. He was crowned with a hat of his own design (looking like a space rocket), and not in St. Peter's but outside the sacred precincts. While spending a fortune on some of the most trivial and ugly modern art known to mankind, he made a great show of selling this Tiara in order to give the money to the poor.⁶⁷ He then proceeded to give his Shepherd's Crook and Fisherman's Ring (his?) to U Thant (then head of the United Nations) who in turn sold them to a Jewish businessman in the Midwest.⁶⁸ He further started to carry what must be one of the world's ugliest crucifixes in place of the Shepherd's Crook. (Traditionally, the Crucifix was carried before the Pope so that he could always look upon his divine Master.)⁶⁹ He then induced all the bishops of the post-Conciliar Church to give up their traditional rings, and gave each of them a new gold one, symbolic of the new Church. He also asked them to give up their shepherd's "crooks" and since then one rarely if ever sees a post-Conciliar bishop "sporting" one.

However, Montini reached the apogee of scandalous example with his visit to Fatima. Here we see a "Pope" who spent time "meditating" in the "meditation room" at the United Nations, a room replete with Freemasonic significance and containing an altar dedicated to "the faceless God"; here we see a man who received with respect the leaders of the Freemasonic B'nai B'rith at the Vatican; here we see a man who has promised to pray for the success of Mrs. Hollister and her "Temple of Understanding" (which Cardinal Bagnozzi told him was "an occult enterprise of the Illuminati whose aim is the founding of 'the World Religion of Human Brotherhood'"); here we see a man who has joined with Cardinal Willebrands in "the common prayer of the World Council of Churches" (*Doc. Cath.* Jan 17, 1971); here we see a man who claims to be the head of the Catholic Church and Christ's representative on earth, finally visiting one of the most sacred shrines in Christendom where he tarried 14 long hours. And what did he do? With the whole world watching on television, he said mass in Portuguese (which

only a small percentage of those watching on television could understand), and then proceeded to give a series of audiences including one to the “representatives of the non-Catholic Communities” (of which there are virtually none in the entire area). Those that watched this 14 hour spectacle tell us that during the entire time he neither visited the shrine at Cova de Iria where the apparitions took place, nor said a *single Hail Mary!* According to the Abbé of Nantes, he even refused to talk privately with Sister Lucia, fifty years a nun, and one of the children who were the recipients of the vision at Fatima and who claimed to have a private message from the Virgin for his ears.⁷⁰

As against all this we have the constant references of conservative *Novus Ordo* Catholics as to Paul VI's orthodoxy because of his encyclical *Humanae Vitae*. Many will be surprised to know that before he died Pius XII had already condemned the use of the “pill” for other than purely medical indications, and this condemnation was suppressed by the post-Conciliar Church. For some 20 years the matter continued to be debated while the faithful were encouraged to engage in the practice of contraception on the grounds that the Church had not as yet come to a decision about the matter. Once *Humanae Vitae* was promulgated protests were loud and vociferous, especially from the celibate clergy. The entire French hierarchy met at Lourdes to discuss the problem and then announced that the faithful were free to use the “pill” when in their (private) judgment the “pill” involved a lesser evil than having children. Now such a statement is apostasy, for while the doctrine of choosing the “lesser evil” may be applied to political situations, it can never be invoked as against the commands of God. But Montini had no desire to be separated from his hierarchy. He sent them a congratulatory telegram praising them for clearly interpreting his intention and meaning.⁷¹

Like his predecessor, he stacked the next Conclave by raising the number of cardinals to 125 and forcing all those over 80 (the conservatives) to retire. He also had a predilection for advancing to higher positions in the hierarchy those whose activities he approved of. For example, he appointed Cardinal Samore to be “Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for Discipline in Sacramental Matters” two months after this Cardinal had distributed Communion to a motley crowd of Protestants—with full awareness that they did not believe in the “Real Presence.” This fact received a great deal of publicity in the French press, so much in fact that Paul VI was led to deplore “the acts of intercommunion that went against the proper ecumenical guidelines” (*Doc. Cath.* 68-141).

Much more could be said of this enigmatic individual described by Malachi Martin as “the first un-pope” and “the man who merely completed

Pope John's destruction of the Church."⁷² Not only did he confirm and promulgate the Documents of Vatican II; not only did he carry forward the program of John XXIII in the political arena (apart from his attitude towards communism, consider the treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty, and his refusal to support the struggles of five million Ukranian Catholics); not only did he refuse in principle to defend the Church against heresy (consider his refusal to condemn the Dutch Catechism), but most significant of all, he was the individual primarily responsible for changing the liturgical and sacramental practice of the Church. And after having done all this he had the gall to tell the distraught faithful that "the smoke of Satan could be seen rising in the Vatican," and that the Church was in the process of "auto-demolition." (The statement is incidentally heretical for the Mystical Body of Christ can never self destruct.) So unbelievable were the statements and actions of this individual that many absurdly claimed he was "a prisoner in the Vatican," "drugged," or that he had died and had been replaced by a satanic "double."⁷³ Like his predecessor, he received the praises of the Freemasons: Yves Marsoudon, State Minister, Supreme Council of France (Scottish Rite), said:

Born in our Masonic Lodges, freedom of expression has now spread beautifully over the Dome of St. Peter's. . . . This is the Revolution of Paul VI. It is clear that Paul VI, not content merely to follow the policy of his predecessor, does in fact intend to go much further.⁷⁴

When he died, he was waked in a simple wooden casket placed upon the ground. An open Bible, its pages fluttering in the breeze, was the only adornment. I leave you then with Montini, often described as a "Hamlet," but in fact, far more an "Iago."

This is the man that John Paul II claimed as his guide and "his spiritual father."

JOHN PAUL I

Space demands that we pass over the reign of this "pontiff" briefly. Cardinal Luciani was known to be a liberal and a favorite of Cardinal "innovator" Bonelli. He had obtained his Doctorate in Theology by defending Serbati Rosmini (1797-1885), a man who had had 40 propositions from his books condemned by the Holy Office in 1887. He was an ardent feminist as is shown by his letters to playwright Carlo Goldini in his briefly famous book entitled *Humbly Yours*. He was prone to making surprising theological statements such as "God is a woman." He openly stated with regard to

Vatican II and the problem of religious liberty that “for years I have taught that only truth has rights. Now I have convinced myself that we have been wrong” (*Time Magazine*). In September of 1978 he held up as a classical example of self-abnegation and devotion to duty, one Giosue Carducci, a Professor at the University of Bologna who founded two Masonic lodges and was the author of a long and blasphemous “Hymn to Satan.” As a thinker he can only be described as “trivial.” Such a background made him eminently suitable to “lead” the post-Conciliar Church.

While his reign was brief, he followed the pattern expected by those who elected him—essentially those who Paul VI had “stacked” in the Cardinalate. He refused to be crowned as Pope and was “invested” with the pallium as “Bishop of Rome,” a favorite ascription of the Anglicans which effectively placed the papacy at the level of the Archbishop of Canterbury.⁷⁵ He then dismissed the Vatican guard, banished the *Sedia Gestatoria*, and abolished the title of *Pontifex Maximus*. Fate did not give him time to destroy much more, for barely thirty days after his election he died under circumstances which remain highly suspicious.⁷⁶

Notes

¹ Some will question the need to review this unsavory history of the post-Conciliar “Popes.” However, to fully understand the deviations of the post-Conciliar establishment, it is necessary to understand the roots from which it grew.

² Placed in the mouth of Charles I by Jane Lane in her *The Severed Crown* (Peter Davies: London, 1972).

³ Taken from the *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*. This oath was taken by “Popes” John XXIII and Paul VI. It was subsequently allowed to fall into oblivion.

⁴ “Die Gebete nach der hl. Messe,” *Theol. prakt. Quartalschrit*, 87, 1934. Some time around 1934 this prayer was shortened by the elimination of the following phrase: “These most crafty enemies have filled and inebriated with gall and bitterness the Church, the spouse of the immaculate Lamb, and have laid impious hands on her most sacred possessions. In the Holy Place itself, where has been set up the See of the most holy Peter and the Chair of Truth for the light of the world, they have raised the throne of their abominable impiety, with the iniquitous design that when the Pastor has been struck, the sheep may be scattered.” The full prayer is available in the *Moto Proprio* of Leo XIII, September 25, 1888 and in Raccoltas published before 1934. I have been unable to determine who was responsible for the deletion. The post-Conciliar Church has completely eliminated the Leonine prayers. An excellent discussion of the topic is available from Fr. Cekada’s web page: www.traditionalmass.org, entitled *Russia and the Leonine Prayers*.

⁵ Modernism can be characterized by the acceptance of the “Nominalist” philosophical principle that all knowledge is experiential; by a belief in the concepts of “progress” and “evolution” as applied to all realms of knowledge, including dogma; by a determination to bring the teaching of the Church into line with contemporary patterns of thinking; and by the belief that truth itself is derived from an inner awareness which man experiences—vital

The Post-Conciliar “Popes”—Part I

immanence—and hence always relative to the individual. These ideas are inimical to those of a divine Revelation and nature of “fallen” man. See also, “The Sin of Liberalism,” *The Roman Catholic*, Vol. V., March 1983, and Chapter 16 in this book entitled, “Modernism in the Church: The Road to Hell is Paved with Good Intentions.”

⁶ Space does not allow for a detailed study of this period. Mary Martinez has covered the period in a series of articles in *The Roman Catholic*. Other sources are Adrian Dansette, *The Religious History of Modern France* (Herder: Freiberg, 1961); Jean-Marie Domenach and Robert de Montvalon, *The Catholic Avant-Garde* (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston: N.Y., 1967); Emile Poulat, *La Crise Moderniste and Intégrisme et Catholicisme intégral* (Casterman: Paris, 1962 and 1969 respectively).

⁷ “After me, the flood.” He vouchsafed his “dying words” to Cardinal Giuseppe Siri: “*Depositum custodi, depositum custodi*” (Peter Hebblethwaite, *Pope John XXIII* [Doubleday: N.Y., 1985]).

⁸ Cardinal Bea, a secret modernist and rabid ecumenist under John XXIII, was his confessor. One can imagine the subtle influence this man wielded under such circumstances. (There were no heretical aspects to the changes in the rites for Holy Week.)

⁹ To take the name of John XXIII was itself revolutionary. His predecessor, John XXII (d. 1419) is described in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908) as “utterly worldly minded, ambitious, crafty, unscrupulous, immoral, a good soldier, but no churchman.” Peter Hebblethwaite describes him as a “pirate who massacred and perjured his way into the papacy” (*Pope John XXIII*). He was forced to resign from the papacy by the Council of Pisa and subsequently became an “antipope.” No subsequent Pope would take the name of John because of his nefarious actions, much less of John XXIII.

¹⁰ Robert Blair Kaiser, *Pope, Council, and World* (Macmillan: N.Y., 1963). M. Trevor (*Pope John* [Doubleday: N.Y., 1967]) notes that some have seen John XXIII’s activities as being “Machiavellian,” but then tries to assure us that this was only in appearance and not actually the case. Avro Manhattan (*The Vatican Moscow Alliance* [Ralston-Pilate: N.Y., 1977]) called him a “determined revolutionary” and a “socialist Pope.” In fact, almost every text dealing with this period of the history of the Church refers to John XXIII as a “revolutionary.”

¹¹ Msgr. Albert Giovannetti (*We Have a Pope* [Newman: Maryland, 1959]). Others say the family were sharecroppers, but all admit they had lived in the same town for hundreds of years.

¹² Peter Hebblethwaite, *Pope John XXIII*.

¹³ Loisy was excommunicated as a modernist, and Duschene’s texts on the history of the Church were placed on the Index.

¹⁴ Cardinal Rampolla’s Freemasonic connections are documented by Msgr. Giovannetti, *We Have a Pope*. Cardinal Rampolla was almost elected to the papacy in 1903, but the Austrian government, aware of his Freemasonic connections, exercised their veto and prevented this.

¹⁵ The Bishop of Bergamo is described as a “complete modernist” by E. Poulat (*Intégrisme et Catholicisme intégral*). The modernist atmosphere in which Roncalli received his early education is also documented in Giancarlo Zizola’s, *The Utopia of Pope John XXIII* (Orbis: N.Y., 1978).

¹⁶ Peter Hebblethwaite tells us repeatedly that “he paid his pound of flesh” to the repressive forces prevailing in Rome under Pius X.

¹⁷ Rudolf Steiner (1861-1925) was the originator of “The Science of the Spirit known as Anthroposophy” and was a member of the “illuminati” (See Mary Martinez, “Pius XII and

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

the Jews.” *The Roman Catholic*, Vol. V, March 1983). A good summary of Steiner’s teachings is available from Carrie Tomko, “Anthroposophy, The Occult Influences of Rudolf Steiner,” *SCP Journal* (Berkeley, Calif.), Vol. 25, Feb. 2001.

¹⁸ Zizola, *The Utopia of Pope John XXIII*.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Most of the French hierarchy had cooperated with the Vichy government of Petain. To understand the politics of post-war France the reader is referred to Sisley Huddleston’s *France—The Tragic Years* (Holborn: London, 1958).

²² Zizola, *The Utopia of Pope John XXIII*.

²³ Sources for this information are available in a publication entitled *L’Abomination de la désolation (Le Mystère d’iniquité)* by Professor Gabriel Chabot and Commandant Rouchette, available from Commandant Rouchette (retired from the French Sûreté) at B.P. 151, 16105 Cognac Cedex, France.

²⁴ McGregor-Hastie, *Paul VI*, quoted by Hutton Gibson, *Paul VI’s Legacy: Catholicism?* (Leo Panakal: Cochin, India, 1979).

²⁵ It is interesting to note that almost everyone accused of Americanism or modernism has admitted the existence of such heresies, but denied that they were guilty of holding them. Those interested in understanding the role of the ex-Jesuit Tyrell will find the best discussion of this in the second half of Malachi Martin’s *The Jesuits*. It is interesting to note that Pope St. Pius X found it necessary to dismiss all but two professors from Catholic University and all the professors from St. John’s seminary in Boston because of their modernist views. After the death of Pius X they all returned to their former teaching positions.

²⁶ Paul Johnson, *Pope John XXIII* (Little Brown and Co.: N.Y., 1974), p. 144. To quote this author further: “If we take *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in Terris* together, they effectively demolish most of the internationalist, social, economic, and political teachings of the Popes for the previous hundred years with the one exception of Leo XIII’s *Rerum Novarum*.” It is of interest that on another occasion when John XXIII was comparing himself to previous Popes he stated: “There come to mind the names of Urban, Clement, and Leo too? Leo, no, that’s not my stuff” (Peter Hebblethwaite, *Pope John XXIII*). Henri Fesquet informs us that his antipathy to the ideas of Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, the redoubtable Secretary of the Holy Office, was “well known.”

²⁷ Zizola, *The Utopia of Pope John XXIII*.

²⁸ That is, to blend the Church’s stance with that of the modern world. According to Zizola, “At the height of the crusading anti-communist period, Jacques Maritain called on Catholics to open their eyes, to discover a Christianity of action under form at times heretical, and even of rebellion which almost seemed like denial, in the depths of conscience and secular existence. ‘It was not given to believers faithful to Catholic dogma . . . but to atheistic communists to abolish in Russia the absolutism of private profit. This last process would have been less vitiated by the force of error and would have occasioned fewer catastrophes had it been performed by Christians. The effort to deliver labor and man from the dominion of money is an outgrowth of the currents released in the world by the preaching of the Gospel, such as the effort to abolish servitude and the effort to bring about the recognition of the rights of the human person” (*The Utopia of Pope John XXIII*). Maritain was to become a dominant influence on Paul VI who wrote the introduction to the Italian translation of his *True Humanism*. As several scholars have pointed out, Maritain was a modernist.

²⁹ Henri Fesquet, *The Drama of Vatican II* (Random House: N.Y., 1967).

The Post-Conciliar “Popes”—Part I

³⁰ Carlo Falconi, *Pope John and the Ecumenical Council* (World Publ.: N.Y., 1964).

³¹ Zizola, *The Utopia of Pope John XXIII*.

³² John XXIII’s favorite author was Alessandro Manzoni from whom he also took the term *aggiornamento*.

³³ Peter Hebblethwaite, *Pope John XXIII*. John XXIII attempted to give the impression that the idea of a Council was a “divine inspiration”; however, Hebblethwaite clearly shows that such was never the case.

³⁴ Peter Hebblethwaite, *Pope John XXIII*. Ursula Oxfort accepts the idea that John XXIII had a sudden inspiration, and points out that such are frequently diabolical. However, it is clear from Hebblethwaite’s book that there was nothing sudden nor inspirational involved (Ursula Oxfort, *The Heresy of Pope John XXIII*, available from her at 260 6th Ave., South, Lake Worth, Florida).

³⁵ He did, however, praise Cardinal John Henry Newman, thus—according to Peter Hebblethwaite, *Pope John XXIII*—rehabilitating this individual who was considered to be a modernist, or at least, a quasi-modernist, and whose “development of Christian doctrine” had been suspected of being nothing more than the endorsement of the “evolution of Christian doctrine.” Newman tells us in his letters that he believed in evolution “lock, stock, and barrel.” Newman is said to have been the most quoted theologian at Vatican II. Cf. *Cardinal Newman in His Age* by Harold Weatherby.

³⁶ “You will be more free,” as he said to Cardinal Bea, “and less bound by tradition if we keep you out of the normal Curial channels.”

³⁷ As one theologian put it: “When those thirty or forty or fifty observers show up at the Council, they’ll have a role that will be psychologically more important than the rest of the Fathers put together.” These Protestant and communist “observers” were royally entertained at Catholic expense. However, when Paul Etoga, the traditional bishop of M’balmayo in the Cameroons arrived, he had to “hitchhike from Le Havre to Rome.”

³⁸ Peter Hebblethwaite, *Pope John XXIII*.

³⁹ Henri Fesquet, *The Drama of Vatican II*.

⁴⁰ The Marxist *Il Paese* had this to say apropos Cardinal Lienart’s intervention: “The Devil has entered the Council” (Henri Fesquet, *The Drama of Vatican II*).

⁴¹ Lawrence Elliott, *I Will be Called John* (Dutton: N.Y., 1973).

⁴² E.E.Y. Hales, *Pope John and His Revolution* (Doubleday: N.Y., 1965).

⁴³ One of John XXIII’s close aids described his attitude towards Marxism in these words: “The Church is not a dam against communism. The Church cannot and should not be against anything. It should be positively for something.”

⁴⁴ Jean Madiran, “The Vatican Moscow Agreement,” *Itinieres*, No. 84, June 1964 and available in English in *The Fatima Crusader*, Issue 16, Sept-Oct, 1984 (Constable, N.Y.)

⁴⁵ He did qualify this by saying: “We are of course aware that some of the points in the declaration did not meet with the unqualified approval in some quarters, that there was justification for this.” However, he never clarified which these were or stated that “some quarters” meant the Church.

⁴⁶ An excellent discussion of this topic is available in Fr. Denis Fahey’s *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World* (Regina: Dublin, 1935). As Leo XIII said: “About the ‘Rights of Man’ as they are called, the people have heard enough; it is time that they heard about the Rights of God” (*Tametsi*).

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

⁴⁷ The American Bishops' Pastoral, *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response* (issued by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops) is a direct reflection of these views. This Pastoral encouraging unilateral disarmament on the part of the American nation, offended many Americans and Rome issued a statement that toned down its aggressive attitude. However, the so-called "conflict" between the American bishops and Rome is a sham. *The New Jersey Catholic News* (Kearny, N.J., No. 15, Spring 1984) tells us that when one bishop asked that the Pastoral request the laity to say a Rosary for the sake of peace, he was "crushingly put down."

⁴⁸ The true Church can never be subverted, for the Gates of Hell can never prevail against the truth. However, enormous sections of the Church, like branches cut from the vine, can be subverted.

⁴⁹ W. Keller, *Diaspora*, (Harcourt: N.Y., 1969). While no one denies that individual Catholics may have been guilty of lacking true charity for the Jews, one can never accuse the Church itself—a perfect society and the spotless Bride of Christ, of lacking such. To do so is blasphemy. John XXIII also presumed to change Scripture by deleting the word *perfidious* in relation to the Jews who crucified Christ. This is to forget or ignore the fact that not all Jews were perfidious, but those responsible for Christ's death. Can one imagine the Jews changing a word of Torah, or deleting sections of the Talmud that are offensive to Christians?

⁵⁰ Malachi Martin, *The Decline and Fall of the Catholic Church* (Putnam: N.Y., 1981). Malachi Martin was to change his views of John XXIII and the post-Conciliar establishment towards the end of his life.

⁵¹ *Item* (France, Christmas, 1976).

⁵² Avro Manhattan, *The Vatican Moscow Alliance*.

⁵³ Alden Hatch, *Pope Paul VI* (Doubleday: N.Y., 1967).

⁵⁴ His father, a banker employed by the Vatican, came from a Jewish family, and his mother was a convert from Judaism at the time of her marriage. Now, no traditional Catholic can have any objection to his Jewish ancestry. What is however significant is that no record of his baptism can be found. If in fact he was never baptized, then his Orders are totally invalidated (Myra Davidoglou, *La Voie*, Cahier No. 5 [France, Imbert-Nicolas, Dec. 1982]).

⁵⁵ Peter Hebblethwaite says: "He was theologically formed by reading Maritain, Congar, and de Lubac, and intellectually formed by Pascal, Bernanos, and Simone Weil" (*The Year of Three Popes* [Collins: London, 1978]).

⁵⁶ Myra Davidoglou provides documentation for these facts which are also confirmed by other authors. The traitor Tondi was thrown into jail for a period. When released, he married his mistress, the militant communist Carmen Zanti. For a while this KGB agent was the secretary of Walter Ulbricht and then Professor of Atheism at the University of Marxism-Leninism. After Paul VI became Pope, Tondi returned to Rome and obtained employment in the Vatican's Civil Service as a cover for his continued KGB activities. He was, without making any retraction, forgiven by Paul VI and his civil marriage ratified *sanatio in radice*—that is to say, without a priest.

⁵⁷ Avro Manhattan states that Montini's transfer, like that of Roncalli's, was intended to remove them from the center of Church activities—a form of exile. He also states that Montini was so angry that he refused to accept the cardinal's biretta from Pius XII.

⁵⁸ Quoted by Mary Martinez, "My Favorite Maritain?" *The Roman Catholic*, Vol. 5, No. 2, February 1983. Jacques Maritain dreamed "of reconciling the vision of a Joseph de Maistre and that of a Lamennais in a superior unity of that great wisdom of which St. Thomas was the herald" (*Du régime temporel de la liberté*). Again: "The nation (France) will never be

The Post-Conciliar “Popes”—Part I

truly united until a sufficiently powerful ideal is able to lead to the point where the two traditions of France, that of Joan of Arc, and that of the Rights of Man [enunciated at the time of the French Revolution] are reconciled. . . . It is no accident that France has two national holidays, that of Joan of Arc, and that of July 14 [commemorating the revolution], two feasts which interpenetrate each other and have as their basis one and the same promise” (*Pour la Justice*). A good discussion of this matter is to be found in Michael Davies’ *Pope John’s Council*; in “Maritain: A Revival,” *Fortes in Fide*, France; and in “Jacques Maritain and Saul David Alinsky—Fathers of the ‘Christian Revolution,’” by Hamish Fraser (*Approaches*, Suppl. 71, Scotland). In his last book, *Approaches sans entraves?*, he teaches: “Lucifer no doubt will be the last to be changed. For a time he will be alone in the abyss and will think that only he is condemned to endless torment, and his pride will be boundless. But there will be prayers for him also, and appeals. And in the end he also will be restored to the good, the good in the natural order, brought back in spite of himself to natural love of God. . . . When all the dwellers in Hell are gathered in Limbo, when all the damned are pardoned, an hymn of gratitude will ascend towards the Church Triumphant, towards God and towards Jesus, towards all the elect, for their great cry of love. It will be nature’s hymn, the hymn of poor lovely nature, left mere nature, but straightened out: the Hosanna of Hell defeated.” Let us hope and presume Maritain was senile at this point.

⁵⁹ Alden Hatch, *Pope Paul VI*.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ Quoted by Cardinal Suenens in *Doctrines do Grow*, ed. John T. McGinn.

⁶² The attachment of traditional Catholics to their “rites,” does not reflect “a sentimental attachment to habitual forms of worship,” as Paul VI claims, but a legitimate sentimental attachment—indeed, a nostalgia, for the “sacred.” The so-called “falsity of doctrinal positions” has never been specified.

⁶³ Hubert Monteilhet, *Papa Paul VI—L’Amen-Dada* (Pauvert: Paris, 1976). The idea that Charity can exist outside the bounds of “true doctrine and right belief” is highly absurd. Was Christ lacking in Charity? Did St. Thomas More lack sufficient charity towards his family when he refused to compromise his faith? Are we to tell lies and dissimulate rather than offend our neighbor or the truth? Hardly.

⁶⁴ *Congregation for the Evangelization of the Peoples* (formerly *De Propaganda Fide*), 1976. One is reminded of Fr. Barry, S.J.’s teaching at Fordham University that Mao Tse-Tung’s famous trek across China is an exact parallel to Moses’ leading his people out of Egypt!

⁶⁵ *Liber Accusationis*. This important document has never had a response from the new Church.

⁶⁶ J. Clancy, *Apostle for Our Times* (Kennedy: N.Y., 1963).

⁶⁷ As to his taste in music, we are informed by Gordon Thomas that his favorite piece of music was “Jesus Christ Superstar,” and his favorite song in this musical was “I don’t know how to love Him,” a song with sexual overtones sung by “Mary Magdalene” (*Pontiff* [Doubleday: N.Y., 1983]).

⁶⁸ *The Voice*, Dec. 9, 1972. Also documented in Hubert Monteilhet, *Papa Paul VI—L’Amen-Dada*.

⁶⁹ This Crucifix on a distorted cross is highly reminiscent of those used by “liberation theology” and is not without its satanic aspects. As Piers Compton has pointed out, the “bend or broken cross” was made use of by the “satanists of the sixth century” and is implicitly forbidden by Canon 1279 which condemns the usage of any sacred image that is not in keeping with the approved usage of the Church (*The Broken Cross* [Spearmen: England, 1983]).

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

⁷⁰ Abbé of Nantes, *Liber Accusationis*.

⁷¹ Hubert Monteilhet, *Rome n'est plus dans Rome* (Pauvert: Paris, 1977). Fr. Greeley states with regard to this encyclical that “the massive exodus from the Church as predicted by the liberal Catholic journals . . . did not occur. Instead, ‘Catholics made an important discovery: you can ignore the Pope and life goes right on’” (*The Cardinal Sins*). Surveys show that 80% of post-Conciliar Catholics use artificial means of birth control, and do not consider that they are “sinning” in doing so.

⁷² *Three Popes and the Cardinal* (Straus: N.Y., 1972) and *The Decline and Fall of the Catholic Church*.

⁷³ It is the old argument of “abuses” in another form. Conservative *Novus Ordo* Catholics cannot accept the fact that their “pope” is an apostate, so they claim that everything is being done by those around him.

⁷⁴ Quoted in Y.L. Dupont, *Freemasonry and Vatican Two* (Britons: London, 1968).

⁷⁵ Both John Paul I and II were shown on television as being “invested” with the pallium. According to Rev. L. O’Connell (*The Book of Ceremonies* [Bruce: Milwaukee, 1956]), the pallium is “a wide circular band of white wool with a pendant attached to the front and back, and with six black crosses stitched on it. . . . Symbolic of the plenitude of the Episcopal power, the pallium is worn by the Pope at all times. It is worn by archbishops also as a mark of their participation in the Pope’s supreme pastoral office. . . . It is a mere honorary dignity.” It is even occasionally conferred on bishops. As such, it denotes no function beyond that of being “Bishop of Rome.” While it is true that the Pope is the “Bishop of Rome,” it is also true that he is much more, for he is the “Bishop of bishops.” A valid Pope is Pope from the moment he is elected and accepts. It is of interest to know the words of the traditional ceremony: “Receive the Tiara of three crowns, knowing you are the father of princes and kings, the guide of the faithful and the Vicar of Christ on earth.” In the new ceremony these words are replaced by: “Be blessed by God who has chosen you as supreme pastor of the whole Church, confiding in you the apostolic ministry. May you shine gloriously during many years of life until called by your Lord to be covered with immortality at the entrance of the heavenly kingdom.”

⁷⁶ See David A. Yallop, *In God’s Name* (Bantam N.Y., 1984).

CHAPTER 10

THE POST-CONCILIAR “POPES”—PART II

JOHN PAUL II

Carol Wojtyla was born and bred in Poland. Many have attempted to paint his youth as that of an anti-Nazi resistance fighter. In point of fact, before entering the priesthood, he worked in a chemical factory, the products of which were used to aid the German war effort. He spent his spare time in the theater, performing leading roles in a quasi-professional theatrical company. After the communists took over Poland, Wojtyla remained a survivor—indeed, as a budding philosopher and cleric, he was given the freedom to travel throughout the world which, as anyone familiar with communist tyranny knows, implies that he remained in the good graces of the powers in control. Certainly he was no Mindszenty! And, indeed, Mary Craig tells us in her biography that when he worked as a parish priest in Poland he kept a “low profile . . . steering clear of politics (even to mention ‘good’ and ‘evil’ could bring down the wrath of the authorities”).¹

Despite the fact that he was the first non-Italian pope to be elected in almost 500 years, he was by no means an “unknown” who arrived on the scene unexpectedly. He was rather a man that the post-Conciliar pseudo-hierarchy knew well and could trust with the continuation of the Conciliar reforms. It was Bishop Garonne of Toulouse, later Cardinal and chief inquisitor of Archbishop Lefebvre, that first recommended this young prelate to the Vatican when the Council was getting underway. Bishop Wojtyla proceeded to bring his “personalist” and “existentialist” ideas—what has been described as his “Heidegger-Husserl-Scheler concepts”—to the key conciliar document entitled *Gaudium et Spes*, otherwise known as “The Church in the Modern World.”² (This document has been described by Cardinal Heenan, Primate of England, as “a treatise unworthy of a Catholic Council,” and by Bishop Russel McVinney as “a doubtful compromise with everything that lies at the basis of the evils affecting humanity.”³) Contacts established at this time led to a close friendship with Paul VI and a rapid rise in the hierarchy. In 1964 he was asked to preach the annual Lenten retreat to the Pope and Curia, and shortly afterwards he was appointed a member of the pontifical commission for the study on the possibility of integrating oral contraception into Catholic moral theology. The same year he was made Metropolitan of Krakow (during which time he invited

Billy Graham to speak from his pulpit), and in 1967 Paul VI made him a cardinal and bestowed upon him the pallium. He was one of the three European bishops appointed as permanent members of the Vatican's Episcopal Synod, the "collegiate" organ established after Vatican II. Finally, it was Cardinal Benelli, whose anti-traditional stand is well known, that engineered his election to the Chair of Peter. With such a background, it is little wonder that he chose as his name "John Paul," or that, like his predecessor, he refused to take the oath of office and be crowned with the Tiara. Instead, he was once again invested with the pallium, this time as the "Bishop of Rome," and shortly thereafter proceeded to address the faithful, not as his "children," but as his "brothers and sisters." (All this refusal to be crowned at a time when the communist government of Hungary was so anxious to have the royal crown returned to its country to give its illegal government some vestige of legitimacy. The crown was returned with the full approval of Paul VI.)

JOHN PAUL THE PHILOSOPHER

It is known that Carol Wojtyla spent many years in the study of philosophy. He is a world renowned "phenomenologist," which philosophy is described as "a technique for discovering what is hidden in appearances by looking at the world through the eyes of an infant." George Williams, a Unitarian divinity Professor at Harvard University who has known John Paul II for some 16 years, describes this philosophical system as being derived "from the Bohemian-born Jew, Edward Husserl (1859-1938)," and notes that it "has led to such recent permutations as the hermeneutic phenomenology of Martin Heidegger and Paul Sartre."⁴ It is pertinent, in passing, to note that it was Heidegger who specifically dethroned the intellect and replaced it with experience.⁵ Professor Williams says that John Paul II "thought it would be possible to use the methodology of one phenomenologist, Max Scheler, as a starting point for rebuilding a Christian ethic." (Since when did it need rebuilding?) All this resulted in Wojtyla's doctoral thesis entitled, "The Possibilities for Building a System of Christian Ethics on the Basis of Max Scheler,"⁶ written at the Marxist-controlled Jagiellonian University in Poland.⁷ (One can see the smiles on the faces of his Marxist docents!)

Anna Tymieniecka, who has translated his book *The Active Person* into English, and who is a personal friend, summarizes his "complex thought" in the following terms: "He stresses the irreducible value of the human person. He finds a spiritual dimension in human interaction, and that leads him to a profoundly humanistic conception of society" (*Time*, Oct.

30, 1978).⁸ Now it blows the mind that any individual familiar with the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. John of the Cross could dissipate his energies on such trash—truly the last gasps and dregs of “Nominalist” thinking. But wait! John Paul II has another side. He obtained a second doctorate from the Angelicum in Rome under Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange on the “Metaphysical and Psychological nature of the Faith in the Writings of St. John of the Cross.” In this thesis he makes the supernatural faith of St. John the object of a pseudo-scientific investigation. I shall give but one quote from his text: “Faith . . . not only produces no knowledge and science, but, as we have said, it blinds the soul and deprives it of all other knowledge and science which cannot judge [faith] well. Other kinds of knowledge can be acquired by the light of the intellect, but the knowledge that is of faith is acquired without the light of the intellect. Faith negates the natural light, and if that light is not darkened, faith is lost.”⁹ I leave it to the reader to make sense of the statement.

Another important influence in his thinking is Teilhard de Chardin—in his book *The Sign of Contradiction* he goes so far as to compare the insights of Teilhard with those of Genesis!¹⁰ Finally, among John Paul II’s close friends are such individuals as Karl Rahner, who as Philip Trower states, “has done for existentialism what Teilhard de Chardin did for evolutionism.”¹¹ This same Karl Rahner, the darling of modernist Catholic intellectuals, and probably the most influential theologian in the Conciliar Church, was condemned by Pius XII, and rehabilitated by Paul VI.

JOHN PAUL THE THEOLOGIAN

My faith . . . had nothing to do with any kind of conformism.
. . . It was born in the depth of my own self. . . It was also the
fruit of the efforts of my own spirit seeking an answer to the
mysteries of man and of the world.

John Paul II¹²

Many greeted the election of Wojtyla with joy. Tired of the antics of Paul VI, conservative Catholics saw in him the possibility of a return to sanity. And for a time he seemed to satisfy this need. As Mary Martinez points out in her book *From Rome Urgently*, the 1977 World Episcopal Assembly had taken cognizance of the fact that the rhythm of Conciliar change had gone too far and too fast. Defections from the church—both lay and religious—were far in excess of “separated brethren” seeking admission, and even those who stayed within were confused and distraught. It was therefore necessary that John Paul II appear to be more traditional than his

predecessor. (In revolutionary terminology this is referred to as a policy of “two steps forward and one step back.”) Conservative Catholics welcomed every action that seemed in the least bit “papal,” such as his asking nuns to get back into their habits, his demand for priestly celibacy, his statement in Mexico that the concept of Christ as a revolutionary was false, and his (ever so gentle) condemnation of Hans Küng.¹³ Even more encouraging was his condemnation of the little known Dominican, Jacques Pohier—the first clearly Catholic action in many a year.¹⁴ He was characterized by the French paper *Le Monde* as a smiling prelate with a finger lifted up saying, “No to abortion,” “No to divorce,” “No to birth control,” “No to marriage of priests,” “No to homosexuality,” and: “Yes to toleration.”

For those who were able to read the “signs of the times,” things became much clearer with the publication of his first encyclical *Redemptor hominis* (The Redeemer of Mankind). In this document he openly states (using “I” instead of the traditional “we”) that he intends no departure from the principles established by his post-Conciliar predecessors and the Second Vatican Council, but rather that he intends to further “develop” the “unique inheritance left to the Church by Popes John XXIII and Paul VI” an “inheritance” which “has struck deep roots in the awareness of the Church in an utterly new way, quite unknown previously, thanks to the Second Vatican Council.” Lest he leave us in any doubt, he continues: “The ways on which the Council of the Century has set the Church going, ways indicated by the late Paul VI in his first encyclical, will continue to be for a long time the ways that all of us must follow . . . through the Church’s consciousness, which the Council considerably developed.” The idea of the Church having a “consciousness” that can “develop” and indeed “deepen” is somewhat novel and so Wojtyla explains: “The Church’s consciousness must go with universal openness”; and further, this “consciousness” is “enlightened and supported by the Holy Spirit” and “is formed in dialogue.” Now according to sociologists the Church is, or was a “closed society” as opposed to the modern world (which is “open” and “pluralistic”) because it embraces a wide variety of viewpoints. Yet the new Church is not only developing its consciousness, it is also according to John Paul II, a “pluralistic Church,” the degree or limits of pluralism being determined by the Pope, namely himself.¹⁵

THE CHARISM OF TRANSFORMATION

The “signs of the times” became even clearer with his General Audience on the anniversary of Paul VI’s death. Calling Montini his “spiritual father”

and “the Pope of Vatican II,” he goes on to suggest that his death on the Feast of the Transfiguration was evidence of God’s approbation of his life and actions.¹⁶ He describes him as “the Pope of that deep change which was nothing but a revelation of the face of the Church, awaited by the man and world of today”! (Is this not an endorsement of “ongoing revelation”?) He goes on to describe a new “charism” being given to his spiritual father, one previously absent throughout the entire history of the Church! “The charism of transformation”! Let me quote him directly:

The Lord, having called Pope Paul to Himself on the solemnity of the Transfiguration permitted him, and us, to know that in the whole work of transformation, of renewal of the Church in the spirit of Vatican II, He is present, as He was in the marvelous event which took place on Mount Tabor. . . . John XXIII and after him, Paul VI, received from the Holy Spirit, the charism of transformation.

Is it any wonder that Paul VI’s canonization is well under way?

VATICAN II

Let it be clear that John Paul II, like his immediate predecessors, saw Vatican II as being inspired by the Holy Spirit and saw in this “spirit” a mandate to follow. “Therefore, brothers, drink at these authentic fountains. Speak with the language of the Council, of John XXIII, of Paul VI: it is the language of experience, of the suffering, of the hope of modern humanity. . . . In these past ten years [since the Council], how much progress humanity has made, and with humanity and at its service, how much progress the Church has made” (Puebla Speech). John XXIII saw all this as a New Pentecost and “*un balzo in avanti*” (a great leap forward). Paul VI described it as a new “Epiphany.” And John Paul II, for some mystical reason, sees it more as a “New Advent”: “We find ourselves in a certain way in the midst of a new Advent, at a time of expectation.” Vatican II provides “the foundation for ever more achievements of the people of God’s march towards the Promised Land at this stage of history.” How can we fail to “trust,” he asks, “in our Lord’s grace as revealed recently through what the Holy Spirit said and we heard during the Council” (*Redemptor hominis* 6.2). And is all this not an endorsement of “ongoing revelation?”

ECUMENISM

On February 15, 1980 John Paul II instructed seminarians and Church educators that met with him at the Lateran University that loyalty to the Church is not to be defined, “in a reduced sense, as maintaining standards, nor does it mean staying within the bounds of orthodoxy—avoiding positions that are in contrast to the pronouncements of the apostolic see, the ecumenical councils, and the learned doctors of the Church.” He went on to tell this group that “we must have a divergence of positions, although in the end, we must rely on a synthesis of all.” One is reminded of his statement to the Polish faithful on the Feast of Corpus Christi in 1978—“we respect all ideologies.”

Like his post-Conciliar predecessors, he is a great advocate of ecumenism, and ecumenism in turn is, as we have shown elsewhere, but a step towards the unity of all mankind. As he said to the non-Catholic delegates at his inauguration: “Tell those whom you represent that the involvement of the Catholic Church in the Ecumenical movement, as solemnly expressed by the Second Vatican Council, is irreversible.” This concept of ecumenism requires one to embrace the false concept of unity promulgated by Vatican II (a concept that implicitly denies that unity exists in the Church). “I am glad to know,” he said, “that where possible the attempt is being made to organize also common prayers with the other brother Christians, in harmony of sentiments, in order that, in obedience to the Lord’s will, we may grow in faith, towards full unity, for the building up of the Body of Christ” (*L’Osservatore Romano*, Jan. 22, 1979).

The phrase “the people of God” was already enshrined in the “doublespeak” of the Conciliar documents—used to refer to Catholics, to all those “baptized in Christ” (i.e., Protestants), and to “all men of good will” (the rest of mankind). The concept is further developed in his encyclical *Redemptor hominis* where he teaches us that “the Church is therefore the people of God” (21.1). He later elaborates: “The people of God” are “a community precisely because all its members form it together with Christ Himself, at least because they bear in their souls the indelible mark of Christ” (21.2). And what is this indelible mark? We can only presume it is baptism. Hence it follows that the minimal requirement for belonging to the Church (He never once in the entire encyclical uses the term “Catholic”) is Baptism. He then adds that, “What the Spirit said to the Church through the Council of our time, what the Spirit says in this Church to all the Churches cannot lead to anything else—in spite of momentary uneasiness—but still more mature solidity of the whole people of God, aware of their salvific mission” (3.1). But the idea of the “people of God” is

to have an even further extension. "Likewise the Church, which has struck root in many varied fields of life in the whole of present-day humanity, also acquires the certainty and, one could say, the experience of being close to man, to each person, of being each person's Church, the Church of the people of God" (22.5). "True ecumenical activity means openness, drawing closer, availability for dialogue, and a shared investigation of the truth in the full evangelical and Christian sense."¹⁷ The Church is seeking the universal unity of Christians (RH 6.2)¹⁸ and her most sacred act is to be subjected to this nebulous goal, for he also tells us that the Church "is gathering particularly today in a special way around the Eucharist and desiring that the authentic eucharistic community should become a sign of the gradually maturing unity of all Christians" (RH 20.7). Of course, this ecumenical spirit will eventually go beyond the Christian sects. "What we have just said must also be applied—although in another way and with due differences—to activity for coming closer together with the representatives of the non-Christian religions, an activity expressed through dialogue, contacts, prayer in common, investigation of the treasures of human spirituality, in which, as we well know, the members of these religions are not lacking."

In line with this outlook Wojtyla has joined in common prayers with the Anglicans at their cathedral (stolen from the Catholics) at Canterbury, renewing his vows of baptism in unison with Mr. Robert Runcie (entitled "archbishop," but actually a layman and among other things a Freemason), giving him full recognition as a fellow bishop, and reciting with him the Credo. (All this with the "Pope" wearing his "stole" which signifies that he was functioning in his sacerdotal role.) Following this he went on procession with him, candle in hand, to the "Chapel of the Martyrs of the Twentieth Century" which holds up for veneration such individuals as Maximilian Kolbe (the anti-fascist saint), Oscar Romero (a subversive bishop killed by rightists in Central America), Martin Luther King, Bonhoeffer, and others of similar ilk. His general behavior during the visit was such that one non-Catholic newspaper commented: "None of this, of course, should have surprised anybody. It has long been obvious that the Pope is a very good Protestant. What is more, it has also been obvious since Vatican II that the Roman Catholic Church has undergone the Reformation."¹⁹

In December of 1983 he acted in a similar manner with the Lutherans in Rome. Having previously stated that the Catholic Church has to bear a share of the "guilt" for "divided Christianity" (Vienna, Sept. 12, 1983), and having praised Luther for his "profound religiousness," he proceeded to participate in the 500th anniversary of Luther's birth by attending a Lutheran service in Rome. Vested in a stole, which is a liturgical vestment a

priest is only supposed to wear when participating in sacramental functions (hence the stole in confession). On entering the Lutheran “sanctuary” he bowed to the Lutheran communion table and then sat in an ordinary chair on the dais, at the same level as the other Lutheran ministers. During the service he joined the Lutheran pastor and congregation in reciting the Apostle’s Creed and the Our Father, and during his sermon he spoke much of his longing for unity. Now all this clearly involves active *communicatio in sacris*, the recognition of the Lutherans as a “sister Church,” the denigration of his function as the supposed Vicar of Christ, and the implicit denial of several points of Catholic doctrines. And to make matters worse, the Lutherans made it quite clear that they were making a concession in inviting the “Bishop of Rome” (never referring to him as “Pope”) and that the visit should in no way be seen as a compromise on their part with Lutheran principles. He is purported, following this, to have traveled to Switzerland where he joined the “worship service” of the World Council of Churches at the Center’s Chapel (*National Catholic Register*, Dec. 25, 1983).

The list of his ecumenical activities with non-Christians is endless. He joined the Jews in their synagogue service in Rome, bowing his head on the dais as they sang “we are awaiting the coming of the Messiah.” These activities were repeated during his various trips to Africa where he received the blessing of a “snake priestess,” his trips to India where he received the “Tilak” or ritual marks on his forehead, and finally in his ecumenical prayer service in Assisi where the Buddhists were allowed to place a statue of the Buddha on top of the tabernacle in a Catholic Church in order to perform their rituals.

Following the pattern of his predecessors, John Paul has no fear of desecrating the Holy Mass itself. On April 30, 1963 he hosted a concelebrated “mass” in the immense Paul VI Hall of Vatican City under the auspices of the first International Congress of Priests and religious in which 5,500 priests concelebrated with him. Each priest had in his face only the back of his confrere: not an altar. None held hosts in their hands. “Among the participants with full privileges, one notices the presence of 18 Anglican ministers, of a certain number of Lutheran and Reformed pastors, some Orthodox ‘popes.’” Yet all concelebrated, for the Eucharist itself has become “a symbol [what happened to the Real Presence?] of the unity of all mankind.”²⁰

JOHN PAUL II’S DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION²¹

It is clear from multiple statements that John Paul II believes the “Holy Spirit spoke to the Church in our times through the most recent Council,”

that “obedience to the teachings of the Council is obedience to the Holy Spirit,” and that the principle task of his pontificate was to “bring these teachings to their full development.”²² Now, one of the most significant passages in *Gaudium et Spes* reads as follows: “By the Incarnation, the son of God is in a certain manner united to every man.” The prepositional phrase “in a certain manner” is never defined; nowhere does it teach that either a personal conversion, or even the desire to adhere to the truth is involved. All that is said in this document is that “since human nature as He assumed it was not annulled, by that very fact it has been raised up to a divine dignity in our respect also” (Para. 22). John Paul II, who repeatedly assures us that he will interpret the Documents of Vatican II “in accord with tradition,” explains: Recalling this seminal phrase from the Conciliar document, he tells in *Redemptor hominis*, that “Jesus Christ is united through this mystery to everyone for all eternity” (13.3). Now the true Church admits that some men are united to Christ, either by the glory of heaven, or by charity, or at least by faith while in this world. She further admits that others are potentially united to Him for as long as they are alive. But those who die in enmity to Christ lose this unity and the possibility of this unity for all time. To quote St. Thomas directly: “As long as they are alive, even infidels can be considered members of the Church [and thus united to Christ] in potential, but when they leave this world [in a state of enmity to the truth], they totally cease to be members of Christ” (*Summa* IIIa, Q.8, A.3).

Not so for John Paul. For him, Christ, through His Incarnation is united for all times with each and every person, even though they make no act of personal conversion and have no implicit desire for this union. And as a result of this each man has a “dignity” and participates supernaturally in the divine life. As he says, “This dignity which each and every person attains and is able to obtain continually in Christ is the dignity of the grace of divine adoption and at the same time the dignity of the interior truth of humanity”(RH 11.4). He teaches the same false doctrine in another encyclical: “God is also the Father. He is united to man who He has called to exist in the visible world by a link even more profound than that of creation itself. It is love which not only creates this good, but which also makes it participate in the same life of God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit” (*Dives et misericordia* 7, 4).²³ Thus “man” in general is united to God by participation in the Trinity. In his Allocution of March 25, 1981 he develops this still further: “Henceforth and for all time, without regret and without change, having become united with all of humanity, God will be with man in order to save him and give him His Son the Redeemer. The incarnation confers on man for all time His extraordinary, unique, and ineffable dignity.”

Now, if this is true, if as a result of the Incarnation, God is for all time united to each and every person without any response on the individual's part being required, then we must ask, what is the purpose of the Crucifixion? John Paul has a ready answer to this question. The Passion is God's "witness" or "testimony" to the grandeur and dignity of man! As he says in *Dives et misericordia*: "On the road of the eternal election of man to his dignity as an adopted son of God, the Cross of Christ rises in history . . . as the ultimate witnessing of the admirable alliance of God with humanity, of God with man—with each and every man" (5); "The reality of the Redemption in its human dimension reveals the unprecedented grandeur of man who has merited such a great Redeemer." Yes, indeed, as another translator of the encyclical puts it: ". . . on account of his unparalleled greatness man *deserved* to have such a great Redeemer" (1) (emphasis mine). Needless to say, it is somewhat difficult to reconcile these statements with our Creed. When did fallen man ever merit, much less deserve, the Redemption. Surely, as the traditional liturgy states, it is the unworthiness of man, on account of sin, that the Redeemer makes atonement for. And moreover, God's gift was freely given, never earned, much less deserved!

It follows from John Paul II's premises that all men are saved. (The use of "all" for "many" in the new "mass" is not accidental.) He made this clear on April 27, 1980 when he stated that:

Christ obtained, once and for all, the salvation of man: of each and every man, of those that none can pluck out of his hand. . . . Who can change the fact that we are all redeemed? It is a fact as powerful and as fundamental as creation itself. . . . We are once again made the property of the Father thanks to that Love that did not recoil even before the ignominy of the Cross in order to guarantee this for all men: "and no man shall pluck them out of my hand" (John 10:28). The Church announces to us this day the Easter certitude of the Resurrection, the certitude of salvation.

He says much the same thing in his *Dives et misericordia*: "The mystery of the election concerns every man, the entire human family" (4, 12). And reiterates the same in his *Redemptor hominis*: "Each person is included in the mystery of the Redemption, and Jesus Christ is united to each and every person for all time through this mystery" (13, 3).²⁴ As opposed to this we have the teaching of the Church as given by the Council of Carisiacum in 853: "The All-powerful God desires that all men without exception be saved, even though not all men are saved. That some are saved is a gift of the Savior, that some perish is their own fault."

Now this heresy that all men are saved—the Apocatastasis,²⁵ to give it its technical name—is by no means without its logical consequences.

These become apparent to us in another statement of Wojtyla, his “Act of Entrusting” the world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary at Fatima in 1982.

Before you, Mother of Christ, before your Immaculate Heart, I today, together with the whole Church unite myself with our redeemer (sic) in His consecration for the world and for people, which only in His Divine Heart has the power to obtain pardon and secure reparation. The power of this consecration lasts for all time and embraces all individuals, peoples, and nations. It overcomes every evil that the spirit of darkness is able to awaken, and has in fact awakened in our times, in the heart of man and in his history. God’s holiness showed itself in the redemption of man, of the world, of the whole of mankind, and of the nations.

As Ursula Oxfort points out, this means that “there are no nations today which are under the rule of satanic communism, forming the mystical body of the anti-Christ. . . . Every evil, including the towering political evil of beastly Marxism, is overcome by Wojtyla’s super-power manifest in his divinized ‘act of entrusting’ at Fatima. It should be clear that Wojtyla frontally contradicts the warning of Our Lady of Fatima that if her requests are not met, ‘communism will spread its errors all over the world.’”²⁶

These ideas are not John Paul II’s alone. They are all found in embryo in the documents of Vatican II and the writings of his predecessors. All John Paul II has done has been to “develop” them further, or more correctly, made them more explicit. Now, if the whole world is saved, and if mankind need not make any response to the Passion of Christ which is but a “witness” to man’s guaranteed redemption and his “dignity,” then all the other post-Conciliar errors such as its teachings on human dignity and religious liberty follow. But once one grants these premises, one is led to question the very need for a Church whose function is no longer to witness to the truth Christ entrusted to her and which is no longer required to provide a means for the salvation of those men who will listen to her message. All she can do is “to help the history of mankind to be more human,” to guide man along the evolutionary path towards a worldly unity and utopian perfection reminiscent of Teilhard’s “point omega.”

THE RENEWAL OF THE JOVINIAN HERESY

Jovinian was a fourth century heretic who, among other things, preached the equality of marriage with virginity embraced for the love of God, and that Catholics who rejected this by giving celibacy priority to marriage

were turning to Manichaeism. Now in his catechetical instruction of April 14, 1982 John Paul II denied the superiority of virginity over marriage and accuses those who uphold the Catholic doctrine as expressed in Canon X (Session XXIV) of the Council of Trent of Manichaean tendencies. He has made similar statements on at least eight occasions.²⁷

THE SOCIAL TEACHINGS OF JOHN PAUL II

It is not surprising to find John Paul II following his predecessors in bestowing praise (*latria*) on the United Nations, and above all on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Oct. 2, 1979). "The governments and states of the world," he says, "must unite." And this "in a movement that one hopes will be progressive and continuous. . . . The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the other international and national juridical instruments are endeavoring to create general awareness of the dignity of the human being . . . the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, and the right to manifest one's religion either individually or in community, in public and in private." He further adds that the fundamental criterion for comparing social, economic, and political systems is not and cannot be, the criterion of hegemony and imperialism; it can be, and indeed must be, the humanistic criterion." Now what is extraordinary is that we have Christ's supposed representative on earth addressing the leaders of virtually all the nations and advocating all the principles of the political and social order established by the French Revolution, while never even mentioning the name of Jesus. (When one compares the official text as published by the Daughters of St. Paul, with the tape recording also available from them, one finds that the speech as given differs from the officially published document in that it deletes all mention of Our Lord.) In a similar manner, his encyclical *Redemptor hominis* speaks much of man (the word is used 350 times), somewhat of Christianity, but never once is the word Catholic used.

His attitude towards communism is no different from that of his post-Conciliar predecessors. He once stated that "Pius XII and others who had no experience of communism understood nothing about it. But I, John Paul II, I understand" (Manila, June, 1981). While it is true that he on occasion criticized the "excesses" of communism (much less than he criticized those of capitalism however), he has never once condemned Marxism or communism as such. He fully shared the opinions of his predecessors that communist governments as such are completely legitimate. (Catholics believe that no government in open rebellion against God can ever be

considered "legitimate.") No wonder the Polish government was delighted with his election to the Papacy, and that one of his first official acts was to entertain Jablonski, the Polish minister of State. This was followed by his granting a long audience to Gromyko and the appointing of Cardinal Agostino Casaroli, the architect of *Ostpolitik*, as his Secretary of State. Similarly, his views on private property reflect his leftist propensities. He finds nothing wrong with the Polish government nationalizing Catholic schools and hospitals, etc., and openly stated while in Mexico that there must not be any hesitation when it comes to the expropriation of private property "correctly carried out" provided it is for the "common good." (Nowhere does he define what such phrases mean.) Now surely the leftists in Latin America, like those of Stalin's era, plan to do away with private property in a "correct" manner, and this for the "common good." But let us now consider his encyclical *Laborem exercens* on the socio-economic order.

Once again we run into the use of ambiguous language, a pattern well established by Vatican II that tends to obfuscate the truth and make his meaning difficult to understand. Ursula Oxfort tells the story of an American newsman who asked Rome what way the encyclical could be applied to the U.S. air controllers' strike and was given the official response that "there is no proper answer or to put it more precisely, it cuts whichever way a person wants it to cut."²⁸ The tale is somewhat misleading, for there are clear-cut clues as to what John Paul II is getting at. The encyclical is but another step along the path outlined by John XXIII's *Pacem in Terris*. In *Laborem exercens* John Paul states: "Christian tradition has never upheld this right [to private property] as absolute and untouchable. On the contrary, it has always understood this right within the broader context of the right common to all to use the goods of the whole of creation; the right to private property is subordinated to the right to common use, to the fact that goods are meant for everyone" (14). He goes still farther in the same paragraph and states that this "should make possible the achievement of the *First Principle* of this order, namely, the universal destination of goods and the right to the common use of them." No one doubts but that the law of Christian charity limits the use of one's private property, and certainly the Church has always insisted that this property be obtained in honorable ways. But John Paul says nothing of this in his encyclical, implicitly leaving the regulation of economic forces in the natural order. Let it be clear that the Church has always taught that man has a right to private property. As Leo XIII said with characteristic precision: "It is surely undeniable that, when a man engages in remunerative labor, the very reason and motive of his work is to obtain property and to hold it as his own private possession

... it cannot but be just that he [man] would possess that portion [what he earns] as his own, and should have a right to keep it without molestation. . . . To say that God has given the earth to the use and enjoyment of the universal human race is not to deny that there can be private property. For God has granted the earth to mankind in general not in the sense that all without distinction can deal with it as they please, but rather that no part of it has been assigned to any one in particular, and that the limits of private possession have been left to be fixed by man's own industry" (*Rerum novarum*). What makes John Paul's statement so damnable is that he never clearly explains these distinctions—rather he leaves the reader to assume that the Marxist attitude towards private property is completely compatible with Christian principles. What John Paul fails to realize, for all his supposed knowledge of communism, is that a person without private property is always a slave of the State. As occurs in communist lands, whenever an individual is "uncooperative," his home and all his possessions are declared State property. At best, he is left free only to starve, though in point of fact even this freedom is denied those who end up in the slave labor camps of Siberia.²⁹

When a Czech newspaper characterized John Paul II as anti-communist and "reactionary," an unsigned article in *L'Osservatorio Romano* expressed strong indignation and called the charge "grossly offensive" and "absurd." Mary Martinez informs me that it is well known in Rome that unsigned articles in this paper are traditionally written by the Pope himself. Archbishop Lefebvre has also accused him of actively "changing the bishops to replace them with communist collaborator bishops" (Paris press conference, Nov. 21, 1983). And even Michael Davies has noted that "there can be no doubt at all that the Kremlin must consider the Catholic bishops of the U.S.A. its most effective agents anywhere in the world" (*The Remnant*, July, 1983). We have been frequently informed that the post-Conciliar Church eschews any desire to be aligned with the "powers" of this world. Will not the "Catholic" slaves of the future communist world order increasingly resent the role this Church has played in bringing about such an Advent? Will they not realize that, like their Divine Master, they also have been sold out and betrayed?³⁰

John Paul is of course a "humanist" along the lines of his spiritual father Paul VI. As he said to the United Nations, "we must affirm Man, for his own sake, and not for some other motive or reason, solely for himself. Even further, we must love man because he is Man, by reason of the special dignity he possesses" (Address to UNESCO, June 2, 1980). Indeed, he tells us that the Church is "centered on man," that it is "anthropocentric" (*Dives et misericordia*, 1, 4). Returning to the encyclical *Laborum exercens* we

find this humanism developed still further and related to work. He tells us that “the proper subject of work continues to be man, and reiterates this at least seven times—stating elsewhere for example that “the primary basis of the value of work is man himself”; “in the final analysis it is always man who is the subject of the work,” etcetera. Work becomes an idol, the idol of the communist worker’s paradise to which everybody must submit. Even Christ Himself is depicted as *The Man of Work*. (The communists in Italy have printed up pictures of Christ as a factory “working man.”) Now this entire concept of work is offensive to any real craftsman, for if one’s work is a “calling,” then *laborare est orare*. Neither work nor man is an end in itself. The only work worth doing is what is worthy of being offered up to God and practiced as a means of personal sanctification.³¹

One is not surprised to find *Laborem exercens* also speaking of “satisfactory socialization,” without ever defining what the term means. Placing the phrase in the context of the post-Conciliar Church, one finds it first used by John XXIII in his *Mater et Magistra*. The term is again found in Vatican II’s *Gaudium et Spes*, where its meaning is said to derive from John XXIII’s encyclical. And once again we see the term in paragraph 14 of John Paul’s encyclical, this time prefaced by the adjective “satisfactory.” Now the term “socialization” can only mean one thing, and that is an economic order based on Marxist principles. Like all his post-Conciliar predecessors, John Paul hesitates to call a spade a spade. He skirts the real issue for fear of giving offence to the erstwhile faithful (Pius IX said that “no one can be at the same time a sincere Catholic and a true socialist” [*Quadragesimo anno*]) who provide his financial support out of their private property.

What is most tragic about this scenario is that the post-Conciliar “Popes” not only fail to condemn communism; they also fail to make any distinctions between capitalism which is capable of reformation and communism which is not; and above all, they totally fail to teach that there is even such a thing as a traditional Catholic social and economic order. Such was never the case with the traditional Church which condemned communism in some 200 documents and which, while being highly critical of laissez-faire capitalism, never described it as “intrinsically evil.” As Pius XI said of capitalism, “It is obvious that this system is not to be condemned in itself. And surely it is not of its own nature vicious” while “communism is intrinsically evil, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever” (*Quadragesimo anno*).

THE NEW CODE OF CANON LAW

Brief mention must be made of the New Code of Canon Law introduced by John Paul II—a subject that will be dealt with in greater detail later. In essence, the new “code” represents the last step in a triad. Any religious body can be characterized by its doctrine, its liturgy, and its law of governance. Up until 1983 the post-Conciliar Church gave lip service to the Canon Law of the traditional church, though for all practical purposes it had lapsed into disuse. Now, with the New Code, the changes in doctrine and liturgy have been confirmed by law. Like a snow-ball on a hill, the new Church has been launched. Time can only carry it in one direction. To give but one brief example, John Paul II tells us that the New Code “determines the relations which should exist between the particular churches and the Universal Church and between collegiality, and the primacy; the doctrine moreover, according to which all the members of the People of God, in the way suited to each of them, participate in the threefold office of Christ: priestly, prophetic, and kingly” (*Sacrae Disciplinaes Leges*). Once again we are brought back to the “double-speak” of the new Church. Traditional Catholics will understand by “the People of God” only Catholics. Those who are familiar with the true meaning of the phrase (God is after all, “in a certain way” united to all men) understand them to include heretics, communists, sodomists, and mini-antichrists who are manifestly destroying Christian civilization at its roots “in a way suited to each of them.”

THE LITURGY

Finally a word on the liturgy. It is obvious that for Catholics brought up in the traditional Church, the liturgy—the Mass—and the sacraments are the most important issues. Conservative Catholics constantly assure us that John Paul II is returning the Church to tradition and point to the “Mass Indult,” and more recently to the “Society of St. Peter,” which describes itself as “the Pope’s own traditional Order” as proof of their contention. Let us examine these with care.

Both these gestures are aimed at keeping conservative Catholics within the post-Conciliar Church. Seen by some as a concession, by others as a return to sanity, it is important for us to know just where John Paul II really stands on these issues. He recognizes that there are still Catholics who have “been educated on the basis of the old liturgy in Latin.” He notes that “it is necessary to show not only understanding, but also full respect towards these sentiments and desires.” But then he insists that this preference for

Latin (as if Latin was the issue) be honored through the New Mass which is the source of unity in the new Church. To again quote him directly: “As far as possible these sentiments and desires are to be accommodated, as is moreover provided for in the new dispositions.” Returning once again to the same topic he states:

liturgical renewal carried out correctly in the spirit of the Second Vatican Council is, in a certain sense, the measure and the condition of putting into effect the teaching of that Council which we wish to accept with profound faith, convinced as we are that by means of the Council the Holy Spirit has spoken to the Church the truths and given the indications for carrying out her mission among the people of today and tomorrow.

And so it is that in offering the conservatives the “Mass Indult” (the “Mass of John XXIII”³²) he is in fact only trying to accommodate the “sensibilities and desires” of an older generation. Those who accept the offer do so however, at a great price. For along with this Mass (said on a monthly basis) they must declare their acceptance of the *Novus Ordo Missae* and all the errors of Vatican II.³³

The Society of St. Peter was established primarily by the followers of Archbishop Lefebvre who abandoned him after he ordained four individuals to the Episcopacy in direct violation of the orders of John Paul II. This new Society plans to use the Mass of John XXIII and is establishing seminaries that will ordain young men to the priesthood by the traditional rites. All this sounds wonderful. John Paul is giving them what he refused to Lefebvre. But is he? What is not recognized in all this tomfoolery is that the individuals who will do the ordaining were themselves raised to the Episcopacy by the post-Conciliar rites and as such almost certainly lack the Apostolic Succession and power to ordain. The net result will be a group of laymen saying the Latin Mass of John XXIII. Such men will truly be wolves in sheep’s clothing. And more recently the priests of the Society of St. Peter have been told that they must on occasion say the *Novus Ordo Missae*, and must join their *Novus Ordo* bishops for services on Holy Thursday. Actually, the whole affair is a storm in a tea-pot because if these society members accept the legitimacy of John Paul II’s pontificate, they accept all his errors.³⁴

Conservative Catholics who point to these and other actions of John Paul II as proof of his return to Tradition should be aware of his statement in Mexico, the country with the largest number of traditional Catholics: “Those who remain attached to incidental aspects of the Church, aspects which were valid in the past, but which have been superseded, cannot be considered the faithful.”

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Here we hear, not the voice of Peter, but the voice of Paul VI. Since when are the Mass and the sacraments “incidental aspects of the Church”? And why are some Catholics still attached to them? The answer is clear. We have not received the “charism of transformation.” We have not been “blessed” with the “renewal of the Church in the Spirit of Vatican II.” And the price he tells us we must pay is that “we cannot be considered the faithful.” Traditional Catholics may not be faithful to Wojtyla’s post-Conciliar Church, but this Church is clearly no longer “The Church of All Times,” the Church that Christ established.

An excellent and well documented review of the apostasy of John Paul II is available from Catholic Restoration on the internet (www.catholicrestoration.org/library/apostasy.htm.)

Notes

¹ Mary Craig, *Man from a Far Country* (Morrow: N.Y., 1979).

² He is reputed to be the principal author of this document.

³ Michael Davies, *Pope John’s Council*. Among other things this document teaches that “Christians are joined with the rest of men in the search for truth.”

⁴ Maritain described Husserl as a person who “abhorred wisdom” and Raïssa Maritain quotes Chestov as saying Husserl “awoke in him (Maritain) all the indignation of which he was capable” (Raïssa Maritain, *Adventures in Grace* [Image: N.Y., 1962]).

⁵ John Paul II also describes himself as an “existentialist.” Existentialism basically holds that experience has more “authenticity” than reason, and indeed, is the only thing that is authentic and real. This is to forget that it is precisely experience that demonstrates that reasoning is something effectual—otherwise no one would reason. Indeed, it is the very existence of reason which shows that experience must have an object. Animals of course experience, but they do not reason, whereas on the contrary, man can avoid many experiences by reasoning. To wish to replace reasoning by experience on the practical plane and in a relative fashion could still be meaningful; but to do so on the intellectual and speculative plane, as the empiricists and existentialists wish to do, is properly speaking demented. For the inferior man, only what is contingent—what he experiences—is real, and he seeks by this philosophy to lower principles to the level of contingencies (when he does not simply deny them). To reduce faith to experience as John Paul II does, is to deprive it of any objective character. Such of course is almost a modernist principle.

⁶ Scheler was born a Jew, became a Catholic convert, and then went on to leave the Church.

⁷ Mary Martinez, *From Rome Urgently* (Statimari: Rome, 1979).

⁸ This text contains many philosophical statements that are overtly heretical. Some of these have been collected and published by Mr. Herman Humbert in St. Pius V’s Sodalitas Information, Plantinkaai, 2, Anvers, Belgium (March 1989).

⁹ Karol Wojtyla, *Faith according to St. John of the Cross* (Ignatius: San Francisco, Calif., 1981). Ursula Oxford provides an interesting discussion of this book in *Christian Counter-Reformation*, Bulletin No. 36, Sept. 1083 (available from P.O. Box 369, Lake Worth, FL 33460).

The Post-Conciliar “Popes”—Part II

¹⁰ Karol Wojtyła, *The Sign of Contradiction* (Seabury: N.Y., 1979).

¹¹ Philip Trower, *The Church Learned and the Revolt of the Scholars* (Wanderer: St. Paul, Minn., 1979).

¹² Quoted in *Catholics Forever* (Monroe, Conn.), November 1989. Such a statement is virtually a definition of modernism.

¹³ Hans Küng has denied the divinity of Christ, the Virgin Birth, the indefectibility of the Church, and the infallibility of the Pope. The penalty he has incurred for his apostasy from the faith was the repudiation of his status as a “Catholic theologian.” The censure does not denounce him for heresy, and does not declare him to be excommunicated, suspended, or under interdict. Thus Hans Küng remains a “priest in good standing” in the Conciliar Church. In so far as his teaching salary came from the State, he was not even deprived of his teaching position. He continues to be professor of ecumenical theology and director of the Institute for Ecumenical Research at the University of Tübingen. This is, canonically speaking, but a slap on the wrist as compared to the “suspension” of Archbishop Lefebvre. Conservative Catholics who accept John Paul II as legitimate Pope are in “full communion” with this individual and others of similar ilk. It is of interest to note the Lutheran reaction to this “Catholic.” When he was accused of being “a little Luther,” the Lutheran weekly, *Christian News*, stated: “Luther was a Christian who believed that Jesus Christ was born of a Virgin, rose physically from the dead and is truly God, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. Küng denies these fundamental doctrines. . . . His views about Christ are thoroughly anti-Christian” (March 10, 1980).

¹⁴ Jacques Pohier’s *Quand je dis Dieu* denies nearly every tenet of the Catholic faith. Hardly anyone had heard of this individual before his existence was brought to public attention by his condemnation. Far more typical is the “silencing” of Fr. Boff, Franciscan exponent of Liberation Theology. This silencing was lifted several months after it was imposed, and no retraction was ever asked or given. Similarly with others who have been “condemned,” such as Hans Küng: no retraction is ever demanded.

¹⁵ Lest I be accused of misrepresenting his statements in this encyclical, I shall give them more completely: “The Second Vatican council did immense work to form the full and universal awareness of the Church, or which Pope Paul VI wrote in his first encyclical. This awareness—or rather, self-awareness—by the Church is formed ‘in dialogue’” (11.1); “The rich inheritance of the pontificate of Pope Paul VI . . . has struck deep roots in the awareness of the Church in an utterly new way, quite unknown previously” (3.1); “The Church’s consciousness enlightened and supported by the Holy Spirit . . . must remain the first source of the church’s love, as love in turn helps to strengthen and deepen her consciousness” (3.2). Now it may be legitimate “in a certain way” to speak of the Church’s “self-awareness” and “consciousness,” but the Church—the Body of Christ—is a perfect society and so it is in no way legitimate to speak of this consciousness being further “enlightened,” “developed,” and “deepened.”

¹⁶ John Paul II, reflecting on Paul VI, described him as having a “lofty stature as a teacher and defender of the faith,” which appears “ever more resplendent to us at this dramatic time in the history of the Church and the world” (Castel Gondolfo, August 18, 2003).

¹⁷ *The Church in the Modern World*—the document that Carol Wojtyła was primarily responsible for—also teaches that “Christians are joined with the rest of men in the search for truth.” Wojtyła may be seeking the truth, but traditional Catholics believe that Christ has already given it to us. Listen to St. Athanasius speaking about the Arian Councils of the fourth century: “The whole world was put into confusion, and those who at the time bore the profession of clergy ran far and near, seeking how best to learn to believe in our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . If they were believers already, they would not have been seeking, as though

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

they were not. . . . No small scandal . . . that Christians, as if waking out of sleep at this time of day, should be inquiring how they were to believe . . . while their professed clergy though claiming deference from their flocks as teachers, were unbelievers on their own showing, in that they were seeking what they had not. . . . What defect of teaching was there for religious truth in the Catholic Church that they should enquire concerning faith now, and should fix this year's date to their profession of faith."

¹⁸ RH refers to John Paul II's aforementioned encyclical *Redemptor hominis*.

¹⁹ *The Sunday Telegraph of London*, June 6, 1982 and *The Mail-Star of Halifax*, June 8, 1982.

²⁰ Reported in *Introibo*, No. 43, Jan-Mar, 1984 (Published by l'Association Sacerdotal Noel Pinot: Angers, France).

²¹ Thanks are expressed to Fr. Blignieres (*Jean-Paul II et la Doctrine Catholique*, Conference of May 13, 1981 [Mutuality: Paris]) and Wigand Siebel (*The Program of John Paul II*, P.O. Box 21, W. Va. [Liberty Bell Publications]), and *Philosophie et Théologie de Karol Wojtyla* [Bale, Saka, 1988] for the contents of the next few paragraphs. Many others, such as Ursula Oxfort and Myra Davidaglou, have written on the same subject.

²² *Redemptor hominis*.

²³ Speech to the Sacred College, *Documentation Catholique* (Paris, 1975), pp. 1002-1003.

²⁴ John Paul II, in one of his last (2003) documents, *Pastores Gregis*, made the following statement: "In proclaiming the Risen Lord, Christians present the One who inaugurates a new era of history and announce to the world the good news of a complete and universal salvation which contains in itself the pledge of a new world in which pain and injustice will give way to joy and beauty. At the beginning of a new millennium marked by a clearer awareness of the universality of salvation and a realization that the Gospel daily needs to be proclaimed anew, the Synodal Assembly raised an appeal that our commitment to mission should not be lessened but rather expanded, through ever more profound missionary cooperation" (Para. 65).

²⁵ Among other things this heresy denies the justice of God who repeatedly in Scripture tells us we shall be judged and that the sheep will be separated from the goats.

²⁶ Ursula Oxfort, "Pope Flounders in the 'Act of Entrusting,'" *Christian Counter-Reformation*, Bulletin No. 24. P.O. Box, 369, Florida, Lake Worth, 1981.

²⁷ Gustavo Daniel Corbi, *Joviniano* 82, "La resurreccion de una herejia" (Editorial Icton: Buenos Aires, 1982).

²⁸ Ursula Oxfort, "*Laborem exercens*," *Christian Counter-Reformation*, Bulletin No. 25. John Paul II's labor encyclical is communistic. I know of one Conciliar Catholic who claims that no one can call John Paul II a heretic because no one can ever know exactly what he means.

²⁹ An excellent example of this is provided by Victor Krasin, "How I was Broken by the KGB," *New York Times* magazine, March 18, 1984. The mediaeval serf who could neither be kicked off his land nor taxed on the goods he produced for his family's use was far more secure than any laborer in any communist land.

³⁰ In line with this playing up to the powers of this world consider the fact that John Paul II received the Trilateral commission in a special audience at the Vatican. He spoke of the "ethical dimension" of their activity, of how they have a "responsibility for encouraging people to face their duty in international human solidarity," and of how the Commission must "do everything for the service of the human person." Photographs were taken showing Z. Brezesinski and Henry Kissinger sitting in the front row of the audience, and of John Paul

The Post-Conciliar “Popes”—Part II

shaking hands with David Rockefeller, the chairman of the U.S. section (*Dialogue* 33, April, 1983). Now the Trilateral commission is probably one of the most subversive of all possible organizations created by man. (Cf. Ursula Oxfort, “The Plot Against America: What we must know about the Trilateral Commission,” *Christian Counter-Reformation*, June, 1978.)

³¹ Of course, people often will work at tasks with no redeeming value in order to support a family, but such is never a craft, a form of work which involves both the intellect and will of the worker.

³² As noted in Chapter 12 on the liturgy, this rite, according to traditional criteria, still retains its validity. However, the indult in no way guarantees that the priest who offers it is properly ordained. The reader is referred to essays on the New Mass on my web page (coomaraswamy-cathoic-writings.com).

³³ The Indult actually requires that those who take advantage of it sign a statement to this effect. Despite the fact that this is not “enforced,” those who take advantage of the Indult implicitly accept its obligations.

³⁴ Archbishop Lefebvre’s position is highly untenable. One cannot recognize John Paul II as a valid Pope, the *in se* validity of all the new sacraments, the authority of the New Code of Canon law, the possibility of interpreting Vatican II in accordance with tradition, and then refuse obedience. Thus it is understandable that many of his followers abandoned his cause. The post-Conciliar Church was of course delighted and established the Society of St. Peter to accommodate these men.

CHAPTER 11

VATICAN II

Any Council called to make drastic change in the Church is beforehand decreed to be void and annulled.

Pius II, *Execrabilis*

THE NATURE OF AN ECUMENICAL COUNCIL

Before considering Vatican II in detail, it is necessary to understand just what an Ecumenical or General Council is. It is, as Hubert Jedin defined it in 1960:

An assembly of Bishops and other specified persons invested with jurisdiction, convoked by the Pope and presided over by him, for the purpose of formulating decisions on questions of the Christian Faith, or Ecclesiastical discipline. These decisions, however, require papal confirmation to assure the proclamation of the Faith by delimiting the Catholic doctrine from contemporary errors. There have been councils which issued no disciplinary canons, but none at which some error was not rejected.¹

The first point to be made is that the term “Ecumenical” means “universal” (i.e., the gathering of Catholic bishops from all over the world), and has nothing to do with the potentially common activities or relationships of different religions. There have been some 20 Ecumenical Councils since Christ established His church on earth. Vatican II, supposedly the 21st, differed from its predecessors in several ways. It was the first to invite non-Catholic “observers” to participate in its proceedings.² It was the first Council to be declared “pastoral” rather than “dogmatic.”³ It was the first council that seemingly neither delimited Catholic doctrine from contemporary errors, nor issued disciplinary canons.⁴ It was the first such Council to reform, not the Church “in its head and members,” but the Church itself. And most important of all, it was the first such Council to depart from the teaching of previous Councils, and indeed, from the traditional teaching of the Church’s Magisterium. So much was this the case that Cardinal Suenens described it as “the French Revolution in the Church” and Yves Congar likened it to the October Revolution (1917) in Russia.⁵

IS VATICAN II BINDING ON THE CATHOLIC CONSCIENCE?

Prior to the stamp of papal approval, a council has no authority whatsoever. Once this has occurred however, Conciliar statements become part of the teaching Magisterium. It matters little as to whether their contents are classified as “extraordinary” or “ordinary,” for in either case, they must be believed with “divine and Catholic faith.”

Considerable confusion has arisen with regard to Vatican II because of its “pastoral” nature. Ursula Oxfort opines that insofar as John XXIII was deluded as to the “spirit” which induced him to convene the Council, the resulting documents are without authority.⁶ Others, like Fr. J. Saenz y Arriaga, hold that the election of Paul VI was totally invalid, and hence the promulgation of the Conciliar documents is in no way part of the Church’s Magisterium.⁷ Cardinal Felici, former secretary for the Curia and Secretary-General of the council stated that the documents of the Council are *de jure*, and not *de fide*.⁸ Presumably this means that we have to obey and act in accord with the Council’s teaching, but have no obligation to believe them true. Michael Davies, in the face of what he knows to be clear-cut changes in the teaching of the Church, states that “the Council comes within the category of the Church’s Ordinary Magisterium which can contain error in the case of a novelty which conflicts with previous teaching,” a statement which is both innovative and self contradictory.⁹ These represent but “theological opinions,” and those who accept the post-Conciliar “Popes” must turn to them for definitive answers.

All the post-Conciliar “Popes” have stated that the Council was guided by the Holy Spirit. Paul VI, in closing the Council stated that “the teaching authority of the Church, even though not wishing to issue extraordinary dogmatic pronouncements, has made thoroughly known its authoritative teaching.” Still later he stated that the Council “avoided proclaiming in an extraordinary manner dogmas endowed with the note of infallibility” but that it conferred on its teachings “the value of the supreme ordinary Magisterium” (Speech of Jan 12, 1966), and that “it has as much authority and far greater importance than the Council of Nicaea.” Elsewhere he has called it “the greatest of Councils,” and “even greater than the Council of Trent.”¹⁰ Perhaps the most clear-cut statement is to be found in a letter to Archbishop Lefebvre demanding his submission to the post-Conciliar Church:

You have no right any more to bring up the distinction between the doctrinal and the pastoral that you use to support your acceptance of certain texts of Vatican Council II and your rejection of others. It is true that the matters decided in any Council do not all call for an assent of the same quality; only

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

what the Council affirms in its “definitions” as a truth of Faith or as bound up with Faith requires the assent of Faith. Nevertheless, the rest also form a part of the Solemn Magisterium of the Church, to be trustingly accepted and sincerely put into practice by every Catholic.¹¹

It is clear then that Paul VI considers the Council as binding on the Catholic conscience, and as having no less authority than any of the previous 20 Councils called Ecumenical. To state that it is part of the Solemn Magisterium is to give it the highest possible authority. However, if it is only the “supreme form of the ordinary Magisterium,” it is equally binding upon the post-Conciliar Catholic conscience.¹²

John Paul II has expressed his full agreement with Paul VI, whom he considers as his “spiritual father,” and has further stated that the Council was “inspired by the Holy Spirit,” and that “obedience to the Council is obedience to the Holy Spirit.”¹³ Still elsewhere he has stated that the Council is “the authentic teaching of the Church.” Clearly in his eyes to refuse to give our assent to the Council is equivalent to “sinning against the Holy Ghost.” Others have stated that the Council is heretical and therefore not to be accepted.

Archbishop Lefebvre believes the Council was convened according to “accepted norms” of the Church (*The Remnant*, March 17, 1977), and is willing to accept the documents of Vatican II provided they are interpreted “in the light of tradition.” Paul VI once again was correct in telling Archbishop Lefebvre that it was the function of the Pope to determine what was and what wasn’t “in the light of Tradition,” and that when he, Lefebvre, or anyone else attempted to do this, they were usurping papal authority. Interestingly enough, John Paul II is also willing to accept this “limitation.” To quote him directly: “What the Holy Spirit says to the Church by the Council . . . He says at the same time in full harmony with Tradition and according to what is required by the ‘signs of the times.’ . . . The Church of Vatican II, of Vatican I, of the Council of Trent, and of the earlier Councils is one and the same Church.”¹⁴ The problem is that everyone seems to disagree as to just what “the light of Tradition” is.¹⁵ The phrase is found in the Vatican II document on the liturgy where it states that “the Council also desires . . . the rites to be carefully and thoroughly revised *in the light of sound Tradition*, and that they be given new vigor to meet the circumstances and needs of modern times”! And as we all know, the end result of the application of this principle was the *Novus Ordo Missae*, or New Mass.

“In the light of Tradition.” Strictly speaking, only a Pope can do this, and Paul VI told those who resisted the changes introduced by the Council that it was necessary “to break with the habitual attachment of what we used to designate as the unchangeable Tradition of the Church.” If Vatican

II represents a break with Tradition, a departure from Tradition, then it is difficult to see how it can be interpreted in the light of Tradition. If Vatican II contains errors—let the reader decide for himself after finishing this chapter—the only response of a Church which is concerned with preserving the truth, is to condemn and reject it. The whole idea of accepting Vatican II in the light of Tradition begs the issue. It allows the Lefebvreites to “pick and choose” while salving their guilty consciences, and leaves the post-Conciliar “pastors” free to promulgate their revolution.

How then are we to find our way in this confusing welter of freely given advice? For those who believe the post-Conciliar “Popes” are orthodox and who accept their authority, the answer is clear. These “Popes” clearly believe that the Documents of Vatican II are both inspired by the Holy Ghost, and are part of the Solemn Magisterium; hence, despite their “pastoral” character, they are binding on the post-Conciliar Catholic conscience. For those who refuse to accept the legitimacy of these “Popes,” there is also no problem. The Council and all the changes that followed in its train are simply to be rejected. Between these two extremes however, and leaving aside those who follow the “new orientations” without any serious thought, there is a whole spectrum of opinion best characterized by the acceptance of the authority of these “Popes” and a refusal to follow them when they act or teach against Tradition. Unfortunately these individuals (characterized as “conservative *Novus Ordo* Catholics”) are placed in the position of deciding for themselves just what is traditional and what is not. Since such decisions normally reside only in a Pope, it can be said of them that “every man is his own Pope.”¹⁶ The inevitable result is still more confusion. Be this as it may, almost everyone agrees that the fruits of the Council have been rotten.

THE COUNCIL ITSELF

As to the documents themselves, there are sixteen of these, and all sixteen are considered to be “established synodally”—that is to say, agreed upon by the majority of the Fathers present at the Council. These sixteen documents are entitled “Constitutions,” “Decrees,” and “Declarations”—distinctions which in the practical order are meaningless. Despite the “pastoral” nature of the Council, two of these are labeled “dogmatic.” In total they number some 739 pages of fine print and reading through them requires, as Fr. Houghton has remarked, “a sufficient supply of anti-soporifics.” (Vatican I runs to 42 pages of large print, and the Council of Trent to 179 pages.)¹⁷ Their tone is “prolix in the extreme” and as Michael Davies states, “much

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

of their content consists of little more than long series of the most banal truisms imaginable.”¹⁸

Yet the Council is important, for it introduced into the bosom of the Church a whole host of “new directions” that are bearing fruit in our days. As Fr. Avery Dulles said:

Vatican II adopted a number of positions which had been enunciated by the Reformation Churches, e.g., the primacy of Scripture, the supernatural efficacy of the preached word, the priesthood of the laity, and the vernacular liturgy.¹⁹

Cardinal Ratzinger, the present “Pope” Benedict XVI, says much the same: *Gaudium et spes* is “a revision of the *Syllabus* of Pius IX, a kind of *counter-syllabus*” which “represents, on the part of the Church, an attempt at an official reconciliation with the new era inaugurated in 1789.” In the same work he stated, “there can be no return to the *Syllabus*, which may have marked the first stage in the confrontation with liberalism, but cannot be the last stage.”²⁰

Cardinal Willebrands, Paul VI’s legate to the World Lutheran Assembly at Evian, stated in July of 1970 that:

Has not the Second Vatican Council itself welcomed certain demands which, among others, were expressed by Luther, and through which many aspects of the Christian Faith are better expressed today than formerly? Luther gave his age a quite extraordinary lead in theology and the Christian life.

And Cardinal Suenens tells us that:

It is possible to draw up an impressive list of theses which Rome has taught in the past and up until yesterday as being the only ones, and which the Council Fathers have thrown out (May 15, 1969).

Cardinal Suenens, who, as we have mentioned, likened Vatican II to a “French Revolution in the Church,” also told us that the Council was only “a stage, and not a terminus.” Those who would dismiss this dismal projection as rhetoric would do well to listen to Paul VI who said that “the Conciliar Decrees are not so much a destination as a point of departure towards new goals. . . . The seeds of life planted by the Council in the soil of the Church must grow and achieve full maturity.”²¹ The point is important because John Paul II considered “the coherent realization of the teaching and directives of the Second Vatican Council . . . to be the principal task of this [his] pontificate.”²²

“A point of departure towards new goals”! According to British analyst William McSweeney, the impact of the Council on the Church “was to carry forward the most fundamental reappraisal of its doctrine, liturgy, and relationship to the world in its 2000-year history.” Schillebeeckx prepared a list of Council actions that he considered to be significant innovations. His list totaled sixty-eight items and covered the liturgy, the Church, Revelation, bishops and priests, the laity, non-Catholics, freedom of conscience, and religious institutes.

Let us not forget that almost all the changes in the post-Conciliar Church are either “blamed” on the Council, or said to derive from it as a “mandate from the Holy Spirit.” Conservative *Novus Ordo* Catholics who object to the drastic changes call them “abuses” that result from the “misinterpretation” of Conciliar teachings. They point to many fine and orthodox statements in support of their contention. Those on the other hand who are at the forefront of the Revolution—the liberal post-Conciliar Catholics—can justify almost anything they wish by recourse to the same documents. The much-debated issue as to whether the Council is only an “excuse” or in fact the “source” of the “auto-demolition” of the Church is entirely beside the point. Whatever the case may be, as the Abbé of Nantes has pointed out: “There is not a heresiarch today, not a single apostate who does not now appeal to the Council in carrying out his action in broad daylight with full impunity as recognized pastor and master” (*Catholic Counter Reformation*, May 1980). Even the Council’s apologist, Michael Davies, tells us that “no rational person can deny that up to the present Vatican II has produced no good fruit”²³

HOW THE COUNCIL WAS SUBVERTED

None of the modernist ideation introduced by means of the Council into the bosom of the Church was new. These ideas, the gestalt of the modern world, had been around for centuries, and in fact had been repeatedly condemned by the traditional Church in such documents as *Mirari vos*, *The Syllabus of Errors* of Pius IX, and the encyclical *Pascendi* of Pius X. Over the past century however, they had gained an increased momentum and had, as it were, permeated the seminaries, and thus the minds of increasing numbers of clergy. In the course of time many of these rose to positions of authority. (In Chapter 8 on Obedience, it is shown how this fits in with the plans of the *Alta Vendita* of the Freemasons.)

Sufficient documentation is available for us to reconstruct the events at the Council. One of the best of these is Fr. Wiltgen’s *The Rhine Flows into*

the Tiber, an analogy for the modernist German theologians flowing into conservative Rome. Fr. Wiltgen was the “International Publicity Director in Rome” for the Council, and was the founder during the Council of “an independent and multilingual council News Service.”²⁴ As such he had excellent access to the material he reports in his book—and insofar as he approved of what the Council achieved, his text becomes a valuable source of information. His information, moreover, is confirmed by numerous other sources. We have as a result, a “play by play” description of how the “liberal” theologians captured the Council. What was proclaimed by the world press as a “spontaneous outbreak of liberal sentiment,” was in fact, as several authors have pointed out, part of a pre-determined plan to subvert the Council.

We have already called attention to the role that John XXIII played in setting the stage. The Curia had for two years been preparing a series of orthodox “schemas” for discussion. Most of the Fathers (some 2,800 bishops or their equivalent) were not well read theologians. Many were skilled administrators and came to the Council “psychologically unprepared” (Cardinal Heenan) and “feeling their way” (Bishop Lucey). They brought with them *periti*, or “experts,” who were to assist them on theological matters, *periti* who were almost to a man modernist in outlook. Other “hierarchies came to the Council knowing what they wanted and having prepared a way to get it” (Bishop Lucey).²⁵ The takeover was surprisingly easy. As Cardinal Heenan stated, “the first General Congregation had scarcely begun when the [modernist] northern bishops went into action.”²⁶ Brian Kaiser tells us “Cardinals Suenens, Alfrink, Frings, Doepfner, Koenig, Lienart, and Bea conferred by phone” the night before the opening session, and received assurances from John XXIII that their plan had his approval.²⁷ Within fifteen minutes of the opening of the first session, the years of preparatory work (the Schemas prepared by the Curia) and the suggested list of individuals for the various commissions (traditional Curial members) were thrown out. This was called by several “The First Victory” of the “European Alliance,” and was quite correctly characterized in the newspapers as “Bishops in Revolt.”²⁸ The Marxist journal *Il Paese* openly stated that “the Devil has entered the Council.” What followed has been described as a “Blitzkrieg” (Michael Davies) and a “demolition exercise” (Henri Fesquet).²⁹ It was only a matter of time and maneuver before the liberal element took over the ten commissions that controlled the various new schemas presented for voting. The “Council Presidency” established by Roncalli was helpless, which was of course as he intended. Instead of intervening on the side of “tradition,” he allowed things to proceed exactly as he wished, only intervening when it was necessary to support the “democratic forces.”³⁰

Initially, any individual Father could rise to voice objection to the statements of the various new schemas. Soon, this was limited to ten minutes.³¹ As opposition gathered to the modernist clique, those in control required that five Fathers had to agree and speak in conjunction before they would be recognized by the chair. Before long the number was raised to 70! Soon, all objections had to be submitted in writing to the various commissions which in turn allowed for considerable behind-the-scene machinations and suppression or “re-wording” of those objections that could not be ignored.³² A petition signed by over 400 Fathers requesting the condemnation of communism was simply and conveniently lost. Complaints made directly to the Pope were ignored, and on occasion the Pope directly intervened to force through a given vote. Both the press and the various liberal organizations within and without the Church carried on heavy propaganda in favor of the “liberalizing” of the Church. Cardinal Frings and Lienart and the members of the “Northern Alliance” were the “good guys,” while Cardinal Ottaviani and the conservative members of the Curia were the “villains” standing “in the way of progress.” As mentioned, the majority of the Fathers present were Church dignitaries rather than theologians and hence were heavily dependent upon the *periti* or experts who were almost invariably in the neo-modernist camp. A list of these *periti* would include almost all the heretical theologians of the post-Conciliar Church, such men as Charles Davis, Hans Küng, Gregory Baum, Edward Schillebeeckx, Bernard Haring, Yves Congar, Karl Rahner, and René Laurentin. Adequate time was frequently not given for proper discussion of the issues, and many of the Fathers admitted to having voted along with the majority without even having read the schemas or amendments in question at all. As Dr. Moorman, leader of the Anglican delegation has stated: “There was a very real division among the Fathers, a deep feeling that two big forces were coming to grips and that this was not just a clash of opinions, but of policies and even of moralities.”³³ Archbishop Lefebvre, looking back over the early sessions, noted that “the Council was under siege by the progressive forces from its very first day. We felt it, we sensed it. . . . We were convinced that something irregular was happening.”³⁴ But as we have pointed out, the traditional forces were “psychologically unprepared,” and the liberal forces “came to the Council knowing what they wanted and having prepared a way to get it.” Things were pushed along very rapidly, and it was only towards the end of the Council that the orthodox Fathers were able to get organized. By the time the *Coetus Internationalis Patrum* became a cohesive force, it was far too late.

THE USE OF AMBIGUITY

Only one major problem remained for the liberals who had captured the Council. They had to express their views in a manner that was not clearly and overtly heretical. (This would have created much stronger opposition and resistance.) The solution was the ambiguous statement. As Cardinal Heenan stated: "The framing of amendments for the vote of the Fathers was the most delicate part of the commission's work. A determined group could wear down the opposition and produce a formula patent of both an orthodox and modernistic interpretation."³⁵ Whenever protests were raised against such tactics, the objector was informed that the Council was "pastoral" and not "dogmatic." What resulted has been described by Archbishop Lefebvre as "a conglomeration of ambiguities, inexactitudes, vaguely expressed feelings, terms susceptible of any interpretation and opening wide of all doors."³⁶ There are of course many statements in the documents that appear good, for it is characteristic of heresy that it comes cloaked in the garb of orthodoxy. The documents themselves are prolix, full of vague phraseology and psychologisms. Terms are frequently used (such as "salvation history")³⁷ that are capable of multiple interpretations. Statements made in one paragraph are qualified several paragraphs later so that multiple interpretations and quoting out of context become possible. In fairness to the liberals, some of the *periti*, such as Yves Congar and Schillebeeckx, disapproved of such methods and wished to state the liberal viewpoint openly and clearly. They were, of course, overruled. Lest the reader feel that this opinion is unjust, I shall quote Professor O. Cullmann, one of the most distinguished Protestant "observers" at the Council:

The definitive texts are for the most part compromise texts. On far too many occasions they juxtapose opposing viewpoints without establishing any genuine internal link between them. Thus every affirmation of the power of bishops is accompanied in a manner which is almost tedious by the insistence upon the authority of the Pope. . . . This is the reason why, even while accepting that these are compromise texts, I do not share the pessimism of those who subscribe to the slogan that "Nothing good will come out of the Council!" All the texts are formulated in such a manner that no door is closed and that they will not present any future obstacle to discussions among Catholics or dialogue with non-Catholics, as was the case with the dogmatic decisions of previous Councils.³⁸

Ambiguity and "double-speak" has always been the refuge of the scoundrel who wishes to lie, not only to his neighbor, but to himself. How does a naughty child respond to an accusing parent from whom he wishes

to hide the truth while not clearly telling a lie? He equivocates. He departs from the Scriptural injunction to “say yea for yea and nay for nay.” The modernist has basically lost his faith in Revelation, and if he wishes to remain within the visible Church, he must either change the meaning of certain words, or else change the words so that they mean one thing to him and another to the faithful. Thus, as one modernist put it, “one learns the use of double meaning, the tortuously complex sentence and paragraphs which conceal meaning rather than reveal it.” The existential theologian has a positive dislike for clarity. As Fr. Daley said of Tyrrell: “He believed that clearness was a snare for the unwary, and that snare was avoided as long as one distrusts clearness and recognizes it as a note of inadequacy.” Pius X, in his encyclical *Pascendi* noted that the writings of the modernist clique appear “tentative and vague,” while those of the Church are always “firm and constant.” He further said: “It is one of the cleverest devices of the modernists (as they are commonly and rightly called) to present their doctrines without order and systemic arrangement, in a scattered and disjointed manner, so as to make it appear as if their minds were in doubt or hesitation, whereas in reality they are quite fixed and steadfast.”

It is, then, the ambiguity of the Conciliar statements which allows for any interpretation one wishes. Yet despite this, when one reads the documents as a whole, one finds there is a certain “animus” or spirit which is “offensive to pious ears.” There is, as Cardinal Suenens has said, “an internal logic in Vatican II which in several cases has been grasped and acted on, showing in everyday practice the priority of life over law. The spirit behind the texts was stronger than the words themselves.”³⁹ It is this undercurrent that has flowed forth as “the Spirit of Vatican II,” a “spirit” that accepts almost all the modernist concepts such as “progress,” “dynamic evolution,” and “universalism.”⁴⁰ Conservative *Novus Ordo* Catholics who deny that such a spirit exists would do well to consider the statement of John Paul II to the effect that it was his “firm will to go forward on the way of unity in the spirit of the second Vatican Council” (inauguration ceremony of his pontificate).

THE “ANIMUS” OF VATICAN II

In order to understand the real nature of Vatican II the reader must recognize that what occurred was not a “debate” between conservative and liberal factions of the Church—as if there is a spectrum of opinion from which the faithful can choose—but rather a fight between those who felt it was their obligation to preserve intact the entire “Deposit of the Faith”

and those who were bent on adapting Christianity to the contemporary world; a battle waged between those who see the Roman Catholic Church as the “visible” Church founded by Christ, and therefore a Church that was entitled to certain privileges (whether the world accorded them to her or not), and those who dreamt of a “union” of all “men of good will”; of those who thought the Church possessed the “fullness of the truth” and those who thought “Christians were joined with the rest of men in the search for truth.” The Church of All Times lost this battle at the Council, but the fight still continues, sometimes in minor skirmishes, and sometimes in open warfare. Scripture informs us that the final outcome can be anticipated. There will be a “great apostasy,” but “the Gates of Hell will not prevail.”

The remainder of this chapter will be divided into two sections. First, we will give a series of quotations from documents of sufficient length as to make the accusation—of having taken them out of context—implausible. We shall then string together a selected series of Conciliar statements in conjunction with their interpretative understanding by the post-Conciliar “pontiffs.” It is this that will provide us with the clearest insight into their import.

THE DOCUMENTS THEMSELVES

Space does not allow us to sample the entire corpus of Vatican II in detail, and hence particular attention will be given to the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (identified as Ch.), and the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (identified as Eccl.), both considered by Paul VI and John Paul II as fundamental documents. With regard to the former document, it was primarily the work of John Paul II.

The human race has passed from a rather static concept of reality to a more dynamic, evolutionary one (Ch. 5).

To a certain extent the human intellect is also broadening its dominion over time: over the past by means of historical knowledge; over the future by the art of projecting and by planning. Advances in biology, psychology, and the social sciences not only bring men hope of improved self knowledge (Ch. 5).

This characteristic of universality which adorns the People of God is a gift from the Lord Himself. By reason of it, the Catholic Church strives energetically and constantly to bring all humanity with all its riches back to Christ its Head in the unity of His Spirit. . . . All men are called to be part

Vatican II

of this Catholic unity of the People of God, a unity which is the harbinger of the universal peace it promotes. And there belong to it or are related to it in various ways, the Catholic faithful as well as all who believe in Christ, and indeed the whole of mankind. For all men are called to salvation by the Grace of God (Eccl. 13).

Every type of discrimination, whether social or cultural, whether based on sex, race, color, social condition, language, or religion, is to be overcome and eradicated as contrary to God's intent (Ch. 29).

Moreover, in virtue of her mission and nature, she [the Church] is bound to no particular form of human culture, nor to any political, economic, or social system. . . . For this reason the Church admonishes her own sons, but also humanity as a whole, to overcome all strife between nations and races in this family spirit of God's children (Ch. 42).

Thanks to the experience of past ages, the progress of the sciences, and the treasures hidden in the various forms of human culture, the nature of man himself is more clearly revealed and new roads to truth are opened (Ch. 42).

It is a fact bearing on the very person of man that he can come to an authentic and full humanity only through culture, that is, through the cultivation of natural goods and values. Wherever human life is involved, therefore, nature and culture are quite intimately connected (Ch. 53).

In every group or nation, there is an ever-increasing number of men and women who are conscious that they themselves are the artisans and the authors of the culture of their community. Thus we are witnesses to the birth of a new humanism, one in which man is defined first of all by his responsibility towards his brothers and towards history (Ch. 55).

The culture of today possesses particular characteristics. For example, the so-called exact sciences sharpen critical judgment to a very fine edge. Recent psychological research explains human activity more profoundly. Historical studies make a signal contribution to bringing men to see things in their changeable and evolutionary aspects. . . . Thus little by little, a more universal form of human culture is developing, one which will promote and express the unity of the human race to the degree that it preserves the particular features of different cultures (Ch. 54).

Man's social nature makes it evident that the progress of the human person and the advance of society itself hinge on each other. From the beginning,

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

the subject and goal of all social institutions is and must be the human person, which for its part and by its very nature stands completely in need of social life. . . . This social life is not something added on to man. Hence through his dealings with others, through reciprocal duties, and through fraternal dialogue, he develops all his gifts and is able to rise to his destiny (Ch. 25).

Thus, through her individual members and her whole community, the church believes she can contribute greatly towards making the family of man and its history more human. In addition, the Catholic Church gladly holds in high esteem the things which other Christian Churches or Ecclesiastical communities have done or are doing cooperatively by way of achieving the same goal (Ch. 40).

It has pleased God to make men holy and save them not merely as individuals without any mutual bonds, but by making them into a single people, a people which acknowledges Him in truth and serves Him in holiness. So from the beginning of salvation history He has chosen men not just as individuals, but as members of a certain community. God called these chosen ones "His People." . . . This communitarian character is developed and consummated in the work of Jesus Christ (Ch. 32).

The Church further recognizes that worthy elements are found in today's social movements, especially in an evolution towards unity, a process of wholesome socialization, and of association in civic and economic realms. For the promotion of unity belongs to the innermost nature of the Church, since she is, by her relationship with Christ, both a sacramental sign and an instrument of intimate union with God and the unity of all mankind (Ch. 42).

Because the human race today is joined more and more in civic, economic, and social unity, it is much more necessary that priests, united in concern and effort under the leadership of the bishops and the Supreme Pontiff, wipe out every ground of division, so that the whole human race may be brought into the unity of the family of God (Ch. 43).

Let them blend modern science and its theories and the understanding of the most recent discoveries with Christian morality and doctrine. Thus their religious practice and morality can keep pace with their scientific knowledge and an ever-advancing technology (Ch. 62).

Such then is a potpourri of statements drawn from the solemn teaching Magisterium of the post-Conciliar Church. It is these ideas which its

members must “religiously observe” and to which they must give their intellectual assent. But what evidence is there for the claim that “the human race has passed from a rather static concept of reality to a more dynamic one”? And what of this “new humanism,” of whose birth we are the witnesses, and which is defined “first of all by man’s responsibility towards his brothers and history,” rather than towards God? And since when does man “rise to his destiny through reciprocal duties and fraternal dialogue”? Where in Scripture does it tell us we are saved as members of a community rather than as individuals? Since when has it been the Church’s function to make “the family of man more human”? And what is all this talk of “unity,” “the process of wholesome socialization” that “belongs to the innermost nature of the Church” and which permits—nay, advocates—the “wiping out of every ground of division” which might impede it? For the Church to state that she is “tied to no political, social, or economic structure” is for her to state that she can live with any political, social, or economic structure in the world today, including communism. And how can the Church proclaim that all discrimination with regard to matters of religion should “be eradicated”? Surely, if she believes she is the true religion, she cannot fail to discriminate between herself and other false religions. And what is all this nonsense about “adapting our morality and religious practice to the discoveries of modern science”—as if these themselves are not always in a state of flux. All this is a far cry from the Church of our forefathers.

No wonder that the Protestant observer Dr. McAfee Brown said that “there are even occasional hints that the Council Fathers have listened to the gospel of Marx as well as the Gospel of Mark.” Truly, as Fr. Campion, *periti* and translator of this document states: “Theological ‘aggiornamento’ means more than a rephrasing of conventional theological teaching in contemporary terminology.”⁴¹ Archbishop Lefebvre and Michael Davies refer to these and similar passages as “time bombs.” They are in fact much more; they are unequivocal proof that the faithful—and not only the faithful, but humanity itself—were “sold out” at the Council. It will take an intellectual agility well beyond the capacity of most people to interpret such statements “in the light of Tradition.” Any one wishing to understand what has happened to the Church in our times would do well to study these documents with care. As the Abbé of Nantes said, these documents provide “a vast launching pad for . . . the subversive operations” of the modernists (*Catholic Counter Reformation*, May, 1980).

VATICAN II—THE CREATION OF A NEW CHURCH

Isolated quotations do not provide us with a complete picture. In order to understand the Council's goals, and achievements, it is necessary to provide quotations from various parts of the documents along with their authoritative interpretations by the post-Conciliar "pontiffs." We shall do this under four headings: 1) The New Orientations—seeing history and the world in a different light; 2) The New Church—how the post-Conciliar Church sees itself; 3) A New Understanding of the Nature of Man; and 4) Why a Church at All? The Teilhardian synthesis and the post-Conciliar utopia.

1) THE NEW ORIENTATIONS—SEEING HISTORY AND THE WORLD IN A DIFFERENT LIGHT

The traditional doctrinal formulations were forged in the light of a general worldview that has by now become obsolete; an unconditional allegiance to any single view of the universe, such as the Christian, seems to demand, impresses the modern mind as fanatical and unscientific. . . . The claim that some privileged source . . . contains the totality of saving truth is likewise distasteful. . . . The assertion that Divine Revelation was complete in the first century of our era seems completely antithetical to the modern concept of progress.

Avery Dulles, S.J., *Doctrines do Grow*

Founded on a "rock," the Church has always been considered as a monolithic, stable, and unchanging institution—one that existed and functioned in *saecula saeculorum*; that is, throughout all ages past, present, and future. She saw herself as a "perfect society," as a divine institution established by Christ. Distinguishing this Church from the inevitable failings of its members (for who of us can live up to Christ?) there was neither need for change, nor room for improvement. (Its members needed change and improvement, but not the Church itself.)

The traditional Church has always been happy to use the discoveries of science for good ends, and indeed, many of these are the result of Catholic efforts. She is not against "progress," if by this one means better mousetraps and ice boxes. But progress as usually understood, implies that man himself is improving, becoming more civilized, more intelligent, and more advanced with each passing generation. This kind of progress is an illusion which the Church has always eschewed. The idea that man himself can and has progressed is the very negation of his celestial origin and destiny.

It denies that his intrinsic nature is fixed, that he is made in the image of God, and that he has sustained the wound of Adam's sin. It further denies the perfection of the Patriarchs, the Holy Family, and the Saints. As for evolution, she has always held that creation *ex nihilo* was *de fide*. In the words of Vatican I: "if anyone does not admit the world and everything in it, both spiritual and material, have been produced in their entire substance by God out of nothing—*ex nihilo*—let him be anathema." But evolution as a limited biological possibility (so-called "micro-evolution") is one thing; evolution as applied to mankind or truth is quite another. As Pope Pius XII said some 55 years ago: "These false evolutionary notions with their denial of all that is fixed or abiding in human experience, have paved the way for a new philosophy of error" (*Humani generis*). The traditional outlook saw these two pseudo-concepts of "progress" and "evolution" as the "opiates of the people," always promising them an unrealizable earthly utopia in the future while deflecting their attention from the present. No longer the command to be "perfect as our Father in Heaven is perfect," but rather the illusion that progress and evolution, thanks to science, will produce a world so perfect that man will no longer have to strive to be good.

Gaudium et spes starts with a long tale of changes affecting mankind, the perpetual justification for innovation. Everything changes, the world, time,—but especially Man who is described as participating in a perpetual "progression." John XXIII believed there had been "a real progress of humankind's collective moral awareness through always deeper discovery of its dignity . . . and that Divine Providence was leading us to a new order of human relations" Vatican II proceeded to make this principle magisterial. "The human race has passed from a rather static concept of reality to a more dynamic, evolutionary one. . . . Historical studies make a signal contribution to bringing men to see things in their changeable and evolutionary aspects. . . . Man's social nature makes it evident that the progress of the human person and the advance of society itself hinge on each other. . . . Citizens have the right and duty . . . to contribute to the true progress of their community. . . . Developing nations should strongly desire to seek the complete human fulfillment of their citizens in the explicit and fixed goal of progress. . . . May the faithful therefore, live in very close union with the men of their time. Let them strive to understand perfectly their way of thinking and feeling, as expressed in their culture. Let them blend modern science and its theories and the understanding of the most recent discoveries with Christian morality and doctrine. Thus their religious practice and morality can keep pace with their scientific knowledge and with an ever-advancing technology" (All from Ch. or Eccl.). For those who may still doubt, let me quote again from John Paul II's speech at Puebla:

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

“In these past ten years (since the Council) how much progress humanity has made, and with humanity and at its service, how much progress the Church has made.”

Not only progress, but evolution. John Paul II has magisterially told us that “all the observations concerning the development of life lead to a conclusion: the evolution of living beings of which science seeks to determine the stages and to determine the mechanism, presents an internal finality . . . a finality which directs beings in a direction for which they are not responsible or in charge.” An editorial in *L'Osservatore Romano* attributed to John Paul II was even more specific: “No one today any longer believes in Tradition, but rather in rational progress. Tradition today appears as something that has been bypassed by history. Progress on the other hand presents itself as an authentic promise inborn in the very soul of man.”

If evolution and progress are true; if, as the Council teaches, “the human race has passed from a rather static concept of reality to a more dynamic and evolutionary one,” then it follows that the world has changed since the time of Christ, and logically, if the Church is to survive, it must also change. Paul VI, in discussing the Council, expressed this clearly: “If the world changes religion should also change. . . . The order to which Christianity tends is not static, but an order in continual evolution towards a higher form” (*Dialogues, Reflections on God and Man*). If the Church is evolving, so also are her doctrines. And so the Council teaches that “as the centuries succeed one another, the Church constantly moves forward towards the fullness of Divine Truth until the words of God reach their fulfillment in her.” Elsewhere she assures us that “new roads to truth are opened.” The statement is quite extraordinary insofar as the Church has always taught that the revelation given us by Christ and the Apostles was final and definitive, and to that body of revealed truth nothing has been, or ever will be, added. One must, of course, distinguish between the legitimate development of a doctrine—its being made more explicit and explained in clearer ways—and the evolution of a doctrine—which implies some form of transformation or change in its intrinsic nature. Thus, as we will show, the doctrine on religious liberty as taught by Vatican II can never be considered a “development” of previous teaching, but only as an “evolution” into something new—a kind of “ongoing revelation.” And as innumerable post-Conciliar theologians have noted, the Council, while not using the phrase, embraced the concept in principle. And why not, when Paul VI teaches:

[The New Church] seeks to adapt itself to the languages, to the customs, and to the inclinations of the men of our times, men completely engrossed in the rapidity of material evolution and similar necessities of their individual

Vatican II

circumstances. This “openness” is of the very essence of the [new] Church. The restrictions of orthodoxy do not coincide with pastoral charity (Talk given in Milan when he was a cardinal).

All this involved a new orientation towards the world itself. The traditional Church taught us to be in the world, but not to “love it.” The Apostle John instructed us: “Love not the world, nor the things that are in the world. If any man loves the world the charity of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world is the concupiscence of the flesh and the concupiscence of the eyes and the pride of life, which is not of the Father but is of the world. And the world passeth away.” What thinking person does not realize that the world—the modern world—has walked away from all the Church has ever stood for? What then is the attitude of the New Church? John Paul II gives us the answer: “The Second Vatican Council laid the foundations for a substantially new relationship between the Church and world, between the Church and modern culture” (*Collegae*, Dec. 22, 1980). Paul VI was more specific: “We must never forget that the fundamental attitude of Catholics who wish to convert the world must be, first of all, to love the world, to love our times, to love our civilization, our technical achievements, and above all, to love the world. . . . The Council puts before us, a panoramic vision of the world; how can the Church, how can we, do other than behold this world and love it? The Council is a solemn act of love for mankind, love for men of today, whoever and wherever they may be, love for all” (Bodart, *La biologie et l’avenir de l’homme*).

John Paul II, following in the steps of his “spiritual father” (Paul VI), confirms this commitment: “The contemporary Church,” he tells us, “has a particular sensibility towards history, and wishes to be in every extension of the term, ‘the Church of the contemporary world’” (Talk to the Roman Curia, Dec 22, 1980).

Thus the Church of All Times has been changed into the Church of our times. A static Church has been changed into an evolutionary and progressive Church. It has even been given new titles—Paul VI called it “the Church of the Council” and Cardinal Benini “the post-Conciliar Church.” A true Council would have spoken of the role of the Church *in* the modern world; Vatican II created the Church *of* the modern world. John XXIII referred to the result as a “New Pentecost,” Paul VI called it an Epiphany and John Paul II speaks of a “New Advent”: “We find ourselves in a certain way in the midst of a new Advent, a time of expectation.” Vatican II provides “the foundation for ever more achievements of the people of God’s march towards the Promised Land in this state of history” (*Redemptor hominis*). Progress of course is never fixed, and so, once the Church accepts the principle of adapting itself to the modern world, it has committed itself

to a perpetual state of flux. This is what *aggiornamento* is all about. This is why the Grand Mufti in Paris invited Catholics who wished to be part of an unchanging religion to become Moslems.

This new orientation resulted in the need for the Church to accept a host of ideas it once considered inimical. The ideology of the modern world is not only evolutionary and progressive; it is also anthropocentric and secular. It envisions itself as dialectically passing from its present condition towards some utopian state in which all men will be united in a socialist structure where there will no longer be any suffering or want. Thus the new Church gladly witnesses to the “birth of a new humanism,” and welcomes “today’s social movements, especially in an evolution towards unity, a process of wholesome socialization” (Ch. 42). Indeed, she considers herself the “instrument” and “sacramental sign of this unity.” She is even willing to make her most precious possession—the Blessed Eucharist—a symbol of this unity.

But the world the Church wishes to embrace has no use for her. It has long ago deserted the bosom of the Father and gone off “into a far country” to seek its own fortune. It has no interest in being “saved,” much less in building up the Kingship of Christ. A Church which seeks to embrace the world’s values and to find a place for itself in the milieu of an “anti-Christian” society, must redefine itself in terms that are meaningful to that society. Paul VI gave us some idea of how this was to be achieved. “From the start the Council has propagated a wave of serenity and of optimism, a Christianity that is exciting and positive, loving life, mankind and earthly values . . . an intention of making Christianity acceptable and lovable, indulgent and open, free of mediaeval rigorism and of pessimistic understanding of man and his customs” (*Doc. Cath.* No. 1538). But the Church went further than this. She not only wished to make herself lovable, she wished to become the “servant of the world.” Having abdicated her spiritual leadership, she had no choice but to declare her desire to be of use “in service and fellowship.” Let us see how she does this.

2) THE NEW CHURCH—HOW THE POST-CONCILIAR CHURCH SEES ITSELF

The world has never been more alienated and more divided than in our times. Wars, famines, and disasters abound. Enormous numbers of people on every continent are being reduced to a state of destitution. Almost everyone sees the solution to this problem not in a return to Christian principles (if only on the socio-economic level), but in internationalizing

the world. Our shrinking planet must unite—must create a world in which the principles of the French Revolution—“Freedom, Equality, and Brotherhood”—will prevail. The New Church, “seeking to define Herself, to understand what it truly is,” finds in the fostering of this unity a veritable *raison d'être*. And thus it is that she “admonishes her sons, but also humanity as a whole, to overcome all strife between nations and races in this family spirit of God’s children.” And further, she tells her priests that they must, “under the leadership of the Bishops and the Supreme Pontiff,” work to “wipe out every ground of division . . . whether based on sex, race, color, social condition, language *or religion* . . . so that the whole human race may be brought into the unity of the family of God” (Ch. 43).

According to Giancarlo Zizola, John XXIII saw this unity as being achieved in three stages: unity of Christians; unity of all believers in God; and then unity of all men.⁴² We will show how this concept is developed by the Council, but first we must see how the Church developed a new concept of unity.

UNITY

Unity is a characteristic of the traditional Church. She is in fact defined as One: “One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic.” These four qualities are completely interdependent. Lose one and you lose them all. The Church is Holy because “she is without spot or wrinkle in her faith which admits of no sin of error against the revealed word of God.” She is called Catholic because her teachings not only extend across time and space, but because the term means “universal” and her truths apply throughout the entire universe, in Heaven, on earth and in Hell. She is called Apostolic because she teaches the same doctrines which the Apostles taught, and because she retains intact the Apostolic Succession, that “initiativ chain” which enables her to provide the sacraments. Finally, she is called One because she is united under one head, she agrees in one Faith, and she offers throughout her body one sacrifice. She is one because she is united with Christ who is One.

Let us be quite clear on what the traditional Church teaches. As a *de fide* statement of the Holy Office puts it:

That the Unity of the Church is absolute and indivisible, and that the Church has never lost its unity, nor ever can.

Pope Pius XII taught the same doctrine in affirming that “only those are to be accounted really members of the Church who have been regenerated

in the waters of baptism and profess the true Faith and have not cut themselves off from the structure of the body by their own unhappy act or been severed therefrom for a very grave crime, by the legitimate authority” (*Mystici corporis Christi*).⁴³

The Anglican convert Cardinal Henry Manning, faced with the Anglo-Catholic Ecumenical movement during the last century, expressed with precision the position of the Church:

We believe union to be a very precious gift, and only less precious than truth. . . . We are ready to purchase the reunion of our departed brethren at any cost less than the sacrifice of one jot of the supernatural order of unity and faith. . . . We can offer unity only on the condition on which we hold it—unconditional submission to the living and perpetual voice of the Church of God. It is contrary to charity to put a straw across the path of those who profess to desire union. But there is something more divine than union, that is the Faith. There is no unity possible except by the way of truth. Truth first, unity afterwards. Truth the cause, unity the effect. To invert this order is to overthrow the Divine procedure. The unity of Babel ended in confusion. To unite the Anglican, the Greek, and the Catholic Church in any conceivable way would only end in a Babel of tongues, intellects, and wills.

The Catholic Church then, by definition, has Unity. As Bishop John Milner said, “if we unite ourselves with the Anglo-Catholic Ecumenical Movement, the Universal Church would disunite itself from us.”

The post-Conciliar Church teaches differently. She claims that she has “lost her unity” and that the various divisions among Christians constitute a scandal which must be repaired. The Decree on Ecumenism is entitled *Unitatis redintegratio*, or the “restoring of unity.” Pope John XXIII established his extra-curial “Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity” and specified that Unity was the term—not reunion. The texts of the documents nowhere specify that the Church is already endowed with the charism of Unity. Many of the statements are vague and ambiguous such as “in all of Christ’s disciples the Spirit arouses the desire to be peacefully united” and “the Spirit guides the Church into the fullness of truth and gives her a unity of fellowship and service,” and “the union of the human family is greatly fortified and fulfilled by the unity, founded on Christ, of the family of God’s sons.” But it is quite specific in other places: “Promoting the restoration of unity among all Christians is one of the chief concerns of the Second Sacred Ecumenical Synod of the Vatican. . . . It is the goal of the Council . . . to nurture whatever can contribute to the unity of all who believe in Christ . . . This sacred Synod [is] . . . moved by a desire for the restoration of unity among all the followers of Christ.”

Vatican II

Many “followers of Christ” are a long way from being or accepting Catholicism. How are they to be united to the Church? Again, the Council provides the answer:

All those justified by faith through baptism are incorporated with Christ. They therefore have a right to be honored with the title of Christian, and are properly regarded as brothers in the Lord by the sons of the Catholic Church. . . . From her very beginnings there arose in this one and only Church of God certain rifts which the apostle strongly censures as damnable. But in subsequent centuries more widespread disagreements appeared and quite large communities became separated from full communion with the Catholic Church—developments for which, at times, men on both sides were to blame. However, one cannot impute the sin of separation to those who at present are born into these communities and are instilled therein with Christ’s faith. The Catholic Church accepts them with respect and affection as brothers; for men who believe in Christ and who have been properly baptized are brought into a certain though imperfect communion with the Catholic Church (*Decree on Ecumenism*).

We see then one possible solution. All who have been baptized are declared to be partially in union. Half or even one quarter Catholicism is acceptable. But this goes against the teaching of the Church. As St. Fulgentius said in post-Apostolic times: “Neither baptism, nor liberal alms, nor death itself can avail a man anything in the order of salvation, if he does not hold the unity of the Catholic Church” (*Ad Petrum Diaconum*). As for “justification through faith in Baptism,” this is pure Lutheranism, for Luther taught that “a Christian or baptized man cannot lose his salvation, even if he would, by sins, however numerous, unless he refuses to believe” (*The Babylonian Captivity*).

Despite these obvious problems, the Council proceeded to delineate yet another basis for its innovative concept of unity.

THE PEOPLE OF GOD

It is hard to recognize the Church, the people of God, as clearly being God’s people. The more vociferously they claim the title, the less Godlike seem their actions.

Fr. John McGoe, *Celibacy*

The term, as the Council admits, originally applied to the Jews of the Old Dispensation. And with justice the Council applies it to those, whether Greek or Jew, who accepted the New Dispensation. But now comes the

hitch. How are these people defined? Remember, Protestants claim not only to have accepted the New Dispensation, but to be the only ones to understand it properly. In the document *Lumen Gentium* one finds “the People of God” defined in a variety of ways. For example, as those who “believe in Christ . . . born of the living water and the Holy Spirit.” Such of course can be Catholic, but by no means excludes any of the most liberal Protestants. But let us go on. The same text tells us in a passage which John Paul II calls the “key to the entire thinking of the Council” that “All men are called to be part of this catholic unity of the People of God, a unity which is a harbinger of the universal peace it promotes. And there belong to it or are related to it in various ways, the Catholic faithful as well as all who believe in Christ, and indeed the whole of mankind. For all men are called to salvation by the Grace of God.” We are not yet finished, for the texts go on to specify that not only are Protestants and Jews related in some way to the People of God, but even those “who have not yet received the gospel.” And here we come to another key passage: “The Church is a kind of sacrament of intimate union with God and the unity of all mankind, that is, she is a sign and an instrument of such union and unity.” Indeed, according to the documents of Vatican II, “it is necessary that priests, united in concern and effort under the leadership of the bishops and the Supreme Pontiff, wipe out every ground of division so that the whole human race may be brought into the unity of the Family of God.” This is serious business, for as mentioned above, the Council instructs us that “every type of discrimination, whether social or cultural, whether based on sex, race, color, social condition, language, *or religion* is to be overcome and eradicated as contrary to God’s intent” (emphasis mine). We see here delineated by John XXIII three levels of unity, that of Christians, that of people who believe in God, and finally, all of mankind.

Lest it should be thought that I quote out of context, allow me to give John Paul II’s interpretation of these statements. Returning from a trip in Africa, graced with the blessings of the snake charming priestess, he referred to the teaching of *Lumen Gentium* and its enumeration of “the different categories that form the People of God.” He then proceeded to tell us that each of these was “full of the particular hope of salvation” and that this can be “accomplished equally outside the visible Church.” In a discourse given to the Roman Curia in 1981 he stated that “in these truly plenary gatherings, the Ecclesial communities of different countries make real the fundamental second chapter of *Lumen Gentium* which treats of the numerous ‘spheres’ of belonging to the Church as People of God and of the bond which exists with it, even on the part of those who do not yet form a part of it.” He further said that the objective of pastors is to “call together

the people of God according to different senses and different dimensions. In this calling together the Church recognizes herself and realizes herself.”

SALVATION OUTSIDE THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Here again the teaching of the traditional Church is clear. There is no salvation outside of the Catholic Church. She is the Ark of Salvation. “Only those are to be accounted really members of the Church who have been regenerated in the waters of baptism and profess the true Faith and have not cut themselves off from the structure of the Body by their own unhappy act or have been severed therefrom for very grave crime by legitimate authority.” At the same time the Church teaches that a person who suffers from an invincible and non-imputable ignorance, may be saved extra-sacramentally by a “baptism of desire” which supernaturally gives him or her charity. But, the *sine qua non* for this is that, as St. Paul says in his Letter to the Hebrews, “they must believe that God exists and is the rewarder of those that seek him.” It is also important that we understand in this teaching that people are never saved by error or by false sacraments. If non-Catholics are saved under certain circumstances, it is because of the truth, because “the Word was made Flesh and dwelt among us.”

Now listen to what Vatican II teaches: Having informed us that she is no longer the “necessary means of salvation” but only the “useful means,” she further teaches that “the brethren divided from us also carry out many of the sacred actions of the Christian religion. Undoubtedly, in ways that vary according to the condition of each Church or community, these actions can truly engender a life of Grace and can be rightly described as capable of providing access to the community of salvation.” And as noted above, John Paul II assures us that “each of the categories of the People of God is full of the hope of salvation, and this can be equally accomplished outside the visible Church.” But if such is the case, what need is there for us to be Catholic?

The Council goes even further and teaches that “Divine Providence does not deny the help necessary for salvation to those who, without blame on their part, have not yet arrived at an explicit knowledge of God.” Fr. Avery Dulles, one of the Council *periti*, comments on this: “The Constitution on the Church in the Modern World confirms this doctrine by asserting that Grace works in an unseen way in the hearts of all men of good will. In these and similar texts, Catholic theologians find an official recognition by the Church that an act of saving Faith is possible without any explicit belief in

the existence of God or any religious affiliation.”⁴⁴ And so it is that even Marxists can be saved.⁴⁵

It would seem then that all men can be saved. One doesn't have to recognize the Catholic Church as the true Church; one doesn't even have to recognize that God exists. But John Paul II goes even further in his interpretation of the Conciliar documents. He holds that salvation for all men is not only a possibility, but a reality. This is, of course, the heresy of apocatastasis. We shall return to this point in discussing the post-Conciliar Church's understanding of the nature of man. For the present we shall continue our discussion of the new Church in the light of Vatican II.

COMMUNICATIO IN SACRIS AND DIALOGUE ON AN EQUAL FOOTING

The traditional Church forbade Catholics to actively participate in non-Catholic rites.⁴⁶ Thousands upon thousands of Catholics have been penalized and martyred for refusing to engage in *communicatio in sacris*. Now the reasons for this are easy to understand: 1) Participation in a non-Catholic rite is seen as an offence against the First Commandment. God instructed us as to how He wished to be worshiped. Of course, God is not in need of our worship, but we have the need to worship him, and hence we must do it properly. To do so in some other way than He taught us is to give acknowledgment to forms of worship He has not approved of. One only has to read the history of Moses to know how God punished those who worshiped in a false manner. 2) The *lex orandi* is the *lex credendi*. The rule of prayer is the rule of belief. In other words, the way we pray reflects our beliefs.

Despite these clear-cut principles, Vatican II actually “commends this practice.” And why not, if such false worship “engenders a life of grace” and the communities that engage in it are “full of the hope of salvation”? It further encourages “the discussion of theological problems . . . where each can treat with the other on an *equal footing*. . . . From dialogue of this sort will emerge still more clearly what the true posture of the Catholic Church is.”

We are not only free to worship with those who deny our Lord, but we must dialogue with them on an “equal footing.” To what absurdity this Council goes! How can those who speak with the words of St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, and Pius X ever deal on an *equal footing* with economic determinists, communists, and village idiots? As Leo XIII said: “There is no parity between the conditions of those who have adhered to the

Catholic truth by the heavenly gift of faith, and those who, led by human opinions, follow false religions.” One thing is clear however: all the much-vaunted “dialogue” has allowed the “true posture of the post-Conciliar Church” to emerge more clearly. In every situation the Church has given in to Protestant demands; never has the reverse occurred. The only thing which is unclear is whether this post-Conciliar posture is supine or prone, whether the new Church is lying on its back or on its belly.

A MORE BENIGN CHURCH

Pre-Vatican II Catholics were used to a rather rigid Church—one that resisted change and drew clear boundaries with the world. It was a Church that spoke of orthodoxy, sin, and heresy and even presumed to guide the reading of the faithful by forbidding to them harmful books.⁴⁷ Such a stance would however not be pastoral, it would not foster the new sense of the unity of the people of God. With this in view Paul VI announced that “we were going to have a period of greater liberty in the life of the Church, and hence for each of her sons. . . . Formal discipline will be reduced, all arbitrary judgment will be abolished, as well as all intolerance and absolutism.” It was to be a Church which in his own words “avoids peremptory language and makes no demands.” In line with this, most of the reasons for automatic excommunication were abolished—though not that for ordaining a bishop without papal approval.⁴⁸ The Index was also abolished, for the People of God were far too mature to have their reading censured. The New Church also decided it would no longer condemn or approve Divine apparitions such as that of the Blessed Virgin. It abolished the “Oath Against Modernism” and it all but eliminated the words sin, hell, and heresy from its vocabulary.

And lest there be any doubt, this Church apologized to the world for its supposed deficiencies—not for the deficiencies of its members, but for the deficiencies of the Church, for the Divine Institution established by Christ. Listen to its blasphemous and abject whimpering: John XXIII, in apologizing to the Jews, declared that the Church—the pure Bride of Christ—“had the mark of Cain on her forehead.”⁴⁹ Paul VI, not to be outdone, said that “if the influence of events or of the times has led to deficiencies in conduct, in Church discipline, or even in the formulation of Church doctrine . . . these should be appropriately rectified.” This new Church admits to no heresies in the present or future, but only in the past. To state that the Church has been “deficient” in her teaching is to either deny her infallibility or to accuse Christ Himself of spreading error.

THE SUBSISTING CHURCH

Non-Catholics have always found the claims of the traditional Church somewhat difficult to swallow—precisely because doing so required the humility to admit that they were in error.⁵⁰ Hence it was clear that the Council could not foster its brand of ecumenism as long as it claimed to be the one true Church of Christ. The solution was to declare that the Church that Christ founded, the one true Church, *subsisted* in the Catholic Church—or more precisely, in the post-Conciliar Church. It is difficult to define subsistence, but the post-Conciliar Church insists it is equivalent to “exists.” It is little help to say that the Church Christ founded exists in the post-Conciliar Church, because the term does not imply exclusivity. It does not mean that this Church and only this Church *is* the Church that Christ founded. And indeed, we have the statement in 1984 of the entire English hierarchy to the effect that the Church that Christ founded also “subsists” in the Anglican Church. As Pope Leo XIII said: “The Catholic religion is the only true religion; to put the other religions on the same level with it is to treat it with the gravest injustice and offer it the worst form of insult.”

THE SEARCH FOR TRUTH AND MEANING

The traditional Church had no doubts about its function. It was the Mystical Body of Christ, Christ’s presence in this world. It was a perfect society, which despite the failures of its members, never asked the world to do other than follow the teachings of her Divine Master. She had the “fullness of the truth” and was here to share that fullness with us. As one theological text put it: “The Proximate end or purpose of the Church is to teach all men the truths of Revelation, to enforce the Divine precepts, to dispense the means of grace, and thus to maintain the practice of the Christian religion. The ultimate end is to lead all men to the eternal life.” Vatican II, however, tells us that “Christians are joined with the rest of men in the search for truth” (Ch. 16). Paul VI tells us that “the Church is seeking itself. With a great and moving effort, it is seeking to define itself, to understand what it truly is” (Address to priests at Varese, Feb. 6, 1963).⁵¹

3) A NEW UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF MAN

Vatican II assures us that we have a better understanding of the nature of man. “Thanks to the experience of past ages, the progress of the sciences,

the hidden treasures in the various forms of human culture, the nature of man himself is more clearly revealed and new roads to truth are opened.” Let us then look to the documents and seek out what has been discovered.

HUMAN DIGNITY

There is endless talk about “human dignity,” but it is rather too often forgotten that “noblesse oblige.” Dignity is invoked in a world that is doing everything to empty it of its content, and thus to abolish it. In the name of an indeterminate and unconditioned human dignity, unlimited rights are conceded to the basest of men, including the right to destroy all that goes to make our real dignity, that is to say, everything on every plane that attaches us in one way or another to the Absolute.

Frithjof Schuon⁵²

The Council says a great deal about the “dignity” of man, which is said to originate in “man’s call to communion with God.” The Council also tells us that “human nature, by the very fact that it was assumed, not absorbed, in Him, has been raised in us to a dignity beyond compare, for, by His Incarnation . . . the Son of God, in a certain way united Himself with each man” (Ch.). John Paul II discusses the implications of this in his encyclical *Redemptor hominis*: “We are dealing,” he says, “with ‘each’ man, for each one is included in the mystery of Redemption, and with each one Christ has united Himself forever through this mystery.” Again, in a speech given in 1981 he states that “from now on and always, without regret and without turning back, God shall be with all mankind, becoming one with it, to save it and to give it His Son, the Redeemer. . . . For all time, the Incarnation bestows upon man his unique, extraordinary, and ineffable dignity. . . . Man redeemed by Christ, and . . . to each man—without any exception whatever—Christ is in a way united, even when man is unaware of it.” He says much the same in the Christmas Message he gave in 1980: “Man was taken up by God as son in this Son of God becoming man . . . in this Son we are all made new to ourselves.”⁵³

How one wishes John Paul II was right.

Now the traditional Church teaches that man, despite the fact that he is made in the image of God, is in a fallen state. Hence it follows that his true dignity lies in his conforming himself to that image. According to St. Thomas, man, being free, is capable of cooperating with Grace or rejecting it; capable of being raised to the dignity of the sons of God or remaining in his fallen state destined to perdition. Sin is never dignified. It also teaches that Christ is primarily and principally the head of those who are united

to Him in act, whether by glory in Heaven, or by charity, or at least by Faith, on earth. Christ is also the Head of those who are united to Him potentially—that is, who have the real possibility of converting to Him. In this latter category fall the infidels, who, as long as they are alive, are able to acquiesce freely to the Grace received from Christ. I quote St. Thomas Aquinas, who continues with regard to those who do not convert to Christ during their lives: “As soon as they leave this world, they cease totally to be members of Christ.” So it is not the sole fact of the Incarnation that unites all mankind to Christ—rather, each man must adhere to the Grace of Christ. To the best of my knowledge, neither Vatican II nor John Paul II makes any mention of the need for personal conversion or sanctity as the *sine qua non* for this claim to dignity.

Admittedly John Paul II often speaks in a circuitous and ambiguous manner. We must however take him at his word, and presumably post-Conciliar Catholics consider such statements as authoritative and binding. But if it is the Incarnation that redeems us, and indeed, all men, and this regardless of whether they conform to it or not, what becomes the purpose of the Cross and the Passion? John Paul II gives the answer in his encyclical *Dives et misericordia*. The Passion is only a “witness” to man’s supernatural dignity; it demonstrates, he tells us, “the solidarity of Christ with human destiny . . . a disinterested dedication to the cause of man.” Let me quote him further:

It is precisely beside the path to man’s eternal election to the dignity of being an adopted child of God that there stands in history the Cross of Christ, the only-begotten Son . . . who has come to give the final witness to this wonderful Covenant of God with humanity, of God with man—every human being.

Now, if we accept John Paul’s doctrine, it follows that all men (or “all people” to use the current non-sexist liturgical phrase) are saved. He tells us as much in *Dives et misericordia*, for he states that “the mystery of election concerns all men, all the great human family.” He is even more specific in a sermon given at Santa Maria in Trastevere in 1980:

[Christ] obtained, once and for all, the salvation of man—of each man and of all men, of those whom no one shall snatch from His hand. . . . Who can change the fact that we are redeemed—a fact that is as powerful and fundamental as creation itself. . . . The Church announces today the paschal certitude of the Resurrection, the certitude of Salvation.⁵⁴

Certainly God desires that all be saved, and certainly the Passion of Christ is sufficient to redeem all men. But not all men are saved, but only those who believe in His redeeming power and conform their lives to it. Perhaps this is what John Paul meant, but it is certainly not what he said, and what he said, as we shall see, is consistent with the other “developments” offered us by the post-Conciliar Church.

THE DEIFICATION OF MAN

If all men are united to Christ and saved by the Incarnation, we have an explanation of how and why they can be united to one another. With his salvation assured and his dignity established, what more can man ask for? Man is truly deified. Surprisingly, Michael Davies concurs. “It was the Council as an event,” he tells us in *Pope Paul’s New Mass*, “that gave the green light to the process of the formal deification of man.” No wonder Montini constantly expressed his confidence in man: “We have faith in Man. We believe in the good which lies deep within each heart, we know that underlying man’s wonderful efforts are the motives of justice, truth, renewal, progress, and brotherhood.” At times Montini even waxed elegant. “There are no true riches but Man. . . . Honor to Man, honor to thought, honor to science, honor to technique, honor to work, honor to the boldness of Man. Honor to Man, king of the earth, and today prince of Heaven.” John Paul II is no less enthusiastic. “To create culture,” he tells us, “we must consider, down to the last consequences and entirely, Man as a particular and independent value, as the subject bearing the person’s transcendence. We must affirm Man for his own sake, and not for some other motive or reason; solely for himself! Even further, we must love man because he is Man, by reason of the special dignity he possesses” (Address to UNESCO, June 2, 1980).

PRIVATE JUDGMENT

Fr. Gregory Baum, one of the Council *periti* and at one time Cardinal-Head of the Congregation in charge of seminary education, is quoted by Michael Davies as saying: “I prefer to think that man may not submit to an authority outside of himself.” And why should deified man seek any authority outside himself? Imbued with such principles it is not surprising to find the Council teaching that “in religious matters” man “is to be guided by his own judgment.” Now the true Church has always taught

that private judgment is never a basis for religious belief. It is the Church which is meant to be our guide. But, as we have seen, the New Church has joined others in “seeking the truth,” and is trying “to define itself.” Such an institution implicitly denies that it has the “fullness of the truth” and so modern man is—*quod absit*—left with no other choice but to use his private judgment.⁵⁵

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Evil and error cannot have a right to be set forth and propagated. . . . The State is false to the laws prescribed by nature when, every bridle being removed, full power is left to evil and error to upset minds and corrupt minds.

Pope Leo XIII

You may wonder why I did not start out with discussing religious liberty. Most people consider it the *bête noire* of the Council, but as we have seen, there is far more wrong with Vatican II than its novel teaching on religious liberty. By bringing it up at this point we can better situate it in the total schema of the documents. Religious liberty is not the only error, but rather it is the inevitable consequence of all the other errors we have listed.

The Council teaches that “religious freedom has its foundation in the dignity of the human person. The right of religious freedom has its foundation not in the subjective disposition of the person, but in his very nature.” Think about it. If Christ is in a certain way united to each man, and each man is redeemed, and if, as John XXIII pointed out, “all men are equal by reason of their natural dignity” (*Pacem in Terris*), then each man’s religious views must be equally true. After all, how can a person who is united to Christ and whose salvation is guaranteed, have false opinions? But, are we not back to the Masonic-Roussouist concept of man with a religious, almost pantheistic twist? Is this not proclaiming the absolute sovereignty of the individual and his independence of God’s authority? But there is more. The Conciliar document adds that this right to religious liberty “continues to exist even in those who do not live up to their obligation of seeking the truth and adhering to it.” And “religious bodies also have the right not to be hindered in their public teaching and witness to their Faith. . . . The right of the human person to religious freedom is to be recognized in the constitutional law whereby society is governed, and thus it is to become a civil right.” It seems clear that according to Vatican II one can believe anything one wants; one can teach whatever one wants even if one does not really believe it; and that the State must guarantee one’s freedom to do this.

It is of interest to quote the comments of Cardinal Siri on this novel teaching of the Council:

Let us speak not against liberty but against the abuses of liberty. Liberty involves the possibility of sinning, but it in no way implies God's approval or even tolerance of sin. In several places the schema claims liberty for all religious communities, even those that are estranged from the natural law and are contrary to good human morals. We cannot legitimize what God merely tolerates; we can only tolerate it, and that within the limits of the common good. We cannot therefore accept the proposed schema, insofar as it recommends liberty for all without discrimination. . . . We should consider more carefully the contribution of theological sources to this problem of religious liberty and determine whether or not the contents of this schema can be reconciled with the teachings of Leo XIII, Pius XI, and Pius XII. Otherwise, we weaken our own authority and compromise our apostolic effort.⁵⁶

Let us be quite clear on the position of the traditional Church. She has never denied to anyone the freedom to worship as they see fit; indeed, she has always insisted that every person must—their very salvation depends upon it—follow their own conscience. But she has never conceded that people have a right to believe error, much less a right to do so hypocritically. She would certainly deny a person the right to teach falsehood to others. (Who of us would knowingly allow a teacher to teach our children falsely?) There is an enormous difference between a freedom and a right. A person may have the freedom to commit abortion or murder, but he can never claim the right to do so. When it comes to matters of religion, God gave man an intellect by means of which he might know the truth. He also gave him the freedom, but not the right, to misuse this intellect. The *Decree on Religious Freedom* violates this fundamental principle. John Paul I made this abundantly clear when he stated that “the Church had always taught that only the truth had rights, but now the Council made it clear that error also has rights” (*Time Magazine*).

Not only does the Council authorize man to believe error, and to do so with hypocrisy, it also demands that this “right” be guaranteed by constitutional governments. This means that any crackpot that comes down the pike can teach whatever he wishes—Marxism can be taught in schools; homosexuals can advocate the freedom of sexual choice in the classroom; and Satanism must be accorded the same rights as the Church that Christ established.

The offence to our Divine Lord is further compounded by the Conciliar declaration that this right “conforms to Divine Revelation,” that the

doctrine was received from Christ, and that all those who denied this right betrayed Christ. Perhaps this is one of those areas where the Church was “deficient in its formulation of doctrine.” Among those who denied to man this right are Gregory XVI in *Mirari vos*; Pius IX in *Quanta cura*; Leo XIII in *Immortale Dei* and in *Libertas*; Pius XII in his speech on Dec. 6, 1953, and Pope St. Pius X in his *Syllabus of Errors*. It would appear that the Holy Spirit, who by definition cannot contradict Himself, made a mistake.⁵⁷ But if Christ is the source of this teaching, the Church is radically destroyed. How is it possible for Christ (who lived and died to provide us with the truth), to say, “go forth and teach all nations whatsoever I have taught you” and at the same time for him to say, “It’s fine with Me if you tell lies about Me [which is blasphemy], you can believe anything you wish and behave in any manner you like. It was to give you this ‘right’ that I hung upon the cross”?

Since the State is obliged to give the same recognition to error as it does to truth, and since there will inevitably be “thousands” of different religions in the State, there must result a radical separation of Church and State. Hence, it was with a mandate from Vatican II that Paul VI induced Spain, Portugal, and several South American governments (which gave primacy of place to the Catholic religion), to change their constitutions in order to bring them into line with this new teaching. In essence this means that no country, even if all its citizens are Catholic, has a right to declare itself Catholic! And no government has the right to establish a Catholic code of ethics within its Constitution! Such a stance is an open denial of the Kingship of Christ by the supposed “Vicar of Christ.”

4) WHY A CHURCH AT ALL? THE TEILHARDIAN SYNTHESIS AND THE POST-CONCILIAR UTOPIA

A Church that believes in man’s innate dignity, a dignity that requires no effort on his part; a Church that believes every man should judge for himself what is right and wrong; a Church that believes that man evolves and, hence, that his religious beliefs evolve; a Church that does not claim to teach what Christ taught in an integral and unchanged manner; a Church which declares it is seeking for the truth along with other men, has a major problem. Such a Church can hardly claim to be the teacher of mankind. What function is it then to have? The answer is that it must place itself in the “service of the world.” And how is it to do this? By being the *avant-garde* of a “new humanism” and “universal culture” based on “wholesome socialization” so that man can act in consort to build a “better world” in the

future. But before this can happen, religious strife must be eliminated and mankind must be united.

And so the function of the New Church is to be the “catalyst” for this unity. “The Church is a kind of sacrament of intimate union with God, and the unity of all mankind, that is, she is a sign and an instrument of such union and unity. . . . At the end of time, she will achieve her glorious fulfillment. Then . . . all just men from the time of Adam will be gathered together with the Father in the Universal Church.” In these statements taken from Vatican II there is both ambiguity and a thinly veiled millenarianism. They continue: Of course the Church “recognizes that worthy elements are to be found in today’s social movements, especially in an evolution towards unity, a process of wholesome socialization and of association in civic and economic realms” and, hence, she must join and encourage all such elements, and she must “wipe out every ground of division so that the whole human race may be brought into the unity of the family of God.” So important is this goal that, as quoted above, her priests are instructed: “Every type of discrimination, whether social or cultural, whether based on sex, race, color, social condition, language, or *religion* is to be overcome and eradicated as contrary to God’s intent” (emphasis mine).

Elsewhere we are given further insights into this proposed unity. “Recent psychological research explains human activity more profoundly. Historical studies make a signal contribution to bringing man to see things in their changeable and evolutionary aspects. The human race has passed from a rather static concept of reality to a more dynamic, evolutionary one. . . . Thus little by little a more universal form of human culture is developing, one which will promote and express the unity of the human race. . . . It is a fact bearing on the very person of man, that he can come to an authentic and full humanity only through culture, that is, through the cultivation of natural goods and values. . . . The Church believes she can greatly contribute towards making the family of man and its history more human. . . . Thus we are witnesses of the birth of a new humanism, one in which man is defined first of all by his responsibility towards his brothers and towards history” (All from Vatican II). Make no mistake about it. This is the program of the New Church. John Paul II tells us specifically that the objective of pastors is to “call together the people of God according to different senses and different dimensions. In this calling together the Church recognizes Herself and realizes Herself”

This is the direction in which the post-Conciliar hierarchy would lead us. Here we have a vision of what the New Church has in mind. As Paul VI said, “The time has come for all mankind to unite together in the establishment of a community that is both fraternal and worldwide.

. . . The Church, respecting the ability of worldly powers, ought to offer her assistance in order to promote a full humanism, which is to say, the complete development of the entire man, and of all men . . . to place Herself in the *avant-garde* of social action. She ought to extend all her efforts to support, encourage, and bring about those forces working towards the creation of this integrated man. Such is the end which the [New] Church intends to follow. All [post-Conciliar] Catholics have the obligation of assisting this development of the total person in conjunction with their natural and Christian brothers, and with all men of good will.” This is what he elsewhere calls “the new economy of the Gospel.” John Paul II fully shares the vision of his “spiritual father.” “The Church, while respecting the competence of the different nations, should offer her assistance in promoting a full humanism, that is to say, the complete development of men, of all men. Placing itself at the head of social action, she should concentrate all her efforts to support, to encourage, to push the initiatives which work to promote the total person.”⁵⁸

It boggles the mind to find the “pontiffs” telling the faithful that they must accept this kind of sophomoric mumbo jumbo and secular humanism as “the authentic teaching of the Magisterium.” What has all this to do with religion? Apart from being blatant nonsense, all these statements falsify the nature of man, the true ends and purpose for which he was created, and the *raison d'être* for the Church. Further, they are based on a variety of theoretical and parochial sociological assumptions that have no basis in reality. The concept of man’s inevitable “progress,” his “dynamic” and “evolutionary” character, and the idea that through “a process of wholesome socialization” we are “building a better world” is nothing but disguised Teilhardianism and Marxism. Suddenly we see the Church supposedly established by Christ propagating all the illusions of the modern world—above all its belief in progress and evolution, and that thanks to science and human endeavor we can build a perfect utopia—a host of false concepts that are truly the “opiates of the people.” To expect a hierarchy that thinks in these terms to be concerned with metaphysical principles, spiritual values, or even the validity of the sacraments, is absurd.

A NEW ATTITUDE TOWARDS COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM

One of the major problems facing the world is the “East-West” socio-economic and political conflict. Mankind cannot be united until this is resolved. Where the traditional Church prayed for the conversion of Russia, the New Church encourages, nay embraces, Socialist values within her own

bosom. Where the one said that no Catholic could cooperate in any way with socialism, the other proclaims the redeeming values of this system. The change came in John XXIII's *Pacem in Terris*: "All men are equal by reason of their natural dignity." This being so he added, "all political communities are of equal natural dignity since they are bodies whose membership is made up of these same human beings." Vatican II followed this up by teaching that the Church "is bound to no particular form of human culture, nor to any political or economic or social system." Lest the faithful be left in doubt about this new attitude towards communism, the Council further noted that, "The Church further recognizes that worthy elements are found in today's social movements, especially in an evolution towards unity, a process of wholesome socialization, and of the association in civic and economic realms." As John XXIII said, "the Church is not a dam against communism. The Church cannot and should not be against anything." It will be argued that all this is not a full endorsement of communism. But it must be considered in the light of the fact that the Council refused, despite the request of over 400 Council Fathers, to condemn communism in any form. It should not be assumed that just because the Berlin Wall has fallen and the failures of communism have been exposed, that socialist ideation (which communism carried to its logical conclusions) has been removed from the bosom of the New Church. The ravages of Liberation Theology—criticized in name, but not in spirit, are still with us.⁵⁹

At no time has the new Church spoken out against communism as such. It occasionally condemns its excesses, but never its principles. This new attitude is part of the Teilhardian dream of combining "the rational force of Marxism" with the "human warmth of Christianity," and the Council, following this clue in stating that "through her [the Church's] individual members and her whole community, the Church believes she can contribute greatly towards making the family of man and its history more human."

Forgotten in all this is the paradigm of the Prodigal. It was not the Father's function to join the wayward son, but for the latter to return to the bosom of the Father. It is better to live in the forecourts of the Lord than to dwell in the tents of the ungodly.

ECUMENISM

We are now in a position to understand the real nature of the ecumenical movement. Given the premise that all men have an equal natural dignity because they are united to Christ for all time; that all men are redeemed;

and that religious liberty and the use of private judgment in religious matters is his right, it surely follows that all men have equal access to the truth—or more precisely, possess it in an equal degree. Given the fact that the Church no longer believes she has the fullness of the truth; that she has lost her unity and that this unity can only be regained when all men are gathered together in the People of God; and that it is her desire to be of service and fellowship to the world, it surely follows that she must see her primary function and internal nature as one of fostering this unity—first of all among Christians, then among believers, and finally among all men. How else can the post-Conciliar Church act than in an ecumenical manner. It is this that explains all the extraordinary actions of John Paul II with the Jews and Lutherans—indeed, with all the world's religions. What happened at Assisi was not an “abuse” but an expression of the Church's “innermost nature.” Let there be no doubt about this. As John Paul II told the non-Catholic delegates at his inauguration: “Tell those whom you represent that the involvement of the Catholic Church in the ecumenical movement, as solemnly expressed by the Second Vatican Council, is irreversible.”

Such, of course, involves the abandonment of any strict adherence to Catholic teaching. Paul VI had already told us that “exigencies of charity often force us to go outside the bounds of orthodoxy” (Speech in Milan). John Paul went further. In talking to the seminarians at the Lateran University he said that loyalty to the Church is not to be defined “in a reduced sense as maintaining standards, nor does it mean staying within the bounds of orthodoxy—avoiding positions that are in contrast to the pronouncements of the Apostolic see, the Ecumenical Councils, and the learned Doctors of the Church.” He continued: “We must have a divergence of positions, although in the end we must rely on a synthesis of all.” As he said elsewhere, we are to have a pluralistic Church, but it is for Rome to decide the limits of this pluralism.

With this goal in view, the Church is not only willing to give up her commitment to the true Faith and sound doctrine; she is also willing to sacrifice her most precious possession, the Holy Eucharist itself. Thus she teaches that the shared Eucharist is to be the sign of this unity. John Paul II tells us in his encyclical *Redemptor hominis* that “the Church is seeking the universal unity of Christians . . . and is gathering particularly today in a special way around the Eucharist and desiring that the authentic Eucharistic community should become a sign of the gradually maturing unity of all Christians.” With this in mind he has himself given Communion to Anglicans and Lutherans.⁶⁰

THE COMMUNITARIAN NATURE OF SALVATION HISTORY

So critical is this task of unity that the new Church tells us that “it has pleased God to make men holy and save them, not merely as individuals without any mutual bonds, but in making them into a single people which acknowledges Him in truth and serves Him in holiness. So from the beginning of salvation history He has chosen men not just as individuals, but as members of a certain community. This communitarian character is developed and consummated in the work of Jesus Christ. . . . She [the Church] likewise holds that in her most benign Lord and Master can be found the key, the focal point, the goal of all human history.” Yet another departure from traditional teaching. Man is declared saved, not as an individual, but as a member of the community—that is, the community of the People of God.⁶¹ The final line is a classic piece of ambiguity. While sounding orthodox, it is a virtual quote from Teilhard de Chardin’s *Divine Milieu*.

But consider yet another point. “Communitarian salvation,” “salvation history,” “the ‘unity of all the people of God,’” the proclaimed salvation of the atheist, and the acceptance of socialism: Are these concepts not consistent with the Teilhardian thesis? Are we not to be saved as members of some future socialist community? And is not God revealing His will through some kind of dialectical process in which all men will be united and joined together in the future socialist utopia? Is this “key” and “focal point” of the new Church anything other than Point Omega!

GLORY TO THE UNITED NATIONS—HOPE OF THE WORLD

And how is all this to be brought about? John XXIII instructed us that this one world community should be under “a public authority, having worldwide power and endowed with the proper means for the attainment of its objective, which is the universal common good.” And what organization is to achieve this: According to the post-Conciliar “Popes,” it is the United Nations. Listen to the words of Paul VI addressing this august body:

It is your task here to proclaim the basic rights and duties of man, his dignity and liberty, and above all his religious liberty. We are conscious that you are the interpreters of all that is paramount in human wisdom. We would almost say: of its sacred character. The people turn to the United Nations as their last hope of peace and concord. . . . The goals of the United Nations are the ideal that mankind has dreamed of in its journey through history. We would venture to call it the world’s greatest hope—for it is the

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

reflection of God's design—a design transcendent and full of love—for the progress of human society on earth; a reflection in which we can see the Gospel message, something from heaven come down to earth.

The United Nations described as “something from heaven come down to earth” and “the world's greatest hope” by Christ's supposed Vicar on earth! John Paul II is even more laudatory. Addressing the United Nations in 1979 he never once mentioned the name of Jesus, but clearly stated that “the governments of the world must unite in a movement that one hopes will be progressive and continuous. The *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and other international and juridical instruments are endeavoring to create general awareness of the dignity of the human being . . . the right of freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, and the right to manifest one's religion either individually or in community, in public and in private.” The United Nations declaration of Human Rights is the same as that of the French Revolution. John Paul II seems to forget that, as Cardinal Pie stated, “the declaration of the Rights of Man are a denial of the Rights of Christ.”

MARRIAGE

It is well known that the family is the basic unit in every society, and that the majority of souls must sanctify their lives in the married state. The Church has always taught that “the primary end of marriage is the procreation and education of offspring, while its secondary purposes are mutual help and allaying [also translated ‘as a remedy for’] concupiscence. They are entirely subordinate to the former.” This principle, incorporated in Canon 1013, makes it clear that the welfare of children comes before that of the parents. Moreover, as Pius XII said, it “has been handed down by Christian Tradition, and [it has been] repeatedly taught by the Supreme Pontiffs.” The doctrine was declared *de fide* by the Holy Office with the approval of Pius XII (*Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 36, 103, 1944). Now Vatican II has not only declared that the two ends of marriage are of equal significance; it has further reversed the order, listing the secondary end before the primary one. Let us look at what the change in this teaching leads to: it opens the door to artificial forms of birth control, infidelity, and divorce. The traditional view demands that even the unitive ends of marriage must be sacrificed for the sake of the children. The new view declares that selfishness—for it is fundamentally selfishness that disrupts both love and marriage—has the right to sacrifice the children for its goals. Couple this inversion with the oft-repeated teaching of John Paul II that both partners in a marriage have equal authority and responsibilities—a direct contradiction of the

teaching of St. Paul—and one in effect destroys the very basis for Christian marriage.⁶²

THE CHURCH'S *RAISON D'ÊTRE*

And so we have a Church that sees its primary purpose as “the promotion of unity”; a Church which sees itself as “the instrument of the unity of all mankind”; a Church which sees itself “as the sacramental sign of this unity”; a Church whose priesthood is to function primarily to bring about this unity; and a Church which envisions Herself obliged to contribute towards “making the family of man and its history more human.” It is this thrust towards the unity of mankind that belongs to “the innermost nature of the Church,” because she is, “by her relationship with Christ, both a sacramental sign and an instrument of intimate union with God and the unity of all mankind.”

CONCLUSION

It has not been possible to cover all the deviations of Vatican II. Needless to say, virtually every aspect of Church teaching and practice has been attacked. Her liturgy, her missionary activities, and even her teachings on marriage have come under attack. Enough has been said however to show the direction in which the New Church would lead us.

We have reviewed the teachings of Vatican II under four general headings—a new attitude towards the world; a new attitude towards herself; a new attitude towards man; and finally, a new attitude towards her own *raison d'être*. We have shown that basic to the “new orientations” of this Church are its belief in progress and evolution, and, hence, a need to constantly adapt itself to the world around it—a world which it admires and loves, but a world which has little use for the Church.

Given these facts, the Church had to develop a new outlook. No longer a “perfect society,” the spotless Bride of Christ, no longer claiming to possess the “fullness of the truth,” she had to abdicate her role as the spiritual guide for mankind. What then was her function and her *raison d'être*? She found the answer to this in “service,” in devoting Herself to the task of making the history of man “more human” and above all in fostering a new concept of worldwide unity, “the unity of the People of God.” She became a sign and sacrament of this unity which will embrace all Christians, then all believers, and finally the whole of mankind.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Having achieved an *aggiornamento* with the modern world, she had to bring her understanding of man into line with the Masonic Rousseauist view. No longer made in the image of God and wounded by Adam's sin, man is now raised to the dignity of the gods by being declared dignified by nature, united for all time with Christ, and redeemed without effort on his part. The Crucifixion becomes a witness to this dignity which is equal in all. But if we are all united to Christ and in fact all saved, then it follows we all have equal access to the truth. Once more we are brought back to the concept of creating a single religion where, as he instructed the seminarians at the Lateran University, "we will have a divergence of opinions, although in the end, a synthesis of all."

Finally, this new utopia, this new humanism which the Church endorses and wishes to foster, will be a socialist paradise, in which all men will be brothers, equal and free. It is for this end that the Council instructs her priests to wipe away every source of discord—be it racial, sexual, or even religious. With the help of the United Nations, we are on the progressive march to this utopia, but we have forgotten the way to Heaven. Point Omega is around the corner.

Forgotten is the way to Heaven! But that is what the Church is all about. That is why Christ was born and that is why He suffered on the Cross.

Notes

¹ Hubert Jedin, *Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church* (Herder: N.Y., 1960). Ecumenical Councils are also called General Councils. The Church has never formally defined what an Ecumenical Council is. Philip Hughes states that "the General Council is a purely human arrangement whereby a divinely founded institution functions in a particular way for a particular purpose" (*History of General Councils* [York: Hanover House, 1961]).

² These Protestant "observers" took an active part in the proceedings behind the scenes. Even their very presence must have had an inhibiting effect on the Council Fathers. This was very significant with regard to Russian Orthodox observers from Moscow who only came with the understanding that communism would not be condemned—a fact reported by several authors and documented by Jean Madiran in *Itinéraires* (Cf. "The Vatican-Moscow Agreement," by Jean Madiran in *The Fatima Crusader* [Constable: N.Y.], Issue 16, Sept-Oct., 1984).

³ Every time the traditional Fathers wished to define more clearly what was being ambiguously stated, they were informed that the Council was "pastoral" and not "dogmatic" (Archbishop Lefebvre, "J'accuse le concile," *Angelus*, May 1982, Vol. 5, No. 5). However to state that what is "pastoral" is not "dogmatic" is like stating that clinical medicine is not based on scientific "fact." Pope Paul himself is witness to this statement. In a General Audience (1975) he stated that Vatican II, "differing from other Councils, . . . was not directly dogmatic but doctrinal and pastoral." In his Lenten address in 1976 he stated that the Council "had perfected the doctrine of the Church to such an extent as not to leave any hesitation about the identity of her theological mystery." The only place where the meaning of "pastoral" is clearly defined

Vatican II

is in the Letter to the Presidents of the National Councils of Bishops concerning Eucharistic prayers. “The reason why such a variety of texts has been offered and the end result such new formularies were meant to achieve are pastoral in nature: namely to reflect the unity and diversity of liturgical prayer. By using the various texts contained in the new Roman Missal, various Christian communities, as they gather together to celebrate the Eucharist, are able to sense that they themselves form the one Church, praying with the same Faith, using the same prayer.” In other words, the pastoral intent of the documents was to facilitate and foster that ecumenism—that false unity—which the post-Conciliar Church considers its “internal mission.”

⁴ Requests by hundreds of Council Fathers for the condemnation of communism—certainly the principal error of our times—were sidetracked by those in control—in clear violation of the Council’s own rules of order—as reported by Rev. Ralph M. Wiltgen, *The Rhine flows into the Tiber* (Hawthorn: N.H., 1967; Augustine: Devon, 1978) and others.

⁵ In a similar manner Santiago Carrillo, head of the Spanish Communist Party, called it “Euro-communism,” “our *aggiornamento*, our Vatican II” (*Itinéraires*, May 1977).

⁶ Ursula Oxford, *The Heresy of John XXIII*. This book is privately published and is available from her. Cf. my review in *Studies in Comparative Religion* (Middlesex, Eng.): “Comments on a Recent ‘Traditional’ Catholic Book,” Vol. 17, 1988. Peter Hebblethwaite in his biography of John XXIII, tells us that the Council was planned well in advance and that no “spirit” other than modernism was involved (Doubleday: N.Y., 1985).

⁷ Fr. Arriaga, *Sede Vacante*.

⁸ Quoted by Dietrich Von Hildebrand, “Belief and Obedience: The Critical Difference,” *Triumph*, March 1970.

⁹ Michael Davies, *Archbishop Lefebvre and Religious Liberty* (TAN: Ill, 1980). Xavier da Silveira in Brazil holds to a similar position.

¹⁰ Quoted in “L’hérésie conciliaire,” by Marcel De Corte, *Itinéraires*, July-August, 1976. The statement is contained in a letter from Paul VI to Archbishop Lefebvre dated June 29, 1976.

¹¹ Epistle *Cum te* to Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, Oct. 11, 1976, published in *Notitiae*, No. 12, 1976.

¹² The reader is referred to Chapter 2 on the Magisterium for the meaning and weight of some of these terms.

¹³ *Redemptor hominis* and Speech to the Sacred College reported in *Documentation catholique* (Paris, 1975), pp. 1002-3.

¹⁴ Speech to the Bishops of France at Issy-les-Moulineaux, *L’Osservatore Romano*, March 6, 1980.

¹⁵ Strictly speaking, the “Pope” and only the Pope has the magisterial authority to determine what is and isn’t traditional.

¹⁶ Conservative *Novus Ordo* Catholics are forced to draw lines between obedience to Tradition and obedience to the “new orientations” established by the post-Conciliar “Popes.” Those who reject the authority of these “Popes” adhere to the teaching of the traditional Church and thus avoid the trap of picking and choosing just what is and isn’t traditional.

¹⁷ Two translations are available in English. Neither carries a *Nihil Obstat* and neither is considered “official”: 1) Walter M. Abbott, S.J., *The Documents of Vatican II* (America Press: N.Y., 1966); and 2) Rev. J. L. Gonzales, *The Sixteen Documents of Vatican II* (Daughters of St. Paul: Boston, 1967). There is not much to choose between them, though the commentaries are different. Quotations in the body of this text are taken from the first.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

¹⁸ Consider the following Conciliar statement: “The widespread reduction of working hours, for instance, brings increasing advantages to numerous people. May these leisure hours be properly used for relaxation of spirit and the strengthening of mental and bodily health. Such benefits are available through spontaneous study and activity and through travel, which refines human qualities and enriches man with mutual understanding. These can help to preserve emotional balance, even at the community level, and to establish fraternal relations among men of all conditions, nations and races.” This from a document of an Ecumenical Council!

¹⁹ Quoted by Rev. Ralph M. Wiltgen, *The Rhine flows into the Tiber*.

²⁰ Cardinal Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology* (Ignatius Press: San Francisco, 1987).

²¹ *Documentation Catholique*, 1775, p. 1002.

²² Michael Davies, *Pope John’s Council*.

²³ Joseph M. Becker, S.J., *The Re-formed Jesuits* (Ignatius Press: Calif., 1992).

²⁴ In essence, this allowed those who had captured the Council to control what information was given out to the public.

²⁵ Bishop Lucey of Cor and Ross in Ireland made these comments in the *Catholic Standard* (Dublin, Sept. 14, 1973).

²⁶ Cardinal J. Heenan, *A Crown of Thorns* (London, 1974).

²⁷ Brian Kaizer, *Pope, Council, and World*. Brian Kaizer was the *New York Times* correspondent to the Council. The “Northern Alliance” consisted of those European theologians who had for a long time been waging a total war against tradition.” As Cardinal Heenan noted: “It is quite clear that the English-speaking bishops were quite unprepared for the kind of Council the rest of the northern Europeans were planning. The Americans were even less prepared than the British.”

²⁸ As E.E.Y. Hales says: “On the face of it Pope John was allowing the Council to take shape in a way that seemed certain not to produce the Aggiornamento of the Church which he wanted. One explanation of this paradox is that he was subtly allowing the Curia to think that it was going to be their Council, so as to ensure that they would not try to thwart it, while he himself knew very well that once it met, it would cease to be theirs, that he [and it] would take over the Curia” (*Pope John and His Revolution* [Doubleday: N.Y., 1965]). Archbishop Lefebvre describes how “a fortnight after the opening of the Council, not a single one of these carefully prepared schemas remained,” and how lists of candidates for the various commissions were prepared and circulated for voting on—men whose names nobody knew: those who prepared the lists knew these bishops very well: they were (I don’t need to tell you) all of the same tendency” (*A Bishop Speaks* [Scottish Una Voce: Edinburgh]). Michael Davies reports much the same (*Pope John’s Council*).

²⁹ Fesquet, *The Drama of Vatican II*.

³⁰ He watched the entire affair on closed circuit television. He would intervene against the established rules of the Council to promote the “revolution,” as for example when he reduced the need for a two thirds majority to pass a given resolution to the 50% level.

³¹ Cardinal Ottaviani, an aged and senior member of the Curia, almost blind, was cut off in the middle of his speech after ten minutes by someone disconnecting the microphone. The response of the Fathers to his embarrassment was to clap with joy. The ancient Cardinal retired in tears. So much for the Christian charity of these “Fathers.”

³² Archbishop Lefebvre’s “J’accuse le concile” documents a letter sent to Paul VI complaining about these tactics and signed by several Cardinals and Superior Generals of Religious Organizations, and the manner in which he dismissed their contentions.

Vatican II

³³ J. Moorman, *Vatican Observed* (Darton Longman and Todd: London, 1967).

³⁴ Archbishop Lefebvre, “J'accuse le concile.”

³⁵ Cardinal Heenan, *A Crown of Thorns*.

³⁶ Archbishop Lefebvre, “J'accuse le concile.”

³⁷ “Salvation History,” one of the favorite phrases of the innovators, and one clearly implying that salvation is a historical process, is particularly offensive. Salvation is an “individual” process. Further, in accord with the Gospel story of the eleventh-hour laborer, salvation today is no different than it was in the days of Abraham. As opposed to this, Karl Rahner defines salvation in his *Theological Dictionary* (Herder: N.Y., 1965), (which carries a *Nihil Obstat* and an *Imprimatur*) in these terms: “It does not primarily signify an ‘objective’ achievement, but rather a ‘subjective’ existential healing and fulfillment.” He defines “Saving history” as “a general term signifying the fact that God, on account of his universal salvific will, has graciously embraced the whole of human history and in it has offered all men his salvation, and that his grace and justification have been concretely and historically realized in humanity. . . . This concept is based on the theological presupposition not only that man has to hope for and accept grace within history, but that grace itself is historical and that history itself, with all that it involves—for instance, the unity of mankind—is grace.”

³⁸ Quoted in H. Fesquet, *Le Journal du concile* (Morel: Paris, 1964).

³⁹ John T. McGinn, *Doctrines do Grow*.

⁴⁰ Avery Dulles, S.J., has said, “Without using the term ‘continuing revelation,’ Vatican II allowed for something of the kind.” Donald Campion, S.J., has said with regard to the *Constitution on the Church Today*, “here as elsewhere, it is easy to recognize the compatibility of insights developed by thinkers (sic) such as Teilhard de Chardin in his *Divine Milieu* with the fundamental outlook of the Council.” (Both were Conciliar *periti* and quotes are from commentaries in the Abbott translation.) For an excellent study regarding the Teilhardian influence, the reader is referred to Wolfgang Smith, *Teilhardism and the New Religion*.

⁴¹ Commentary in the Abbott translation.

⁴² Zizola, *The Utopia of John XXIII*.

⁴³ The reader is referred to the essay on Baptism of Desire, lest this quote should suggest that there is no possibility of salvation for the unbaptized. (Available on web page: Coomaswamy-catholic-writings.com.)

⁴⁴ Commentary in the Abbott translation of the Documents.

⁴⁵ Fr. Gustavo Gutierrez, the Peruvian liberation theologian goes so far as to say that Marxists will be saved, but not so Christians who fail to join in with the forces of history (i.e., who do not become revolutionary).

⁴⁶ *Communicatio in sacris* is engaging in common worship with heretics. “Passive” participation—as, for example, attending a Protestant wedding—was allowed. But actively joining in the service was forbidden. “Bear not the yoke with unbelievers. For what participation hath justice with injustice? Or what fellowship hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever?” (2 Cor. 6:14).

⁴⁷ Permission for reading books on the Index could be obtained if one had any reason to read them. What loving parent would not limit the reading of a child?

⁴⁸ Ordaining a bishop without papal permission was made an excommunicative act by Pius XII. The new Code of Canon Law retains this, but dropped over 30 other reasons for being automatically excommunicated. The new law demanding resignation of prelates at the age

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

of 75 allowed the New Church to remove from office any conservatives they disapproved of. This was used in the case of Bishop Castro Meyer in the Diocese of Campos, Brazil (Cf. Dr. David White, *The Mouth of the Lion* [Angelus Press: Kansas City, Mo., 1999]).

⁴⁹ Quoted in Werner Keller, *Diaspora* (Harcort: N.Y., 1969).

⁵⁰ All genuine religion has been subjected to the corrosive influence of modernism. This is particularly true in the east where for example orthodoxies have been particularly affected.

⁵¹ Listen to St. Athanasius speaking about the Arian Councils of the fourth century: “The whole world was put into confusion, and those who at the time bore the profession of clergy ran far and near, seeking how best to learn to believe in our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . If they were believers already, they would not have been seeking, as thought they were not. . . . [It is] no small scandal . . . that Christians, as if waking out of sleep at this time of day, should be inquiring how they were to believe . . . while their professed clergy, though claiming deference from their flocks as teachers, were unbelievers on their own showing, in that they were seeking what they had not. . . . What defect of teaching was there for religious truth in the Catholic Church that they should enquire concerning Faith now, and should fix this year’s date to their profession of Faith?”

⁵² *Light on the Ancient Worlds* (Perennial: Middlesex, Eng., 1965).

⁵³ Sources for quotes in this paragraph are to be found in Louis-Marie de Bagnieres’ *John Paul II and Catholic Doctrine* (Society of Pius V: Oyster Bay Cove, N.Y., 1981). Originally a talk given in Paris and published by the Société Saint-Thomas-d’Aquin in Belgium. This remarkable text fully substantiates this teaching on the part of John Paul II.

⁵⁴ This is probably the best explanation of the mistranslating of *Multis* by “all” in the Words of Consecration in the *Novus Ordo Missae*.

⁵⁵ Private judgment is more fully discussed in Chapter 2 on the Magisterium.

⁵⁶ Fesquet, *The Drama of Vatican II*.

⁵⁷ Pope Gregory XVI called this “insanity.” Pius IX in his encyclical *Quanta cura* (a document whose magisterial intent is made clear by the fact that he initiates it with the statement: “By Our Apostolic Authority We reject, proscribe, and condemn . . .”) had this to say: “Against the doctrine of Scripture, of the Church, and of the Holy Fathers, they do not hesitate to assert ‘that the best condition of civil society, in which no duty is recognized, as attached to the civil power, of restraining by enacted penalties, offenders against the Catholic religion, except so far as public peace may require.’ From which totally false idea of social government they do not fear to foster the erroneous opinion, most fatal in its effects on the Catholic Church and the salvation of souls, called by our Predecessor, Gregory XVI, ‘an insanity,’ viz., that ‘liberty of conscience and worship is each man’s personal right, which ought to be legally proclaimed and asserted in every rightly constituted society; and that a right resides in the citizens to an absolute liberty which should be restrained by no authority whether Ecclesiastical or civil, whereby they may be able openly and publicly to manifest and declare their ideas whatever either by word of mouth, by the press or in any other way.’”

⁵⁸ “In those days went there out of Israel wicked men, who persuaded many, saying, let us go and make a covenant with the heathen that are round about us: for since we departed from them, we have had much sorrow. Then certain people were so forward therein, that they went to the King who gave them license to do after the ordinances of the heathen . . . [and they] made themselves uncircumcised and forsook the holy covenant, and joined themselves to the heathen” (Maccabees). Let him who has ears, hear.

⁵⁹ Pope Pius IX in 1846 called communism “absolutely contrary to the natural law itself” and added that “once adopted, would utterly destroy the rights, property, and possessions

Vatican II

of all men, and even of society itself” Leo XIII in 1878 called it “a mortal plague which insinuates itself into the very marrow of human society only to bring about its ruin.” Pius XI in 1937 called it “a pseudo-ideal of justice, of equality, and of fraternity” and further stated that “communism is intrinsically evil, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever.”

⁶⁰ Cf. *Introibo*, No. 43, Jan-Mar, 1984 (l'Association sacerdotale Noel Pinot: Angers, France).

⁶¹ Cardinal Vaughan spoke to this when he said: “Tarry not for Corporate Reunion. It is a dream, and a snare of the Evil One. We have all to be converted to God individually; to learn of Christ, to be meek and humble of heart individually; to take up our Cross and follow Him individually, each according to his personal Grace. The individual may no more wait for Corporate Reunion than he may wait for Corporate Conversion” (J.G. Snead-Cox, *Cardinal Vaughan*, Vol. II [Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1910]).

⁶² It follows that if the parents do not get along, they can get an annulment (often described as a “Catholic divorce”) on psychological grounds. There are, of course, valid reasons for obtaining an annulment, but psychological grounds are open to almost any abuse of interpretation. Psychological immaturity is present in almost every marriage at the start, and frequently at the finish.

CHAPTER 12

THE LITURGICAL REVOLUTION

The faithful had never asked for a Council. Most of them were perfectly content with the Church as she was, and even John XXIII had acknowledged that the Church that had elected him was “vibrant with vitality.” It was one thing for the modernists to capture the Council; it was quite another for them to induce the faithful to change their ways of thinking. After all, how many Catholics had ever read the Canons of the Council of Trent? (What need was there to do so as long as the clergy could be trusted?) And how many would wade through the tedious and ambiguous statements of Vatican II? Change would occur far too slowly for the impatient innovators. If the liberals were going to introduce what Paul VI called “the new economy of the Gospel” into the everyday life of the Catholic, it was absolutely necessary to attack and change the liturgy.

Such was only logical. What is extraordinary is the degree to which such an attack had been anticipated. As long ago as 1840 the Abbé Guéranger, noting that “Satan also has his traditions,” prophetically described the *Novus Ordo Missae* in his *Liturgical Institutions*.¹ In 1896 Pope Leo XIII stated that the modernists and reformers (they had other designations then) “knew only too well the intimate bond which unites Faith and worship, the *lex credendi* and the *lex orandi*, and so, under the pretext of restoring the order of the liturgy to its primitive form, they corrupted it in many respects to bring it into accord with the errors of the innovators” (*Apostolicae curae*).² We shall see how prescient these men were.

In this chapter we shall discuss the character, meaning, and history of the Catholic Mass; the predictions about its possible loss; the effects of the Conciliar “Constitution on the Liturgy,” and how the innovators brought about the changes that resulted in the *Novus Ordo Missae*. In the next chapter we will consider the New Mass in depth.³

THE CATHOLIC MASS

Before proceeding, the reader should be aware of the crucial position that the traditional Mass has always had in the Church. According to St. John Chrysostom, when the Mass is said, “A fountain is opened which sends forth spiritual rivers—a fountain round which the angels take their stand,

looking into the beauty of its streams, since they more clearly see into the power and sanctity of the things that lie to open view, and their inaccessible splendors.” St. Alphonsus de Liguori described it as “the most beautiful and best thing in the Church.” And why? Because, “at the Mass, Jesus Christ giveth Himself to us by means of the most holy sacrament of the altar, which is the end and the purpose of all the other sacraments.”⁴ St. Leonard of Port Maurice called the Mass “the sole sacrifice which we have in our holy religion . . . a sacrifice, holy, perfect, in every point complete, by which each one of the faithful nobly honors God.”⁵ Fr. Muller says, “the holy sacrifice of the Mass is one of those works greater than which the omnipotence of God cannot produce. . . . It is an utter impossibility for any human or angelic understanding to conceive an adequate idea of the Mass. All we can say is that its dignity and sanctity are infinite.”⁶ The Curé of Ars tells us “all the good works together are not of equal value with the sacrifice of the Mass, because they are the works of man, and the Holy Mass is the work of God.”

“The celebration of the Mass,” says Dr. Nicholas Gehr, “is the most worthy and most perfect Divine service, for it procures to the Most High a worship and a veneration which millions of words would be incapable of rendering Him. . . . It is a unique sacrifice [and] infinitely excels in value and dignity, in power and efficacy, all the many prayers of the Church and the faithful. . . . As often as this memorial sacrifice is celebrated the work of redemption is performed. . . . It is the soul and the heart of the liturgy of the Church; it is the mystical chalice which presents to our lips the sweet fruit of the passion of the God-Man—that is Grace.”⁷ Pope Urban VIII said of it:

If there is anything divine among the possessions of men, which the citizens of Heaven might covet (were covetousness possible for them), it would certainly be the most holy sacrifice of the Mass, whose blessing is such that in it man possesses a certain anticipation of Heaven while still on earth, even having before their eyes and taking into their hands the very Maker of both Heaven and earth. Now greatly must mortals strive that the most awesome privilege be guarded with due cult and reverence, and take care lest their negligence offend the eyes of the angels, who watch with envious adoration (*Si quid est*).

Such has been the constant belief of the Church.

THE CATHOLIC MASS IS A TRUE SACRIFICE

The Catholic Church always speaks of the Mass as a sacrifice. The Council of Ephesus (431 A.D.) teaches that “Christ hath delivered Himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odor of sweetness.” St. Cyprian tells us that “the right to celebrate the holy sacrifice constitutes the most beautiful adornment and garland of honor of the Catholic priesthood, and for this reason the deprivation of this privilege was regarded as the most severe and most painful of punishments.” St. Ambrose tells us that “angels are present . . . when we are celebrating the sacrifice, for you may not doubt that angels are present, when Christ is there, when Christ is being sacrificed.” The Liturgy of St. James the Apostle states: “Let all mortal flesh be silent, standing there [at the time of the Consecration] in fear and trembling; let all things of earth vanish from our thoughts; for the King of kings, the Lord of lords, Christ our God is about to be sacrificed and to be given as food to the faithful.”⁸

Now a sacrifice cannot occur without the immolation of a victim. As St. Thomas Aquinas says, “it is proper to this sacrament that Christ should be immolated in its celebration” (*Summa*, III, 83, 1). In the sacrifice of the Cross and the sacrifice of the Mass, the primary sacrificing priest and the sacrificial gift are identical. Only the nature and the mode of the offering are different. Each and every valid Mass recapitulates—makes present once again—that same sacrifice which occurred at Calvary. Christ’s sacrifice on the Cross was bloody, that of the Mass is unbloody. It nevertheless is one and the same sacrifice. As the Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches: “The bloody and unbloody victim are not two, but one victim only, whose sacrifice is daily renewed in the Eucharist. . . . The priest is also one and the same, Christ the Lord; for the ministers who offer sacrifice, consecrate the Holy Mysteries, not in their own person, but in that of Christ, as the Words of Consecration itself make clear; for the priest does not say: ‘This is the Body of Christ,’ but ‘This is my body,’ and thus, acting in the person of Christ the Lord, he changes the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of His Body and Blood.”⁹ Such is binding on the Catholic conscience, for as the Canons of this Council state: “If anyone saith that in the Mass [each and every Mass] a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God . . . let him be anathema!”

Protestants and Anglicans reject this dogma. They deny that there is any immolative action and, hence, any Real Presence. Where Catholics give veneration to the sacred Species, Protestants admit of only bread and wine and so accuse us of idolatry. They admit that the sacrifice of the Cross was a true sacrifice, but insist that it occurred once and for all, and

that all that happens in the daily Mass is a retelling of what occurred some two thousand years ago. In their eyes the rite is a mere “memorial” of this historical event. As Luther said, “The Mass is not a sacrifice. . . . Call it benediction, Eucharist, the Lord’s table, the Lord’s Supper, Memory of the Lord or whatever you like, just so long as you do not dirty it with the name of a sacrifice or action.”¹⁰ As for the Anglicans, Article Thirty One of their “creed” states that the Mass as understood by the Council of Trent is a “blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit.”¹¹

Because of the infinite magnitude of this immolative sacrifice, Catholic doctrine holds the Mass is also and at the same time, a sacrifice of praise, of thanksgiving, or propitiation, and of impetration (petition). The Mass is a sacrifice of praise and adoration because, as Dr. Gihl says, “the celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice contains an infinitely perfect adoration of God, for it is the sacrifice which Christ Himself offers to His heavenly Father. Nor is it possible for man to create a rite that is a greater sacrifice of praise and Adoration, for it is Christ Himself and the Holy Ghost, acting through the Apostles, who is the author of the Mass.” At the same time and in the same way the Mass is a sacrifice of thanksgiving. “In as much as in the Holy Mass we adore, praise, and magnify God through and with Christ, we fulfill in a perfect manner that first duty, which as creatures we owe to the Creator—the duty of gratitude.”

Protestants are perfectly willing to grant that the Catholic Mass can be called a “sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.” But this is where they stop. To claim that the Mass is more than this is to them a blasphemy. The Church however insists that the true Mass is much more. Among other things, it is a “propitiatory sacrifice”; it “propitiates” (appeases) God’s anger and justice. As Dr. Gihl says, “In the Cross Christ merited for us all forgiveness of sin, the grace of sanctification, and eternal beatitude. . . . Whosoever separates himself from this sacrifice; whosoever, through disobedience and unbelief, despises and rejects it, for him ‘there is left no [other] sacrifice for sins, but a certain dreadful expectation of judgment and the rage of fire’ (Heb. 10:26).” Further, as an act of propitiation, the Mass “calms and appeases the righteous anger of God, disarms His justice, and induces the Lord to regard sinful man with favor and mercy. . . . As a propitiatory sacrifice the Mass has, therefore, the power and, in consequence of the ordinance of Christ, has for object directly and infallibly—that is, in the strictest sense *ex opere operato*, to cancel temporal punishment [due to sin].”¹²

Moreover, this canceling of temporal punishment can be applied to both “the living and the dead.” As St. Augustine says, “it must not be doubted that the departed receive help by the prayers of the Church and the life-giving sacrifice.”¹³ For the living, this fruit is only “medially” granted, for

by virtue of the sacrifice, the Eucharist obtains this grace for sinners only “if it finds them disposed” (St. Thomas, *Sent.*, IV. 12, q.2, a.2); for the dead it infallibly remits, though not necessarily entirely, but in accord with the good pleasure of Providence. The Council of Trent holds it to be *de fide* that “the Holy Mass is a true propitiatory sacrifice . . . for the living and the dead,” and the Catechism of the Council of Trent states the Mass is “truly a propitiatory sacrifice, whereby we are reconciled to God and regain His favor.” Protestant theology specifically denies both the “propitiatory” nature of the Mass as well as the doctrine of Purgatory.

Finally, the Mass is described as a sacrifice of petition or impetration, for as the same Council states, the Mass is offered not only for sins, punishments, and satisfactions, but also for “other remedies.” Man, in offering Mass, can anticipate that his requests—providing they are in conformity with God’s will—receive an appropriate response. And in view of all that has been said above, how could it be otherwise?

O my God, Eternal and Omnipotent Father, I offer Thee in union with Thine Only-begotten son Our Lord Jesus Christ, His very own Passion and Death on the Cross in this Holy Sacrifice of the Mass: in profound ADORATION of Thy Divine Majesty; in joyful THANKSGIVING for all Thy graces and blessings; in humble REPARATION for my innumerable sins and those of the whole world; and in ardent SUPPLICATION for Thy mercy and grace, as well as for the temporal needs of myself, my loved ones, and my neighbor. O God, be merciful to me a sinner!

The Reformers knew that if they took the time-honored Mass from the faithful, they would have to face a violent reaction. They therefore initially only “reformed” it by removing from it any reference to a sacrifice other than that of “praise and thanksgiving.” They left the outer shell intact after removing its essential character. This is why the Council of Trent insisted that: “If anyone saith that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving . . . let him be anathema!”

Not only is the Mass the most sacred and central act of worship in the Church, it is also, in line with the oft-repeated phrase “*legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*”—“let prayer fix the law of faith”—an infallible source of truth and doctrine. As Pius XI said, it is “the most important organ of the ordinary Magisterium of the Church.” Having been in greater part established by Christ and the Apostles, “it is a theological locus of the first importance in knowing the living Tradition of the Church.”¹⁴

Clearly no human or group of ordinary people could have created a service that fulfills all the above criteria. And hence it is not surprising that the essential ceremonies of the traditional Mass date back to the Apostles.

As Dr. Gehr says:

Christ's example was the norm for the Apostles at the celebration of the sacrifice. They did, first, only that which Christ had done before. According to His directions and under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they observed other things besides, namely, according to circumstances, they added various prayers and observances, in order to celebrate the Holy Mysteries as worthily and as edifyingly as possible. Those constituent portions of the sacrificial rite which are found in all the ancient Liturgies, have incontestably their origin from Apostolic times and Tradition: the essential and fundamental features of the sacrificial rite, introduced and enlarged upon by the Apostles, were preserved with fidelity and reverence in the mystical blessings, the use of lights, incense, vestments and many things of that nature that she [the Church] employs by Apostolic prescription and Tradition.¹⁵

This then is the Mass of All Times, the Mass "codified by Pius V" and protected by the Apostolic Bull *Quo Primum*, that Mass that Paul VI changed because, among other things, it contained "undesirable features" and "failed to adequately express the holy things it signified."¹⁶

THE "HISTORY" OF THE TRADITIONAL MASS

While certain prayers were at times added to the traditional Mass, it is well recognized that its central core or "Canon" (meaning "rule") remained fixed and unchanged from the earliest days. According to Sir William Palmer, a non-Catholic historian:

There seems nothing unreasonable in thinking that the Roman liturgy, as used in the time of Gregory the Great [540-604] may have existed from a period of the most remote antiquity, and perhaps there are nearly as good reasons for referring its original composition to the Apostolic Age.

Contrary to modernist principles, the Christian Revelation ceased with the death of the last Apostle. The Canon of the Mass essentially consists of those parts instituted by Christ, and of certain prayers added by the Apostles under Divine inspiration. The resulting Canon was considered so sacred that mediaeval theologians referred to it as the "Holy of Holies," comparable to the inner sanctum of the Temple of Jerusalem. Intense historical research has discovered only two additions to this Canon after the fourth century. Pope St. Leo (440-461) added the phrase "a holy sacrifice, a spotless victim" (*Sanctum sacrificium immaculatam hostiam*) to the prayer,

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

“Be pleased to look upon these offerings” (*Supra quae propitio*); and Pope St. Gregory (540-604) added the phrase, “Order our days in Your peace and cause us to be saved from everlasting doom and to be numbered among Your chosen ones” (*Diesque nostros in tua pace disponas, atque ab aeterna damnatione non eripi et in electorum tuorum jubeas grege numerari*), to the prayer, “This then is our beautiful offering . . .” (*Hanc igitur*). Apart from these minor additions (not deletions), the Canon in use today by the traditional Church is the same as that used by Pope St. Damasus in the years 366-384. Historical evidence prior to Pope St. Damasus is sparse. After all, before the reign of Constantine (who died in 337) the Church was under constant persecution. Furthermore, the words of the Canon were so sacrosanct that they were part of the Arcana—that is to say, they were kept secret lest they be profaned. Thus it is that Chapter IV, Session XII of the Council of Trent states:

For it [the Canon] is composed out of the very words of the Lord, the Traditions of the Apostles, and the pious institutions of the Holy Pontiffs.

Any claim to “return to primitive practice” other than by use of this Canon is patently false. As Fr. Louis Bouyer, an ex-Lutheran who helped compose the New Mass, wrote prior to the Council:

The Roman Canon, as it is today, goes back to Gregory the Great. There is not, in the East or the West, a Eucharistic prayer remaining in use to this day, that can boast of such antiquity. In the eyes not only of the Orthodox, but of Anglicans and even those Protestants who have still to some extent a feeling for tradition, *to jettison it would be a rejection of any claim on the part of the Roman Church to represent the true Catholic Church* (emphasis mine).¹⁷

The additions to the Mass outside of the Canon proper are also of ancient origin. Consider, for example, the reading of Scripture. The first Gospel was written some eight years after the Crucifixion, and the Apocalypse many decades later. We know that it was the custom to read from Scripture and other sacred writings (such as the Shepherd of Hermes) before the Canon, because St. Procopius (martyred in the year 303) had the function of translating these readings into the vernacular. The “Canon” of Scripture was established in 317, and the Scriptural readings used in the traditional Mass were fixed by St. Damasus in the fourth century. (He established a one year cycle which the post-Conciliar Church, following the example of the Lutherans, has changed to a three year cycle.) In the fifth century Pope St. Celestine I introduced the Introit and the Gradual, chants taken from the

Psalms appropriate to the season and the feast. In the sixth century Pope St. Gregory added the Biblical phrase *Kyrie Eleison* (Lord have mercy on me). In the seventh century Pope St. Sergius introduced the *Agnus Dei*. The practice of the priest stating at the time of Communion “*Corpus domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat . . .*” (“May the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ preserve . . .”) is said to date from the time of the Albigensian heretics who denied the “Real Presence,” though St. Hippolytus (A.D. 220) informs us it was customary in his day to say, “This is the body (blood) of Christ.” And throughout history the various religious orders have added special prayers such as those commemorating their own saints. Over the centuries then, various additions were made to the ceremonies surrounding the Canon. But the Canon itself remained sacrosanct.¹⁸

Finally, at the time of the Reformation when the authority of tradition was being attacked, and when innovations and novelties of all sorts were being introduced, it became necessary to codify and “fix” for all times the most Holy Mass so as to protect it from any possible corruption. This was achieved by the study of original documents over the course of several pontificates. The Roman Missal and Breviary were eventually published by Pope St. Pius V in accord with the wish expressed by the Fathers of the Council of Trent. (This is why the traditional Mass is sometimes called “the Mass of Pius V”—a misnomer taken advantage of by the new Church to promulgate the calumny that Paul VI’s drastic changes did nothing other than was done by his predecessor Pope St. Pius V).¹⁹

The publication of the Roman Missal was accompanied by the proclamation of the Apostolic Constitution *Quo Primum*. From henceforth this Missal was to be used throughout the Roman Church by all her members, though exceptions were made in favor of certain religious orders (like the Dominicans) who had said essentially the same Mass with slightly different ceremonies for at least 200 years prior to that time. Thus, even today, should one have the privilege of hearing a traditional Dominican Mass, one would recognize certain minor variations, but would easily be able to follow it with the standard Roman Missal. *Quo Primum* is to be found in the front of every Missal published between 1570 and 1968. It has been repeatedly reconfirmed by every Pontiff from Pius V to John XXIII, some 42 in all. Let us consider some of the statements in this Constitution:

We specifically command each and every patriarch, administrator, and all other persons of whatever Ecclesiastical dignity they may be, be they even cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, or possessed of any other rank of preeminence, and *We order them in virtue of holy obedience* to chant or to read the Mass according to the rite and manner and norm herewith laid down by Us and, hereafter to discontinue and completely discard all

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

other rubrics. They must not in celebrating Mass presume to introduce any ceremonies or recite any prayers other than those contained in this Missal. . . . Furthermore, by these presents [this law], *in virtue of Our Apostolic authority*, We grant and concede *in perpetuity* that for the chanting or reading of this Mass in any church whatsoever, *this Missal is hereafter to be followed absolutely, without any scruple of conscience or fear of incurring any penalty, judgment, or censure, and may freely and lawfully be used*. Nor are superiors, administrators, canons, chaplains, and other secular priests, or religious of whatever order or by whatever title designated, obliged to celebrate the Mass otherwise than as enjoined by Us. We likewise declare and ordain that no one whatsoever is to be forced or coerced to alter this Missal, and that *this present document cannot be revoked or modified, but remains always valid and retains its full force*. . . . Therefore, no one whosoever is permitted to alter this letter, or heedlessly to venture to go contrary to this notice of Our Permission, statute, ordinance, command, precept, grant, indult, declaration, will, decree, and prohibition. Would anyone however presume to commit such an act, he should know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul (emphasis mine).

This is the Mass that Fr. Faber said “was the most beautiful thing this side of heaven.” Yet this is the Mass that the post-Conciliar Church has abandoned, destroyed, and forbidden to the faithful.²⁰

THE MEANING OF THE MASS

There is in the traditional Mass, no word or phrase, no single act of the celebrant, and no adornment of the altar or the priest, which is without significance. As M. Olier, the saintly founder of St. Sulpice said: “In order to present the mystery of the holy sacrifice of the Mass, one must know that this sacrifice is the Sacrifice of Heaven. . . . A Sacrifice is offered up in Paradise which, at the same time, is offered up here on earth, and they differ only in that here on earth the sacrifice occurs unseen.” What M. Olier is referring to is explained in the Apocalyptic vision of St. John the Apostle in which he describes the sacrifice of the Lamb, slain but alive and seated on the throne, with the twenty-four ancients adoring Him with melodies on the harp and with the burning of incense, while multitudes of angels and all creatures sing praise to the Lamb and the eternal Amen (Apoc. 5:6-14). As Scripture teaches: “The Lamb was slain from the beginning of the world” (Apoc. 13:8), this “Lamb, unspotted and undefiled, foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world, but manifested in the last times for you” (1 Pet. 1:19-20). Thus, in the Mass we see the Celestial Sacrifice

of the Lamb brought down from Heaven and present on the altar before our eyes. As Canon Smith tells us, such saintly individuals as “P. Condren, Cardinal de Bérulle, M. Olier, and P. Lapin are at one in holding that Christ in Heaven continues for ever to make an external and visible offering of His sacred Body, but whereas on Calvary that Body was destroyed in death, in Heaven it is annihilated, so to speak, in the radiant devouring glory of the divine life.”²¹ The consecration and sacrifice effected by the priest (standing in the place of Christ) is then, the visible manifestation of an eternal act. As the Abbé Guéranger says in *The Liturgical Year*, after the consecration, “the divine Lamb is lying on our altar”! The reader is asked to consider the accompanying illustration drawn from a standard text. It shows how the liturgy celebrated at a precise moment in time, is the visible reality, here and now, of the timeless, eternal Mass of Heaven described in the Apocalypse. Through it, we participate in the Celestial Liturgy; through it the Gates of Heaven and the possibility of eternal life are made available to us.²²

The concept is important if we are to understand in what way the Mass is a “memorial.” It is not a memorial in the sense that we commemorate the death of the unknown soldier, or even the death of a loved one. (This is the Protestant view, namely that the Mass is a “memorial” of the Crucifixion.) Rather, the Mass is a memorial in the sense that it “recalls to mind,” once again, in time and space, what happened on Calvary and what is occurring eternally and perpetually in Heaven.²³ This can only occur through the mediation of a priest who has been given the power to bring, as it were, Heaven down to earth.

It naturally follows that every word and action of the priest is significant. The Mass recapitulates the entire history of the Redemption. If, for example, he makes 33 Signs of the Cross, this is to commemorate the number of years Our Lord spent on earth. If he extends his hands over the chalice while reciting the *Hanc Igitur*, he is recapitulating the action of the High Priest of the Jews who placed his hands on the sacrificial goat to transfer to it the sins of the people. (The “scapegoat,” prefiguring Christ, was adorned with a red ribbon—as Christ was mockingly covered with a red cape at His trial—and then led out into the desert where he was hurled down from a high precipice as a sacrifice.) If the priest faces the altar during the sacrifice (except when he turns to bring us the blessings that derive therefrom), it is because it is on the altar that the action is occurring, and the priest is, like Christ whom he represents, an intermediary between us and God. If the altar traditionally faces the East, it is because this is the direction of the rising sun, a symbol of our Lord. As to the altar—it is not a “table”—we know from its consecration that it relates to the altar of Moses and also

to that of Jacob (Jacob's pillow)—and that the altar itself is the Body of Christ and is placed “at the center of the world”—the *axis mundi*—so that all creation is, as it were, peripheral to the Mass and thus capable of being integrated through the divine action. The prototype of the altar is the ark which rested in the Holy of Holies of the Jewish temple. Between the cherubim rested the *shekhina* or the presence of God. Thus it is that our Catholic altars placed the tabernacle in the center of our altars. And if the priest is dressed in royal fashion during the rite, it is because he represents Christ the King. He is no longer an individual (“Fr. ‘Bob’”), but an *alter Christus*—another Christ. It is not for nothing that the priest purifies his hands before performing the sacrifice, nor for vain reasons that he cleanses the chalice with exquisite care after consuming the Sacred Species. None of these acts are the inventions of men. As the Abbé Guéranger says:

It is to the Apostles that those ceremonies go back that accompany the administration of the sacraments, the establishment of the sacramentals, the principal feasts. . . . The apostolic liturgy is found entirely outside of Scripture; it belongs to the domain of Tradition.²⁴

Yet this is the Mass that the post-Conciliar “Popes” saw as having “undesirable features” and “failing to adequately express the holy things it signified.” In the face of the changes mandated by the post-Conciliar “Popes,” will not Our Lord once again complain that “my pastors have destroyed My Vineyard, they have trodden My portion under foot . . . , they have changed My delightful portion into a desolate wilderness” (Jer. 12:10-11).²⁵

CAN WE LOSE THE TRUE MASS?

Had Satan been aware that Christ was the Divine Logos, he would never have agitated for the Crucifixion. Needless to say, every true Mass reminds him once again of his terrible mistake and at the same time is a vehicle for infinite Graces being bestowed on mankind. No wonder that he has an intense hatred for the Mass. It has always been predicted that the true Mass would be taken from us. Listen to the words of St. Alphonsus de Liguori:

The devil has always attempted, by means of the heretics, to deprive the world of the Mass, making them precursors of the anti-Christ, who, before anything else, will try to abolish and will actually abolish the holy sacrifice of the altar, as a punishment for the sins of men, according to the prediction of Daniel, “And strength was given him against the continual sacrifice” (Dan. 8:12).²⁶

The Liturgical Revolution

Much the same is said by Fr. Fahey:

All the frightful energy of Satan's hatred is especially directed against the holy sacrifice of the Mass. Arrayed with him and animated with the same hatred, there is an army of invisible satellites of the same nature. All their efforts are directed towards preventing its celebration by exterminating the priesthood, and towards curtailing its effects. If Satan cannot succeed in completely doing away with the one and only acceptable act of worship, he will strive to restrict it to the minds and hearts of as few individuals as possible.²⁷

The hatred of the Reformers for the traditional Mass is well known. Luther called it an "abomination," a "false blasphemous cult," and instructed the rulers under his influence "to attack the idolaters" and to suppress their worship as much as possible. He repeatedly denied its true sacrificial nature and above all hated the "abominable Canon in which the Mass is made a sacrifice." Indeed, he went so far as to say: "I affirm that all brothels, murderers, robberies, crime, adulteries are less wicked than this abomination of the Popish Mass." As to the Canon or core of the Mass, he stated:

The Mass is not a sacrifice. It is not the act of a sacrificing priest. Together with the Canon, we discard all that implies an oblation.²⁸

In words that are almost prophetic Luther noted that "when the Mass has been overthrown, I think we shall have overthrown the Papacy. I think it is in the Mass, as on a rock, that the Papacy wholly rests. . . . Everything will of necessity collapse when their sacrilegious and abominable Mass collapses."

When we come to the Anglicans we fare little better. While their phraseology was slightly more restrained, it is clear that they also denied the Real Presence. Texts current during the time of the Reformation describe the blessed sacrament as "a vile cake to be made God and man," and the Mass itself as "the worshiping of God made of fine flour." The phrase "hocus pocus" was used by the English Reformers to deride the Words of Consecration, "*Hoc est enim Corpus meum.*" Anglican theology denied that the Mass is a sacrifice as Catholics understand it, and allowed the word "sacrifice" to be applied in only three senses: the sacrifice of thanksgiving; benevolence and liberality to the poor; and the mortifying of our own bodies. None of these requires an altar. As Cranmer said, "The form of a table shall more move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass into the right use of the Lord's Supper. For the use of

an altar is to make a sacrifice upon it: the use of a table is to serve for men to eat upon.”²⁹ Cranmer and his ilk specifically denied the doctrine of transubstantiation (or the Real Presence), and if the First Book of Common Prayer, due to the ambiguous use of language, was capable of a Catholic interpretation, changes were made in the Second Book of Common Prayer specifically designed to exclude this possibility. If any doubt remains as to their attitude the reader is referred to the “Thirty Nine Articles” to which every Anglican (and Episcopalian) clergyman must adhere, and which “no man may hereafter either print, or preach, to draw the Article aside in any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof.” The list of articles which are *de fide* for Anglicans includes the one we have already called attention to, namely that the Mass as understood by the Council of Trent is “a blasphemous fable and a dangerous conceit.”

What then are we to think when we find Paul VI being photographed with, and thanking the six Protestant “observers”³⁰ for helping in the creation of his *Novus Ordo Missae*—for assisting in “reediting in a new manner liturgical texts tried and tested by long usage, or establishing formulas which are completely new . . . [thus] imparting greater theological value to the liturgical texts so that the *lex orandi* conformed better with the *lex credendi*” (*L’Osservatore Romano*, May 11, 1970)? Quite apart from admitting the scandal of non-Catholic involvement in the creation of this new “rite,” the statement implies that either the liturgical texts prior to 1969 did not possess the degree of theological value that was desirable, or that the *lex credendi* (the Church’s law of belief) had changed! Should we have any doubt about which of these two alternatives to choose, the Protestants have resolved them for us. The Superior Consistory of the Church of the Augsburg Confession of Alsace and Lorraine (Evangelical Lutheran) publicly acknowledged that Lutherans could take part in the “Catholic eucharistic celebration,” because it allowed them to “use these new eucharistic prayers with which they felt at home.” And why did they “feel at home with them”? Because they had “the advantage of giving a different interpretation to the theology of the sacrifice than they were accustomed to attribute to Catholicism” (Dec. 8, 1975). Dr. M.G. Siegvall, a Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the Protestant faculty at Strasbourg has testified that “nothing in the renewed Mass need really trouble the Evangelical Protestant.” The Protestant theologian Jaroslav Pelikan tells us that the obvious purpose of the Conciliar document on the liturgy was to introduce “the liturgical program set forth by the Reformers.” And what was this program of the Reformers other than to destroy the Mass and thus to destroy the Church? The final result is described by Archbishop Bugnini,

the primary person responsible for the creation of the *Novus Ordo Missae*: “The liturgical reform is a major conquest of the Catholic Church.”³¹

Both Lutherans and Anglicans, to say nothing of other categories of “separated brethren,” find no objection to participating in the *Novus Ordo Missae*, and indeed, in using it themselves as an alternative form of worship. Nor does the post-Conciliar Church have any objection to Anglican “priests” who join the Catholic Church, using their own rites.³² Obviously, Protestants do not find the new rite a “blasphemous fable . . . more wicked than all brothels, murders, robberies, crimes, and adulteries.” Indeed, some Protestant sects have made alterations in their own rites to bring them into line with the *Novus Ordo*. As Brother Thurian of the Taizé community states, “One of the fruits [of the *Novus Ordo*] may be that non-Catholic communities may be able to celebrate the last Supper with the same prayers as the Catholic Church. Theologically this is possible.”³³ The Anglican Archdeacon Pauley states that the *Novus Ordo* has, in many places, “outstripped the liturgy of Cranmer.”³⁴ Supposed Catholics also bear witness to the situation. As Fr. Galineau, S.J., says, “The Roman rite as we knew it no longer exists. It has been destroyed.”³⁵ In a similar manner Archbishop Dwyer said “the Latin past of the Church” has been “all but expunged . . . reduced to a memory in the middle distance.”³⁶ In the light of such statements, how are we to understand the words of Paul VI, whose primary function was to preserve the Deposit of the Faith intact:

Let everyone understand well that nothing has been changed in the essence of our traditional Mass. . . . There is nothing in this idea, absolutely. . . . The new rite, the Mass, is the same as always. If anything, its identity has been made more recognizable in certain of its aspects (*Allocution*, Nov. 16, 1969).

It is in the name of Tradition that we ask all our sons and daughters, all Catholic communities, to celebrate with dignity and fervor the renewed liturgy. The adoption of the *Novus Ordo Missae* is certainly not left to the free choice of priests or faithful. . . . The *Novus Ordo* was promulgated to take the place of the old (*Custos, quid de nocte*, May 24, 1976).

VATICAN II'S LITURGY CONSTITUTION

The traditional Mass is, then, not only the most sacred possession of the Church, but also a treasure that can be traced back to Apostolic times. It was the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy promulgated by Vatican II that opened the doors to change by stating that the sacramental rites are to be reformed “in accord with sound Tradition”—as if sound Tradition did not

demand their retention without change. Let us see how it set about doing this. It stated:

The divine liturgy is made up of unchangeable elements divinely instituted, and elements subject to change. The latter not only may but ought to be changed with the passing of time if features have by chance crept in which are less harmonious with the intimate nature of the liturgy, or if existing elements have grown less functional. In this restoration, both texts and rites should be drawn up so that they express more clearly the holy things which they signify.

While the first sentence is true, the second implies that the traditional liturgy contained features which were undesirable and which failed to adequately express the holy things they signified. For this there is absolutely no evidence whatsoever. But the second sentence was much more—it was a “time bomb”—for the simple reason that the document never specified what was and what wasn’t “unchangeable.” As we shall see in the next chapter, even the very words “Our Lord” used for the consecration at the Last Supper fell into the category of “elements subject to change”!

The Council then went on to specify some of the changes they considered necessary. They were to be characterized by the need for a “noble simplicity,” they were to be “short, clear, and unencumbered by useless repetitions,” and they were to place the rite “within the people’s powers of comprehension” so that they “didn’t require much explanation.” In addition, they were to be such that the “Christian people” could “take part in them fully, actively, and as befits a community.” Needless to say, the use of the vernacular was approved. Taking advantage of the theological usage of the term “Logos” (which can be applied to Christ, to the Eucharist, or simply translated as “the Word”), the document stressed the concept that Scripture was “the Word of God” and that the role of Scripture “was of paramount importance in the celebration of the liturgy.”³⁷ Such a statement allowed for the displacement of the Eucharist in favor of Scripture, and indeed, for the displacement of Tradition in favor of the Bible. The Eucharist itself was described as the “Sacrament of Unity,” the term “unity” meaning one thing to the traditional bishops, and quite another to those who envisioned a new world order. In order to satisfy the conservatives, however, certain phrases were inserted. The rites were to be revised in accord with “sound Tradition”; “there were to be no innovations unless the good of the Church generally and certainly required them”; and Latin was to be retained as the “official language of the Church.” Such phrases were of course more “time bombs.” They sounded fine but were open to multiple interpretations.

But there is more. Having said all this, the document went on to state that “in some places and circumstances . . . an even more radical adaptation of the liturgy is needed,” and power to approve these further “adaptations” was to be granted to local “territorial Ecclesiastical authority.” History will show that this was one of the biggest “time bombs” of all. Every local hierarchy set up its own “territorial authority” or “Liturgical Commission,” and every possible innovative variation was introduced. When Rome sorted these out and returned to a somewhat more stable and conservative liturgical form, the faithful who had not abandoned the Church completely were able to breath a sigh of relief. Relative to what had been going on it seemed like a return to orthodoxy.

As the Protestant theologian Jaroslav Pelikan stated, the Constitution on the Liturgy “does not merely tinker with the formalities of liturgical worship,” it “seeks to form and to reform the very life of the Church,” and that it represents “the acceptance, however belated, of the liturgical program set forth by the [early Protestant] Reformers.” Freemason Annibale Bugnini, who was primarily responsible for the final form of the Constitution and, hence, in an excellent position to evaluate it said, “the image of the liturgy as given by the Council is completely different from what it had previously” (*Doc. Cath.*, Jan. 4, 1967).³⁸ No wonder Cardinal Ottaviani asked the assembled Fathers if they were “planning a revolution.”

PREPARING THE FAITHFUL BEFORE THE COUNCIL

Paul VI said that the acceptance of the New “Mass” was an “act of obedience” to the Council. The Council, however, only opened the flood-gates to reform—the innovators had been hard at work for many years and were well prepared to take advantage of the situation John XXIII created. Attacks upon the liturgy and sacraments date back to sub-Apostolic times, and can be documented throughout the course of history. The Freemasons have always had an intense interest both in creating their own rituals, and in having the Church alter those established by Christ and the Apostles in order to bring them into line with Freemasonic principles.³⁹ The Abbé Dom Guéranger described the service that the reformers would create over 100 years ago and it is amazing to note the degree to which the *Novus Ordo Missae* fulfills his criteria.⁴⁰

Over the past 50 to 100 years the attacks on the liturgy have been in the hands of modernist “reformers” within the Church. They have continuously labored and primarily achieved their goals, by infiltrating the “Liturgical Movement” which had originally been instituted to preserve and foster the

traditional forms of worship. Even though the Church frustrated most of their efforts prior to Vatican II, the innovators were successful in introducing a whole host of concepts into this movement—such as the idea that the liturgy had to be “pastoral,” simple, and easily understandable (how can we easily understand such a high mystery?); the need for using the vernacular; the concept of “the people of God”; “the primacy of the Word of God” by which they meant the primacy of Scripture over the Eucharist; and the insistence on activism and participation on the part of the laity. All this, plus a large number of pseudo-historical studies aimed at undermining the historical foundations of the liturgy helped to prepare the way.

Even the claim that the Liturgical Commission created the *Novus Ordo Missae* after the Council is false, for a virtually similar rite had been in use in South India as early as 1950, and at Taizé since 1959.⁴¹ All that the innovators did with the help of the Protestant “observers” was to put the finishing touches on their earlier efforts. The Abbé Bonnetterre provides an excellent review of the machinations of these reformers over the past 50 years. We shall review a few of them briefly.⁴²

In 1948 Pius XII established the “Commission for Liturgical Reform.” Its director was the Rev. Ferdinando Antonelli, O.F.M. (later Cardinal) and the Secretary the Rev. Annibale Bugnini, C.M. (later Archbishop). It is these two individuals who have primarily been responsible for the various steps that culminated in the *Novus Ordo Missae*.

We have already presented evidence that Archbishop Bugnini was a Freemason.⁴³ The Freemasons have long dreamed of infiltrating, and indeed, of taking over the Church. It was Cardinal Leinart, another Freemason, who in 1950 petitioned Pius XII for permission to celebrate the Easter Vigil at night rather than in the morning—and this for “pastoral reasons.”⁴⁴ Frs. Antonelli and Bugnini were glad to assist. What resulted was a new rite with 1) optional prayers; 2) the use of the vernacular; and 3) the rubric directing the celebrant to “sit and listen” rather than read the lessons from the altar. Then in 1953 the immemorial midnight Eucharistic fast was reduced from midnight to three hours (and later reduced by Paul VI to one hour). The next step occurred in 1955 when a new Holy Week rite was introduced. It contained the following key features: 1) everything was short and simple; 2) the priest faced the people during the essential parts of the rite; 3) the prayers at the foot of the altar and the Last Gospel were suppressed; and 4) the laity recited the Our Father aloud with the priest. The Palm Sunday service was altered along similar lines. Six of the collects, the ancient rite for the Blessing of the Palms, and the *Gloria Laus et honor* at the door were all suppressed. In addition the recitation of the Passion was shortened so as to omit the accounts of the anointing at Bethany and

The Liturgical Revolution

the Last Supper. Still more, the *Triduum Sacrum* or the services of the last three days of Holy Week along with the beautiful Office of *Tenebrae* were virtually destroyed; the Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday was abolished and replaced with a simple communion service, and contrary to immemorial custom, a genuflection was prescribed at the prayer for the Jews. The Holy Saturday Vigil was dramatically changed, with its lessons reduced from twelve to four. There was also a drastic modification of the traditional rite for the Blessing of the New Fire and the Paschal Candle. The following year the ancient Vigil Service for Pentecost Eve was entirely suppressed. The liturgical revolution was well on its way.

The next step was the promulgation of the decree *Cum Nostra Hac Aetate* in 1955. This introduced a host of minor changes in the Breviary and Missal which in no way affected the laity, but which introduced among the clergy a sense that “change was in the air” and further alterations were in the offing. But the laity were also to be softened up and *Cum Nostra Hac Aetate* was followed up by the suppression of the Solemnity of St. Joseph as “Patron of the Universal Church” and its replacement by the Feast of “St. Joseph the Worker”—and this on May Day, the international socialist holiday. Then in 1958, one month before the death of the beleaguered Pius XII, the Instruction on Sacred Music was promulgated which fostered the “Dialogue Mass.”⁴⁵ Under the cover of encouraging lay participation, commentators made their first appearance—their supposed role being to read in the vernacular while the priest read in Latin. All these changes were masterminded by Antonelli and Bugnini.

In October 1958 John XXIII came to the pontifical throne and within three months the Council was under way. Annibale Bugnini was appointed to serve as secretary of the Preparatory Liturgical Commission of the Council. Clearly the ideal person was placed in the ideal position to leave behind the “time bombs” that later exploded. The fox was given the run of the chicken-coop.

In July of 1960 John XXIII promulgated a new body of rubrics (rules) for the Breviary and Missal; he thus established what has come to be known as “the Mass of John XXIII,” or “Middle Bugnini.” Then in 1962, during the Council itself (and during the debates on the sacred liturgy), John XXIII introduced the name of St. Joseph into the Canon of the Mass—the first change in over 1500 years and a clear-cut message to the assembled Fathers that virtually nothing was sacrosanct.⁴⁶

John XXIII died in 1963 and was followed by Paul VI. Almost immediately we had a host of continuous minor liturgical changes culminating in the promulgation of the New “Mass” on April 3, 1969. Once again, the person appointed to oversee all this was the infamous Annibale Bugnini. Over

200 documents are involved and those who wish to follow the dismantling process step by step are referred to “Documents on the Liturgy” published by the Liturgical Press.⁴⁷ As Michael Davies has noted, “a cursory reading [of these documents] will reveal that they are frequently replete with sound theology, stern warnings against abuses and unauthorized innovations, profound veneration of Tradition and traditional liturgical forms, [and] urgent admonitions to preserve these Traditions. . . . In reading these documents it is necessary to ignore the orthodox padding and discover exactly what they permit which was not permitted before and exactly what they forbid which was not forbidden before.”

Perhaps the most important of these documents was *Sacram Liturgiam* (Jan. 1964), which established the *Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgica* or the Concilium for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy. It consisted of some 50 bishops, several Protestant “observers,” and 200 consultants or advisors, mostly drawn from the *periti* of the Council. It also emphasized the right of the national hierarchies (“territorial authorities” mentioned above) to approve vernacular translations, a fact which Fr. Bugnini considered a most significant development because it “broke the centuries-old barrier” which insisted that Rome had to approve liturgical translations. He further noted that the term territorial is “designedly elastic.” Another was *Inter Oecumenici* (Sept. 1964) which, among other things, initiated the laity praying the *Pater Noster* with the priest, changed the formula used by the priest in distributing communion, forbade the Leonine Prayers after Mass for the Conversion of Russia (including the prayer to St. Michael the Archangel), introduced the “Prayer of the Faithful” (the “Bidding Prayers” of the Anglican Church), and allowed for the entire Mass apart from the Preface and Canon to be said in the vernacular. Other changes included the abolition of the *Judica Me* (the priest’s prayers) at the beginning of Mass and the dropping of the Last Gospel. Perhaps the most important thing it did, however, was to set up “National Diocesan Liturgical Commissions” dominated by liberals, an act which resulted in “the creation of a vast liturgical bureaucracy with a vested interest in the reform, particularly its continued evolution.” *Inter Oecumenici* went beyond the Mass; it also introduced changes in the other sacraments, little noticed at the time.

What the laity saw was a constant series of innovations in their liturgy. Every week something new was introduced. In April of 1965 the Holy See authorized the vernacular for the Preface. In September the practice of substituting Saturday evening Mass for the Sunday obligation was approved. Then in May of 1967 *Tres Abhinc Annos* allowed the entire Canon to be said in the vernacular; forbade the laity to genuflect (kneel down) at

the *Incarnatus*; the priest to genuflect after consecrating the Sacred Species and abolished all Signs of the Cross between the *Quam oblationem* and the consecration of the Chalice. (Cranmer suppressed all but two of them in his 1549 Communion Service and dropped the remaining two in 1552 after Martin Bucer objected to their retention.) Because the prayers said in association with these Signs of the Cross remained unaffected at this stage, most priests accepted the change without complaint. This further conditioned them to accept the new Eucharistic prayers when they were promulgated—“Canons” which contained neither the prayers nor the Signs of the Cross. Other significant changes were that the priest no longer had to keep his thumbs and forefingers together lest the smallest part of the Host should fall; he was only to kiss the altar at the start of the service, and he was free to say Mass without the chasuble, thus appearing like a typical Protestant minister.

As Michael Davies says: “The list of mutilations to the traditional Mass is long and depressing. The mask was off completely.” Fr. Bryan Houghton was blunter in stating that “this was the revolution.” Fr. Stephen Rigby discussed the situation in these terms: “Withdraw this, make that optional, and see how they take it. Condition them by the gradual and permissive for the compulsory and the revolutionary.”⁴⁸

The stage was set. The fact that the *Tres Abhinc Annos* met with little resistance meant that no large scale opposition was to be feared when the New “Mass” appeared. The next step was the English (ICEL) mistranslations. The penultimate step was the Decree *Praeces eucharisticae* promulgated in May 1968, which introduced three new Canons. The Consilium had wished to abolish the ancient Roman Canon completely, but Paul VI “intervened” to save it. Saved it was, to become Eucharistic Prayer No. 1, but changed in significant ways which will be discussed in the next chapter.⁴⁹ Conservative priests hailed this as providing a way “out,” while others were perfectly free to use the other “Eucharistic Prayers” which were shorter, easier, and according to the Consilium, better reflected “the worldwide and Ecumenical perspectives of the Second Vatican Council and also those of the so-called ‘theology of secular values.’” We no longer had to use the venerable Canon “composed out of the very words of the Lord, the traditions of the Apostles, and the pious institutions of the holy pontiffs.” These three new “canons” blew the old Mass to pieces!

Archbishop Annibale Bugnini was ecstatic. He stated:

The new song has begun, and it will not cease. Life generates life: the first verses of this new canticle will call forth other verses, other hymns, and other innumerable and unceasing songs: the songs of the liturgy of perennial youth. It is the law of life. We should not then turn our backs on

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

this inescapable demand of the Spirit because of temporary discomfort, technical difficulties, or force of habit—even if these habits are deeply rooted. In their relationship with God, the new generations feel the need for new formulas which express more explicitly the spiritual needs of today. They know that they can pray equally well to God with a “new song.” It is to this that the Church now invites us.

The liturgical revolution was thus introduced by stages. This was precisely the policy followed by Cranmer, who, at the beginning of his liturgical revolution, avoided any drastic changes “which would needlessly provoke the conservatives and stiffen the attitude of that large class of man, who, rightly handled, could be brought to acquiesce in ambiguity and interim measures.”

As Cardinal Heenan said in a pastoral letter:

I would have been foolhardy to introduce all the changes at once. It was obviously wise to change gradually and gently. If all the changes had been introduced at once, you would have been shocked (Sept. 1969).

And so we are brought to April 1969, and the introduction of the *Novus Ordo Missae* which Paul VI asked us to accept “with joyous enthusiasm and to implement it with prompt and unanimous observance.” This was demanded on the grounds that the reform was “due to the express wishes of the recent Ecumenical Council.” Every Catholic was obliged to render “prompt adherence” because “the reform about to be implemented corresponds to an authoritative mandate of the Church. It is an act of obedience, an attempt by the Church to maintain her true nature” (General Audience, Nov. 1969).

Notes

¹ Dom Guéranger, *Institutions Liturgiques*, Vol. III. A translation of this is available in *Studies in Comparative Religion*, Summer, 1975; and *The Roman Catholic*, Vol. II, No. 3, May 1980.

² Quoted in Fr. Michael Muller, C.S.S.R., *God the Teacher of Mankind* (Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1885).

³ A “Constitution” is defined as “an irreformable statement of what the Church’s belief is” (Fr. Louis Bouyer, *The Liturgy Revived* [Libra Books: Notre Dame University, 1964]), and “the binding force of a pontifical constitution is . . . beyond question” (*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1908).

⁴ St. Alphonsus de Liguori, *The Holy Mass* (Benzinger: London, 1887).

⁵ St. Leonard of Port Maurice, *The Hidden Treasure* (TAN: Rockford, Ill., 1982).

The Liturgical Revolution

⁶ Fr. Muller, *God the Teacher of Mankind*.

⁷ Dr. Nicholas Gihl, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass* (Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1929).

⁸ Ibid. The liturgy of the Apostle James can be found in *The Anti-Nicene Fathers* (Eerdmans: Mich., 1967).

⁹ Tanquerey, *A Manual of Dogmatic Theology*.

¹⁰ They describe the efficacy of the bread and wine used in their services in a wide variety of ways. Some admit that Christ is “subjectively” present for the worshiper, but all deny any objective “Presence” independent of the worshiper.

¹¹ The Anglicans and Lutherans say the Nicene Creed. The statement, however, is taken from “The Thirty-Nine Articles” to which the Anglican and Episcopalian Churches demand assent.

¹² Gihl, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Ex opere operato*—literally: “by its own power.” The defects of the priest or communicant do not affect its power except as explained in the text.

¹³ *Confessions* 1, 9, e, 11-12.

¹⁴ A.M. Henry, O.P., *Introduction to Theology*, Vol. I (Fides: Chicago, 1954).

¹⁵ Gihl, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*.

¹⁶ The Apostles established different Masses in different parts of the world—all with the same essential core. (Revelation comes to us from the Apostles as well as from Christ.) Many of these have been translated into other languages such as Arabic, Coptic, etc. Thus it is that the Church recognizes some 83 different “rites” of the Mass as valid.

¹⁷ Fr. Louis Bouyer, *The Decomposition of Catholicism* (Franciscan: Chicago, 1969). Prior to Vatican II Fr. Bouyer gave his full support to the liturgical revolutionaries. After he saw their new mass—the *Novus Ordo Missae*—he stated: “The present situation in Catholic worship has merely gone the same road as the least traditional and most undisciplined aspect of Protestantism.”

¹⁸ Patrick H. Omlor, *Interdum*, available as a chapter in his collected writings, *The Robber Church* (Stouffville, Ontario: Silvio Mattacchione Co., 1998). He also quotes Muratori (1672-1750), who *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908) describes as “one of the greatest scholars of his time,” to the effect that “in ancient times, although the liturgy of the Roman Mass was observed generally in the churches of Italy, France, Germany, Britain, and other countries, yet there was no small variety in their Missals; but this did not affect the substance of the mystery, or the chief and essential rites of the Mass. The difference ran in adding collects, sequences, and special feasts which each Bishop might insert in his own Missal. But to change the sacred words of the Canon was a crime.”

¹⁹ Paul VI stated that “in no different way did our holy predecessor Pius V make obligatory the Missal reformed under his authority, following the Council of Trent” (*Custos quid de nocte*). Post-Conciliar defenders often state that changes were made in the Mass after the Council of Trent. This is false. There were four minor corrections made necessary by the carelessness of printers or reference to original texts. One has only to examine the so-called “reforms” of Popes Clement VIII and Urban III to see that they have absolutely nothing in common with the “reforms” of Paul VI. Similarly, Pius X made a revision, not of the text, but of the music, in order to bring the Gregorian Chant back into usage.

²⁰ *Quo Primum* does not forbid a Catholic from attending a Mass of the Eastern Rite, though formerly Canon Law required that the faithful remain within one rite (and remain attached to a single parish church) unless special circumstances prevailed. Church law since Vatican

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

It allows people to go to any Church they wish (providing it isn't traditional); and thus they are free to pick from a spectrum of conservative to liberal *Novus Ordo's*.

²¹ Canon Smith, *The Teaching of the Catholic Church*.

²² Dangle Rock, D.D., *Hierurgia of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass* (Booker: London, 1883).

²³ This is not unconnected with the Platonic idea of "recollection."

²⁴ Dom Guéranger, *Institutions liturgiques*.

²⁵ During the Reformation in England, altars were destroyed and replaced with wooden tables. Altar stones were incorporated into church steps to force the faithful to walk on them when entering the churches (F. G. Lee, *The Church under Queen Elizabeth* [Baker: London, 1896]). As for the post-Conciliar Church, it has spared no expense in tearing up altars and replacing them with tables. While some of the traditional regulations are still recommended, they are no longer mandatory and, hence, are ignored with impunity. For example, in the traditional Church an altar stone or its equivalent was mandatory. Now, "an altar stone containing the relics of the martyrs is to be commended but is optional" (General Instruction to the New Roman Missal). Traditional rubrics required that the altar be covered with three clean and blessed linen cloths which symbolized the members of the Mystical body as well as the shroud in which Christ was wrapped before being placed in the tomb. Now, only one, and not necessarily linen, is required. Former regulations demanded two lighted candles on the altar at the time of the low Mass, and these made of beeswax for the wax extracted by bees from flowers symbolized the pure flesh that Christ received from the Blessed Virgin. It is no longer necessary to have candles of any kind on the altar. (The use of six candles at High Mass represented the incorporation of the Jewish Menorah into the Christic sacrifice. The seventh light is Christ Himself.) The Crucifix, which formerly always had to be present on the altar before the priest, is now, according to the rubrics, only required to be "near by."

The post-Conciliar rite is described as a "Supper," takes place on a "table," around which the faithful are said to "gather." The chalice is not referred to as a "cup." These are all Protestant ways of denigrating the sacrificial character of the Mass. The new rite was also created by individuals whose names we know.

²⁶ St. Alphonsus de Liguori, *Dignity and Duties of the Priest or Selva* (Benzinger: London, 1889).

²⁷ Fr. Dennis Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ and the Reorganization of Society* (Regina: Dublin, many editions). The faithful can survive without the sacraments, as indeed the Japanese Catholics did for some 300 years. At the end of this period however, they immediately recognized the priests who came to them. The Desert Fathers also went for years without receiving the sacraments. However, the ordinary means of sanctification are the sacraments of the Church and the faithful have the right and the duty to receive them without having doubts about their validity.

²⁸ Quoted in Fr. Hartman Grisar's six volume study on Luther (Herder: St. Louis, 1917). As to the collapse of the Church, consider the following: "In Europe, 39% of the population still officially calls itself Catholic, and 25% in the United States. But the hard core of 'practicing' Catholics is growing ever smaller both in the Old World and in North America. A priest of the populous periphery of Rome said last month that the percentage of practicing Catholics in his parish is only a bit more than 2% of those registered as Catholics. In France there are some who speak of a 'terminal crisis' of Catholicism" (*30 Days*, March 1989).

²⁹ Quoted by Michael Davies in *Cranmer's Godly Order* (Augustine: Devon, 1976).

³⁰ While they were said to be only "observers," and indeed such was claimed by the post-Conciliar Church (*La Documentation catholique*, July 4, 1976), the fact remains that, as

The Liturgical Revolution

Cardinal W.W. Baum said, “They are not simply there as observers, but as consultants as well, and they participate fully in the discussions on Catholic liturgical renewal. It wouldn’t mean much if they just listened, but they contributed” (*The Detroit News*, June 27, 1967). Michael Davies gives much more ample evidence of their participation in his book *Pope Paul’s New Mass*.

³¹ *Notitiae*, April, 1974. If Bugnini was primarily responsible for its creation, it was Paul VI who was totally responsible for its implementation.

³² They are “re-ordained” in the post-Conciliar Church but encouraged to use their own rites because their congregations are used to them. Even Cardinal Newman admitted that “Catholic and Protestant modes of worship represent radically different beliefs” (*Loss and Gain* [Longmans Green: London, 1891]).

³³ *La Croix*, Paris, May 20, 1969.

³⁴ B.M. Pawley, *Rome and Canterbury through Four Centuries* (Mowbray: London, 1974).

³⁵ Quoted by Michael Davies, *Pope Paul’s New Mass*.

³⁶ *Twin Circle*, Oct. 23, 1973

³⁷ This is to ignore the fact that the Mass was established some 300 years before the Bible came into existence.

³⁸ Annibale Bugnini’s Masonic affiliations are beyond dispute. According to Michael Davies, “a priest placed what he claimed was documentary evidence proving that Msgr. Bugnini was a Mason in the hands of the Pope himself and warned that if drastic action was not taken, he would be bound in conscience to make the facts public.” What followed was the “exile” of Bugnini and the dissolving of the congregation. Michael Davies, having investigated the evidence, is willing to stand warrant for its truth (*Pope John’s Council*). No wonder the New Mass is little more than a “Masonic meal.” Bugnini committed suicide by hanging while in “exile.” John Paul II appointed Bugnini’s secretary as Master of Liturgical Ceremonies in the Vatican.

³⁹ Cf. C.W. Leadbeater, *The Science of the Sacraments*, and an excellent discussion in *The Remnant*, March 16, 1981. Leadbeater actually wrote a new mass, but the *Novus Ordo Missae* goes much further than his creation in the direction of Freemasonic conceptions.

⁴⁰ Dom Guéranger, *Institutions Liturgiques*.

⁴¹ Published for the Church of South India by the Christian Literature Society (P.O. Box 501, Park town, Madras). The purpose of this rite was to allow a variety of different Protestant sects to worship together. Taizé is a Lutheran community in France. Taizé currently uses the *Novus Ordo Missae*.

⁴² Abbé Didier Bonnetterre, *Le Mouvement Liturgique* (Fideliter: Switz., 1980).

⁴³ For Freemasonry and the Church see Msg. Jouin, *Papacy and Freemasonry*, and the Cardinal of Chile, *The Mystery of Freemasonry Unveiled*, both from Christian Book Club of America, Hawthorne, Calif. To quote one of Freemasonry’s authorized spokesmen, F. Limousin: “Freemasonry is an association . . . an institution . . . so it is said . . . but it is not that at all. Let us lift up the veils risking even to evoke numberless protestations. Freemasonry is a Church: It is the counter-Church, counter-Catholicism: It is the Other Church—the Church of Heresy and Free Thought. It is opposed to the Catholic Church . . . the first church . . . the Church of dogmatism and of orthodoxy.”

⁴⁴ “Pope Pius XII . . . did not understand the real nature of the ‘Liturgical Movement.’ The most dangerous members of this organization were covered over and protected by the highest dignitaries of the Church. How could the Pope suspect these experts, so much

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

praised by Cardinals Bea and Lerclero, were in fact the most dangerous enemies of the Church?" (Abbé Bonnetterre, *Le Mouvement Liturgique*).

⁴⁵ It should be remembered that Pius XII was both elderly and sick. This was three years before his death. Surrounded with like-minded individuals and with the revolutionary Cardinal Bea as his confessor, it is not surprising that he gave in to these innovators.

⁴⁶ Previous attempts at introducing St. Joseph's name into the Canon had been rejected. Pius VII on being pressed to do this answered: "Negative quod additionem nominis S. Joseph Sponsi B.V.M. in Canone" (Urbs et Orbi decree, Sacred congregation of Rites, Sept. 16, 1815).

⁴⁷ *Documents on the Liturgy 1963-1979 Conciliar, Papal, and Curial Texts* (Liturgical Press: Minn., 1982). This is perhaps the most valuable single source of information about the launching of the reform.

⁴⁸ Michael Davies, *Pope Paul's New Mass*.

⁴⁹ This intervention was the height of hypocrisy. It enabled people to see him as a defender of orthodoxy when he is totally responsible for the introduction of the New "Mass." Most of the faithful failed to notice the minor changes in Eucharistic Prayer No. 1 that brought it into line with Protestant theology.

CHAPTER 13

THE *NOVUS ORDO MISSAE*

He who goes about to take the holy sacrifice of the Mass from the Church plots no less a calamity than if he tried to snatch the sun from the universe.¹

St. John Fisher

As noted previously, those who wished to achieve an *aggiornamento* with the modern world feared “that nothing would come out of the Council.” Innovators are always impatient people. Even though they had managed to insert their false ideas into the “official” documents of the Church, they knew that this alone was insufficient. For most people things would have gone on much as before. The only way to introduce all these new ideas—that Paul VI called “the new economy of the Gospel”—into the hearts of the Catholic laity, was by means of the liturgy. This way the innovators would have a captive audience on every Sunday. Of course, as was demonstrated in the previous chapter, the innovators had planned long and well. Revolution is always well planned and directed by the upper strata of any group.

The *Novus Ordo Missae* was first publicly offered in the Sistine Chapel before a Synod of Bishops in October of 1967. At that time it was called the *Missa Normativa* (or “normative Mass”). The bishops were polled as to their opinion. 71 voted yes, 62 voted yes with reservations, and 43 rejected it outright. To accommodate their wishes, a number of minor changes were made, including the restoration of two of the traditional offertory prayers.

Paul VI promulgated the final form as the *Novus Ordo Missae* in his Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum* (April 3, 1969). Tied to it was an explanatory text entitled the *Institutio Generalis* (General Instruction). While the liberals were delighted, others were far from pleased. Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci wrote to Paul VI in September stating that the New “Mass” represented, “both as a whole, and in its details, a striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Mass as it was formulated in Session XXII of the Council of Trent.” Along with the letter they presented to him the *Critical Study of the Novus Ordo Missae by a Group of Roman Theologians*. In an attempt to deflect the criticisms of this document, a revised *General Instruction* was issued on March 26, 1970—but absolutely no change was made in the text of the *Novus Ordo Missae* itself. Since then some further

minor changes have been made; the current version appeared in 1975. Let us examine this new rite in greater detail.

If the *Novus Ordo Missae* (henceforth, the NOM) was to reflect the beliefs of the post-Conciliar Church and at the same time remain acceptable to Catholics brought up in the ancient Faith, it had to: 1) avoid professing the new doctrines too openly, while expunging anything which contradicted them. At the same time it could not deny any Catholic doctrine directly—it could only dilute or expurgate it; 2) introduce changes slowly and retain enough of the outer trappings of a true sacrifice so as to give the impression that nothing significant was changed; 3) create a rite that for ecumenical reasons was acceptable to Protestants of every shade and persuasion, but all of whom consistently denied that the Mass was truly the unbloody sacrifice of Calvary and that a “sacrificing” priest was necessary; and 4) soften up Catholic resistance and introduce into the lives of the faithful the modernist ideas promulgated by Vatican II. The only way the NOM could achieve all this was by the use of ambiguity.

There is nothing ambiguous about the traditional rites of the Church; and indeed, the Mass is, as the theologians say, a primary locus (source) of her teachings. Despite the laxity of modern language, we should not forget that the ambiguous statement is fundamentally dishonest. Every father knows that when his child resorts to equivocation, he is attempting to hide something. And every priest knows how penitents sometimes use this technique in the confessional. It is even more dishonest when the Magisterium of the Church has once clearly spoken to an issue, and then those responsible for preserving the “Deposit of the Faith” use equivocation or ambiguity to disguise a change in belief. As it says in Proverbs, “God hates a forked tongue.”

Cranmer used ambiguity in order to establish the Anglican-Protestant (Episcopalian) sect in England.² Pastor Dryander wrote to Zurich stating that The First Book of Common Prayer harbored “every kind of deception by ambiguity or trickery of language.” According to T.M. Parker, an Anglican theologian, the net result was that:

The First Prayer Book of Edward VI could not be convicted of overt heresy, for it was adroitly framed and contained no express denial of pre-Reformation doctrine. It was, as an Anglican scholar put it, “an ingenious essay in ambiguity,” purposely worded in such a manner that the more conservative could place their own construction upon it and reconcile their consciences to using it, while the Reformers would interpret it in their own sense and would recognize it as an instrument for furthering the next stage of the religious revolution.³

The Novus Ordo Missae

Apart from ambiguity, one must consider the numerous “deletions” which the post-Conciliar innovators made—some 60 to 80 percent of the traditional rite depending upon what Eucharistic prayer is used. And these deletions are precisely those which Luther and Cranmer made—those which relate to the sacrificial nature of the Mass. Ambiguity, deletions, and lastly mistranslation; all were used to achieve the goals of our outline.

The second requirement was the need that the NOM retain the outer trappings of a Catholic rite. Once again there were plenty of precedents. Consider the following description of the early Lutheran service as given us by the great Jesuit scholar Hartmann Grisar:

One who entered the parish church at Wittenberg after Luther’s victory discovered that the same vestments were used for Divine service as of yore, and heard the same old Latin hymns. The Host was elevated and exhibited at the consecration. In the eyes of the people it was the same Mass as before, despite the fact that Luther omitted all prayers which represented the sacred function of the sacrifice. The people were intentionally kept in the dark on this point. “We cannot draw the common people away from the sacrament, and it will probably be thus until the Gospel is well understood,” said Luther. The rite of celebration of the Mass, he explained, is a “purely external thing,” and said further that “the damnable words referring to the sacrifice could be omitted all the more readily, since the ordinary Christian would not notice the omission and hence there was no danger of scandal.”⁴

The post-Conciliar innovators followed the same pattern. As the authors of the *Critical Study of the Novus Ordo Missae* noted: “Having removed the keystone, the reformers had to put up a scaffolding.” One is reminded of Lenin’s dictum: “Keep the shell, but empty it of substance.”

After the Council, following the pattern established by Luther and Cranmer, changes were introduced, at first slowly, and then, at an increasing pace. Those victimized by the early days of *aggiornamento* will remember the almost weekly changes mandated. Cardinal Heenan bears witness to this, stating that we would have been “shocked” if all the changes had been introduced at once. Changes came, however, one on top of another, and if we are to believe the hierarchy, still more are in the planning stage. There is much talk today of “institutional violence.” I can think of no better example of this than the manner in which the New “Mass” was forced down the throats of the laity.

TWO TECHNIQUES OF DELETION

The innovators used two techniques to purge the Mass of Catholic doctrines—omission and emasculation. As noted above, between 60 and 80 percent of the traditional Mass was deleted. I would ask the reader to compare the NOM with the traditional rite as found in any old Missal published during the past 500 years—that is, prior to 1964. (Old Missals usually give the Latin on one side and the English on the other.) The number of prayers missing is astounding.

Gone are all the prayers said at the foot of the altar (not a “table”) including Psalm 42 and the *Aufer a nobis*. Confession is replaced by a truncated “Penitential Rite” which stresses sins against our “brothers and sisters.” The prayer for absolution (*indulgentiam*) is omitted. In the Offertory, the *Suscipe Sancte Pater*, the *Deus qui Humanae*, the *Offerimus Tibi*, the *Veni Sanctificator*, the *Lavabo* (Ps. 25), and the *Suscipe Sancte* are all gone. Note how many of the doctrinal concepts clearly proclaimed in these prayers the New Church finds objectionable. Only the *In Spiritu Humilitatis* and the *Orate Fratres* have been retained, and this, as we shall see for specific reasons. In the Canon, if the “president”⁵ chooses not to use “Eucharistic Prayer No. 1,” (which is falsely called the Old Roman Canon, and which, being the longest Eucharistic Prayer, is in fact, rarely used), the following six prayers before the highly questionable consecration have been deleted: the *Te Igitur*, *Memento Domine*, *Communicantes*, *Hanc Igitur*, *Quam Oblationem*, and the *Qui Pridie*. After the consecration, the following six prayers are dropped: the *Unde et Memores*, *Supra quae Propitio*, *Supplices Te Rogamus*, *Memento Etiam*, *Nobis quoque Peccatoribus*, and the *Per quem haec Omnia*. As if that were not enough, numerous prayers that used to follow the *Pater Noster* are also dropped: the *Panem Coelestam*, *Quid Retribuam*, the second *Confiteor*, the *Misereatur*, and the *Indulgentiam* or Absolution are gone. Also eliminated are the threefold *Domine non sum Dignus*, the *Corpus Tuum*, *Placeat Tibi*, and the Last Gospel. Once again, consider the innumerable doctrinal concepts that have been cast into oblivion—above all, any reference to an immolative sacrifice and the need for a true sacrificing priest. And this says nothing of the numerous genuflections, Signs of the Cross, blessings, and other actions of the priest which also are expunged.

An excellent example of the second technique of deletion—emasculation—is provided by the changes made in the prayer *Libera nos* (“Deliver us . . .”) which follows the Our Father. In the traditional rite it reads:

Deliver us, we beseech Thee, O Lord, from all evils, past, present, and to come, and by the intercession of the Blessed and Glorious Ever-Virgin

The Novus Ordo Missae

Mary, Mother of God, together with Thy blessed Apostles Peter, Paul, and Andrew, and all the saints, mercifully grant peace in our days, that through the bounteous help of Thy mercy, we may be always free from sin and secure from all disturbance.

It now reads:

Deliver us, Lord, from every evil, and grant us peace in our day. In your mercy keep us free from sin and protect us from all anxiety as we wait in joyful hope for the coming of our Savior, Jesus Christ.

The references to the Blessed Virgin, the Apostles, and all the Saints have been obliterated. Their intercession is no longer required—presumably because it would offend Protestant sensibilities and thus frustrate the “pastoral” intent of the rite.

Note that in both techniques the innovators cannot be accused of directly “changing” Catholic teaching—just of ignoring it. This pattern is consistent throughout: all clear-cut references to the propitiatory, and impetratory nature of the Mass are removed. Every reference to the immolative aspect of the sacrifice and the Real Presence is deleted. The residue is but a “sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” such as the Protestants find acceptable. Recalling that the *lex orandi* is the *lex credendi*, and admitting that adults well formed in the Faith may have some degree of protection, how, we must ask, can our children avoid having their religious beliefs “neutralized”?

* * *

While most Catholics, accustomed to trusting Rome, went along with the changes, others protested strongly. Petition after petition was sent to Rome, and were consistently ignored. (Some conservative *Novus Ordo* Catholics are still playing this game.) Paul VI, desiring to foster the revolution without losing any of the faithful, gave his usual conflicting responses.⁶ He told us on the one hand that the New Order of the Mass was changed in “an amazing and extraordinary way,” that “it was singularly new,” and that “the greatest innovation [—he used the word “mutation”—] was in the Eucharistic Prayer.” On the other hand, he found it necessary to repeatedly assure us that “nothing had changed in the essence of the traditional Mass.”⁷ Other witnesses were more honest and straightforward. Fr. Joseph Gelineau, S.J., one of the Conciliar *periti*, bluntly declared that the end result was “a different liturgy of the Mass.” He continued: “This needs to be said without ambiguity. The Roman rite as we knew it no longer exists. It has been destroyed.” Cardinal Benelli stated that the new liturgy

reflected a “new ecclesiology.”⁸ The liturgist Fr. Louis Bouyer opined that “the Catholic liturgy has been overthrown under the pretext of rendering it more compatible with the contemporary outlook.” Finally, Archbishop (Freemason) Bugnini, Paul VI’s executive officer in the creation of the NOM, described the result as “a new song” and as “the conquest of the Church.” Despite all this Paul VI persisted: “Be very sure of one point: nothing of substance of the traditional Mass has been altered.”⁹ There was no retrenchment. The Liturgical Revolution became a *fait accompli*.

WHO WROTE THE NOVUS ORDO MISSAE?

We know that ultimately the Holy Ghost is the author of the traditional Mass, “the most beautiful thing this side of Heaven,” as St. Alphonsus Liguori called it. According to the Council of Trent, the central part, the “Canon,” was “composed out of the very words of the Lord, the Traditions of the Apostles, and the pious institutions of the Holy Pontiffs.” As Fr. Bouyer once said, “to jettison it would be a rejection of any claim on the part of the Roman Church to represent the true Catholic Church.” As for the prayers and ceremonies surrounding the Canon, these are all drawn from Scripture and/or Tradition.

When we come to the NOM, we also know its authors. While Paul VI was formally and juridically responsible, it was composed by a committee called the Consilium which consisted of some 200 individuals, many of whom had functioned as Conciliar *periti*. At its head was Archbishop Annibale Bugnini whose Freemasonic connections are virtually beyond dispute. He was helped by six Protestant “observers” whom Paul VI publicly thanked for their assistance in “re-editing in a new manner Liturgical texts . . . so that the *lex orandi* (the law of prayer) conformed better with the *lex credendi* (the law of belief).” As previously noted, we are forced to assume that either the *lex orandi* prior to this time did not conform to the *lex credendi*, or else that the *lex credendi* was changed. And since when did the Church need the assistance of Protestant heretics—men who by definition reject her teaching—to assist her in formulating her rites? Considering the nature of those responsible, and despite the NOM’s bland use of Scriptural phrases, one can certainly question whether the Holy Ghost had anything whatever to do with it.

WHY WAS IT WRITTEN?

The claim that the laity had demanded the “renovation” of the Mass has never been substantiated; but then, revolutionaries always attempt to promulgate their dictatorial schemes “in the name of the people.” Why then all the changes? And these, not only in the rite, but in everything that went to support the rite—the altars turned into tables, the tabernacles displaced, the priest facing the congregation, the altar rail removed—the list is endless, the cost enormous.

According to the statements of Paul VI, the changes were made: 1) to bring the Church’s liturgy into line with the modern mentality; 2) in obedience to the mandate of Vatican II; 3) to take cognizance of progress in Liturgical studies; 4) to return to primitive practice; and 5) for “pastoral” reasons. Let us consider each of these in turn.

The first reason is but a way of expressing the principle of *aggiornamento*, of bringing the entire gestalt of the modern world, its anthropocentrism and utopian thought, its false ideas of Progress and Evolution as applied to truth itself—into the bosom of the Church. As Paul VI said: “If the world changes, should not religion also change? . . . It is for this very reason that the Church has, especially after the Council, undertaken so many reforms” (General Audience, July 2, 1969). Is the Father of the “Prodigal Son” to join his son in dissipating the treasures of the family, or must the son return to the bosom of his Father?

The second reason: Vatican II’s *Constitution on the Liturgy* recommended that the rite be revised “in accord with sound Tradition.” It also said that the liturgy was made up of “unchangeable elements divinely instituted, and of elements subject to change.” Surely the “unchangeable elements” referred to the time-honored Canon, and above all to the form and substance of the sacrament itself. Indeed, such an opinion is strengthened if one reads the *Council Daybook*, which states that the Fathers “insisted that the Canon of the Mass especially should remain intact” (Nov. 5, 1962).¹⁰ If one compares the NOM with the traditional rite, however, one soon finds that few if any items were considered truly unchangeable. Furthermore, the Latin original of Paul VI’s New Missal is loaded with “options” and whatever reflections of Catholic doctrine were found within it were soon obliterated by translations into the vernacular—translations sanctioned by Rome’s official guidelines.¹¹ True, such words as “Alleluia” (why not in the vernacular?) and certain prayers such as the Our Father were left intact. But these were, in any event, always acceptable to the Protestants. One thing is clear however: despite the many “time bombs” in the *Constitution on the Liturgy*, none of the Fathers at Vatican II—except those “in the

know”—envisioned the radical changes that followed as a “mandate” from this Council.

The third reason: One presumes that Paul VI was referring to the voluminous modernist productions that fill the Liturgical journals of the pre- and post-Conciliar period. (Examples of these will be given in the next chapter on Orders.) However, to call these pseudo-scholarly productions—all aimed at fostering the Liturgical Revolution—“progress,” is an abuse of language. It is also to forget the tremendous legitimate scholarship that preceded the codification of the Mass by Pius V.

With regard to the fourth reason, it is hard to understand just why those who would adapt our Faith to the modern world, would at the same time have us return to primitive practice. Like burning a candle at both ends, it soon leaves very little in the middle. Beyond this, the only ancient document with any real significance that has come to light since the time of Pope St. Pius V is the “Apostolic Tradition” of Hippolytus, and of this we only have a partial and reconstructed version of the original document.¹² Moreover, Hippolytus was both a schismatic and an anti-Pope at the time he wrote. It was at the suggestion of Hans Küng—a person who denies many of the Church’s teachings—that the Second Eucharistic Prayer was taken from this dubious source. Moreover, as we shall see below, it was drastically rephrased so as to bring it into line with Protestant and modernist theology. So much is this the case that Fr. John Barry Ryan calls the result an entirely “new creation.”¹³ The only other ancient prayer incorporated into the NOM is what Fr. Jungmann calls a “reconstruction . . . probably the very words used at the blessing of bread and wine in a Jewish meal at the time of Christ.”¹⁴ It is indeed such. Anyone who has had the privilege of attending a Jewish banquet is familiar with the phrase, “Blessed art Thou, O Lord, God of all creation.” It is the Jewish grace before meals said by the Rabbi as he cuts the loaf of bread.

Paul VI’s last reason was “pastoral.” As far as I can determine, neither he nor the Council ever defined this term. In the “double-speak” of the post-Conciliar Church, just what does “pastoral” mean? The answer can be found in the *Letter to the Presidents of National Councils of Bishops* concerning Eucharistic Prayers sent out by the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship.

The reason why such a variety of texts has been offered [referring to the multitude of Eucharistic Prayers in the NOM], and the end result such new formularies were meant to achieve, are pastoral in nature: namely, to reflect the unity and diversity of Liturgical prayer. By using the various texts contained in the new Roman Missal, various Christian communities, as they gather together to celebrate the Eucharist, are able to sense that

they themselves form the one Church, praying with the same Faith, using the same prayer.

In other words, the “pastoral intent” was and is to create a service that any Christian body can use—to foster that ecumenism and “unity” which the post-Conciliar Church believes and teaches is its “internal mission.”

THE RESULT IS ENTIRELY ACCEPTABLE TO THE PROTESTANTS

Now, the real issue for the innovators was not whether the NOM retained enough of its Catholic character to be acceptable to the Catholic faithful, but whether it was sufficiently “ecumenical” to satisfy Protestants of both liberal and conservative persuasions. Here the answer must be a resounding yes! As pointed out in the previous chapter, Lutherans, Anglicans, and a wide variety of other sects not only find it acceptable; many of them have actually changed their own rites in order to bring them into line with the NOM. In order to understand why, let us turn to a French Protestant theologian:

If one takes account of the decisive evolution in the Eucharistic liturgy of the Catholic Church, of the option of substituting other Eucharistic prayers for the Canon of the Mass, of the expunging of the idea that the Mass is a sacrifice and of the possibility of receiving communion under both kinds, then there is no further justification for the Reformed Churches forbidding their members to assist at the Eucharist in a Catholic Church.¹⁵

Now there is something a little surprising in all this. Let us recall that the Anglicans (Episcopalians in America)¹⁶ officially consider the Catholic teaching on the Mass to be a “blasphemous fable,” and a lot of hocus pocus (the anti-Catholic epithet based on the phrase *Hoc est enim corpus meum*—the words used by a priest at the time of consecration); we have already adequately demonstrated Luther’s attitude towards the traditional Catholic Mass. Even more to the point, Luther said of his own *Novus Ordo*: “Call it a benediction, Eucharist, the Lord’s table, the Lord’s Supper, memory of the Lord, or whatever you like, just so long as you do not dirty it with the name of a sacrifice or an action.”¹⁷

The *Critical Study of the Novus Ordo Missae* by the Roman Theologians also explains just why the New “Mass” is so acceptable to those who reject all belief in an immolative sacrifice:

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

The position of both priest and people is falsified and the celebrant appears as nothing more than a Protestant minister. . . . By a series of equivocations the emphasis is obsessively placed upon the “supper” and the “memorial” instead of on the unbloody renewal of the sacrifice of Calvary. . . . The Real Presence of Christ is never alluded to and belief in it is implicitly repudiated. . . . It has every possibility of satisfying the most modernist of Protestants.

We shall see whether this statement is justified as we go through the rite itself.

IS THE *NOVUS ORDO MISSAE* A SACRIFICE? THE STRUCTURE OF THE RITE

The traditional Mass is divided into two parts: “the Mass of the Catechumens” and “the Mass of the Faithful.” As the *St. Andrew Missal* states, “the catechumens, Christians by desire and belief, could take part in the prayers and chants of the faithful, listen with them to the readings and instructions, but as they were not yet baptized, they could not communicate or be present at Mass. They were dismissed before the Offertory.”

The NOM is also divided into two sections, “the Liturgy of the Word,” and “the Liturgy of the Eucharist.” The former roughly corresponds to the Mass of the Catechumens, but has been altered so as to bring it completely into line with Protestant theology. Gone are the prayers before the altar. After the “priest-president” greets the parishioners, we start out with a truncated confession “to our brothers and sisters.” Post-Conciliar Catholics no longer confess to the Blessed Virgin, the angels, and the saints. They are also denied the traditional absolution formula “*Indulgentiam . . .*” which is capable of forgiving those venial sins that even the best of us fall prey to.¹⁸ The *Gloria* is still allowed on Sundays and a few feast days, but falsely and incompletely rendered—with the false concept that peace is available to “all men,” and not just to those of “good will.” (It will be argued that the Latin version found in Paul VI’s New Missal is unchanged, but in the practical order, Latin is a dead liturgical language.)

The principal aspect of “the Liturgy of the Word” is the reading of Scripture. Now the idea that the “Word” (*Logos*) of God is only to be found in Scripture is totally Protestant—it is an implicit denial of the doctrine that “the Word was made flesh,” and that such specifically occurs in the second part of the rite. As to the readings, they are taken from the new ecumenical and frequently false translations. They are, further, part of a “three-year” cycle, but as such are hardly “fixed,” for the new Lectionary

allows for a whole host of options which can be followed at the celebrant's discretion. The traditional Mass used a one-year cycle established by St. Damasus in the fourth century. (Readings heard each year become part of the Catholic consciousness. Those based on a three-year cycle, even apart from the problem of "options," never will.) Scripture is followed by a "homily" which, in accord with Protestant practice, almost always becomes the center of the new rite. (In the traditional rite the priest is a "nobody," his personality counting for nothing. One never thought to ask who was saying Mass. In the NOM, the personality of the priest becomes all important, his elocution significant, and people often select which service they attend on the basis of who is celebrating. This practice has the further advantage of providing everyone with a choice of "liberal" or "conservative" formularies.) The Liturgy of the Word concludes with the Credo—which the Anglicans and Lutherans also retained—but rendered in the vernacular with the communitarian "we," so that it is not so much a Credo as a *Credimus*. Absent from this statement of belief is the hallowed term "consubstantial."¹⁹

All these changes in what used to be called the Mass of the Catechumens, however offensive, in no way affect the sacrifice itself. It is to the second part of the rite that we must give our special attention. For the sake of convenience, I shall first discuss the Offertory, and then the changes in the Canon—that part of the rite in which the consecration occurs. It will be shown that in almost every situation accommodation to Protestant belief is implied, if not enforced. As a result, the New "Mass" lacks a clear immolative character and the celebrant no longer appears as a "sacrificing priest." Indeed, as will become clear, it is not the priest, but the "people of God" who celebrate the liturgy under the "priest-president's" direction.

THE OFFERTORY

In the traditional rite, the first part of the Mass of the faithful is the Offertory. Its importance is manifest in that in ancient times, the catechumens were dismissed before this started, and also by the fact that the faithful must be present during these prayers in order to fulfill their Mass obligation. In it the sacrifice is both prepared and directed to a determinate end. In essence, the Offertory prayers anticipate the consecration and make the sacrificial nature of the remainder of the rite unmistakably clear.

In the true Mass the Offertory prayers refer to the bread by the term *hostia* or "victim." Thus, in the first Offertory prayer, the priest unveils the chalice, takes the gold-plated paten with the host of unleavened bread,

raises it to the level of his heart, and says: “Receive, O Holy Father, almighty and everlasting God, this spotless host which I, thy unworthy servant, offer unto Thee, my living and true God, for mine own countless sins and negligences, and for all here present, as also for all faithful Christians, living and dead, that it may avail for my own and their salvation unto life everlasting.” (Though these prayers are said by the priest in Latin, the faithful follow them in their Missals which provide an exact parallel vernacular translation. Post-Conciliar Catholics, unfamiliar with the devotions of their parents, should not assume that the average person could not follow the traditional rite.)

What a marvel of doctrinal exactitude. Along with the actions of the priest, the prayer makes it clear that what is offered is the “spotless host” or victim. Second, the propitiatory nature of the Mass is explicit—it is offered for our sins. Third, it reminds us that the Mass is offered for the living and the dead²¹; and fourth, that it is the priest who offers the sacrifice as a mediator between man and God. The beauty of the precise expression is the *splendor veritatis*—“the splendor of the truth.”

This prayer has, needless to say, been deleted. And one of the reasons Paul VI offers for doing so is to make the doctrinal content of the Mass “more clear.”

Also deleted is the second Offertory prayer, *Deus qui humanae . . .*, an oration equally rich in doctrinal content: “O God, who in a wonderful manner created and ennobled human nature and still more wonderfully renewed it, grant that, by the mystery of this water and wine, we may be made partakers of His divinity who was pleased to become partaker of our humanity, Jesus Christ, Your Son Our Lord . . .” The reason it had to be deleted is that it refers to man’s former condition of innocence and to his present one of being ransomed by the Blood of Christ and it recapitulates the entire economy of the sacrifice. In fact, of the twelve Offertory prayers in the traditional rite, only two are retained. And of course, the deleted prayers are the same ones that Luther and Cranmer eliminated. And why? Because, as Luther said, they “smacked of sacrifice . . . the abomination called the offertory, and from this point on almost everything stinks of oblation.”²⁰

The NOM not only omitted these significant prayers, but it effectively abolished the entire Offertory. The *General Instruction* speaks instead of the “Preparation of the Gifts.” And within this part of the new rite there is not a word which so much as hints that it is the Divine Victim which is offered. The bread and wine—“the work of human hands”—is all that is offered. Michael Davies points out that this concept is fully compatible with the Teilhardian theory that human effort, the work of human hands,

becomes in a certain way, the matter of the sacrament. And further, except for the prayer of the washing of the hands, all the petitions are in the first person plural—“we”—which is consistent with the concept that it is not the priest-president who offers up the Mass, but the “assembly” or “the people of God.”²¹

In line with this principle, all prayers that differentiate the priest from the laity have been systematically eliminated. The Latin original of the new Missal still makes such a distinction within the prayer *Orate Fratres*. This was a prayer which the Consilium wished deleted and which was replaced at the demand of the Synod of Bishops. However, the innovators achieved their desire in the vernacular translation where—in English, French, Portuguese, and German—the distinction of priest from laity was eliminated.

Conservatives will point to the retention in the NOM of the traditional Offertory prayer, *In Spiritu Humilitatis* (In a spirit of humility), as proof that the new Offertory rite alludes to the traditional teaching that the Mass is first and foremost a sacrifice offered to God. Now, this prayer is taken from chapter three of Daniel and refers to the personal sacrifice—at most, a “sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving”—made by Azarias and his companions in the fiery furnace. As such, it is totally acceptable to Protestants and was retained by them in the Lutheran and Anglican services. Should any one doubt its acceptability to the modernist, he has but to consider the interpretation placed on this prayer by Fr. Joseph Jungmann—one of the most scholarly members of the Consilium responsible for the new rite.

The prayer “In a spirit of humility” which had always served as an emphatic summary of the process of offering, and as such was recited with a deep inclination, has been retained unchanged for the very reason that it gives apt expression to the “invisible sacrifice” of the heart as the interior meaning of all exterior offering.²²

In the NOM, interpreted literally, all that is offered is the bread and wine. Against this, some will say that, in the offering of the bread-host, the priest says, “It will become for us the bread of life.” But as the late Fr. Burns, one of America’s most conservative *Novus Ordo* priests, pointed out, this can as well be understood as referring to the bread we eat each day, often called “the staff of life.” It also includes the phrase “for us” which Cranmer insisted denied the sacramental principle *ex opere operato*²³—the principle that, providing proper form and matter is used, and providing the celebrant is a true priest, consecration occurs regardless of the disposition of the participants. The same comment can be made with regard to the phrase “it

will become our spiritual drink.” And so, once again, the conclusion of the *Critical Study* appears appropriate.

The three ends of the Mass are altered; no distinction is allowed to remain between Divine and human sacrifice; bread and wine are only “spiritually” (not substantially) changed. . . . Not a word do we find as to the priest’s power to sacrifice, or about his act of consecration, the bringing about through him of the Eucharistic Presence. He now appears as nothing more than a Protestant minister.

THE CANON: THE NEW EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS

The heart of the traditional Mass is the Canon. It remains the same every time Mass is offered, except during the most solemn feasts of the Church, when a phrase or two is added which refers to the mystery being celebrated (nothing however being deleted). In the New “Mass” the Canon is abolished. In its place are four (at least for now) “Anaphoras” or “Eucharistic Prayers” (henceforth EP).

The first EP is not, as is often claimed, the ancient Roman Canon. It is merely modeled on the traditional Canon. Its retention, against Archbishop Bugnini’s wishes, allowed the new rite to be accepted with a minimum of protest. (Those using it were assured they were saying the old Mass.) However, with the destruction of the traditional Offertory (with its prayers that state precisely what occurs during the Canon), EP 1 is entirely capable of being given a modernist and Protestant interpretation.

The phrase which allows for this is found in the prayer *Quam Oblationem*: “Be pleased to make this same offering wholly blessed, to consecrate it and approve it, making it reasonable and acceptable, so that it may become *for us* the Body and Blood . . .” (emphasis mine). In the absence of the traditional Offertory prayers, “for us” can be understood in the Cranmerian sense. In Cranmer’s first edition of the Book of Common Prayer, he prefaced the words of Institution (i.e., the words used for the consecration) with this phrase: “Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech Thee; and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creation of bread and wine that they may be made *unto us* the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved son, Jesus Christ” (emphasis mine). Some of his fellow reformers attacked this on the grounds that it was capable of being understood as effecting transubstantiation! To this Cranmer indignantly replied: “We do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made into the body and blood of Christ, but that *unto us* in that holy mystery they

may be made so; that is to say, that we may so worthily receive the same that we may be partakers in Christ's body and blood, and that therefore in spirit and in truth we may be spiritually nourished." Cranmer was insisting that the expression "for us" meant that no objective transubstantiation occurred, but that rather it was the personal disposition of those involved which allowed them to be spiritually nourished. In other words, these two words in effect denied the Catholic doctrine "as it was formulated in Session XXII of the Council of Trent."

As in Cranmer's second Book of Common Prayer, so also in the *Novus Ordo's* EP No. 2, all pretence of a Catholic interpretation is eliminated. When EP No. 2 is used, the *Te Igitur*, *Memento domine*, and *Quam Oblationem*—three prayers that ambiguously allow for a Catholic interpretation of *nobis* (for us)—are no longer said. There is absolutely no preparation for the "consecration." Sneeze and you miss it.

EP No. 2 is said to have been taken from Hippolytus' "Apostolic Tradition" (written, as mentioned above, at a time when he was a schismatic and an anti-Pope). However, to this questionably authentic document, the innovators made significant changes. Thus for example, they gratuitously inserted into the original text this very phrase "for us." EP No. 2 further follows Cranmer in suppressing the word *benedixit* ("He blessed . . ."), a word which the Reformers associated with the doctrine of transubstantiation, and in suppressing the phrases *ut mortem solveret et vincula diaboli dirumperet, et infernum calceret et iustos illuminet* ("so that He [Christ] could conquer death, break the chains of Satan, trod hell under foot, and illuminate the just"), and *qua nos dignos habuisti adstare coram te et tibi sacerdotes ministrare* ("for holding us worthy to stand before Thee and serve Thee as priests")—all concepts the innovators and liberal Protestants abhor.

In the traditional Mass it is impossible to understand *nobis* in the Cranmerian sense. In EP No. 1 of the NOM, the situation is ambiguous. But in EP No. 2, Catholic teaching disappears and Protestantism triumphs. As Hugh Ross Williamson said, "It is impossible to understand it any other way than in the Cranmerian sense."²⁴ Further, the deliberate nature of the changes in EP No. 2—the addition of these two words—reflect back on the manner in which we are to understand *nobis* in EP No. 1.

To make matters worse, the creators of the New "Mass" clearly show their preference for EP No. 2. The official documents from Rome instruct us that it can be used in any "Mass." It is recommended for Sundays "unless for pastoral reasons another Eucharistic prayer is chosen." It is also particularly suitable "for weekday Masses, or for mass in particular circumstances." Further, it is recommended for Masses with children, young people, and

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

small groups, and above all for Catechism classes. Beyond this, human nature being what it is, most priests will use it because of its brevity and simplicity.²⁵

It is worth noting at this point that Paul VI added the phrase *quod pro vobis tradetur* (“which is given up for you”) to the Words of Consecration. So also did Luther and Cranmer. Luther explained the reasons for this in his Shorter Catechism. “The word ‘for you’ calls simply for believing hearts.” And such of course only further highlights the importance of the word *nobis* in this entire sordid affair.

Space allows for only a brief comment on EP Nos. 3 and 4. In EP No. 3 the following words are addressed to the Lord: “From age to age You gather a people to Yourself, in order that from east and west a perfect offering may be made to the glory of Your Name.” This phrase once again makes it clear that it is the people, rather than the priest, that are the indispensable element in the celebration. Even Michael Davies, who presumably believes that only an ordained priest can consecrate, is forced to note that “*in not one* [his emphasis] of the new Eucharistic prayers is it made clear that the consecration is effected by the priest alone, and that he is not acting as a spokesman or president for a concelebrating congregation.”²⁶

EP No. 4, composed by innovator Fr. Cipriano Vagaggini, presents yet another interesting aspect of the Liturgical Revolution. The Latin itself is innocuous, but the official (and Roman approved) translation used in the United States is clearly open to an heretical interpretation. Compare the following passages, one from the Preface to EP No. 4, and the other from the Preface of the traditional Mass of the Holy Trinity.

<i>Novus Ordo</i>	Traditional Mass
Father in Heaven, it is right that we should give You thanks and glory; You alone are God, living and true . . .	It is truly meet and just, right and profitable unto salvation, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee, O holy Lord, Father Almighty, everlasting God, who with the only begotten Son and the Holy Ghost are One God, One Lord, not in the oneness of a single person, but in the trinity of One substance.

Faced with the fact that “the entire teaching of the Church is contained in the liturgy,”²⁷ this is a most instructive piece of skullduggery. In the Latin

version of the NOM, the words *Unus Deus*, or “one God . . . living and true,” are to be found, and no explicit heresy is taught. However, even in the Latin, apart from the Creed, there is no clear expression of the doctrine of the Trinity. (What a striking economy of language is used in our traditional Preface!) When we come to the vernacular Anaphora or EP No. 4, the mistranslation of *Unus Deus* by “You alone are God” clearly departs from the traditional norm. In the absence of any other reference in this prayer to the Son or the Holy Ghost, the use of the word “alone” is an explicit denial of the Trinity. It is for this reason that some have referred to this EP as the “Arian Canon.” Yet another example of a return to primitive practice! Because of repeated complaints this mistranslation has been recently corrected. That an explicitly heretical formula could have been used for 18 years in the post-Conciliar Church speaks volumes about the innovators’ ignorance of the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic Church.

THE NARRATIO INSTITUTIONIS

In the NOM, as in the Lutheran service, the Words of Consecration—the very heart of the traditional rite—are part of what is called the *Narratio Institutionis* or the “Institution Narrative.”²⁸ This phrase is not found in the traditional Missals of the Church. The placing of the Eucharistic Prayers—the “canons”—of the NOM within such a section, or under the heading of such a title, is bound to induce the priest-president to say these words as if he were merely retelling the story of the Last Supper; that instead of making an action present “here and now,” he is merely calling to mind an event that occurred some 2000 years ago. Nowhere in Paul VI’s *Missale Romanum* is the priest-president instructed that the “action” is happening here and now, and that he must say the Words of Consecration *in persona Christi*. (The traditional teaching is that the priest must say these critical words in the person of Christ, for it is Christ who, through the priest, effects the consecration. The “revised” version of the *General Instruction*, seeking to mollify criticisms, does speak of the priest acting *in persona Christi*, but not with regard to the manner in which he says the Words of Consecration.) Even if this were the only defect in the new rite, it would be sufficient to raise grave doubts as to whether or not any true Catholic sacrifice occurs.

The traditional Church has always taught that for the sacred species to be conformed, that is, for consecration to occur, the priest must not only be properly ordained, intend to do what the Church does, use the proper matter, and use the correct words (form), but he must also say the Words of Consecration *in persona Christi*, and not as part of a historical narrative

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

such as occurs when he reads the relevant Scripture passages. Should he say them as part of a historical narrative, he turns what occurs at Mass into just a simple memorial of an event that occurred two thousand years ago, and nothing sacred happens. As St. Thomas Aquinas says:

The consecration is accomplished by the words and expressions of the Lord Jesus. Because, by all the other words spoken, praise is rendered to God, prayer is put up for the people, for kings, and others; but when the time comes for perfecting the sacrament, the priest uses no longer his own words, but the words of Christ. Therefore, it is Christ's words that perfect the sacrament. . . . The form of this sacrament is pronounced as if Christ were speaking in person, so that it is given to be understood that the minister does nothing in perfecting this sacrament, except to pronounce the words of Christ (*Summa*, III, Q. 78, Art. 1).

To say the Words of Consecration merely as part of a narrative renders the Mass invalid; that is, the bread and wine remain just bread and wine, and do not become the Body and Blood of Christ. According to Rev. J. O'Connell, in *The Celebration of Mass*:

The Words of Consecration have to be said, not merely as a historical narrative of words used once by our Lord—as the celebrant recites them, for example, in the accounts of the Last Supper, which are read in the Mass in Holy Week, or on the Feast of Corpus Christi—but as a present affirmation by the priest speaking in the person of Christ, and intending to effect something, here and now, by the pronouncing of these words.²⁹

Older priests may do this from habit. Younger priests, basing their practice on the *General Instruction* and on the modernist theories of sacramental theology which they imbibe in the post-Conciliar seminaries, almost certainly will not. Thus it is hardly surprising to find the *Critical Study* noting that:

The Words of Consecration, as they appear in the context of the *Novus Ordo* [in Latin] may be valid according to the intention of the ministering priest. But they may not be, for they are so no longer *ex vi verborum* (by the force of the words used), or more precisely, in virtue of the *modus significandi* (way of signifying) which they have had till now in the Mass. Will priests who, in the future, have not had the traditional training and who rely on the *Novus Ordo* to do what the Church does, make a valid consecration? One may be permitted to doubt it.

CHANGING CHRIST'S WORDS AND THE FORM OF CONSECRATION

And so we are brought to the Words of Consecration. These are most sacred, for they are attributed by Tradition to Christ Himself, and it is by means of them that the sacred species is “confectured.” These precious words, the very words of Christ, once only written in gold, and always highlighted in their printed form, have been altered and imbedded in the *Narratio Institutionis* of the New “Mass.”

Now, a sacrament is a sensible sign, instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ, to signify and produce Grace. This sensible sign consists of a “matter” and a “form.” As St. Augustine taught: “The word is joined to the element and the sacrament exists.” Examples of “matter” are water in Baptism and the mixture of water and wine in the Mass. The “form” consists of the words which the minister pronounces and which he applies to the matter. These words determine the matter to produce the effect of the sacrament and also closely signify what the sacrament does. The forms of the sacraments were given to us either *in specie* (exactly) or *in genere* (in a general way). According to standard teaching:

Christ determined what special Graces were to be conferred by means of external rites: for some sacraments (e.g. Baptism, the Eucharist) He determined minutely (*in specie*) the matter and form: for others He determined only in a general way (*in genere*) that there should be an external ceremony, by which special Graces were to be conferred, leaving to the Apostles or to the Church the power to determine whatever He had not determined—for example, to prescribe the matter and form of the sacraments of Confirmation and of Holy Orders.³⁰

A NOTE ON “MATTER”

The matter of the sacrament we are considering is wine mixed with water, and bread made from wheat mixed with natural water and baked in fire (either leavened or unleavened). Canon 815 states: “The bread must be pure wheat and freshly baked.” Despite this, no less a person than Cardinal Joseph L. Bernadine has approved for the “bread” a mixture of “two cups of white flour to which baking soda has been added, with 1 1/4 cups of cold water, 1/3 cup of melted butter, and two teaspoons of honey—the entire mixture being baked on a buttered cookie sheet.” Such, as any cook knows, is cake and not bread. This recommendation has led to his being called by some “the cookie cardinal.” Similarly with regard to the wine:

according to Canon 814, this must be “natural wine made from the juice of the grape,” naturally fermented, “and uncorrupted.” Again, the post-Conciliar Church has given permission *ad experimentum* for Catholics in Zaire to use hosts made of farina of cassava and wine made from corn.³¹ Such “matter” would, needless to say, render the rite invalid. In any event, it is clear that the faithful are by no means automatically assured that the matter (be it the bread or the wine) used in the NOM is “valid” and capable of transubstantiation.

BACK TO THE FORM

The form of the consecration in the traditional Mass has been fixed since Apostolic times. It has been “canonically” fixed since the so-called Armenian Decree of the Council of Florence (1438-1445). According to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, the form (capitalized below) is found within these words in the Canon:

Who the day before He suffered took bread into His holy and venerable hands, and with His eyes lifted up to heaven, to You, God, His almighty Father, giving thanks to You, He blessed, broke, and gave it to His disciples, saying: Take and eat you all of this FOR THIS IS MY BODY. In like manner, after He had supped, taking also this glorious chalice into His holy and venerable hands, again giving thanks to You, He blessed and gave it to His disciples saying: Take and drink you all of this FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT: THE MYSTERY OF THE FAITH: WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS. As often as you shall do these things, you shall do them in memory of me.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent continues: “of this form, no one can doubt.”

Taken from the “People’s Mass Book,” and in accord with DOL 1360, the following is the “form” for the NOM. (In the “People’s Mass Book”—as in the “Missalette” in common use in American churches—no words are capitalized or italicized; they are run together so that the form of the sacrament can in no way be distinguished from the rest of the text which forms part of the *Institution Narrative*: however in Paul VI’s Latin original, the words are italicized and in the paragraph below italicization is used.)

Before he was given up to death, a death he freely accepted, he took bread and gave you thanks. He broke the bread, gave it to his disciples, and said:

The Novus Ordo Missae

take and eat, all of you, this is my body which will be given up for you. When supper was ended, he took the cup. Again he gave you thanks and praise, gave the cup to his disciples, and said: Take this, all of you, and drink from it: this is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven. Do this in memory of me.

In introducing these new forms Paul VI called them “the words of the Lord” (*verba dominica*) rather than “the Words of Consecration”—thus once again stressing the narrative nature of the rite. Having changed the very words of Our Lord, he further said that he “wished them” to be “as follows” (DOL 1360). How any one, even a “Pope” could “wish” them to be other than they are is beyond conception. It would seem however that for the innovators, even the very words of Christ are neither sacrosanct nor inviolable.³² And so it is with exactitude that Paul VI described the changes introduced into the Eucharistic Prayers as “singularly new,” as “amazing and extraordinary” and as the “greatest innovation” of all the innovations introduced. Indeed, with regard to the Words of Consecration instituted by Christ at the Last Supper, Paul VI used the Latin term “mutation.” When such a “mutation” is substantial—that is, when it changes the meaning of the form, it renders it invalid. As we shall see, even if there is only doubt about whether or not a change is substantial, that is, whether or not there is a change in meaning, the use of such a form is considered sacrilegious.

In changing the form the innovators argued that they were bringing it “into line with Scripture.” Now there is absolutely no reason why this should have been done. Scripture is not a greater source of Revelation than Tradition—indeed, strictly speaking, it is part of Tradition. Imagine the hue and cry that would be raised if someone were to say that he wanted to change Scripture to bring it into line with Tradition! It is not from Scripture, but from Tradition that we receive the form used in confecting the Eucharist. Such indeed must be the case as the earliest Gospel was written some eight years after our Lord’s death. Listen again to the words of Cardinal Manning:

We neither derive our religion from the Scriptures, nor does it depend upon them. Our faith was in the world before the New Testament was written.

And, as Fr. Joseph Jungmann states:

In all the known liturgies the core of the *eucharistia*, and therefore of the Mass, is formed by the narrative of the institution and the Words of Consecration. Our very first observation in this regard is the remarkable

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

fact that the texts of the account of institution, among them in particular, the most ancient, are never simply a Scripture text restated. They go back to pre-Biblical tradition. Here we face an outgrowth of the fact that the Eucharist was celebrated long before the evangelists and St. Paul set out to record the Gospel story.³³

Beyond this, “Pope Innocent III notes that there are three elements in the narrative not commemorated by the Evangelists: ‘with his eyes lifted up to Heaven,’ ‘eternal testament’ (whereas the Gospels give only ‘of the New Testament’), and ‘the Mystery of the Faith’ (*mysterium fidei*).” And these he holds to be derived from Christ and the Apostles, “for who would be so presumptuous and daring as to insert [much less remove] these things out of his own devotion? In truth, the Apostles received the form of the words from Christ Himself, and the Church received it from the Apostles themselves.”

Indeed, it is quite possible that the Scripture accounts intentionally avoided giving the correct form lest it be profaned. Listen to St. Thomas Aquinas:

The Evangelists did not intend to hand down the form of the sacraments which in the primitive Church had to be kept concealed, as Dionysius observes at the close of his book on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy; their object was to write the story of Christ (*Summa*, III, Q. 78, Art. 3).

No one can doubt but that the new Church has gone against Tradition, against the decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, and against the Catechism of the Council of Trent in changing the form of the sacrament. It is not a matter of debate as to whether she has the right to do so. As Leo XIII said in the Bull *Apostolicae curae*:

The Church is forbidden to change, or even touch, the matter or form of any sacrament. She may indeed change or abolish or introduce something in the non-essential rites or “ceremonial” parts to be used in the administration of the sacraments, such as the processions, prayers, or hymns before or after the actual words of the form are recited.³⁴

One of the documents printed in front of every edition of the traditional Missal (*De defectibus*) states:

If anyone omits or changes anything in the form of the consecration of the body and blood, and in this change of words, changes the meaning [lit: does not mean the same thing], then he does not effect the sacrament.

With regard to those sacramental forms given us *in genere*, the words can be changed providing there is no change in meaning. When such occurs the change is called “substantial.” Now apart from the fact that one cannot apply this principle to those forms given us *in specie*, it is nevertheless argued by some that, despite the change in the words, there is no change in meaning, and hence no substantial change. It behooves us then to consider the substance of the Eucharistic form, for if there is a “substantial” change—that is to say, a change in meaning—then the form is unquestionably rendered invalid. This is not a matter of debate, but of fact.

First, consider the change in the first and last sentences. Instead of “do these things” we find the celebrants instructed to “do this,” that is, “take and eat (drink),” thus strongly suggesting that what is involved is a “supper” and a “memorial,” rather than the entire action. Next note the addition of the phrase “which will be given up for you.” We have already alluded to Luther’s reason for adding this phrase and of course the NOM had to be brought into line with the Lutheran rite. The removal of the phrase “mystery of the Faith” (which Tradition tells us was added by the Apostles) and its displacement to the so-called “Memorial Acclamation” leads the faithful to believe that the mystery lies, not in the consecration, but rather in Christ’s Death, Resurrection, and Final Coming. While Christ is supposedly on the altar, the faithful are made to say “until you come again.”

It is also argued that as long as the priest says the essential words—“This is My body. . . . This is My Blood . . .”—nothing else is required.³⁵ Those who hold to this position ignore the defects in the form and the fact that the other words—the setting in which these words are used (as we shall see below)—alter the meaning of these words. They also ignore the fact that these words, while essential, do not constitute the complete form. Finally, they ignore the fact that it is forbidden for a priest to use the Words of Consecration with the intent to confect the sacred species outside of a true Mass. As Canon 817 states: “It is unlawful even in the case of extreme necessity, to consecrate one species without the other, or to consecrate both outside the Mass.” Benedictine canonist Fr. Charles Augustine comments on this to the effect that “to consecrate outside of the Mass would not only be a sacrilege, but probably an attempt at invalid consecration.”³⁶

The issue of the context in which the essential Words of Consecration are used is most important because this setting is capable of changing their meaning in a substantial manner. This is another reason why the traditional Church has always been so insistent upon the integrity of the form used. Consider the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas:

Some have maintained that the words “This is the Chalice of My Blood” alone belong to the substance of the form, but not those words which

follow. Now this seems incorrect, because the words that follow them are determinations of the predicate, that is, of Christ's Blood; consequently they belong to the integrity of the expression. And on this account others say more accurately that all the words which follow are of the substance of the form down to the words "As often as ye shall do these things" [Not including these words, for the priest puts down the Chalice when he comes to them.] Hence it is that the priest pronounces all the words, under the same rite and manner, holding the Chalice in his hands (*Summa*, III, Q. 78, Art. 3).

MANY FOR ALL

The culmination of sacrilege occurs in the new form with the mistranslation of the Latin word *multis* (many) by "all," a change which clearly "determines the predicate," namely Christ's Body and Blood (cf. paragraph above). The excuse given for this was that there is no Aramaic word for "all," a philological falsity propagated by the Protestant scholar Joachim Jeremias, and one that has been repeatedly exposed.³⁷ Moreover, of the various Mass rites which the traditional Church has always recognized as valid—some 86 different rites in many different languages—many of which date back to Apostolic times—not one has ever used "all." (Imagine turning each of the "manys" in St. Matthew's gospel to "alls.") What makes this particular mistranslation most offensive is that the Church has always taught that the word "all" is not used for specific reasons. St. Alphonsus Liguori, a Doctor of the Church, explains why in an opinion confirmed by St. Thomas Aquinas and the Catechism of the Council of Trent.

The words *Pro vobis et pro multis* ("For you and for many") are used to distinguish the virtue of the Blood of Christ from its fruits: for the Blood of our Savior is of sufficient value to save all men, but its fruits are applicable only to a certain number and not to all, and this is their own fault. Or, as the theologians say, this precious Blood is (in itself) sufficiently (*sufficenter*) able to save all men, but (on our part) effectually (*efficaciter*) it does not save all—it saves only those who cooperate with Grace (*Treatise on the Holy Eucharist*).

It is pertinent that Pope Benedict XIV discussed this issue and stated that this teaching "explains correctly" Christ's use of "for many" as opposed to "for all" (*De Sacrosanctae Missae Sacrificio*). In view of the constant teaching of the Church, this change from many to all cannot be accidental. (The Latin original of the NOM still uses *multis*, but how often does one hear the new "Mass" in Latin? Moreover this mistranslation occurs in

almost all the vernacular versions: German: *fur allen*; Italian, *tutti*; and in French, the vague word *multitude*. In Polish, for some reason, “many” is retained.) It is clearly mandated from Rome (DOL 1445, footnote R 13). According to Archbishop Weakland, Paul VI reserved to himself the approval of the vernacular translations of the *Institution Narrative*, and especially of the word *multis*. Given all this, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the heresy of apocatastasis is being promulgated—the heresy held by many of our “separated brethren” such as the Anabaptists, the Moravian Brethren, the Christodelphans, rationalistic Protestants, Universalists, and Teilhardians—namely, the false notion that all men will be saved. (This perhaps explains why Hell is also in disfavor.) Reference to the chapter on Vatican II will show to what extent all this is highly consistent with many of the statements of this dubious Council, as well as those of the post-Conciliar “Popes.”³⁸

THE MEMORIAL ACCLAMATION

As mentioned above, the phrase *mysterium fidei* (the Mystery of the Faith) was part of the consecration form of the traditional Mass. In the New “Mass” the phrase has been removed from the form and made into the introduction of the people’s “Memorial Acclamation.” Right after the supposed consecration, the faithful are asked to say (or sing), “Christ has died, Christ has risen, Christ will come again.” Not only is this an entirely new practice, but it implies that the Mystery of the Faith is the Death, Resurrection, and Final Coming of Our Lord, rather than His “Real Presence” on the altar. Nor are the other Memorial Acclamations any more specific—for example, “When we eat this bread and drink this cup we proclaim your death Lord Jesus, until you come in glory.”

Archbishop Annibale Bugnini informs us in his memoirs that this issue was discussed directly with Paul VI. The Consilium had wished to leave the “Memorial Acclamation” up to the National Bishops’ Committees on the Liturgy, but Paul VI urged that “a series of acclamations (5 or 6) should be prepared for [use] after the consecration.” According to Archbishop Bugnini, Paul VI feared that “if the initiative were left to the Bishops’ Committees, inappropriate acclamations such as ‘My Lord and My God’ would be introduced.” (The traditional Church had always encouraged the use of the ejaculatory prayer “My Lord and My God” at the elevation of the Host during Mass as it both affirmed belief in the Real Presence and gave praise to God.)³⁹

THE BODY OF CHRIST

Some conservative *Novus Ordo* Catholics claim that the Real Presence is affirmed when the priest-president says “the Body of Christ” at the time of giving out communion. Not so! Let us listen to the *Instruction of the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy* that laid down the rule that the priest was to use this new truncated expression instead of the traditional, “May the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ preserve your soul unto life everlasting, Amen.”

The use of the phrase “the Body of Christ, Amen,” in the communion rite asserts in a very forceful way the presence and role of the community. The minister [sic] acknowledges who the person is by reason of baptism and confirmation and what the community is and does in the liturgical action. . . . The change to the use of the phrase “the Body of Christ,” rather than the long formula which was previously said by the priest has several repercussions in the liturgical renewal. First, it seeks to highlight the important concept of the community as the Body of Christ; secondly, it brings into focus the assent of the individual in the worshipping community; and finally, it demonstrates the importance of Christ’s presence in the liturgical celebration. (To understand this “presence” the reader should refer to Paul VI’s “definition” of the Mass discussed below.)

And indeed, in line with this “new Gospel,” the Bishops’ Committee on the Liturgy strictly forbade the priest to say, “This is the Body of Christ”! More recently the American Bishops have forbidden kneeling when receiving the host.

THE ALTAR CHANGED INTO A TABLE

Now all this “spiritual nourishment” is effected, not on an altar, but on a table. An altar stone containing relics is no longer required. Tabernacles are no longer to be placed on these tables—indeed, if they were, the president would have great trouble addressing his congregation.⁴⁰ The six candles used at High Mass, and which recall the Jewish Menorah (candle stick), with Christ, “The Light of the World” being the central and seventh “candle,” are gone. No longer does the priest face the crucifix which, according to *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908), is “the principal ornament of the altar . . . placed to remind the celebrant and the people that the Victim offered on the altar is the same as was offered on the Cross,” and “which must be placed on the altar as often as Mass is celebrated.” Instead, the president

now faces a microphone! (Some conservative priests have a cross lying flat on the table, but such is not mandated.) No longer is the altar covered with three linen or hemp cloths to absorb any possible spillage of Our Lord's Blood—cloths symbolic of the shrouds in which Our Lord's Body was wrapped. Nor is there any requirement to use linen—any material will do. As for the priest-president, he no longer says the *Lavabo inter innocentes* . . . (“I will wash my hands among the innocent, and will encompass Thy altar, O Lord”). Instead, he now recites a single verse from Psalm 50 in which no altar is mentioned and in which he simply asks for God to forgive his sins. The sacred vessels are no longer handled only by sacristans or those in Holy Orders, but by laymen, often chosen from the congregation at random. Nor are the vessels any longer made of precious metals and covered with a veil, symbolic of their mysterious and sacred character. At the end of the “meal” the “cup” need not be purified at once; its purification can be deferred to a later time. In some places (in accord with “optional” rubrics) it is handed unpurified to a layman who places it off on a side table. Altar rails are gone so that the sanctuary is joined to the nave—the distinction between the sacred enclosure and the world is obliterated in the same manner as that between the priest and the layman. Communion is received in the hand and standing (as mentioned above, kneeling has been forbidden!)—if not distributed in a basket. Kissing the “table” is done but twice, and not before every blessing and *Dominus vobiscum* as before. Signs of the Cross are reduced to three. But by now, one is hardly surprised. As Cranmer said: “An altar is for a sacrifice, a table is for a meal.”⁴¹

THE PRIEST FACING THE PEOPLE

All this is done with the priest facing the congregation. He is no longer an intermediary between God and man, but the “president” of an assembly, presiding at the table around which the faithful are to gather and “refresh” themselves at the “memorial supper” (all phrases from the *General Instruction*). At great expense altars were destroyed and replaced by tables, placed—at least symbolically—in the center of the community, there no longer being any distinction between the sanctuary and the nave.

Why this extraordinary change. Cardinal Lercaro, the president of the Consilium, informed us that this “makes for a celebration of the Eucharist which is true and more communal” (DOL 428). Paul VI approved the new arrangement because it was now “placed for dialogue with the assembly,” and because it was one of the things that made the Sunday Mass, “not so much an obligation, but a pleasure; not just fulfilled as a duty, but claimed as a right” (DOL 430).⁴²

The significance of the positional change of the president is very great. How can a priest perform a sacrifice to God as both an *alter Christus* and an intermediary between man and God, when he is facing the “ontological”⁴³ congregation? Many religions other than Catholicism have sacrificial rites, but in none of them is this inversion seen. And within the Catholic Tradition there is no more precedent for the priest facing the congregation than there is for the laity gathering around the table to partake of a “paschal meal.” Can anyone imagine the High Priest of the Jews acting this way before the Holy of Holies? Can one imagine a child asking his father’s forgiveness while facing his school-friends? Be this as it may, this inversion once again makes the non-sacrificial nature of the NOM clear.

It is totally false to claim that the practice of the priest facing the people is a return to primitive practice. At the Last Supper, the Apostles did not sit around the table in some casual manner, but, rather, as in any solemn Jewish feast, they sat facing the Temple of Jerusalem. As Msgr. Klaus Gamber, Director of the Liturgical Institute at Regensburg states, “there never was a celebration *versus populum* (facing the people) in either the Eastern or Western Church. Instead, there was a turning towards the East.” Not surprisingly, it was Martin Luther who first suggested this inversion. It is true that there were certain churches in which the priest did incidentally “face the people,” but this was because architectural restrictions occasionally imposed this necessity in order to have the altar placed over a particularly sacred tomb—as with St. Peter’s and St. Cecilia’s in Rome. Fr. Louis Bouyer, in his *Liturgy and Architecture*, has conclusively shown that there is absolutely no evidence from antiquity that the priest ever faced the people when saying Mass for any reason. Those who talk of returning to early Christianity—be they reformers or post-Conciliar theologians—would do well to remember our Lord’s complaint made through the mouth of the Prophet Jeremias: “They have turned their backs to Me, and not their faces” (2:20).

The truth of the matter is that the priest has, whenever possible, faced the East. And this, as St. Thomas Aquinas tells us, is because: 1) the way in which the Heavens move from East to West symbolizes God’s majesty; 2) it symbolizes our desire to return to paradise; and 3) Christ, the Light of the world, is expected to return from the East (*Summa*, II-II, Q. 84, 3 ad. 3). Despite all this, Paul VI assures us that “nothing essential has been changed in the Mass.”

CAN WE ACCEPT A DOUBTFUL CONSECRATION?

It is hard to see how conservative *Novus Ordo* Catholics can argue that the changes in the Mass, and above all, the changes in the consecratory

formula, have not rendered the Mass invalid. Certainly, in the face of the evidence given, they must agree that the matter is open to debate. But if it is open to debate, there is doubt—and above all, there is doubt with regard to the form of the consecration.

Under such circumstances, Catholics are obliged to abstain from any participation in such rites. Listen to what Catholic theologians have said about using a doubtful form of a sacrament:

The very raising of questions or doubts about the validity of a given manner of confecting a sacrament—if this question is based on an apparent defect of matter or form—would necessitate the strict abstention from use of that doubtful manner of performing the sacramental act, until the doubts are resolved. In confecting the sacrament, all priests are obliged to follow the “*medium certum*” (the certain means).⁴⁴

Matter and form must be certainly valid. Hence one may not follow a probable opinion and use either doubtful matter or form. Acting otherwise, one commits a sacrilege.⁴⁵

No wonder then that traditional theologians like J.M. Hervé instruct the priest to:

Omit nothing of the form, add nothing, change nothing. Beware of transmuting, corrupting, or interrupting the words.⁴⁶

Some have advocated saying a special prayer when they have doubts about the validity of the sacrament. Such of course achieves nothing and ignores a fundamental principle of sacramental theology.

IN WHAT WAY IS THE EUCHARIST THE SACRAMENT OF UNITY?

The post-Conciliar Church repeatedly tells us that the Eucharist is the “Sacrament of Unity.” One must be careful how one understands this perfectly legitimate phrase. The traditional Church teaches that only Catholics in a state of Grace can worthily receive the sacred species. Unity is, by definition, a characteristic of the true Church, and those who have the privilege of receiving Communion from her, partake of that unity.

As has been pointed out elsewhere, the post-Conciliar concept of “unity” is vastly different. The New Church envisions itself as having lost “unity” with those outside itself due in large part to its own failings. It seeks to re-

establish this unity by a false ecumenism—by asking those separated from her to join her in partaking of the Eucharistic sacrament without in any way demanding that they accept the fullness of the Catholic faith or that they be in a state of Grace. And so it naturally follows that in the post-Conciliar Church, non-Catholics are allowed to receive the Eucharist providing they show “some sign of belief in these sacraments consonant with the Faith of the Church” (DOL 1022, 1029).⁴⁷ “Some sign of belief” is, to say the least, a vague phrase. And further, it is unclear whether this consonant belief is to be with the traditional teaching of the Church, or only with the warped post-Conciliar theology. Certainly, if our “separated brethren” had full belief, they would become Catholics. But many Protestants who are in a state of mortal sin can be said to have “some sign of belief” in the Eucharist. Be that as it may, non-Catholics are now permitted to communicate at the post-Conciliar rite, and this is enshrined both in practice and in the New Code of Canon Law. And why shouldn’t this be so when one considers the following text taken from the documents of Vatican II.

The Ecclesial Communities separated from us do not have the full unity with us that derives from baptism. . . . Nevertheless, when in the Lord’s Supper they commemorate His death and resurrection, they attest to the sign of the life in communion with Christ and await His glorious Second Coming (*Decree on Ecumenism*).

THE GENERAL INSTRUCTION AND PAUL VI’S DEFINITION OF THE MASS⁴⁸

So far we have shown that everything in the New “Mass” points in one direction. It was created to accommodate the Protestants, and to foster that unity which is the “internal mission” of the new Church. Hence it implicitly or explicitly denies the sacrificial nature of the Mass. But there is more. The *General Instruction* on the *Novus Ordo* insists that it is not the priest-president who celebrates the rite, but rather the “people of God,” or the “community.” And why not, if, as Vatican II states, “salvation is a communitarian” affair? We shall now examine this *General Instruction* and above all the definition of the Mass it contains.

The *General Instruction* serves as a sort of preface to the new rite and was promulgated along with it in Paul VI’s Constitution *Missale Romanum*. It is to be found in the new Missals in the same location that the *Quo Primum* and *De defectibus* occupied in the old. According to the Sacred Congregation of Divine Worship, “the Instruction is an accurate resumé and application of those doctrinal principles and practical norms on the

The Novus Ordo Missae

Eucharist that are contained in the Conciliar Constitution” and “seeks to provide guidelines for catechesis of the faithful and to offer the main criteria for Eucharistic celebration.” Cardinal Villot is even more specific:

The *General Instruction* is not a mere collection of rubrics, but rather a synthesis of theological, ascetical, [and] pastoral principles that are indispensable to a doctrinal knowledge of the Mass, to its celebration, its catechesis, and its pastoral dimensions (DOL 1780).

In view of all this it is difficult to agree with Michael Davies’ contention that the NOM must be judged independently of the Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum* which contains the *General Instruction*. On the contrary, if we are to understand the new rite, we must have recourse to this *General Instruction*—even if it is, as Michael Davies says, “one of the most deplorable documents ever approved by any Supreme Pontiff.” Moreover, it should be clear that, regardless of who actually wrote it, it is Paul VI who promulgated it in his official capacity. It is pertinent that subsequent documents of the post-Conciliar Church make frequent reference to it when questions arise about liturgical practice.

Now, according to paragraph 7 and 8 of this document:

7) The Lord’s Supper or Mass is the sacred assembly or congregation of the people of God gathering together, with a priest presiding, in order to celebrate the memorial of the Lord. For this reason Christ’s promise applies supremely to such a local gathering together of the Church: “Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in their midst” (Matt. 1:20) (DOL 1397).

8) The Mass is made up as it were of the Liturgy of the Word and the Liturgy of the Eucharist, two parts so closely connected that they form but one single act of worship. For in the Mass the table of God’s word and of Christ’s body is laid for the people of God to receive from it instruction and food. There are also certain rites to open and conclude the celebration (DOL 1398).

In the traditional Mass it is clearly the priest alone who celebrates; the Real Presence is effected independently of, and regardless of, whether or not an “assembly” is present. In the above definition, however, the phrase “with a priest presiding” is by no means essential to what occurs. One has only to leave it out to see that the action of the rite is performed by the “assembly or congregation of the people of God gathered together.” Other sentences of the *General Instruction* add weight to such an interpretation.

Thus paragraph 60 states that the priest “joins the people to himself in offering the sacrifice” and 62 that “the people of God . . . offer the victim, not only through the hands of the priest, but also together with him.” The point is continuously stressed within the rite itself by the insistent use of “we” in all the prayers.

The concept of “presiding,” despite the fact that it is found in Justin Martyr, is innovative. The verb “to preside” comes from the Latin *praesedere*, which means literally to “sit in the first place,” and signifies, as Webster’s Dictionary states, “to occupy the place of authority, as a president, chairman, moderator, etc.” To preside at an action in no way means to accomplish the action personally—indeed, in almost every situation where a person “presides” he is isolated from the action performed. The president of the French Assembly doesn’t even cast a vote! Nor does the president of the U.S. Senate, except when there is a need to break a tie. Further, one can hardly avoid the political implications of the term.

The Mass is made equivalent to the Lord’s Supper. While the phrase can be found in Scripture (I Cor. 11:20), it is in no way part of Catholic theological tradition. Indeed, the phrase “Lord’s Supper” was specifically used by the Reformers to distinguish their services from the Catholic Mass. To state that they are equivalent is, to say the least, offensive to pious ears.

Far worse is the statement that “Christ’s promise applies supremely to such a local gathering. . . . ‘Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in their midst.’” Let the meaning be clear. If this is accepted, Christ is no more present at Paul VI’s “Mass” than he is when a father joins his children for evening prayers! One is reminded of Cranmer’s statement when this issue was brought up with regard to the Anglican (Episcopal in America) rite: “Christ is present whensoever the Church prayeth unto Him, and is gathered together in His name.”

Many were horrified by this definition. As the *Critical Study of the Novus Ordo Missae* by the Roman theologians stated, it in no way implied “either the Real Presence, or the reality of the sacrifice, or the sacramental function of the consecrating priest, or the intrinsic value of the Eucharistic sacrifice independent of the people’s presence. . . . In a word, it does not imply any of the essential dogmatic values of the Mass.”

In an attempt to obviate this and other criticisms which the *Critical Study* presented, a second version of the *General Instruction* was promulgated (1970). That this was in fact a “white wash” is quite clear; those responsible (ultimately, once again, Paul VI) stated that in reviewing the initial version “they found no doctrinal errors.” It should be added that no change in the rite itself was made.

The Novus Ordo Missae

A review of the *General Instruction* both before and after its publication by the Fathers and *periti* of the Consilium found no reason for changing the arrangement of the material or any error in doctrine (DOL 1371).

Indeed, that they changed it at all was “in order to avoid difficulties of all kinds, and in order to make certain expressions clearer.” They assured us that absolutely “no innovations were introduced” into the second version and that the “amendments were few in number, sometimes of little importance, or concerned only with style” (DOL 1371). Yet the amended version did its task. Despite such clear-cut statements, and despite the fact that it in no way “clarified” expressions, but rather obfuscated them, the conservative *Novus Ordo* Catholics found it mollified their consciences.

Let us consider how the definition reads now:

At Mass or the Lord’s Supper, the people of God are called together, with a priest presiding and acting in the person of Christ, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord or Eucharistic sacrifice. For this reason Christ’s promise applies supremely.

A careful reading of this changed definition will show that its authors were correct when they said that “no innovations were introduced” (one must smile at the innovators expressing themselves in this manner) and that “the amendments were only a matter of style.”

First of all, the Mass is still made equivalent to the Lord’s Supper. Moreover, this is a persistent pattern. The complaint of the Roman theologians holds true of both versions of the *General Instruction*. Throughout both, as they said, the Mass “is designated by a great many different expressions, all acceptable relatively, all unacceptable if employed as they are separately and in an absolute sense.” The study cited as examples:

The Action of Christ and of the People of God; the Lord’s Supper or Mass; the Paschal Banquet; the common participation in the Lord’s table; the memorial of the Lord; the Eucharistic prayer; the Liturgy of the word; and the Eucharistic Liturgy. . . .

In order to avoid the accusation that I have either misinterpreted the definition or misjudged the document, allow me to give two statements taken from books used in post-Conciliar seminaries—both have the semi-official approval of the new church. The first, Fr. Richstätter’s *Liturgical Law Today*:

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

The priest also sees his relation to the laity in a new perspective. The priest is no longer the one “officially delegated” to perform a clerical action in which the people are invited to participate. For example, the second edition of the *General Instruction* on the Roman Missal systematically refuses to speak of the priest as “the celebrant”: as though the priest alone celebrates. It is *the community who celebrates the liturgy* [my emphasis]. The priest celebrating has different responsibilities than the laity, but it is not the priest alone who celebrates. The priest sees his role more as a leadership role within an action which belongs to the community.⁴⁹

Again, consider the following quote from the *Commentary on the General Instruction* which was written and edited, among others, by Fr. Martin Patino, one of the members of the Consilium who assisted in preparing the New Order of the Mass:

The [New] Mass is not an act of the priest with whom the people unite themselves, as it used to be explained. The Eucharist is, rather an act of the people, whom the ministers serve by making the Savior present sacramentally. . . . This former formulation, which corresponds to the classical theology of recent centuries was rejected because it placed what was relative and ministerial (the hierarchy) above what was ontological and absolute (the people of God).

A further change, or rather, addition, was made in the definition given in paragraph 7 of the new *Instruction*. After the quotation from Matthew it added:

For the celebration of Mass, which perpetuates the sacrifice of the Cross, Christ is really present to the assembly gathered in his name; he is present in the person of the minister, in his own word, and indeed substantially and permanently under the eucharistic elements.

Once again, there is nothing in these ambiguous phrases that would offend a Protestant. Nowhere are we informed that the celebration involved is other than a memorial—and the word “memorial,” like the phrase “the Lord’s Supper,” is another Reformation term used to distinguish a Protestant service from the Catholic Mass. The new *Instruction* states that the Mass “perpetuates” the sacrifice of the Cross; this is another bit of ecumenical sleight-of-hand. The traditional expression is that the Mass renews the sacrifice of the Cross. Further, the *Instruction* states that Christ is “really” present, as much in the assembly as in the priest and in his words. Nothing suggests to us that he is any more present in any other parties or “elements” than he is in the assembly of the people. Some may argue that the reference

to His “substantial and continued presence in the eucharistic elements” suffices to remove all doubt about the orthodoxy of the definition, but this “substantial” presence is in no way differentiated from His “presence” in the assembly or the priest-president. Moreover, the use of the term “perpetual” suggests that no “change” has occurred. One is reminded of Luther’s comment that “if Jesus is present everywhere, perhaps he is also present in the Eucharist.”

Conservatives who would defend the new “Mass” may also contend that the *General Instruction* itself nowhere specifically states that the people confect the sacrament. This indeed is true. For in fact, in no place does the *Instruction* state that a sacrament is confected! What exactly do the people of God do? “They gather together to celebrate the memorial of the Lord or the Eucharistic sacrifice.” The text does not say “. . . and the Eucharistic sacrifice,” which clearly implies once again that such is in no way different from the memorial of the Lord as Protestants understand it. Moreover, the term “Eucharist” literally means “thanksgiving,” and this ambiguity makes it possible once again, to bring the entire definition into line with Protestant theology, according to which the “sacrifice” is only one of “praise and thanksgiving,” and never one of propitiation or immolation. Looking elsewhere in the *Instruction* is not much help. Such phrases as “the Mass is the culminating action by which God in Christ sanctifies the world and men adore the Father” or “the eucharistic Prayer, a prayer of thanksgiving and sanctification is the center of the entire celebration,” if anything, confirm the Protestant orientation of the rite.

Looking briefly at paragraph 8 of the *Instruction* (unchanged), one finds nothing to contradict what we have said up to now. As noted previously, the division of the rite into the “Liturgy of the Word” and the “Liturgy of the Eucharist” implies that the Word of God is only found in Scripture, and that the “Word” (*Logos*—another name for Jesus Christ) is not made flesh. The term “Eucharist,” meaning thanksgiving, allows one to see the second part of the service as only a “sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.” (And nothing in the rite itself would lead us to believe differently.) Now this second paragraph affirms that the entire affair is carried out on a “table,” and that from this “table” the faithful are “instructed” and “fed.” Once again, this is fully in line with the Protestant idea that the function of a minister is primarily to instruct. While “food” can have a spiritual connotation, its use in this situation is more consistent with the breaking of the brief post-Conciliar fast with a little bread and wine. Once again, Protestantism prevails—indeed, triumphs.

Other changes were made in the revised *Instruction*. A Foreword was added which feebly attempted to reiterate the teaching of Trent on the

Mass, but at the same time the Foreword or Introduction insisted once again that it is the “people” who are responsible for the celebration of the NOM: “For the celebration of the Eucharist is the action of the whole Church. . . . They are a people called to offer God the prayers of the entire human family, a people giving thanks in Christ for the mystery of salvation by offering His sacrifice.” The net impression left is that the second version of the *Instruction* does little (if anything) to affirm orthodoxy or to assure us of the reality of the consecration. Indeed, all it does—and such was its intent—is to provide conservative Catholics the opportunity of mollifying their consciences. It should further be noted that, while Paul VI may have made his belief in the Catholic teaching on the Mass explicit in other documents or speeches, this in no way changes the immediate situation. What is important is that nowhere in the NOM or the *General Instruction* is such a belief made specific.

Conservative post-Conciliar Catholics argue two ways: 1) that the *General Instruction* in no way affects the validity of the NOM, and 2) that the changes in the second version of the *General Instruction* somehow make the rite acceptable and capable of being interpreted in an orthodox manner. Whatever position they take, they cannot deny that both the NOM and the *General Instruction* are ingenious and masterful compilations of ambiguity aimed at obfuscating Catholic teaching and propagating Protestant unbelief. Indeed, one has to express a certain amazement and awe at the skill with which this has been achieved. “The children of the world are wiser in their generation than the children of light.”

THE “INDULT” MASS OF JOHN XXIII

Passing mention should be made of the changes mandated in the Missal of 1959 by John XXIII, popularly called the “Mass of John XXIII,” the Mass of the “Indult.” Many of the changes in this Mass were significant, even radical for the time. It was initially introduced as: 1) the first step down the slippery path to the NOM;⁵⁰ 2) to introduce the faithful to the idea that their time-honored rites could be changed; and 3) to determine how strong the resistance to the new rite would be. It became obsolete three years later with the additional changes introduced to accustom us to the NOM, and was subsequently brought back as an “indult” in order to give the faithful the impression that the present hierarchy is returning to tradition. Many falsely advertise this Indult mass as the Tridentine or traditional Mass. It is not. It is the Mass of John XXIII. Moreover, the Indult requires that those who take advantage of it accept without reservation the “doctrinal

soundness and legitimacy” of the NOM and the teachings of Vatican II, and that they have no connection with groups that do not. Some “bishops” insist that those attending these celebrations must first sign a statement to this effect. Even those who do not sign such a statement implicitly accept the terms of the Indult. (This is to say nothing of accepting priests whose ordinations are open to question—after all, the current ordination rite confers on priest-presidents the power to “celebrate the liturgy” and not to say the Mass.)

Along with the Mass of John XXIII, significant changes were mandated in the Breviary which have grave consequences on the spiritual lives of the clergy. Also, the changes in the calendar made obsolete the use of older Missals and Breviaries.⁵¹ Once again, this rite should not be confused with the so-called Tridentine or traditional Mass; nor should the unwary be fooled by the term “Latin Mass” which may well be nothing else than the Latin version of the heretical NOM. One is reminded of the fact that Cranmer had his rite translated into Latin for the benefit of those at Oxford University who wanted their worship to be in Latin.

One thing is clear: however ecumenical the post-Conciliar Church is, one group it will have nothing to do with is the traditional Catholics. John Paul II has participated in every conceivable rite, be it Islamic, Buddhist, Lutheran, Jewish, or whatever. But he has never participated in or approved of the traditional Mass. Notwithstanding all the debate about “abrogation” or the status of the Apostolic Bull *Quo Primum*, the traditional Mass is forbidden.⁵² As Paul VI said, the NOM was created to “replace” it. The attitude of the post-Conciliar hierarchy parallels that of Cromwell, the ravisher of Ireland:

I had rather that Mahometanism were permitted amongst us than that one of God's children should be persecuted. . . . I meddle not with any man's conscience. But if by liberty of conscience you mean a liberty to exercise the Mass, I judge it best to use plain dealing and to let you know . . . that will not be allowed of.⁵³

Some (such as Michael Davies) are willing to concede all that I have said but proclaim the NOM to be a true and Catholic mass because it was promulgated by a valid pope. This however is a two-way argument. If the NOM is in fact a false rite, it is *prima facie* proof that the person promulgating it was not acting as the Vicar of Christ, but acting on his own. I have already called attention to the use of “institutional violence” in its introduction. According to Plato, he who governs other than by divine right, acts as a despot.

ARE THE MISTRANSLATIONS “ABUSES”?

It should be clear that in the above discussion of the NOM I have made reference to the rite as used by the most conservative post-Conciliar Catholics. Any reference to such entities as “clown masses,” “marihuana masses,” “guitar masses,” etc., would immediately have raised the defensive cry that such are “abuses.” (The allowance of such side-shows, participation in them by the hierarchy, and the fact that they have never been clearly condemned, significantly undermines the abuse argument.)

However, one must clearly deal with the issue of mistranslations. These are not and cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be dismissed as “abuses” enforced by those who surround the poor beleaguered “Popes.” Several points should be made: 1) Latin is for all practical purposes a dead liturgical language. Those who point to the Latin original to prove the Catholicity of the vernacular, or who use the Latin to exonerate the “Popes” of heresy must recognize this fact; 2) almost every defect in the NOM we have discussed applies to the Latin version as much as to the English; 3) we have given evidence that critical aspects of the translations have had direct papal approval, and we shall show below that they are advocated by official curial documents; 4) the mistranslations have been in use for decades, and complaints about them, as with the NOM itself, have been repeatedly ignored by Rome and the post-Conciliar “Popes.” The mistranslations are therefore not “abuses,” but an integral part of the Liturgical revolution.

One might well ask why those who felt the vernacular would allow greater participation on the part of the laity (such being required, as they now are the celebrants), did not use the already available translations of the old Mass. The answer is given by Fr. Philip Hughes. Discussing Cranmer’s new (Anglican/Episcopal) rite, which shares so many features with the NOM, he stated that,

such a proceeding would have advertised only the more loudly the conflict between the newly-imposed doctrine and the older belief. The new service was indeed in English, and in better English almost than any man before or since has ever devised. But it was also a careful re-modeling of the service and a re-writing of its prayers such that every sign that this rite was ever, or was ever meant to be, a sacrifice itself efficacious for the living and the dead, was entirely removed.⁵⁴

It should also be emphasized that the errors in translation are paralleled in all the various vernaculars used. Further, the pattern they follow was first outlined in *Inter Oecumenici* (1964), and further delineated in subsequent Vatican pronouncements (such as DOL 843 and 871). There can be no doubt

but that they have the clear approval of the Pope, for Archbishop Bugnini informs us in his memoirs that Paul VI reserved to himself the approval of the translations of the Canon, and above all, the Words of Consecration. (As we noted above, this was also confirmed by Archbishop Weakland.) In English-speaking countries the organization responsible for translations is the “International Committee for English in the Liturgy” (ICEL). It is one of the most powerful organizations within the New Church and has the authority to overrule even National Bishops’ Conferences in certain matters. Its complex and far-reaching tentacles are described by Gary Potter in “The Liturgy Club.”⁵⁵

Christopher Monckton, former editor of *The Universe*, informs us that in the English version of the NOM there are over 400 mistranslations from the Latin.⁵⁶ Of far greater importance is the pattern they follow. According to Michael Davies, the “motivating force” which they follow is “precisely the same . . . [as that] behind the official Latin version of the New Mass, i.e., a tendency to minimize the liturgical expression of Catholic Eucharistic teaching which is not acceptable to the Protestants.” Mr. Monckton describes this two-stage pattern in the following terms:

The errors display a common theme which reveals the intentions of the translators. That theme is the dilution or removal of allusions and references to those doctrines of the Mass which are specifically and peculiarly Catholic. . . . The thoroughness and determination with which these teachings which distinguish Catholic beliefs from those of other Christians have been removed is demonstrated by many minor omissions which are often repeated.

But the errors are not just limited to the Order of the Mass itself, that is, to the Creed or the Eucharistic Prayers. The entire new Missal in its official vernacular version is packed with outrageous translation errors. Fr. Anthony Cekada, a priest who celebrates the traditional Mass, did a study of this question and presented the results in a lecture given in Detroit on October 25, 1986. To quote him directly:

The fraud is not confined to the translations of the new Eucharistic Prayers and the other more or less fixed parts of the New Mass you hear in English every Sunday. I recently came across a Latin-English Missal produced by a “conservative” organization which promotes celebrating the New Mass in Latin. I compared the 34 sets of Orations for the Sundays in Ordinary Time (*Dominicae per Annum*) in Paul VI’s Missal to their English translations.

The American liturgical mafia completed the process of de-Catholicizing which Rome began [i.e., first stage in Latin, second in the vernacular]. Phrases and expressions in the “translated” Orations which

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

allude to “negative” ideas are suppressed; pleasing God or appeasing His wrath, Christ’s Passion, our need for worthiness, our wickedness, error, the weakness of human nature, sins which “burden the conscience,” and putting aside our own inclinations, as are expressions referring to the human will and our minds and bodies.

The translators also downplayed or omitted ideas non-Catholics consider “offensive.” Heretics will be pleased to note that the translations do not speak of the faithful or of the offering of Christ as the victim at Mass, and Jews and Moslems will be delighted to note that phrases referring to the perfection of the sacrifices of the Old Testament in that of the New, and the redemption for “those who believe in Christ” have been excised. And Martin Luther himself would have had no problems reciting those prayers in which the translators have suppressed the notion of performing good works.

But the greatest outrage that the translators perpetrated was consistently leaving out the word “grace” from their translations. It appears in the Latin original of the Orations 11 times, but not once in the official English version. Thus, the word which is fundamental to Catholic teaching on the Fall of man, the Redemption, sin, justification, and the entire sacramental system has utterly disappeared without a trace.

All this may not bother those who have become inured to the NOM by weekly attendance. However, I would ask any reader who retains some sense of the Catholic faith to consider the horror of being buried by the NOM funeral rites. In the Latin original of Paul VI’s Missal there are 114 possible funeral Orations (prayers). The word “soul” (*anima*) only occurs in two of them, and these are not only “optional,” but when translated into English, have this offensive word expunged. Those who have attended NOM funerals will note that, not only is no sacrifice offered “for the living and the dead,” but that at no time is the congregation asked to pray for the soul of the departed—at least not within the rite itself. Of course if all men are saved, the importance of all this becomes minimal. But then why bother to attend the NOM at all.

CONCLUSION

The NOM has caused havoc among the Catholic faithful, a fact evident even to the Lutheran sociologist Dr. Berger:

The Liturgical Revolution—no other term will do—is a mistake . . . touching millions of Catholics at the very core of their religious belief. Let me only mention the sudden abolition, and indeed, prohibition of the Latin Mass,

The Novus Ordo Missae

the transposition of the officiating priest from the front to the back of the altar (the first change symbolically diminished the universality of the Mass, the second, its transcendent reference) and the massive assault on a wide variety of forms of popular piety. . . . If a thoroughly malicious sociologist, bent on injuring the Catholic community as much as possible, had been advisor to the Church, he could hardly have done a better job.

While almost every phrase of the NOM and the *General Instruction* are open to widely differing interpretations, the overall result is a Protestant rite with some superficially Catholic “scaffolding.” The innovators’ “editing”—nay, butchering—of the ancient texts, reveals a clear-cut pattern of “accommodation” to Protestant errors. Nowhere is the NOM clearly presented as an immolative or propitiatory sacrifice. Nowhere is it clearly stated that a sacrificial act is performed by a priest acting independently of the assembly and acting *in persona Christi*. Indeed, it is repeatedly affirmed that it is the ontological “people of God” who celebrate the rite. No immolation, no propitiation, and no sacrificing priest! Now, if such is the case, whatever the NOM is, it is not a Catholic Mass. The resulting concoction is, however, admirably suited to use by any and all Christian denominations—indeed, it is a harbinger of the universal religion which “ecumaniacs” have in view.

Despite this, is it possible that a true immolative sacrifice can occur within the setting of the NOM? If one accepts Paul VI’s definition, if one accepts the wording of the rite in its literal meaning, and if one believes in the Church’s constant teaching on sacramental theology, one cannot see how such is possible.

Many conservative post-Conciliar Catholics try to avoid the issue by insisting that every phrase and word of both the *Instruction* and the rite can be interpreted in an orthodox manner. Others assure us that we can accept the NOM while rejecting the *Instruction* completely. But such requires a kind of “pretzel” mentality and avoids the natural obligation to understand the teaching and instructions of the Church in the plain sense of the language used. The children of such Catholics, not having the advantage of the old teaching, will invariably fall victim to the obvious meaning of the words, that is, if they bother to attend it at all. As a recent *Catholic* journal noted that in the United States there has been a 50 percent drop in those people who even call themselves Catholic (i.e., register as such, whether they practice or not).

Obedience is always brought forth as a defense for the NOM. While the issue was discussed in an earlier chapter, those who use this argument should recognize the obligation for their obedience to be “total.” Those

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

priests who say the NOM but have the traditional “intent” or who use the proper form for consecration are simply in disobedience. One cannot talk of obedience to the NOM without obedience to the pernicious teaching of the *General Instruction* that accompanies it. And similarly, one cannot talk of obedience to either unless one understands them in the plain sense of the language used. Finally, obedience requires that one respect the constant teaching of the Church that one should eschew any sacrament in which there is doubt about validity. Those who would attend or say the NOM after considering the issues raised in this chapter are obliged in conscience to refute beyond doubt all that we have said.

Consider once again the traditional Mass. As Fr. M. Jean-Jacques Olier, the famous Curé of Saint-Suplice put it: “One must know that this sacrifice is the Sacrifice of Heaven . . . a Sacrifice offered up in Paradise which, at the same time is offered up here on earth, and they differ only in that here on earth the sacrifice remains unseen.” What power! What a sacred action! The Divine made present on our altars! St. Alphonsus Liguori tells us that “the entire Church cannot give to God so much honor, nor obtain so many graces, as a single priest by celebrating a single Mass.” Indeed, as he also says, the sacerdotal dignity is so great that it “surpasses the dignity of angels.”

It is then easy to understand why, in almost every major city of the world, there are priests and laypeople who refuse to have anything to do with the NOM, and who continue to say or attend the ancient Mass at great personal sacrifice. It should not be forgotten that the Apostolic Bull *Quo Primum* guarantees their right to do so. Those who would deny us this right, risk “incurring the wrath of Almighty God and of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.” That is to say, they risk their eternal damnation.

To conclude this discussion of the NOM, let us consider two last quotes, the first from St. Thomas Aquinas, and the second from St. Basil:

Falsehood in outward worship occurs on the part of the worshiper, and especially, in common worship which is offered by ministers impersonating the whole Church. For even as he would be guilty of falsehood who would, in the name of another person, proffer things that are not committed to him, so too does a man incur the guilt of falsehood who, on the part of the Church gives worship to God contrary to the manner established by the Church or divine authority, and according to the ecclesiastical custom. Hence St. Ambrose says: “He is unworthy who celebrates the mystery otherwise than as Christ delivered it” (*Summa*, II-II, Q. 93, A. 1).

Religious people keep silence, but every blaspheming tongue is let loose. Sacred things are profaned; those of the laity who are sound in faith avoid

The Novus Ordo Missae

the places of worship as schools of impiety, and raise their hands in solitude with groans and tears to the Lord of Heaven. . . (Ep. 92). Matters have come to this pass; the people have left their houses of prayer and assemble in deserts. To this they submit, because they will have no part in the wicked Arian leaven. . . (Ep. 242). Only one offense is now vigorously punished, an accurate observance of our Father's traditions. . . . Joy and spiritual cheerfulness are no more; our feasts are turned into mourning; our houses of prayer are shut up; our altars deprived of their spiritual worship (Ep. 243).

Notes

¹ Rev. T. E. Bridgett, *Life of Blessed John Fisher* (Burns Oates: London, 1888).

² As Hilaire Belloc said: "The first new service [of Cranmer] in the place of the Mass had to be a kind that men might mistake for something like the continuance of the Mass in another form. When that pretence had done its work and the measure of popular resistance taken, they could proceed to the second step and produce a final Service Book in which no trace of the old sanctities would remain" (*Cranmer*, several editions).

³ Quoted by Michael Davies in *Cranmer's Godly Order*.

⁴ Grisar, *Luther*.

⁵ In referring to the "priest" as a "president" we are only following the pattern established by the *General Instruction*. The term "president" (*praestoo*s in Greek) is found in the *First Apology* of St. Justin Martyr. According to Fr. Cekada, Justin Martyr used the term in writing to the emperor so as to avoid the confusion with the priests of the Greek religion. In the context of the New "Mass" it is impossible to divorce the meaning of this word from its political connotations. This ambiguity is most satisfying to those who, in line with Protestant theology, consider the "minister," not as one called ("vocation") by God, but as a person chosen by the congregation.

⁶ A group of 400 pilgrims walked from Paris to Rome to ask Paul VI to grant them permission to use the traditional Mass. He was too busy to see them. Later it became known that at the time of their arrival he was entertaining the Belgian soccer team.

⁷ "It would be well to understand the motives for such a great change introduced [into the Mass]. . . . It is the will of Christ. It is the breath of the Spirit calling the Church to this mutation" (General Audience, Nov. 26, 1969). According to the Canon lawyer Fr. Capello, a "mutation" in the form of a sacrament would invalidate it (*De Sacramentis*).

⁸ *Christian Order*, Oct. 1978. The full quote is of interest. Reporting on a conversation: "At the end Dr. de Saventham asked the prelate whether the traditional liturgy could not be permitted at the side of the new one. The answer was startling: 'Sir, all these reforms go in the same direction: whereas the old Mass represents another ecclesiology!' Dr. de Saventham: 'Monseigneur, what you said is an enormity!' Benelli: 'I shall say it again: those who want to have the old Mass have another ecclesiology!'" It was shortly after this that Benelli was made a Cardinal, and Michael Davies describes him as "a most authoritative spokesman for the post-Conciliar Church."

⁹ DOL 1757, *Documents on the Liturgy 1963-1979, Conciliar, Papal, and Curial Texts*. (In the text DOL refers to this source with appropriate numerical designation.)

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

¹⁰ For example, Archbishop R.J. Dwyer said: “Who dreamed that on that day [when the Council Fathers voted for the *Constitution on the Liturgy*] that within a few years, far less than a decade, the Latin past of the Church would be all but expurgated, and that it would be reduced to a memory fading in the middle distance? The thought of it would have horrified us, but it seemed so far beyond the realm of the possible as to be ridiculous. So we laughed it off.”

¹¹ These “options” often contained traditional ideas. This was a clever method of allowing post-Conciliar apologists to claim that the new rite was still orthodox, while at the same time virtually guaranteeing that no one would utilize these “options” in the everyday liturgy.

¹² In Chapter 14 on Orders, the nature of the Hippolytus’ document is discussed in detail.

¹³ Fr. John Barry Ryan, *The Eucharistic Prayer* (Paulist Press: N.Y., 1974).

¹⁴ Fr. Joseph Jungmann, S.J., *The Mass* (Liturgical Press: Minn., 1975). Fr. Jungmann was a member of the revolutionary Liturgical Consilium and fully approved of the changes made in the Mass.

¹⁵ *Le Monde*, Sept. 1970.

¹⁶ The head of the Anglican Church is the King or Queen of England. Changes in its teaching or liturgy have to have the approval of the British Parliament. Hence American Anglicans in 1776 found themselves in a somewhat awkward position. They resolved this by declaring themselves independent of British royalty and government, and by changing their name to Episcopalian. No doctrinal or ritual changes of significance were involved in this transition (Bard Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* [New American Lib: N.Y., 1974]).

¹⁷ These phrases will be very familiar to post-Conciliar Catholics. It is pertinent that Luther tells us that it was Satan who convinced him that the Mass was not a true sacrifice, and that in worshipping bread, he was guilty of idolatry. Satan appeared to him and said: “Listen to me, learned doctor, during fifteen years you have been a horrible idolater. What if the body and blood of Jesus Christ is not present there, and that you yourself adored and made others adore bread and wine? What if your ordination and consecration were as invalid as that of the Turkish and Samaritan priest is false, and their worship impious. . . . What a priesthood is that! I maintain, then, that you have not consecrated at Mass and that you have offered and made others adore simple bread and wine. . . . If then, you are not capable of consecrating and ought not to attempt it, what do you do while saying Mass and consecrating, but blaspheme and tempt God?” Luther acknowledged at the close of this conference that he was unable to answer the arguments of Satan, and he immediately ceased saying Mass. The details are available in Audin’s *Life of Luther*, and are quoted by Fr. Muller in his chapter on “The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass” (*God the Teacher of Mankind*).

¹⁸ Fr. Jungmann, tells us that the new prayer “is simply a confession that we are sinners.” He further tells us that the *Misereatur* was retained, while the *Indulgentiam* was discarded because the former could be said by any layman (*The Mass*, p. 167).

¹⁹ The word “consubstantial” is of hallowed use since the Council of Nicaea where it was used to distinguish Catholic doctrine from the Arian heresy. Arius, like many liberal Protestants, denied the divinity of Christ, and hence the term has anti-ecumenical connotations. Pope St. Damasus anathematized all who refused to use the term “consubstantial.” The post-Conciliar translators justified this error on the grounds that “the son is not made but begotten, he shares the same kind of being as the Father.” This, to say the least, is semi-Arianism. Michael Davies discusses this issue in some detail in his book, *Pope Paul’s New Mass*.

²⁰ Msgr. Fredrick McManus was the directing force behind the English translations. As early as 1963 he objected to the Offertory Prayers that “anticipate the Canon and obscure

The Novus Ordo Missae

the sacrificial offering in the Canon itself” One wonders how the Church survived over the past 2000 years without the help of these Liturgical innovators (“The Future: Its Hopes and Difficulties,” in *The Revolution of the Liturgy* [Herder: N.Y., 1963]).

²¹ Michael Davies, *Cranmer’s Godly Order*.

²² Fr. Jungmann, *The Mass*.

²³ Catholics believe that providing the priest is validly ordained, uses proper form and matter, and has the right intention, consecration occurs. The technical phrase is *ex opere operato*. It occurs regardless of the spiritual state of the priest or the believer. Space has limited our ability to discuss the issue of “intention.” Suffice it to say that there is an external intention implicit in the words and actions of the priest, and also an internal intention on the part of the priest which we can never know apart from his informing us of it. In the traditional Mass, one could presume that the internal intention corresponded with the outer acts and words—the priest would have had to entertain a positively contrary internal intention to invalidate the Mass. (That is, a priest can intend not to consecrate while using the correct words and actions, and then nothing would happen. Of course he would be guilty of a grave sacrilege.) In the new rite, the external words and acts in no way assure us that a proper intention on the part of the celebrant is present. If the priest’s internal intention is based on the external words and actions of the NOM, the sacrament is, to say the least, most doubtful. For the priest in the NOM to consecrate—assuming for the moment that such is even possible within this rite—he must have the positive intention to “do what the Church does,” and/or, “to do what Christ intended.” What makes this pertinent is that the majority of priests being trained today are not taught traditional sacramental theology and therefore cannot know the nature of the positive intention they must entertain. According to Fr. Robert Burns, C.S.P., editorial writer for *The Wanderer*, “Many newly ordained priests are either formal or material heretics on the day of their ordination. This is so, because their teachers embraced modernist errors and passed them along to their students. Their students, after ordination, in turn propagated these errors, either in catechetical teaching or in pulpit preaching. The same situation is also true in the cases of many older priests who return to schools of theology for updating courses or ‘retooling in theology’” (Aug. 10, 1978).

²⁴ Hugh Ross Williamson, *The Modern Mass* (TAN: Rockford, Ill., 1974). Mr. Ross Williamson appealed to the English hierarchy to remove the words “for us” from EP No. 2 “as evidence of good faith,” but his petition was completely ignored.

²⁵ DOL 1712, 1960.

²⁶ Michael Davies, *Cranmer’s Godly Order*.

²⁷ Fr. Jungmann, *Handing on the Faith* (Herder and Herder: London, 1981).

²⁸ The term “Institution” refers to the institution of the sacrament by Christ, and is a perfectly legitimate theological word. The idea that the Mass is a mere “narrative” however, is patently false and entirely Protestant. Despite this, official French catechisms make such statements as “at the heart of the Mass lies a story.” The official French Missal, published with the approval of the hierarchy, states that the Mass “is simply the memorial of the unique sacrifice accomplished once”! (“Il s’agit simplement de faire memoire de l’unique sacrifice deja accompli.”) This statement has been repeated in more than one edition, and despite the repeated protests of the faithful. It would however appear to be the “official” teaching of the Conciliar Church.

²⁹ Fr. J. O’Connell, *The Celebration of Mass* (Bruce: Milwaukee, 1941). This is a standard text or at least was such prior to Vatican II.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

³⁰ *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908), Vol. 13, p. 299.

³¹ *La Croix*, Aug. 9, 1989.

³² In the *General Instruction* that accompanies the New Mass, these words are referred to as “the words of the Lord,” rather than, as in the rubrics attached to the traditional rite, the “Words of Consecration.” I am aware that the second version of the *General Instruction* was amended in paragraph 55d to read: “Institution narrative and consecration,” but this in no way changes the import of what we have said. Consecration can, in the context of the NOM, simply mean that the bread and wine are “set apart” for sacred use.

³³ Fr. Jungmann, S.J., *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development* (Benzinger: N.Y., 1950). Dom Guéranger also noted that “it is to the Apostles that those ceremonies go back. . . . The Apostolic liturgy is found entirely outside of Scripture; it belongs to the domain of Tradition” (*Institutions Liturgiques*).

³⁴ This is by no means an isolated quotation. Consider the following: “It is well known that to the Church there belongs no right whatsoever to innovate anything on the substance of the sacraments” (Pope St. Pius X, *Ex quo nono*). And St. Thomas: “It is clear, if any substantial part of the sacramental form is suppressed, that the essential sense of the words is destroyed; and consequently the sacrament is invalid” (*Summa*, III, Q. 60, Art. 8).

³⁵ Certain words in the sacramental forms are said to be essential. Others are said to be substantial because they are so intimately connected with the essential words that any change in them involves a change in meaning. Still others are required for the integrity or completeness of the form. Needless to say, anyone who believes in the power of the form will hesitate to tinker with it in any way.

³⁶ Fr. P. Charles Augustine, *A Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law* (1917) (Herder: London, 1925).

³⁷ Joachim Jeremias was a Protestant who specifically denied the possibility of transubstantiation. His contention that there was no word for “all” in Aramaic is also proved false by referring to the *Porta Linguarum Orientalium* (*Interdum*, No. 2 Menlo California, 1970). All this is not a matter of quibbling over inconsequential details. The Council of Nicaea fought over the issue of adding one letter to the word *homoousios* which changed the meaning of the term. As Leo XIII said: “Nothing is more dangerous than the heretics who, while conserving almost all the remainder of the Church’s teaching intact, corrupt *with a single word*, like a drop of poison, the purity and simplicity of the Faith which we have received through Tradition from God and through the Apostles” (*Satis cognitum*) (emphasis mine).

³⁸ Provided are all the known forms from the various rites which the Church has always accepted as valid. (There are 86 such rites in various languages, but they all fall into one of the patterns given below.) Note that the only significant variation relates to the words *mysterium fidei*. These two words are said to have been added to the words of Christ by the Apostles—an act entirely within their province and function, for Revelation comes to us both from Christ and the Apostles. The reason for the other minor variations is that the various Apostles established the Mass separately in various parts of the world to which they were dispatched. Thus St. Thomas informs us, “James, the brother of the Lord according to the flesh, and Basil, Bishop of Caesarea, edited the rite of celebrating the Mass” (*Summa*, III, Q. 83, Art. 4). All use the same formula for the consecration of the Bread. For the wine: Byzantine: “This is My blood of the New Testament which is shed for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins.” Armenian: “This is My blood of the New Testament which is shed for you and for many for the expiation and forgiveness of sins.” Coptic: “For this is My blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins.” Ethiopic: “This is My blood of the New Covenant, which shall be poured out and offered for the forgiveness of sins and eternal life of you and of many.” Maronite: As in the Latin rite.

The Novus Ordo Missae

Chaldean: “This is My blood of the New Covenant, the mystery of faith, which is shed for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins.” Malabar: “For this is the chalice of My blood of the New and Eternal Testament, the Mystery of Faith, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins.” The most complete listing is given in Rev. J.M. Neale and Rev. R. F. Littledale’s *The Liturgies of Ss. Mark, James, Clement, Chrysostome, and Basil and the Church of Malabar* (Hayes: London, date uncertain).

³⁹ Annibale Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975* (Liturgical Press: Collegeville, Minn., 1990).

⁴⁰ The prototype of the altar is the Ark of the Covenant in the Holy of Holies. Between the Cherubim lies the *shekhina* or the presence of God. While our altars do not have visible Cherubim, the same Divine Presence is found in the Tabernacle that contains the Body of Christ.

⁴¹ Quoted from *The Works of Thomas Cranmer*, Vol. I. The assumption here is that the various actions of the priest in the traditional Mass are arbitrary and without metaphysical meaning. That such is not the case is clearly shown by Fr. James Meagher, D.D., *How Christ Said the First Mass* (TAN: Rockford, Ill., 1984). The NOM, however, is clearly the product of arbitrary and purely human decisions.

⁴² It is of interest that the practice of the priest facing the congregation was practiced among priests working with the Boy Scouts and other youth movements in Italy as early as 1933. The chaplain of the Catholic Youth Movement was at that time none other than Fr. Giovanni Battista Montini (Fr. Francesco Ricossa, “The Liturgical Revolution,” *The Roman Catholic*, Vol. IX, No. 2, Feb. 1987).

⁴³ Thomas Richstatter O.F.M., *Liturgical Law Today: New Style, New Spirit* (Franciscan: Chicago, 1977).

⁴⁴ Taken from the Introduction to Patrick Henry Omlor, *Questioning the Validity of the Masses using the New All-English Canon* (Athanasius Press: Reno, Nev. 1969).

⁴⁵ Rev. Heribert Jone, *Moral Theology* (Newman: Westminster, Md., 1952).

⁴⁶ Canon J.M. Hervé, *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae* (Berche et Pagis: Paris, 1934).

⁴⁷ Canon 844, *Code of Canon Law, Text, and Commentary* (Paulist: N.Y., 1985).

⁴⁸ *The New Order of Mass, Official Text of Instruction, English Version and Commentary*, translated by the Monks of Mount Angel Abbey (Liturgical Press: Collegeville, Minn., 1977).

⁴⁹ Thomas Richstatter O.F.M., *Liturgical Law Today: New Style, New Spirit*.

⁵⁰ Archbishop Lefebvre insists that members of his fraternity use the Missal of John XXIII, which is a half-way house between the traditional Mass and the NOM. While it almost certainly retains validity (provided the priest is truly ordained), it remains, as it has been described, “half-way Bugnini.” This is also the Mass which the post-Conciliar Church allows as part of its “Indult.” (Some traditional Catholics call it the “Insult” Mass.) Those interested in a detailed comparison between the traditional Mass and this concoction will find it in *The Roman Catholic*, Vol. VI, Sept. 1984.

⁵¹ An excellent discussion of the problems associated with this Mass by Fr. Cekada is available on the following web site: traditionalmass.org.

⁵² While this is denied by some, Fr. Cekada has reviewed the issue and demonstrated that such is clearly the case. See his web page: www.traditionalmass.org. Also, see my correspondence with Mother Theresa available on my web page: Coomaraswamy-catholic-writings.com.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

⁵³ *English Liberty*, 1650.

⁵⁴ Philip Hughes, *Rome and the Counter Reformation* (McMillan: London, 1942).

⁵⁵ *Triumph*, May, 1968.

⁵⁶ *Faith*, Nov., 1979.

CHAPTER 14

ORDERS AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

I must to some degree apologize for the length and amount of detail in this chapter. If, however, one considers the drastic effect of destroying the priesthood and episcopate of the Catholic Church—a contention which the facts seem to bear witness to—then it behooves one to provide clear-cut evidence. This in turn requires some understanding of sacramental theology and the history of the sacrament of Orders. If the reader accepts the fact that for all practical purposes the sacrament of Orders has been destroyed, he may proceed to the following chapter.

It has been a constant teaching of the Church that the bishops are the spiritual descendents of the Apostles, and that as such they carry the Apostolic Succession, or what has been called an “initiatic chain,” which links them back to the Apostles and through them to Christ. It is this Apostolic Succession which enables them to ordain priests and provide them in turn with the power to administer the other sacraments.

Protestants hold that either there is no need for bishops, or that if such are necessary, it is only for administrative purposes, and they should be elected by the people. If in fact the Apostolic Succession has been destroyed—an accommodation to the Protestants who deny any need for such (they only admit to the sacraments of Baptism and Marriage), then it matters not what Mass an individual priest-president says, for there is no possibility of a valid consecration. The same applies to the other sacraments dependant upon a valid priesthood. Before examining the post-Conciliar rite of Orders, some knowledge of sacramental theology is necessary.

BASIC SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY

According to the teaching of the Church, a sacrament is a sensible sign, instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ, to signify and to produce Grace. There are seven sacraments: Baptism, Marriage, Holy Orders, Eucharist, Absolution (Penance or Confession), Confirmation, and Extreme Unction. I have listed them in this order because Baptism and Marriage do not, strictly speaking, require a priest.¹ Holy Orders are administered

by a bishop and the remaining sacraments require priestly “powers” to be conferred or administered.

Sacramental theology by definition dates back to Christ and the Apostles.² It has “developed” over the centuries, which to paraphrase St. Albert the Great, does not mean it has “evolved,” but rather that our understanding of it has become clearer, as various aspects were denied by heretics and the correct doctrine affirmed and clarified by definitive decisions of the Church. The end result can be called the traditional teaching of the Church on the sacraments.

The rise of modernism gave rise to a different and modernist view of sacramental theology, one which holds that the sacraments are not so much fixed rites handed down through the ages, as “symbols” that reflect the Faith of the faithful—a Faith which is itself a product of the collective subconscious of those brought up in a Catholic milieu.³ The traditional sacraments, according to this view, reflect the views of the early Christians. As modern man has progressed and matured, it is only normal that his rites should also change. It is for the reader to decide how much such opinions have affected the changes instituted in the sacraments in the wake of Vatican II.

THE SOURCE OF THE SACRAMENTS

“Who but the Lord,” St. Ambrose asks, “is the author of the sacraments?” St. Augustine tells us: “It is Divine Wisdom incarnate that established the sacraments as means of salvation,” and St. Thomas Aquinas states that, “As the Grace of the sacraments comes from God alone, it is to Him alone that the institution of the sacrament belongs.” Thus it is that the Apostles did not regard themselves as authors of the sacraments, but rather as “dispensers of the mysteries of Christ” (1 Cor. 4:1). There is some debate as to whether Confirmation and Extreme Unction were established by Christ directly or through the medium of the Apostles. But the issue is of no importance, for Revelation comes to us from both Christ and the Apostles. The latter, needless to say, would hardly go about creating sacraments without Divine Authority.

A BRIEF HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The early Church Fathers, mostly concerned with defining doctrine, expended little effort on defining or explaining the sacraments. One

should not, however, assume that they lacked understanding. Consider St. Justin Martyr (100-165), who made it clear that the effect of Baptism was “illumination” or Grace. And again St. Irenaeus (d. 190) who, in discussing the “mystery” of the Eucharist, noted that, “When the mingled cup [i.e., wine mixed with water] and the manufactured bread receives the Word of God, and the Eucharist becomes the Body of Christ. . . .” In these two Fathers we see the essential theology of the sacrament—the joining of “form” and “matter” (though other terms were used), and the conveyance of Grace.

The earliest Church Fathers placed the sacraments among the “mysteries” (from the Greek *mysterion*)⁴ without clearly specifying the number. It was Tertullian (c. 150-250) who first translated this term into Latin as *sacramentum*, though once again, not in an exclusive sense.⁵ It is of interest to quote him in order to show that he was familiar with the essential features of sacramental theology:

All waters, therefore . . . do, after invocation of God, attain the sacramental power of sanctification; for the Spirit immediately supervenes from the Heavens, and rests over the waters, sanctifying them from Himself, and being thus sanctified, they imbibe at the same time the power of sanctifying. . . . It is not to be doubted that God has made the material substance, which He has disposed throughout all His products and works, obeying Him also in His own peculiar sacraments; that the material substance which governs terrestrial life acts as agent likewise in the celestial.⁶

From this point on the term “sacrament” was increasingly used—often interchangeably with “mystery.” St. Ambrose (340-397) clearly provides us with the first treatise dedicated exclusively to the subject of what he calls sacraments, specifically to those of Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist. He made no attempt at a universal definition, but certainly understood the principles involved, as is shown by his statement that “the sacrament which you receive is made what it is by the word of Christ.” It is with St. Augustine (354-430) that the first attempt is made to define clearly the term as “a sign,” or “signs,” which, “when they pertain to Divine things, are called sacraments.” Elsewhere he states that they are called sacraments because in them one thing is seen, and another is understood. He still uses the word as virtually equivalent to “mysteries” and speaks of Easter, as well as the allegory of sacred numbers that he sees in the twenty-first chapter of John’s Gospel, as sacraments. Marriage, ordination, circumcision, Noah’s Ark, the Sabbath, and other observances are also so labeled. Perhaps his most important contribution to sacramental theology was the distinction

he drew between the sacrament as an outer sign and the Grace that this sign conveyed. The former without the latter, as he indicated, was useless.⁷

The next person to discuss the sacraments was St. Isidore of Seville (560?-636), who functioned in this area as an encyclopedist rather than as an individual who provided us with further clarification. His discussion is limited to Baptism, Chrism (Holy Orders), and the Body and Blood of the Lord. Next was Gratian (1095-1150), who made the first attempt to bring all the Canon Laws of the Church together. In his *Concordia Discordantium Canonum* he quotes the various definitions we have reviewed, and lists as examples the sacraments of Baptism, Chrism, and the Eucharist. This collection became a standard source and Roland Bandinelli, who later became Pope Alexander III (1159-1181), wrote a commentary on this text in which he lists the sacraments as Baptism, Confirmation, the Sacrament of the Body and Blood (in which he treats of the Consecration of Priests), Penance, Unction, and Matrimony. This commentary itself became a standard text and a pattern for Peter Lombard's *Commentary on the Sentences*.⁸

Finally, it is Hugh of St. Victor (1096-1141) who reviewed the subject and provided us with a definition which most closely resembles that officially accepted today. In his text *De Sacramentis Christianae Fidei*, he defines a sacrament as "a corporeal or material element sensibly presented from without, representing from its likeness, signifying from its institution, and containing from sanctification, some invisible and spiritual Grace." He also states: "Add the word of sanctification to the element and there results a sacrament." He further distinguished between those sacraments essential for salvation, those "serviceable for salvation because by them more abundant Grace is received, and those which are instituted that through them the other sacraments might be administered [i.e., Holy Orders]."

We shall conclude this historical discussion with three definitive decisions of the Church which are *de fide*, that is, "of Faith."

A sacrament is an outward sign of inward Grace, Christ for our sanctification (*Catechism of the Council of Trent*).

If anyone shall say that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that there are more or less than seven, namely Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, or even that any one of these seven is not truly and strictly speaking a sacrament: let him be anathema (*Canon of the Council of Trent*, Denzinger, 844).

Orders and the Destruction of the Apostolic Succession

If anyone say that the sacraments of the New Law do not contain the Grace which they signify, or that they do not confer Grace on those who place no obstacle to the same, let him be anathema (*Canon of the Council of Trent*).

MATTER AND FORM

The concepts of “form” and “matter”—i.e., the words used and the material over which they are said (as, for example, the Words of Consecration said over wine mixed with water in the Mass)—were borrowed from the Hylomorphic theory of Aristotle, and introduced into Catholic theology by either William of Auxerre or St. Albert the Great. The terminology was new but the doctrine old. For example, St. Augustine used such phrases as “mystic symbols,” and “the sign and the thing invisible,” “the word and the element.”⁹

Thus it is that, while the proper words and the material vehicle of the sacraments date back to Christ, debates as to proper form and matter only occur after the 13th century. It should be clear that these concepts help to clarify, but in no way change, the principles enunciated by the earliest Church Fathers. The manner in which they clarify will become clear when we consider the individual sacraments. With regard to validity, the Church clearly teaches that, “A sacramental form must signify the Grace which it is meant to effect, and effect the Grace which it is meant to signify.”

DOES MAN NEED THE SACRAMENTS TO BE SAVED?

Not absolutely, but “relatively absolutely.” The present study cannot discuss in detail the Catholic principle that “*Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*”—that is, “outside the Church there is no salvation.”¹⁰ Suffice it to say that the Church understands by this that, apart from the invincibly ignorant, salvation is normally dependent upon being in the Catholic Church; and that the normal means of entering this Church is Baptism.¹¹ The other sacraments are not absolutely necessary, but are required insofar as one is a member of the Church and insofar as they are the normal means of Grace instituted by Christ. Thus one must confess and receive the Eucharist at least once a year—providing a priest is available.¹² Now clearly Christ, who established the Church, also established the other sacraments as normal means of Grace. Not to avail ourselves of them when they are available is as absurd as not seeking medical assistance when one is ill.

HOW THE SACRAMENTS WORK

Many so-called “conservative Catholics” are convinced of the validity of the post-Conciliar rites because of the manifold Graces they believe they receive from them. Even if we grant that they are not subject to self-deception in this area, such an argument is useless in defending validity, for it is a constant teaching of the Church that in the reception of the sacraments, Grace enters the soul in two ways. The first is *ex opere operato*, or by virtue of the work performed. The second is called *ex opere operantis*, which is to say, by virtue of the disposition of the recipient. Thus, one who participates in good faith in false sacraments can indeed receive Grace—but only that Grace that comes from his own good disposition, and never that much more ineffable Grace which derives from the sacrament itself.

It has also been argued that, providing the disposition of the recipient is proper, the deficiencies of a sacrament are “supplied” by the Church. Such an argument is patently false, for it implies that no matter what the minister does, the Church automatically makes up for the defect. (It would also declare all the Protestant rites as being of equal validity to those of the Church.) It is possible that Christ Himself may make up for the defect in the case of those who are “invincibly ignorant,” but the Church can in no way make up for such a defect. As A.S. Barnes, the admitted authority on Anglican Orders says: “God, we must always remember, is not bound by the sacraments which He Himself has instituted—but we are.”

The phrase *ex opere operato* was used for the first time by Peter of Poitiers (c. 1130-1215). It was subsequently adopted by Pope Innocent III as well as St. Thomas Aquinas to express the constant teaching of the Church to the effect that the efficacy of the action of the sacraments does not depend on anything human, but solely on the will of God as expressed by Christ’s institution and promise. The meaning of the phrase should be clear. The sacraments are effective regardless of the worthiness of the minister or of the recipient. What this means is that the sacraments are effective, even if the priest is himself in a state of mortal sin (it would be sacrilegious for him to administer them in a state of mortal sin—should a priest not be able to get to Confession before confecting a sacrament, he should at least make an Act of Contrition), and even if the recipient’s disposition is not perfect (he also commits sacrilege if he receives them in a state of mortal sin—apart from Penance of course). This is because the priest is acting on the part of Our Divine Master, Jesus Christ, and the sacraments have their efficacy from their Divine institution and through the merits of Christ. The sacraments, and the priests who administer them, function as vehicles or

instruments of Grace, and are not their principal cause.¹³ It is Christ who, through the priest, forgives sins or confects the Eucharist, etc.

Unworthy ministers, validly conferring the sacraments, cannot impede the efficacy of signs ordained by Christ to produce Grace *ex opere operato*. But what of *ex opere operantis*? Obviously, there must be no deliberate obstacle to Grace on the part of the recipient. These principles follow from the nature of Grace. Grace is God's free gift to us (whether in or outside the channels which He established), but man always remains free to refuse or to place obstacles in the way of God's Grace. The recipient's disposition need not be perfect—indeed, only God is perfect. It must, as is discussed in greater detail below, be appropriate.

A further principle follows: the priest and the Church must follow the pattern which Christ established in instituting a special vehicle of Grace. As St. Ambrose said: "He is unworthy who celebrates the mystery (sacrament) otherwise than Christ delivered it." And as the Council of Trent states, "If anyone saith that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, wont to be used in the solemn administration of the sacraments, may be contemned, or without sin be omitted by the ministers, or be changed by every pastor of the churches into other new ones; let him be anathema."

The Church, of course, has a certain amount of latitude with regard to the manner in which the sacraments are administered, and, as we shall see below, can change the manner of their administration and the ceremonies that surround them. However, she cannot make a sacrament be other than what Christ intended, and she cannot create new sacraments. The acceptance of the traditional sacraments in their traditional form is part of that obedience that the faithful Catholic (which obviously should include members of the hierarchy¹⁴) owes to Christ through Tradition. As evidence to this anti-innovative attitude, consider the following letter of Pope Innocent I (401-417) addressed to the Bishop of Gubbio:

If the priests of the Lord wish to preserve in their entirety the Ecclesiastical institutions, as they were handed down by the blessed Apostles, let there be no diversity, no variety in Orders and Consecrations. . . . Who cannot know, who would not notice that what was handed down to the Roman Church by Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, is preserved even until now and ought to be observed by all, and that nothing ought to be changed or introduced without this authority.

As St. Bernard says: "It suffices for us not to wish to be better than our fathers."

OTHER REQUIREMENTS FOR VALIDITY

All that has been said so far being granted, it behooves us to ask just what is required for a sacrament to be valid. The Church's answer is usually given under several headings. There must be a proper minister—and where the minister is a priest, he must be validly ordained; the minister must have the proper intention; he must use proper “form” and “matter”; the recipient must be capable of receiving the sacrament. If any one of these is faulty or absent, the sacrament is not effective. Each of these requirements will be considered sequentially.

The Minister: For administering Baptism validly no special ordination is required. Anyone, even a pagan, can baptize, providing that he use the proper matter and pronounce the words of the essential form with the intention of doing what the Church does or what Christ intended. However, only a bishop, priest, or in some cases a deacon, can administer Baptism in a solemn manner.¹⁵ In marriage the contracting parties are the ministers of the sacrament, because they make the contract and the sacrament is the contract raised by Christ to the dignity of a sacrament.¹⁶ All the other sacraments require a duly ordained minister by which term Catholics understand a priest.

Intention: The Minister must have the proper intention. That is, he must intend to do what the Church intends, or what Christ intends (which is in fact the same thing). Intention is usually seen as having both an external and internal aspect. The external intention is provided to the minister by the rite he uses and it is assumed that he intends what the rite intends. His internal intention is another matter and can never be known with certainty unless he exposes it or makes it known. The minister can, by withholding his internal intention, or having an internal intention that contradicts that of the rite, obviate or prevent the effect of a sacrament. The Church, recognizing that it can never know the internal intention of the minister, assumes it is the same as his external intention (the intention which the traditional rite provides by its very wording), unless he himself informs the Church otherwise.¹⁷

Proper Form and Matter: It is well known that the manner of administering the sacraments was confided by Christ to His Church. We know that Christ specified certain sacraments in a precise manner—in *specie* to use the theological term. Such is the case with both Baptism and the Eucharist. With regard to the other sacraments, it is generally held that He only

Orders and the Destruction of the Apostolic Succession

specified their matter and form *in genere*—in a general way, leaving to the Apostles the care and power of determining them more precisely.

As the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908) teaches:

Christ determined what special Graces were to be conferred by means of external rites: for some sacraments (e.g., Baptism, the Eucharist) He determined minutely (*in specie*) the matter and form: for others He determined only in a general way (*in genere*) that there should be an external ceremony, by which special Graces were to be conferred, leaving to the Apostles or to the Church the power to determine whatever He had not determined—for example, to prescribe the matter and form of the sacraments of Confirmation and of Holy Orders.¹⁸

Now the Church has been around for a long time, and has long since determined the essential components of the sacraments—almost certainly within the lifetime of the Apostles. These essentials are part of Tradition and cannot be changed at will—not by any individual, not by a Council, and not even by a Pope. As Patrick Omlor said:

The Church is forbidden to change, or even touch, the matter or form of any sacrament. She may indeed change or abolish or introduce something in the non-essential rites or “ceremonial” parts to be used in the administration of the sacraments, such as the processions, prayers, or hymns, before or after the actual words of the form are recited.

As Pope St. Pius X and other Popes taught:

It is well known that to the Church there belongs no right whatsoever to innovate anything on the substance of the sacraments (*Ex quo nono*).

It [the Council of Trent] declares furthermore that this power has always been in the Church, that in the administration of the sacraments, *without violating their substance*, she may determine or change whatever she may judge to be more expedient for the benefit of those who receive them (Session XXI, Chap. 2, Council of Trent) (emphasis mine).

The crux of the debate about “substance” revolves around the issue of “meaning.” Thus, as we shall see, in some of the sacraments, the form used varies over the centuries, and in the different (traditionally recognized) Churches. But providing the “meaning” of the form was not changed, the words used substantially carried the same import that Christ intended. This is clearly the teaching of St. Thomas:

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

It is clear, if any substantial part of the sacramental form is suppressed, that the essential sense of the words is destroyed, and consequently the sacrament is invalid (*Summa*, III, Q. 60, Art. 8).

Sacramental terminology can be confusing. “The substance of the form” refers to the words that convey its meaning. “The essential words of the form” are those words on which the substance depends. Theologians might argue about what the essential words are, but all agree on the need to maintain the integrity (i.e., the completeness) of the received forms.¹⁹ Again, a form may contain the “essential words” but be invalidated by the addition of other words that change its meaning. As the *Missale Romanum* states: “If words are added which do not alter the meaning, then the sacrament is valid, but the celebrant commits a mortal sin in making such an addition” (*De Defectibus*).

The Recipient: The previous reception of Baptism (by water) is an essential condition for the valid reception of any other sacrament. In adults, the valid reception of any sacrament apart from the Eucharist requires that they have the intention of receiving it. The sacraments impose obligations and confer Grace, and Christ does not wish to impose those obligations or confer Grace without the consent of man. There are certain obvious impediments to reception of the sacraments, such as the rule that women cannot be ordained. Finally, according to Ecclesiastical Law, a married person cannot receive ordination in the Western Church without a dispensation and without the permission of his spouse, and a priest who has not been laicized cannot enter the state of Matrimony.²⁰ There are various impediments to priestly ordination for men, such as age or blindness. Obviously, someone who is blind cannot say Mass without risk of spilling the consecrated species.

The reason the sacrament of the Eucharist is excepted from this rule—namely, that the recipient have the intention of receiving it—is that the Eucharist is always, and always remains, the Body of Christ, regardless of the state of the recipient. In general, attention on the part of the recipient is not essential. Obviously inattention is disrespectful of the sacred and an intentional indulgence in “distractions” would involve a proportional sin. In Penance, however, because the acts of the penitent—contrition, confession, and willingness to accept a penance in satisfaction—are necessary to the efficacy of the rite, a sufficient degree of attention to allow for these is necessary.

Obviously, the recipient of a sacrament would sin gravely if he received the sacrament (Penance apart) when not in a state of Grace, or

sin proportionally if he received them in a manner not approved by the Church.

WHAT TO DO WHEN THERE IS DOUBT ABOUT A SACRAMENT

The Church, being a loving mother, desires and indeed requires, that the faithful never be in doubt about the validity of the sacraments. For a priest to offer doubtful sacraments is clearly sacrilegious and where this doubt is shared by the faithful, they also are guilty of sacrilege. As Fr. Brey states in his introduction to Patrick Henry Omlor's book *Questioning the Validity of the Masses using the New, All-English Canon*:

*In practice, the very raising of questions or doubts about the validity of a given manner of confecting a sacrament—if this question is based on an apparent defect of matter or form—would necessitate the strict abstention from use of that doubtful manner of performing the sacramental act, until the doubts are resolved. In confecting the sacraments, all priests are obliged to follow the “medium certum”—that is, “the safer course.”*²¹

Similarly, Fr. Henry Davis, S.J.:

In conferring the sacraments, as also in the consecration in Mass, it is never allowed to adopt a probable course of action as to validity and to abandon the safer course. The contrary was explicitly condemned by Pope Innocent XI (1676-1689). To do so would be a grievous sin against religion, namely an act of irreverence towards what Christ Our Lord has instituted. It would be a grievous sin against charity, as the recipient would probably be deprived of the Graces and effects of the sacrament. It would be a grievous sin against justice, as the recipient has a right to valid sacraments.²²

POST-CONCILIAR CHANGES IN THE SACRAMENTS

It is well known that the post-Conciliar Church changed all the sacraments. The changes in the Mass were covered in the preceding chapter as well as in my book *The Problem with the New Mass*. The present chapter will discuss the changes made in the sacrament of Orders. The importance of this matter cannot be exaggerated; it is that sacrament by means of which priests are ordained, that is, given the “power” to say Mass and administer the other sacraments pertinent to their function. It is said to imprint a “sacramental character” on the recipients that provides them with the

special Graces necessary for them to fulfill their high calling and to act *in persona Christi*. Priests are ordained by bishops who are consecrated by other bishops going back in an “initiatic chain” to the Apostles, and hence it is through the “episcopacy” that the Apostolic Succession is passed on.²³ It follows that, if the rite for consecrating bishops were in some way to be destroyed, then all the other sacraments dependent upon validly consecrated bishops, even if they used proper form and matter, would be null and void.²⁴ (The word “invalid” can be replaced by “doubtful” with similar consequences.) In order to place the subject under consideration in a proper perspective it will be necessary to define the “Sacrament of Orders,” to determine whether the rite of Episcopal consecration is a true sacrament, to specify what is required for validity, and then to examine the new rite and see whether it “signifies the Grace” which it is meant to effect, and “effects the Grace” which it is meant to signify.

Considerable perplexity arises from the fact that while the sacrament of Orders is one, it is conferred in stages. In the Western Church these are divided into seven steps—the “Minor Orders” of acolyte, exorcist, lector, and doorkeeper; and the “Major Orders” of the subdeaconate, deaconate, and priesthood. Almost at once confusion enters the picture, for some of the ancient texts list six, others eight and nine. In the Greek Church, the rites of which are considered unquestionably valid, subdeacons are listed in the “minor” category. In all the Churches that recognize Orders as a sacrament (the Protestants—which category includes Anglicans—do not) we find both deacons and priests are “ordained” and that the episcopate or rank of bishop is included under the heading of “priests”; it is in fact called the “*summum sacerdotium*” or the “fullness of the priesthood.” Higher ranks in the Church such as archbishop, cardinal, or pope, are considered administrative and not sacramental. Thus once a pope is elected he is installed with appropriate ceremonies, but not with a sacramental rite.²⁵

For the sake of completeness it should be noted that an ordinand (an individual about to be ordained) to any order, automatically receives the graces pertaining to the lower orders. (This principle is called *per saltum*, or “by jumping”). Thus if an individual were consecrated to the priesthood without receiving the lesser orders, he would automatically receive all the power and Graces that relate to the lesser orders, such as, for example, exorcism. The post-Conciliar Church has abolished many of the minor orders, but if this Church validly ordains priests, then these priests automatically receive the powers that pertain to these lower and “abolished” orders. However, when it comes to bishops, almost all theologians hold that they must already be ordained priests, lacking which the Episcopal rite conveys nothing. The Church has never infallibly pronounced on this

issue and contrary opinion—namely that the Episcopal rite automatically confers on the recipient the character of priestly orders—exists.²⁶ So critical is the Apostolic Succession that it is the customary practice of the Church to ordain a bishop with three other bishops. The rule is not absolute, for validity only requires one, and innumerable examples of where this custom has been by-passed can be given.

It is of interest that many traditional theologians have questioned whether the elevation of a priest to the rank of bishop is a sacramental or juridical act. The point is important because: 1) it implies that an ordinary priest has the ability (not the right) to ordain (make other priests); and because 2), if the Episcopal rite involves no “imprinting of a sacramental character,” the question of validity can hardly arise. However, insofar as the ordination of bishops has a “form” and a “matter,” the greater majority hold that it is in fact a sacrament—or rather that it is the completion of the sacrament of Orders and confers upon the individual the “fullness of priestly powers” and functions. Leo XIII clearly taught that such was the case. To quote him directly: “The episcopate, by Christ’s institution, belongs most truly to the sacrament of Orders and is the priesthood in the highest degree; it is what the holy Fathers and our own liturgical usage call the high priesthood, the summit of the sacred ministry” (*Apostolicae curae*).

DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN THE PRIEST AND THE BISHOP

In the traditional ordination rite of the priest, the bishop instructs him that his function is “to offer sacrifice, to bless, to guide, to preach, and to baptize.” (In the post-Conciliar rite this instruction has been deleted and the priest is consecrated to “celebrate” the liturgy, which of course means the *Novus Ordo Missae*.²⁷) Such an instruction is not all-inclusive, for it mentions nothing of the power of absolution—its intent being to specify the principal functions of the priest. The power to absolve is, however, clearly specified in other parts of the traditional rite. (Again, the post-Conciliar rite has abolished the prayer that specifies this power.)

Bishops, however, have certain powers over and beyond those of priests. According to the Council of Trent, “Bishops, who have succeeded to the position of the Apostles, belong especially to the hierarchical order; they are set up, as the same Apostle [St. Paul] says, by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God; they are superior to priests, and can confer the sacrament of Confirmation, ordain ministers of the Church, and do several other functions which the rest who are of an inferior order have no power to perform” (Denzinger, 960). Again, the seventh canon on the Sacrament

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

of Orders states: “If anyone says the bishops are not superior to priests, or have not the power of confirming and ordaining, or have that power but hold it in common with priests . . . let him be anathema” (Denzinger, 967).

However, as Fr. Bligh states in his study on the history of ordination:

From the practice of the Church it is quite certain that a simple priest can in certain circumstances (now not at all rare) administer Confirmation validly, and it is almost certain that with Papal authorization he can validly ordain even to the diaconate and priesthood. The Decree for the Armenians drawn up by the Council of Florence in 1439 says that the Bishop is the *ordinary* minister of Confirmation and the *ordinary* minister of ordination—which would seem to imply that in extraordinary circumstances the minister of either sacrament can be a priest. Since the decree *Spiritus Sancti Munera* of 14 September 1946, it has been the common law in the Latin Church that all parish priests may confer the sacrament of Confirmation on their subjects in danger of death. And there exist four Papal Bulls of the fifteenth century which empowered abbots, who were not bishops, but simple priests, to ordain their subjects to Sacred Orders; two of them explicitly give powers to ordain “even to the priesthood.”²⁸

Some have held that such ordinations were invalid because the Popes were acting “under duress,” but the fact remains that, at least with regard to the diaconate, these powers were exercised for centuries without papal objection. In the Greek and other “Eastern Churches,” the priest is the ordinary minister of Confirmation and the bishop is the ordinary minister of ordination.²⁹

Canon Law (1917) states that “the ordinary minister of sacred ordination is a consecrated bishop; the extraordinary minister is one, who, though without Episcopal character, has received either by law or by a special indult from the Holy See power to confer some orders” (CIC 782 and 951). Now the term “extraordinary” minister is important, for it is commonly used with regard to the priest who administers the sacrament of Confirmation; in the post-Conciliar Church it is used to describe lay-persons who distribute the bread and wine. And so it seems necessary to conclude that a simple priest can, by apostolic indult, be given certain powers, or, since no additional ceremony is involved, the right to exercise certain powers that normally are not considered appropriate to his status. One could draw a parallel with the sacrament of Baptism, which is normally administered by a priest, but which under certain circumstances, can be administered by any Catholic.

How are we to resolve these seeming conflicts? One solution is to consider the right of conferring Orders as juridical. When Pope Pius XII

gave permission for parish priests to become extraordinary ministers of Confirmation, he did not confer this power by means of a sacramental rite, but through a mandate. Thus, one could hold that by his ordination every priest receives the power to confirm and ordain, but cannot utilize these powers without papal authorization. As Fr. Bligh says, “by his ordination to the priesthood a man receives no power whatever to confirm or ordain.” He, however, is stamped with an indelible character so that “he is a fit person to whom Episcopal or Papal authority can communicate power when it seems good.”

On the assumption that the matter is jurisdictional, several questions can be raised. Did Christ Our Lord Himself lay down the rule that in normal—or perhaps all—circumstances, only bishops should confirm and ordain? Was this rule laid down by the Apostles in virtue of the authority they received from Christ? Is the rule sub-Apostolic, which would make it part of Ecclesiastical Law rather than Revelation? Further, the necessity for the papal indult can be conceived of as arising either from an ecclesiastical law restricting the priest’s valid use of his power, or from a Divine Law requiring that a priest who exercises these powers must receive a special authority or some kind of jurisdiction from the Pope. The Council of Trent deliberately left the answer to these questions open and undecided. In its sixth Canon on the Sacrament of Orders it simply states:

If anyone says that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy, instituted by divine ordination and consisting of bishops, priests and deacons, let him be anathema.

Before adopting the phrase “by divine ordination” the Council considered the phrases “by divine institution” and “by a special divine ordination,” but rejected them because it did not wish to decide the question.

Reference to the practice of the early Church suggests that normally all the sacraments were administered either by the bishop or by priests explicitly delegated by the bishops. Fr. Bligh quotes De Puniet as saying that priests in apostolic times administered the churches under the direction of the Apostles and almost certainly enjoyed the fullness of sacerdotal powers which included the power of ordination. St. Jerome taught that the priest at his ordination received the power to ordain, which power was immediately restricted ecclesiastically. Even in mediaeval times, after the bishops ordained a priest, the other clergy present would place their hands on the head of the ordinands (the “matter” of the rite) and repeat the consecratory prayer—thus acting as “concelebrants.” In current traditional practice the priests bless the ordinands by placing their hands on their heads, but they no longer repeat the consecratory form. The point is important for under

such circumstances it is clearly only the bishop who ordains. The post-Conciliar Church retains this practice. It is also pertinent that the history of the Popes as recorded in the traditional Breviary, often informs us of the number of ordinations they personally performed.

IS THE BISHOP ORDAINED OR CONSECRATED?

The question as posed is illegitimate, for Pius XII uses both terms interchangeably in his *Sacramentum Ordinis*.³⁰ The real issue is whether or not the raising of a priest to the rank of bishop involves a sacramental act or an administrative decision. According to the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908), “most of the older scholastics were of the opinion that the episcopate is not a sacrament; this opinion finds able defenders even now (as for example, Billot’s *De Sacramentis*), though the majority of theologians hold it as certain that the bishop’s ordination is a sacrament.”³¹ Whatever the answer, two points are clear: 1) the Council of Trent defines that bishops “belong to a divinely instituted hierarchy, that they are superior to priests, and that they have the power of confirming and ordaining which is proper to them” (Sess. XXIII, c. iv, can. 6 & 7); 2) Leo XIII, as already noted, clearly teaches that the episcopate “belongs most truly to the sacrament of Orders,” and Pius XII, in defining both the matter and form to be used in the rite, implicitly teaches that it is, indeed, a sacramental act. The position taken by this author is that, while the issue as to whether a simple priest receives the power (not the right) to ordain remains open, the episcopate remains part of the sacrament of Orders. Despite the fact that the power to ordain is a lesser power than that of offering the propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead (that is to say, the Holy Mass), and despite the fact that the priest may indeed already have this power, one can certainly hold that special Graces are required of a bishop to properly perform his functions, and that these Graces are transferred to him by means of a sacramental act. It is thus that the bishop receives within this sacrament what is called the *summum sacerdotium* or the “fullness of the priesthood.” Again, it should be stressed that in the ordination of priests, regardless of earlier practice, both in the traditional and the post-Conciliar practice, it is only the bishop who repeats both the matter and the form. Consequently, when a bishop ordains, the “validity” of his own orders and of his sacramental act remains not only essential, but critical.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE SACRAMENTAL RITE OF ORDINATION

The rites used for ordination are to be found in the *Pontifical*, a book that contains all the rites and ceremonies that are normally reserved to bishops. Such was not always the case, for the first time we find reference to Pontificals as such is around the year 950. Prior to that time, however, ordination rites existed and were to be found in various collections under a variety of different titles. One of the earliest of such collections still extant is that compiled in Rome by the schismatic anti-Pope Hippolytus—about the year 217—and it is essentially from this source that Paul VI derived the new post-Conciliar rite of episcopal ordination.³² Next in time are the three famous “sacramentaries” of the Roman Church, called the Leonine (Pope St. Leo died in 461), the Gelasian (Pope St. Gelasius died 496) and the Gregorian (Pope St. Gregory the Great died in 604). These collections of ceremonies include ordination rites. The last was revised and introduced into the Carolingian Empire during the eighth century; it was subsequently further revised and eventually became the Pontifical, a title that as such dates from 954. In the thirteenth century the celebrated canonist Guillaume Durand once again revised the text and this in turn was the basis of the first printed Pontifical which was issued in 1485. With the advent of printing, greater uniformity throughout Christendom became possible and Pope Innocent VII formally recommended the use of this text to all the churches in communion with Rome. Now, presumably, St. Leo did not himself create the ordination rite found in his sacramentary—but rather wrote down the practice of the Church as he received it. No significant change in the rites of the Western Church occurred between the time of St. Leo (461) and 1968.

THE ESSENTIAL ASPECTS OF THE ORDINATION RITES

In the sixth chapter of *Acts*, the disciples, at the bidding of the Apostles, chose seven deacons. “These were set before the Apostles; and they praying, imposed hands upon them.” The two elements discernible in this unique description of the Apostolic rite, that is, the outward gesture of imposing hands and the recitation of a prayer, form the substance of the rite of ordination.³³

Prior to the twelfth century liturgical and theological writers did not concern themselves with determining the precise moment of ordination or the exact words required for validity. They were inspired with the principle of retaining intact all that had been handed down to them, though they

did not hesitate at times to elaborate the rites further with appropriate additions. They were doubtless satisfied with the knowledge that the whole rite properly performed conferred the priesthood. However, when one reads their explanations of the symbolism involved in the rites, one can conclude that they had opinions about what was essential as opposed to what was ceremonial—thus some thought that the sacrament was conferred by the imposition of hands on the ordinand's head, while others considered that it occurred when the bishop anointed the hands or gave the newly ordained priest the paten and chalice—the so-called “tradition of instruments.”³⁴

As noted above, it was William of Auxerre or St. Albert the Great who introduced the Aristotelian terminology of “matter” and “form” into the discussion, a pattern followed by St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventura, and all subsequent writers. Yet these individuals had differing opinions as to just what constituted proper matter and form. Once again, it should be stressed that they accepted without question the traditional rites of the Church handed down from time immemorial. They also recognized that these rites, like the Mass itself, had undergone certain changes in the way of appropriate additions (but not deletions) over the centuries. Thus, for example, the tapping of the shoulder of the deacon with the Scriptures could not have occurred prior to the establishment of the Scriptures which occurred some 300 years after the death of our Lord. Again, the “tradition of instruments” was added to the rite some time after the fourth century and is not even mentioned in any ritual composed before 900. One must logically assume that the essential form and matter remained unchanged from the time of the Apostles who ordained the first deacons and priests. Appropriate additions, unlike deletions, do not affect validity.

DETERMINING THE “SUBSTANCE” OF THE SACRAMENTAL FORM

As noted above, the form and matter of Holy Orders were not among those given *in specie*, or precise detail, by Our Lord. These being established by the Apostles, the Church was free to change the words of the form, providing she retained their “substantial” nature as specified by Christ and the Apostles.

The first “form” is to be found in the Decree for the Armenians promulgated in 1439:

The sixth sacrament is that of Orders; its matter is that by giving of which the Orders is conferred: thus the priesthood is conferred by giving the chalice with wine and of a paten with bread. . . . The form of the priesthood

Orders and the Destruction of the Apostolic Succession

is as follows: “Receive power to offer sacrifice in the Church for the living and the dead, in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost.

This statement reflected the opinion of St. Thomas Aquinas and the shared common practice of the Roman and Armenian Churches. It was, however, never considered as definitive. For one thing, the Greeks, the validity of whose Orders has never been questioned, do not practice the “tradition of instruments.” For another, historical studies demonstrate that this practice was introduced some time after the fourth century. Thus it is that the Fathers at the Council of Trent left the issue open and deliberately avoided defining either the matter or form of this sacrament.³⁵

EVENTS DURING THE REFORMATION

Luther, and those that followed after him, clearly denied that the Mass was an immolative sacrifice, and among other things, propitiatory for the living and the dead. If such is the case, it follows that there is no need for a priesthood. Hence it is that Protestants deny that Holy Orders and the rites that flow from Orders are in fact sacraments at all. (They only accept Baptism and Marriage as such.) However the reformers faced a serious problem. The laity was unwilling to accept as religious leaders individuals who were not in some way consecrated, and in whom they did not see the character of their familiar priests.³⁶ As a result, the reformers devised new rites aimed at incorporating their new and heterodox theology, but clothed them in the outward forms familiar to the people. In essence they did this by changing the form of the sacrament, and by deleting any statements in the accompanying rites (what theologians call “*significatio ex adjunctis*”) that specified special powers and graces such as were pertinent to the priesthood or episcopacy.

In England, Cranmer (strongly influenced by both Luther and Calvin) was the individual who masterminded the changes during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI—changes incorporated into the Anglican Ordinal.³⁷ During this period innumerable “presbyters” and “bishops” were “ordained” with rites aimed at voiding the Catholic understanding of their function.³⁸ Shortly after this first apostasy of the English realm the true Faith was restored under Catholic Queen Mary. Almost at once the problem of the validity of these Cranmerian ordinations came into question.

In June of 1555 Pope Paul IV issued the Bull *Praeclara carissimi*, in which he stated that anyone ordained a bishop who was not “*rite et recte*

ordinates” (properly and correctly ordained) was to be ordained again. He further clarified this statement in another Brief entitled *Regimini universalis* (issued Oct. 1555) in which he stated, “*eos tantum episcopos et archiepiscopos qui non in forma ecclesiae ordinati et consecrati fuerunt, rite et recte ordinatos dici non posse*” (anyone ordained to the rank of bishops or archbishops by rites other than those used by the Church are not properly and correctly ordained). To be properly and correctly ordained it was necessary to use the “customary form of the Church.” In accord with the traditional practice of the Church, the fact that rites were performed by schismatics did not invalidate them. Where doubt existed conditional re-ordination was required.

This practice of the Church did nothing to solve the issue of what was correct form and matter, and what has to be understood is that the theologians of that period were not concerned with determining the matter and the form, but with assuring themselves that the entire rite of the Church be used with the proper intention on the part of the officiating consecrator. But it was also a period when the number of Protestant sects was growing by leaps and bounds, and with them the number of rites containing major and minor changes. As in the Mass, minor changes did not necessarily invalidate the rite or even make it depart from what was considered customary form.

To make matters worse, affairs in the Anglican Church later took a conservative turn. After the reign of Queen Elizabeth the Puritans, with their anti-sacramentarian attitudes, gained increasing control. But in 1662, under Archbishop Laud, there was a reaction in the opposite direction which resulted in the creation of a “High Anglican” party that Romanized much of the Anglican liturgy while firmly retaining her reformist principles. Words were added to the consecratory forms of Orders to bring them closer to Catholic practice—specifically the term “priest” and “bishop” were introduced into their formulas and the claim put forth that the Anglican body was, like the Greek Church, separate but “orthodox.” This led to the birth of the “branch theory” which claimed for the High Anglicans the status of a “sister Church.” Regardless of the words used, however, the adherence to Protestant theology (Anglicans still had to adhere to the “39 Articles”) left these rites with at least a defect of intention.³⁹ And so the debates went on as to what was proper form and matter, and what constituted the essential words required to confer the priestly and/or episcopal character on ordinands.

A sacrament must by definition be an “outward sign of inward Grace instituted by Christ for our sanctification” (Catechism of the Council of Trent). As Leo XIII stated in his *Apostolicae curiae*, “all know that the

sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible Grace, ought both to signify the Grace which they effect, and effect the Grace which they signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the essential rite, that is to say, in the ‘matter’ and ‘form,’ it still pertains chiefly to the ‘form’ since the ‘matter’ is the part which is not determined by itself but which is determined by the ‘form.” (One can illustrate this with Baptism where the matter is water and the form is “I baptize you in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.”) The “form” is then of paramount importance and it is primarily with this that we will concern ourselves in what follows.

THE WORK OF FR. JEAN MORAN

By the middle of the 17th century, both as a result of printing and the increase in international travel, scholars became familiar with the ordination rites in use throughout the world. In 1665, Jean Moran, a French Roman Catholic theologian, published a work in which he set out a large collection of ordination rites of both the Eastern and Western Churches. Following the principle that the matter and form must be something which was held in common by all these valid rites, he concluded that for matter what was required was the imposition of hands,⁴⁰ and that all the forms agreed in requiring that the office conferred must be specified. To quote him directly:

Let Protestants search all Catholic rituals not only of the West, but of the East; they will not find any one form of consecrating bishops (or priests), that hath not the word bishop (or priest) in it, or some others expressing the particular authority, the power of a bishop (or priest) distinct from all other degrees of holy orders.

This of course was a private opinion and theologians continued to debate as to whether it was sufficient that the office conferred be mentioned in the other parts of the rite—the so-called principle of “*significatio ex adjunctis*.” Further, as already mentioned, Protestant sects who had in earlier times avoided the word “priest” like the plague, began to reintroduce the word “priest” within the context of their rites—understanding by the term “priest,” not a “sacrificing priest,” but an individual elected by the community to preach the Word of God. In a similar manner they reintroduced the term “bishop”—but understood in a purely juridical or administrative sense and often translated as “overseer.” This particular issue—namely, the need to mention the office of the ordinand within the “form”—was seemingly

settled by Leo XIII's *Apostolicae curae*, which criticized the Anglican form prior to 1662 for lacking this specification, and criticized the Anglican form after 1662 for using the terms priest and bishop in other than the Catholic sense.

THE DEFINITION OF PIUS XII

As a result of the work of Jean Moran, Catholic theologians shifted the grounds of their objection to Protestant ordination rites. Two things became clear: 1) the fact that they had no “tradition of the instruments” could no longer be said to invalidate them; and 2) the prayer, “Accept the Holy Ghost,” which the Anglicans used in their Episcopal ordinations and which they claimed transferred the sacramental power, was not universally used, and hence could not be said to constitute an essential part of the rite. Debate on the issue of the “form” continued until 1947 when Pius XII determined for all future times just what the matter and the form for the sacrament of Orders was.

His definition is to be found in the Decree *Sacramentum Ordinis*,⁴¹ which document has, according to such renowned theologians as J.M. Hervé and Felix Capello, all the characteristics of an infallible definition.⁴² According to Fr. Bligh, “its purpose was not speculative . . . but practical.” The rite itself was in no way changed, and, indeed, Pius XII insisted that it should not be. His aim was “to put an end to scruples about the validity of Orders received by priests who felt that some possibly essential part of the long and complicated rite had not been properly performed in their cases.” For the future it intended “to remove all disputes and controversy: the character, Graces, and powers of the sacrament are all conferred simultaneously by the imposition of hands and the words *Da, quaesumus*. . . . The other ceremonies—the vesting, anointing, tradition of instruments, and second imposition of hands—do not effect what they signify; they signify in detail what has already been effected by the matter and the form.”

FORM AND ESSENTIAL WORDS FOR ORDAINING PRIESTS (PIUS XII)

Pius XII stated that “the form consists of the words of the Preface, of which these are essential and required for validity”: “*Da, quaesumus, omnipotens Pater, in hos famulos tuos presbyterii dignitatem. Innova in visceribus eorum spiritum sanctitatis, ut acceptum a te, Deus, secundi meriti munus obtineant;*

censuramque morum exemplo suae conversationis insinuent” (Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty Father, to these Thy servants, the dignity of the priesthood; renew the spirit of holiness within them so that they may obtain the office of the second rank received from Thee, O God, and may, by the example of their lives inculcate the pattern of holy living).

Similarly, in the ordination of bishops, the same infallible document states that “the form consists of the words of the Preface of which the following are essential and therefore necessary for validity”: “*Comple in sacerdote tuo ministerii tui summum, et ornamentis totius glorificationis instructum coelestis unguenti rore sanctific*” (Fill up in Thy priest the perfection [*summum* can also be translated “fullness”] of Thy ministry and sanctify him with the dew of Thy heavenly ointment, this thy servant decked out with the ornaments of all beauty).

It should be stressed that Pius XII in no way changed the rite—indeed, he stressed that the rite was to remain intact. At the end of the document he states:

We teach, declare, and determine this, all persons notwithstanding, no matter what special dignity they may have, and consequently we wish and order such in the Roman Pontifical. . . . No one therefore is allowed to infringe upon this Constitution given by us, nor should anyone dare to have the audacity to contradict it.

THE PROBLEM OF SIGNIFICATIO EX ADJUNCTIS

According to the majority of theologians, “Catholic theology teaches that if a properly constituted minister of a sacrament uses due matter and form, with at least the minimum personal intention necessary, his sacrament is valid, even if he adheres to a sect which is openly heretical.”⁴³ Now if this is the case, it would seem that the remainder of the rite—the so-called “ceremonial” part—is not essential for validity. (As has been pointed out elsewhere, a priest who uses these criteria within a non-Catholic rite is guilty of sacrilege, but sacrilege as such does not necessarily invalidate the sacrament.)

Despite this principle, Pope Leo XIII taught that the revised 1662 form of Anglican Orders is invalid (among other reasons) because the terms “priest” and “bishop” mean vastly different things to Anglicans than they do to Catholics. This, he said, is made clear from the other parts of the Anglican rite which deliberately delete every reference to the sacrificial nature of these exalted states. To quote him directly:

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

In the whole [Anglican] ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the sacrifice, of consecration, of the priesthood (*sacerdotium*), and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifice, but, as We have just stated, every trace of these things which had been in such prayers of the Catholic rite as they had not only entirely rejected, was deliberately removed and struck out (*Apostolicae curae*).

In the traditional Catholic rite innumerable references make it clear that the primary function of the priest is to offer the sacrifice; his other functions are also delineated. (So also with the bishop.) The fact that other parts of the rite make the meaning of the form quite clear is termed *significatio ex adjunctis*. It would seem that while a positive *significatio ex adjunctis* may not be essential for validity, a negative one—as for example when every reference to the sacrificial nature of the priesthood is deliberately omitted—may invalidate the form.⁴⁴

THE POST-CONCILIAR RITE FOR ORDAINING PRIESTS

The issue of *significatio ex adjunctis* becomes critical in evaluating the validity of the post-Conciliar rite for ordaining priests. Like its Anglican prototype, the new Latin “form” contains the word “priest,” but like its Anglican prototype, the remainder of the new rite fails to specify the sacrificial nature of the priesthood.⁴⁵ Thus it would appear to suffer from precisely the same defects that Leo XIII pointed to in the Anglican rite.

It is interesting to consider Michael Davies’ assessment of the new rite.⁴⁶ He points out that, while the “form” used in the new rite is not greatly different from that specified by Pius XII, it nevertheless contains nothing “to which any Protestant could take exception,” and nothing that “is in the least incompatible with Protestant teaching.” Now, if the form is “indeterminate,” and if the remainder of the rite fails to specify that it intends to ordain sacrificing priests, then the new rite suffers from exactly the same defects as its Anglican prototype. The fact that Leo XIII’s pronouncement irreformably condemned the Anglican rite on just these grounds obviously justifies raising questions about the validity of the post-Conciliar result.

According to Michael Davies:⁴⁷

Paul VI promulgated the new ordination rites for deacon, priest, and bishop with his Apostolic Constitution *Pontificalis Romani recognitio* of 18 June 1968. Where the rite for ordaining a priest is concerned, the first point to make is that the matter and essential form designated by Pius XII

Orders and the Destruction of the Apostolic Succession

in *Sacramentum Ordinis* remain unchanged. [This is not strictly speaking true as the next section points out.] This is a point in favor of the new rite. It is the only point in its favor. The traditional rite of ordination has been remodeled “in the most drastic manner,” and following Cranmer’s example, this has been achieved principally by the subtraction of “prayers and ceremonies in previous use,” prayers and ceremonies which gave explicit sacerdotal signification to the indeterminate formula specified by Pius XII as the essential form. This formula does indeed state that the candidates for ordination are to be elevated to the priesthood—but so does the Anglican. Within the context of the traditional Roman Pontifical there was not the least suspicion of ambiguity—within the new rite there most certainly is. While the new rite in no way suggests that it is not intended to ordain sacrificing priests, where (and if) it does refer to the sacrifice of the Mass it does so in muted tones, and with considerable stress laid on the ministry of the Word—a change in emphasis well calculated to please the Protestants. . . . Cranmer’s reform has been followed not simply in the composition of the new Ordinal, denuded of almost every mandatory reference to the sacrifice of the Mass—the very term “sacrifice of the Mass” does not occur in either the Latin or vernacular.

So much is this the case that Michael Davies believes that the strongest—and perhaps only—argument in favor of its validity is that it was promulgated by, in his mind, a valid Pope (Paul VI). While the principle that a valid Pope cannot promulgate an invalid sacrament is correct, Michael Davies seems oblivious to the possibility that his argument can be inverted. If the rite is shown to be invalid, or for that matter, even doubtful, one is forced to question the legitimacy of the Pope.⁴⁸

Michael Davies is of course mistaken when he states that the post-Conciliar “form” for ordaining priests is unchanged. Consider once again the words specified by Pius XII: “*Da, quaesumus, omnipotens Pater, in hos famulos tuos presbyterii dignitatem. Innova in visceribus eorum spiritum sanctitatis, ut acceptum a te, Deus, secundi meriti munus obtineant; censuramque morum exemplo suae conversationis insinuent*” (Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty Father, to these Thy servants, the dignity of the priesthood; renew the spirit of holiness within them so that they may obtain the office of the second rank received from Thee, O God, and may, by the example of their lives inculcate the pattern of holy living). The sacrosanct character of the substance of a sacramental form has already been discussed. Pope Pius XII specified that for validity the sacrament of Orders must clearly specify the sacramental effects involved. These are, in the rite under consideration, the power of Orders and the Grace of the Holy Ghost (*Sacramentum Ordinis*).

If we examine this new formula we see that the first part expresses the power of the priestly order, but not the Grace of the Holy Ghost. The word “priesthood,” however, has lost its specifically Catholic meaning during the past few centuries, so that the second sentence fulfills two functions: it specifies that the priesthood is an “office of the second rank,” and further specifies that the “Grace of the Holy Ghost” accompanies the sacrament.

When we come to the post-Conciliar form, confusion reigns. In the Latin, the form specified in Paul VI’s official promulgation (found in the *Pontificalis Romani Recognitio*) uses the phrase “*in his famulos tuos*” (similar to the traditional form and Pius XII), while the *Acta Apostolica*—equally official—uses the phrase “*his famulis tuis*.” Further, regardless of which post-Conciliar form is considered “official,” both delete the word “*ut*.”

What do these changes signify? The deletion of the word “*ut*” (meaning “so that”) removes the causal relationship between the two sentences. No longer is it made clear that the ordinand receives the “office of the second rank” as a result of the “renewal of the spirit of holiness.” Whether or not this invalidates the rite is open to question and much depends on the reason why *ut* was deleted.

By changing *in hos famulos tuos* (on these Thy servants) to *his famulis tuis*, not only are the words of Pius XII further altered, but their sense is changed. *In hos famulos tuos* implies giving something to the ordinand in such a manner that it enters into him and becomes interior to him. To specify *his famulis tuis* has the sense of giving something to someone merely as an external possession—without the idea of it entering into him and becoming part of him. The significance of this difference should hit home, as Fr. Jenkins points out, when we remember that we are speaking here of the order of priesthood, which involves the indelible character imprinted upon the very soul of the recipient. This idea is clearly conveyed in the traditional expression, but not in the new form created by Paul VI.⁴⁹ Rather, the new formula communicates the idea that the priesthood is an external office (such as the “Presidency”), and such as Reformers believed in. Such a change in meaning is thus clearly “substantial.”

Things are made even more confusing when the vernacular is used. The “provisional” ICEL (English) translation used between June 1968 and June 1970 asked that the ordinand be given “the dignity” of the “presbyterate.” Now the term “presbyter” has been used throughout history by the Reformers to designate their non-sacrificing and non-ordained “ministers.” As I have clearly shown above, the term in English can in no way be considered as equivalent to “priest”—indeed, it signifies just the opposite, and even the High Anglicans reject its use.⁵⁰ This casts still further doubt on validity—as is recognized by the fact that after 1970 the ICEL translation no longer

used it, but reverted to “priesthood.” However, the innovators seem determined to maintain the doubtful status of the rite. Even though in 1970 they changed “presbyter” back to “priesthood,” they also changed the meaning of the second part of the formula by mistranslating and changing “the office of the second rank” (the importance of which was demonstrated above) to “co-workers with the order of bishops.” Needless to say, this latter phrase is completely indeterminate and can mean almost anything except “office of the second rank.”

Highly significant of the post-Conciliar presidential “ordination” is the omission or rather deletion of the phrase which states that a priest is ordained according to the Order of Melchisedech, for Melchisedech who is both king and priest, is a figure of the Messiah who offers a sacrifice of bread and wine.⁵¹

Consider some of the other deletions. In the traditional rite the Bishop addresses those about to be ordained stating that, “It is a priest’s duty to offer the sacrifice, to bless, to lead, to preach and to baptize.” This admonition has been abolished in the new ceremony. In the traditional rite, while the men to be ordained lie prostrate on the floor, the Litany of Saints is sung: “That thou wouldst recall all who have wandered from the unity of the Church, and lead all unbelievers to the light of the Gospel.” This unecumenical petition is excluded. Again, in the traditional rite, after the newly ordained priests are vested with stole and chasuble, the bishop recites a long prayer including the words, “Theirs be the task to change with blessing undefiled, for the service of Thy people, bread and wine into the body and blood of Thy Son.” This prayer has been abolished.

In the traditional rite, after the anointing and consecrating of the hands which are then bound together, the bishop extends to each priest the chalice containing wine and water, with a paten and host upon it for the priest to touch, while he says to each: “Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass, both for the living and the dead in the name of the Lord.” This has also been abolished. Again, just before the post-communion, each new priest kneels before the bishop who lays both hands upon his head and says: “Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.” Again, this has been abolished. The final blessing of the bishop: “The blessing of God Almighty come down upon you and make you blessed in the priestly order, enabling you to offer propitiatory sacrifices for sins of the people to Almighty God” has been abolished. So much for the *significatio ex adjunctis* of the new rite.

But if all this is not enough to cast doubt on the validity of post-Conciliar ordinations, there is yet more. Obviously, one of the requirements for valid

ordination of a priest is a validly ordained bishop. No matter how correct the rites used for the priesthood are, the absence of a validly ordained bishop would make the rite a farce.⁵² Let us then look at what has been done for the episcopate.

COMPARING THE TRADITIONAL WITH THE POST-CONCILIAR MATTER AND FORM FOR ORDAINING BISHOPS

As noted above, Pope Pius XII, while in no way changing the rite used since time immemorial,⁵³ determined in a presumably infallible manner that:

In the ordination or consecration of bishops the matter is the imposition of hands which is done by the consecrating bishop. The form consists of the words in the Preface of which the following are essential and therefore necessary for validity: “*comple in sacerdote tuo ministerii tui summum, et ornamentis totius glorificationis instructum coelestis unguenti rore sanctifica*”—fill up in Thy priest the perfection (*summum* can also be translated “fullness”) of Thy ministry and sanctify him with the dew of Thy heavenly ointment this Thy servant decked out with the ornaments of all beauty.

Later in the same document he states: “We teach, declare, and determine this, all persons notwithstanding, no matter what special dignity they may have, and consequently we wish and order such in the Roman Pontifical. . . . No one therefore is allowed to infringe upon this Constitution given by us, nor should anyone dare to have the audacity to contradict it.”

One would have thought that this statement by Pius XII had settled the issue once and for all. Not so! Only 20 years later we find Paul VI issuing his Apostolic Constitution entitled *Pontificalis Romani* (June 23, 1968) in which he retains the matter—the laying on of hands—but in which he specifies that the form for ordaining bishops is to be:

et nunc effunde super hunc electum eam virtutem, quae a te est, spiritum principalem, quem dedisti dilecto filio tuo Jesu Christo, quem ipse donavit sanctis apostolis, qui constituerunt ecclesiam per singula loca, ut sanctuarium tuum, in gloriam et laudem indificentem nominis tui—So now pour forth upon this chosen one that power which is from You, the governing Spirit whom You gave to your beloved Son, Jesus Christ, the Spirit given by Him to the holy Apostles, who found the Church in every place to be your temple for the unceasing glory and praise of your name.⁵⁴

We have then two forms, or more precisely two groups of “essential” words wherein the substance of the form is to be found, and both of which are stated to be required for validity. How are we to explain this apparent disparity? We know that the Church has the right to change the wording of the form for Holy Orders, but only insofar as she doesn’t change their “substance” or meaning. The problem to be resolved then, is whether both forms mean the same thing. Several approaches are possible:

1) We can compare the wording of the two forms and find those words or phrases held in common. Doing this however yields the following common element: the single word “*et*” which means “and.” Now, obviously “and” cannot represent the substantial aspect of these two forms and such an approach must be rejected as absurd.

2) Another way to determine the substance of the form is to consider the various consecratory prayers in use throughout the universal Church (Eastern and Western). This was indeed done by Jean Moran, and still later, by the English bishops in their “Vindication of the Bull,” *Apostolicae curae*.⁵⁵

In each of the rites which the Catholic Church has recognized, the “essential form” is contained in a “consecrating prayer” to accompany the imposition of hands, and these prayers are in all cases of the same type, defining in some way or other the Orders to which the candidate is being promoted, and beseeching God to bestow upon him the graces of his new state.⁵⁶

They then proceed to give a list of these prayers which includes the ancient Leonine Sacramentary “still preserved in the modern Pontifical,” the Greek, the Syro-Maronite (which is also the Syro-Jacobite), the Nestorian, the Armenian, the Coptic (or Alexandro-Jacobite), and the Abyssinian, together with the ancient Gallican, the rite in the Apostolic constitutions, and the “Canons of St. Hippolytus.” They proceed to list the significant words respectively in each—the “high priesthood” (*summi sacerdotii*), the “Pontifical dignity,” the term “bishop,” the “perfect (or complete) priest,” and the “episcopate.” This specification is to be found in all the known used forms (i.e., in the essential words of the various Western Catholic and Orthodox Churches).⁵⁷ It is even found in the Canons of Hippolytus. *The form of Paul VI does not fill these requirements. Present in the words specified by Pius XII, it is conspicuous by its absence in the post-Conciliar form. Neither the rank, nor the power, nor a clear equivalent is present.* And as Leo XIII made clear in his *Apostolicae curae*, the mentioning of the Holy Ghost—if “governing Spirit” is in fact the Holy Ghost—is insufficient.

3) Another way to determine what is substantial is to consider the opinions of the theologians during the post-Reformation period. They are

reviewed in some detail by Paul Bradshaw in his history of the Anglican Ordinal. One such individual was the Benedictine Wilfrid Raynal who stated that a valid form must express the distinctive character of the order being conferred in one of three ways: a) an allusion to the type found in the ancient Testament of the order conferred; b) the mention of some spiritual power which is the distinctive privilege of the order to which the candidate is raised; or c) the actual mention made of the office under the name which from earliest times has become attached to it, namely *summus sacerdos* for bishop or *sacerdos secundi ordinis* for priest. He further added that the actual mention of the words “bishop” and “priest” must really and truly bear the meaning attached to them by the Universal Church. A formal denial of the distinctive character of these two sacred offices must vitiate the intention, and would render the ordination null and void. Now, as Bradshaw points out, “all the Western and Eastern forms fulfilled these requirements.” *The new rite of Paul VI does not.*

All debate is resolved by the statement of Pius XII in his *Sacramentum Ordinis*. As the renowned theologian J.M. Hervé, who considers this definition infallible, states: “*forma vero, quae et una est, sunt verba, quibus significatur effectum sacramentale, silicet potestas Ordinis et gratia Spiritus Sancti*”—the true form (i.e., the substance of the form) is that which signifies the sacramental effect, which is to say the power of orders (i.e., priest or bishop) and the Grace of the Holy Spirit.”⁵⁸

Consider once again the form specified by Paul VI:

So now pour forth upon this chosen one that power which is from You, the governing Spirit whom You gave to your beloved Son, Jesus Christ, the Spirit given by Him to the holy Apostles, who found the Church in every place to be your temple for the unceasing glory and praise of your name.

It is perfectly clear that in no place is it specified that the rank or dignity of a bishop has been conferred. The request that God give the “governing Spirit” (*spiritum principalem*—whatever that is) “whom You gave to your beloved Son, Jesus Christ, the Spirit given by Him to the holy Apostles” may imply that he is raised to the rank of the Apostles, but it doesn’t clearly so state. The sacramental effect is not clearly specified and at best we are left with another post-Conciliar ambiguity. Again, in the former, the Grace of the Holy Spirit is clearly indicated by the time-honored phrase “*Coelestis unguenti rore*” while in the latter we are left with a phrase entirely new to sacramental theology—*spiritum principalem*. Insofar as some will argue that this phrase (or the phrase “*eam virtutem quae a te est, spiritum principalem*”) suffices for the substance of the form, and indeed, insofar as

it is the only phrase in the new form for which such a claim could be made, it behooves us to examine it in detail.

SPIRITUM PRINCIPALEM—WHAT IS IT?

Apart from the concoction ascribed to Hippolytus (discussed below), the phrase “*spiritum principalem*” is not to be found in any known ordination rite, as can be seen by referring to either *Vindication of the Bull “Apostolicae curae,”* or Bishop Kendrick’s book on *The Validity of Anglican Ordinations*, both of which list all the known episcopal rites. The phrase is found in only one place in Scripture—Psalm 50, verse 14—“*redde mihi laetitiam salutaris tui et spiritu principali confirma me*” (restore unto me the joy of Thy salvation and strengthen me with a governing [or upright] spirit). The context is that of David asking God’s forgiveness for his adulterous relationship with Bathsheba and the strength to control his passions, and thus can be applied to any individual.⁵⁹

What does the word *principalem* mean? Cassell’s *New Latin Dictionary* translates it as: 1) first in time, original; first in rank, chief; 2) of a prince; 3) of the chief place in a Roman camp. Harper’s *Latin Dictionary* also translates it by the term “overseer.” Now this latter term is of great interest because it is the one used by the Reformers to distort the true nature of a bishop. As the *Vindication of the Bull “Apostolicae curae”* points out:

The fact that the Anglicans added the term “bishop” to their form did not make it valid because doctrinally they hold the bishop to have no higher state than that of the priest—indeed, he is seen as an “overseer” rather than as one having the “fullness of the priesthood.”

It is pertinent that post-Conciliar theologians have recognized the difficulty of adequately translating this phrase into the vernacular. Prior to 1977 it was rendered in English as “Perfect Spirit,” but since then Rome has officially insisted on the phrase “governing” or “ruling” Spirit, and in French, “the Spirit of Authority.”⁶⁰ Fr. B. Botte, O.S.B., the individual (apart from Montini) primarily responsible for the creation of this new rite for ordaining bishops, tells us in the semi-official journal *Notitiae* that the meaning of the phrase need not necessarily be drawn from its Scriptural use. Indeed, he states that in the third century it probably had a meaning quite different from that used during the time of David and that in Hippolytus’ document it almost certainly meant Holy Spirit. He explains that meaning in the following words:

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

The expression has, for the Christian of the third century (the time of Hippolytus) a theological meaning which has nothing in common with the thought of the king of Judah [David] twelve centuries earlier. Even assuming that “*principalis*” is a mistranslation, it is not important here. The only problem is to know what meaning the author of the prayer (Hippolytus) wanted to give the expression.

The statement as applied to a sacramental form is a quite extraordinary new force. It admits that not only are we unsure of the meaning of “*principalis*” but that the word itself may be a mistranslation. It further admits that this critical word is not derived from either Christic or Apostolic sources. But even more, Fr. Botte, with exquisite historical insight (some seventeen centuries after the fact), proceeds to tell us just what Hippolytus did mean!

The solution must be sought in two directions: the context of the prayer and the use of *hegemonikos* (Greek for *principalis*) in the Christian language of the third century. It is clear that “spirit” means the person of the Holy Ghost. The whole context so indicates: everyone keeps silent because of the descent of the “Spirit.” The real question is why among other relevant adjectives, has *principalis* been chosen? The research must be widened here.

Fr. Botte then proceeds to give us a truly innovative theological interpretation of the primary function of the different members of the hierarchy in orders, and moreover one which the new rite incorporates.

The three hierarchies have the gift of the Spirit, but it is not the same for each of them. For the bishop it is the “*Spiritus Principali*”; for the priests who are the counselors of the bishops, it is “*Spiritus Consili*”; for the deacons who are the right hand of the bishop it is the “*Spiritus zeli et sollicitudinis*.” It is evident that these distinctions are made in accord with the functions of each rank of minister. It is clear then that *principalis* must be understood in relation to the specific function of the bishop. One only has to reread the prayer to be convinced of this. . . . God has never left His people without a chief, or His sanctuary without ministers. . . . The bishop is the chief of the Church. Hence the choice of the term *hegemonikos* is self-explanatory. It is the gift of the Spirit that pertains to the chief. The best translation would seem to be “the Spirit of Authority.”⁶¹

Those unfamiliar with Catholic teaching will perhaps not be shocked by this statement made by the person who was the principal architect of the new rite of Holy Orders. Suffice it to say that the primary function

of the bishop is to ordain priests; the primary function of the priest is to offer the immolative sacrifice. Without this power, the power to forgive sins cannot be received. It is a common saying among Catholic theologians that the priest must receive first the power over the real Body of Christ, and only afterward over the mystic Body of Christ or over the Christian people whose sins he forgives or retains. Nowhere in the new rite for ordaining priests is it made clear that he is given the power to offer sacrifice, and nowhere in that of bishops that he is given the power to ordain!

The new form also asks that this “governing Spirit” that is given to the ordinand be the same that was given to the Holy Apostles. It should be clear that such a request in no way states that the ordinands are themselves raised to the rank of the Apostles. (It would after all be legitimate to ask God to give any Catholic layman the same Holy Spirit that was given to the Apostles.) Now, Leo XIII makes note of the fact that the Anglican rite has the phrase “Receive the Holy Ghost” but that this “cannot be considered apt or sufficient for the sacrament which omits what it ought essentially to signify.” And so, even if we grant that this “governing Spirit” could be the Holy Spirit, the form lacks sufficient “power” to function in a sacramental manner. What is more, its use thrusts the sacramental form into a totally Protestant setting.

THE PROTESTANT UNDERSTANDING OF THE EPISCOPAL RANK

Many Protestant sects retain the title of “bishop” among their clergy. This is true for the Lutherans in Germany, but not in America. It is also true of the Anglicans, the Episcopalians, and certain Baptist sects. Yet all of these denominations deny that either the priesthood or the episcopacy involves any imprinting of a sacramental character. In what sense then do they understand the function of their bishops? Their primary function is jurisdictional. While it is true that Anglican bishops “ordain” and “confirm”—both are, in their view, non-sacramental acts. In England they are appointed by the reigning King or Queen who is the current “head” of their Church. Among other Protestant sects they are “elected” from among the people. And thus, in all these situations they are seen as “overseers.” The inclusion of the term “bishop” and “high priest” in a Protestant rite in no way confers on such a rite validity in the Catholic sense, especially when all reference to Catholic understanding of their function is deliberately removed from the content of the sacramental form and from the remainder of the rite. Moreover, Leo XIII instructs us in his *Apostolicae curae* that

such terms when used in ambiguous situations must be understood in their Protestant sense.

Thus the use of “governing Spirit” is not only inoffensive to Protestants; it also functions to make the new rite highly acceptable to them. This is not to deny that Catholic bishops have such a function—but what is offensive in a supposedly Catholic rite is the implication, if not the ecumenically-inspired surrender, that this is their only—or even their primary—function.

In determining Anglican orders to be “null and void” Leo XIII discussed the “negative” effect of the remainder of the rite—its *significatio ex adjunctis*—upon an indeterminate sacramental form. The deliberate deletion from the rite of all reference to a Catholic understanding of Orders made it quite clear that the sacramental form was meaningless. If the new post-Conciliar rite follows the Anglican prototype in this, then clearly it is subject to the same condemnation that was leveled against Cranmer’s creation. Before discussing this aspect of the problem, however, we must examine with greater care the source from which Paul VI drew his new sacramental form.

THE SOURCE OF PAUL VI’S ORDINATION RITE

When Paul VI approved the new rite for ordaining bishops in June of 1968 he stated that “it was necessary to add, delete, or change certain things, either to restore texts to their earlier integrity, to make the expressions clearer, or to describe the sacramental effects better. . . . It appeared appropriate to take from ancient sources the consecratory prayer which is found in the document called the *Apostolic Traditions* of Hippolytus of Rome, written in the beginning of the third century, and which is still used in large parts in the ordination rites of the Coptic and Western Syrian liturgies.”

Needless to say, he does not tell us why it was necessary “to add, delete, or change certain things” which had presumably been adequate for some 2000 years. As to whether the result expresses things more “clearly” or “describes the sacramental effects better,” this the reader will have to see for himself. But Paul VI is up to his old tricks again. While he is correct in pointing to the “Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus” as the source of his new rite, he stretches the truth to the limit in stating that this highly questionable document is still used “in large part in the ordination rites of the Coptic and Western Syrian liturgies.” In fact the Hippolytus text has almost nothing in common with the Eastern rites, and the crucial words—especially the critical phrase of “governing spirit,” is nowhere to be found within these Eastern rites.

Orders and the Destruction of the Apostolic Succession

Let us then compare these still-used rites with the new rite. The first paragraph below is translated from pages 204-5 of the Pontifical of the Antiochean Syrians, Part II, printed in 1952, Sharfe, Lebanon, and carries the *Imprimatur* of Ignatius Gabriel Cardinal Tappuni, Syrian Patriarch of Antioch. This is the rite used by the Coptic and West Syrian Liturgies. The second paragraph is the consecratory prayer promulgated by Paul VI—supposedly taken from the first. It is taken from the new rite in English as used in the United States.

The Antiochean Pontifical:

O God, Thou hast created everything by Thy power and established the universe by the will of Thine only Son. Thou hast freely given us the grasp of truth and made known to us Thy holy and excellent love. Thou hast given Thy beloved and only-begotten Son, the Word, Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, as pastor and physician of our souls. By His Precious Blood Thou hast founded Thy Church and ordained in it all grades pertaining to the priesthood. Thou hast given guidance that we may please Thee in that the knowledge of the name of Thine Anointed has increased and spread in the whole world. Send on this Thy servant Thy Holy and Spiritual Breath so that he may tend and oversee the flock entrusted to him, namely—to anoint priests, to ordain deacons, to dedicate altars and churches, to bless houses, to make appointments, to heal, to judge, to save, to deliver, to loose and bind, to invest and divest, as well as to excommunicate. Grant him all the power of Thy saints—the same power Thou gavest to the Apostles of Thine only begotten Son—that he may become a glorious *high priest* with the honor of Moses, the dignity of the venerable Jacob, in the throne of the Patriarchs. Let Thy people and the flock of Thine inheritance be well established through this

Thy servant. Give him wisdom and prudence and let him understand Thy will, O Lord, so that he can discern sinful things, know the sublimities of justice and judgment. Grant him this power to solve difficult problems and all bonds of iniquity.

Paul VI's consecratory prayer:

God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Father of mercies and God of all consolation, you dwell in heaven, yet look with compassion on all that is humble. You know all things before they come to be; by your gracious word you have established the plan of your Church. From the beginning you chose the descendants of Abraham to be your holy nation. You established rulers and priests and did not leave your sanctuary without ministers to serve you. From the creation of the world you have been pleased to be glorified by those whom you have chosen. (All consecrating bishops) *So now, pour out upon this chosen one that power which is from you, the governing spirit*

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

whom you gave to your beloved son Jesus Christ, the Spirit given by Him to the Holy Apostles, who founded the Church in every place to be your temple for the unceasing glory and praise of your name. (Principal consecrator alone) Father, you know all hearts. You have chosen your servant for the office of bishop. May he be a shepherd to your holy flock, and a *high priest* blameless in your sight, ministering to you night and day; may he always gain the blessing of your favor and offer gifts of holy Church. Through the Spirit who gives the grace of high priesthood grant him the power to forgive sins as you have commanded, to assign ministries as you have decreed, to loose every bond by the authority which you gave to your Apostles. May he be pleasing to you by his gentleness and purity of heart, presenting a fragrant offering to you, through Jesus Christ, your Son, through whom glory and power and honor are yours with the Holy Spirit in your holy Church now and forever. (All) Amen.

The essential words of Paul VI's form have been placed in italics, but are not to be found in the Antiochean Pontifical. In the Antiochean rite, while the essential words are not specified—the theological terms of form and matter are not used in the Eastern Churches—the bishops hands—the matter of the sacrament—are placed on the ordinand's head for the entire prayer, while in the new Roman rite, only during the repetition of the essential form. As pointed out in the introduction, form and matter must be united to effect the sacrament.

Clearly the prayer taken from the Antiochean Pontifical is intended to consecrate a Catholic bishop and fulfills several times over all the requirements we have discussed in the section in this chapter on the history of sacramental rites. The latter has barely a dozen words in common with the former and is suitable for use in the most liberal Protestant communions. It is hardly just to say that one is derived from the other.

Obviously deleted from the Eastern liturgical prayer are such phrases as “anointing priests”—there is a vast difference between “ordaining priests” and “assigning ministries.” Also deleted are references to his function of protecting the Church against heresy. The post-Conciliar “bishop” is to “loose every bond” but not “to loose and bind, to invest and divest, as well as to excommunicate.” Retained, however, are two important words, that of “bishop” and “high priest,” but they are placed outside the “essential” form. Moreover, one can seriously question whether the terms “bishop” and “high priest” can be understood in the Catholic sense of the words. In view of any proper indication in the *significatio ex adjunctis*, one can be permitted to doubt it.

Where then does the new “form” of Paul VI come from? The answer is the “Apostolic Tradition” of Hippolytus.⁶²

THE “APOSTOLIC TRADITION” OF HIPPOLYTUS

The real source of Paul VI’s new consecratory prayer is the so-called *Apostolic Traditions* of Hippolytus—a composite document of dubious origins for which there is no evidence whatsoever that it was ever actually used to consecrate a bishop. We shall consider two aspects of the problem raised by the use of this source: Who was Hippolytus and what do we really know about the form he used?

Hippolytus was a highly enigmatic person who lived in the third century. He was born about 160 and is thought to have been a disciple of St. Irenaeus. He became a priest under Pope Zephyrinus about the year 198 and won great respect for his learning and eloquence. Because of doctrinal differences with the Pope, Hippolytus left Rome, found a bishop to consecrate him, and established a schismatic Church, as a result of which he was formally excommunicated. He drew up his *Apostolic Traditions* while he was outside the Church, presumably to establish a “pontifical” for his schismatic sect. Subsequently, after Maximus became emperor and instituted a new persecution against the Christians, both he and the reigning Pontiff (Pontianus) were arrested and sent to the mines in Sardinia. It was here, just prior to his death, that he became reconciled to the Church. Both he and the Pope were martyred together and later canonized. The Hippolytic schism ended with this event.

The text written by Hippolytus as a “Pontifical” for his schismatic sect was named by him *The Apostolic Traditions*. (He was not the last to lend authority to his acts by referring them back to “earlier authority”!) Insofar as Hippolytus was extremely conservative—he objected to the legitimate relaxation of the Church’s laws, especially those related to forgiving and readmitting to communion those Christians who in times of persecution had sacrificed to the Roman gods—it has been assumed that he preserved the rites then in use—but this is by no means certain.

Now Hippolytus wrote in Greek, and once the Roman Church adopted the almost exclusive use of Latin, his works were for all practical purposes forgotten in the West. The particular work in question, *The Apostolic Traditions*, was rediscovered by Job Ludolf in Ethiopia in 1691. In 1848 another version came to light through the study of Coptic documents. Still later a Sahidic version was found, and then, around 1900, a Latin translation from the Greek in the sixth century came to light. None of these versions were complete and scholars therefore were forced to “reconstruct” the various segments in order to produce a relatively cohesive document. According to Professor Burton Scott Easton of Cambridge University, we can summarize what we know of this document in the following words:

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

The original Greek of the *Apostolic Tradition* has not been recovered, except in small fragments. The Latin is generally trustworthy, but is incomplete. The only other primary version, the Sahidic, is likewise incomplete, and the results of the moderate abilities of its translator have been further confused in later transmission. The Arabic is a secondary text, offering little that the Sahidic does not contain. The only practically complete version, the Ethiopic, is tertiary and is otherwise unreliable. All four of these versions presuppose a common Greek original, in which two different endings have been conflated. The other sources, the Constitutions, the Testament, and the Canons are frank revisions, in which the original is often edited out of recognition or even flatly contradicted. Under these conditions the restoration of a really accurate text is manifestly impossible.⁶³

With this in mind, and with absolutely no idea of what Hippolytus considered to be the “form” or essential words involved, let us consider his consecratory prayer as the scholars have reconstructed it:

God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Father of mercies and God of all comfort, who dwellest on high, yet hast respect to the lowly, Who knowest all things before they come to pass. Thou hast appointed the borders of Thy Church by the words of Thy grace, predestinating from the beginning the righteous race of Abraham. And making them princes and priests, and leaving not Thy sanctuary without a ministry, Thou has glorified among those (or possibly, in those places) whom Thou hast chosen. Pour forth now the power which is Thine, of Thy governing spirit which (Greek version) . . . Thou gavest to Thy beloved Servant (Greek but not Latin) Jesus Christ which He bestowed on his Holy Apostles (Latin) . . . Who established the Church in every place, the Church which Thou hast sanctified unto unceasing glory and praise of Thy name. Thou who knowest the hearts of all, grant to this Thy servant whom Thou hast chosen to be bishop, (to feed Thy holy flock, in some versions) and to serve as Thy high priest without blame, ministering night and day, to propitiate Thy countenance without ceasing and to offer Thee the gifts of the Holy Church. And by the Spirit of high-priesthood to have authority to remit sins according to Thy commandment, to assign the lots according to Thy precept, to loose every bond according to the authority which Thou givest Thy apostles, and to please Thee in meekness and purity of heart, offering to Thee an odor of sweet savor. Through Thy Servant Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom be to Thee glory, might, honor, and with the Holy Spirit in the Holy Church both now and always world without end. Amen (Greek).⁶⁴

Such then is the true nature and source of the post-Conciliar sacramental prayer for ordaining bishops. Clearly we have no exact knowledge of the form that Hippolytus used, and just as clearly, there is no evidence that the

form adopted by Paul VI was ever used to ordain anybody. What are we to say when the Church teaches:

Matter and form must be certainly valid. Hence one may not follow a probable opinion and use either doubtful matter or form. Acting otherwise, one commits a sacrilege.⁶⁵

THE COUP DE GRACE

In the traditional rite, *prior* to the superimposition of hands—the matter of the rite—the consecrator took the open book of the Gospels, and saying nothing, laid it upon the neck and the shoulders of the bishop-elect, so that the printed page touched the neck. One of the chaplains kneeled behind supporting the book until it was given into the hands of the bishop-elect. After this the consecrator superimposed his hands on the head of the ordinand, saying, “Receive the Holy Ghost,” and then proceeded with a short prayer and the preface which contained the words of the form. There was a moral continuity of action so that the form was not really separated from the matter.

In the new rite the principal consecrator lays his hands upon the bishop-elect in silence. *Following* this the principal consecrator places the open book of the Gospels upon the head of the bishop-elect; two deacons, standing at either side of the bishop-elect, hold the book of the Gospels above his head until the prayer of consecration is completed. Here the continuity of action is discontinuous, which is to say that the matter and the form are separated by the imposition of the Gospels over the head of the bishop-elect.

Whatever we may think of the new “form,” Tradition makes it clear that the form must be added to the matter in order for the sacrament to be effected. In Holy Orders, it is the superimposition of the hands which is the matter (as confirmed by Leo XIII in his *Apostolicae curae*). As Augustine said with regard to Baptism: “What is the Baptism of Christ? A washing in water by the word. Take away the water and you have no Baptism; take away the word, and you have no Baptism.” And again: “And in water the word cleanses. Take away the word and what is water but water? The word comes to the element and a sacrament results.”⁶⁶

Matter and form must be united or concurrent. “The matter and form must be united—so far as union is possible—to produce the one external rite, and so to produce a valid sacrament.” However in Holy Orders, “moral simultaneity is sufficient, that is, these sacraments are valid though the proximate matter is employed immediately before or after the use of the

word. What interval would suffice to render the sacrament invalid cannot be determined; the interval of the recital of the ‘Our Father’ appeared sufficient to St. Alphonsus, but in such matters we should not rely on probabilities, we should make sure the matter and form are as united as we can make them.”⁶⁷

In the new rite, the placing of the Gospels on the head of the bishop-elect comes after the superimposition of hands and thus breaks the “moral simultaneity” between the matter and the form much in the same way as taking a coffee-break at this moment would break it. Once again, one is given grounds for seriously doubting validity.

OTHER ASPECTS OF THE NEW EPISCOPAL RITE—ITS “SIGNIFICATIO EX ADJUNCTIS”

It may be argued that the other parts of the post-Conciliar rite—its “*significatio ex adjunctis*”—function to correct the obvious defects of a highly indeterminate form. It behooves us then to examine the remainder of the ceremonies and see if such is the case. We will consider this under the two categories of additions and deletions:

What has been added?

Reading through the text of the new Ordination Rite for Bishops one finds the Consecrator’s Homily given under the title “Consent of the People.” This is a totally Protestant concept, for in Catholicism the bishop is appointed by the Pope (or his agent), and no consent on the part of the laity is required. Did Christ ask for the approval of anyone in appointing the Apostles?

Continuing in the next paragraph we are informed that “in the person of the bishop, with the priests around him, Jesus Christ the Lord, who became High Priest for ever, is present among you. Through the ministry of the bishop, Christ Himself continues to proclaim the Gospel and to confer the mysteries of Faith on those who believe.” Such a statement is again misleading, for strictly speaking, the presence of Christ among us and the proclamation of the Gospel do not depend upon the bishop. However, this manner of expressing things has the advantage of being acceptable to Protestants.

Next we read that the bishop is a “minister of Christ” and a steward of the Mysteries of God. He has been entrusted with the task of witnessing to the truth of the Gospel and fostering a spirit of justice and holiness. But this task is not particular to a bishop. Each and every Catholic is obliged “to give witness to the truth and to foster a spirit of justice and holiness.” In

a still later paragraph the bishop-elect is told that he is to be an “overseer.” Once again we are left with an individual whose function as a Catholic bishop is in no way delineated. There is nothing in the entire statement that would offend Protestants, and indeed, the delineation of his function as “overseer” would delight them. And so this homily continues to the end without providing any positive *significatio ex adjunctis*.

What follows is the “Examination of the Candidate.” Again, the bishop-elect is asked if he is “resolved to be faithful and constant and proclaiming the Gospel of Christ.” The only part of this examination which could relate to his function as a Catholic bishop is the question as to whether or not he is “resolved to maintain the Deposit of Faith entire and uncorrupt as handed down by the Apostles and professed by the Church everywhere and at all times.” He must respond in the affirmative, but then, so must every layman who wishes to call himself a Catholic. Moreover, it is obvious from the statements of the post-Conciliar bishops that they hardly take this responsibility seriously.⁶⁸

After the Litany of the Saints we find what is perhaps the only saving statement in the entire post-Conciliar rite. The principal consecrator at this point stands alone, with his hands joined and prays: “Lord, be moved by our prayers. Anoint Your servant with the fullness of priestly grace and bless him with spiritual power in all its richness.” This prayer is also found in the traditional rite where the Latin for the important phrase is “*cornu gratiae sacerdotalis*” (literally, “the horn of sacerdotal grace”). The statement however is ambiguous because the “horn of sacerdotal grace”—or even the mistranslation “fullness of priestly grace”—could be applied to the priesthood as much as to the episcopacy. Moreover, and most important, it is made outside the sacramental form and apart from the matter, and it in no way specifies the power or Grace conferred in the sacrament.

What has been deleted?

In the present historical context, and in view of Pope Leo XIII’s *Apostolicae curae*, what has been deleted is of greater significance than what has been added. Because of the great length of the traditional rite (taking some two or three hours to say), I shall only discuss those passages which might influence the validity of the sacrament.

The traditional rite is initiated by a request on the part of the senior assistant to the consecrator: “Most Reverend Father, Our Holy Mother the Catholic Church asks that you promote this priest here present to the burden of the episcopate” (Retained). This is followed by an oath on the part of the ordinand in which he promises God “to promote the rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the Holy Roman Church,” and to

“observe with all his strength, and cause to be observed by others, the rules of the Holy Fathers, etc.” (omitted in the new rite and replaced by the Homily described above under the title of “Consent of the People.”) Next proceeds the “examination of the candidate” in which he is asked among other things if he will “keep and teach with reverence the Traditions of the Orthodox Fathers and the decretal constitutions of the Holy and Apostolic See.” (omitted, though he promises to “maintain the Deposit of Faith, entire and uncorrupt, as handed down by the Apostles and professed by the Church everywhere and at all times.”) Then he is asked to confirm his belief in each and every article of the Creed (omitted). Finally he is asked if he will “anathematize every heresy that shall arise against the Holy Catholic Church” (omitted). The deletion of the requirement to anathematize heresy is significant, for this is indeed one of the functions of a bishop. Further, this function remains unspecified in the remainder of the post-Conciliar rite.

In the traditional rite the consecrator instructs the bishop-elect in the following terms: “A bishop judges, interprets, consecrates, ordains, offers, baptizes, and confirms.” Now such a statement is indeed important for the *significatio ex adjunctis*. Its deletion in the new rite is most significant. Nowhere in the new rite is it stated that the function of the bishop is to ordain, or to confirm, much less to judge (“to loose and to bind”).

The consecratory prayer in the traditional rite of the Roman Church is different from that of the Antiochean-Syrian rite and provides the necessary “form” (including the essential words as specified by Pius XII). Its content or “substantial meaning” is sufficiently close to that of the Coptic, Antiochean, and Syrian prayers as to require no further discussion. If in fact Paul VI had adopted the form used in the Eastern rites, absolutely no doubt would remain about validity.

In the traditional rite, after the consecratory prayer, the functions of a bishop are once again specified. “Give him, O Lord, the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. . . . Whatsoever he shall bind upon earth, let it be bound likewise in Heaven, and whatsoever he shall loose upon earth, let it likewise be loosed in Heaven, Whose sins he shall retain, let them be retained, and do Thou remit the sins of whomsoever he shall remit. . . . Grant him, O Lord, an episcopal chair . . .” This entire prayer has been omitted in the new rite.

**THE RESULT OF THESE CHANGES IS THE PROTESTANTIZING
OF THE ORDINAL**

Clearly, almost every reference to a specifically Catholic understanding of the episcopate has been deleted from the post-Conciliar rite. Included in these deletions are his function of ordaining priests, confirming, and his use of the “Keys.” Admittedly the term “bishop” is retained, but outside the essential form, and in such a way as would in no way offend our Protestant brethren. As such there is no positive *significatio ex adjunctis*, but rather a negative one. With this in mind, let us consider some of the statements of Leo XIII in his *Apostolicae curae* that irreformably declared Anglican Orders “null and void.”⁶⁹

In vain has help been recently sought from the plea of the validity of Anglican Orders from the other prayers of the same Ordinal. For, to put aside other reasons which show this to be insufficient for the purpose of the Anglican rite, let this argument suffice for all. From them has been deliberately removed whatever sets forth the dignity and office of the priesthood of the Catholic rite. That “form” consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for the sacrament which omits what it ought essentially to signify. . . . The same holds good of Episcopal consecration. . . . Nor is anything gained by quoting the prayer of the preface, “Almighty God,” since it, in like manner, has been stripped of the words which denote the *summum sacerdotium*. . . . The episcopate undoubtedly, by the institution of Christ, most truly belongs to the sacrament of Orders and constitutes the *sacerdotium* in the highest degree, namely that which by the teaching of the Holy Fathers and our liturgical customs is called the *summum sacerdotium, sacri ministerii summa*. So it comes to pass that, as the sacrament of Orders and the true *sacerdotium* of Christ were utterly eliminated from the Anglican rite, and hence the *sacerdotium* is in no wise conferred truly and validly in the Episcopal consecration of the same rite, for the same reason, therefore, the episcopate can in no wise be truly and validly conferred by it and this the more so because among the first duties of the episcopate is that of ordaining ministers for the Holy Eucharist and sacrifice.

Michael Davies, despite his dubious conclusion in *The Order of Melchisedech* that the new ordination rite is unquestionably valid, provides us with all the necessary evidence required to state that the intention of Paul VI was to make the new ordination rites acceptable to Protestants. He also provides us with the evidence that Paul VI’s Ordinal was created with the help of the same henchmen that assisted in creating the *Novus Ordo Missae*—Archbishop Bugnini and the six heterodox (Protestant)

“consultants.” Francis Clark also stresses Paul VI’s ecumenical intent. Indeed, he goes so far as to parallel it with Cranmer’s intent in creating the Edwardian (Anglican) rite, namely that of destroying the sacerdotal character of Orders. He considers the Cranmerian result invalid, but that of the post-Conciliar Church as legitimate because it derives from a Pope.⁷⁰

Let the import of such an intent be clear. Protestants deny the sacramental character of Orders, and any attempt to create a rite that would satisfy them must resort to both ambiguity and deliberate obfuscation of doctrine. If Michael Davies’ contention is correct, and I believe it is, Paul VI had no choice but to deliberately delete every reference to a specifically Catholic characterization of the episcopacy. Let us once again turn to Leo XIII’s *Apostolicae curae*:

For the full and accurate understanding of the Anglican Ordinal, besides what we have noted as to some of its parts, there is nothing more pertinent than to consider carefully the circumstances under which it was composed and publicly authorized. . . . The history of the time is sufficiently eloquent as to the animus of the authors of the Ordinal. . . . As to the abettors whom they associated with themselves from the heterodox sects . . . for this reason, in the whole Ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the sacrifice, or consecration, of priesthood (*sacerdotium*), and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifice, but, and as We have just stated, every trace of these things which have been in such prayers of the Catholic rite as they had not entirely rejected, was deliberately removed and struck out. . . . In this way, the native character—or spirit as it is called—of the Ordinal clearly manifests itself. . . . *Any words* in the Anglican Ordinal as it now is, *which lend themselves to ambiguity, cannot be taken in the same sense as they possess in the Catholic rite.* For once a new rite has been initiated in which, as we have seen, the sacrament of Orders is adulterated or denied, and from which all idea of consecration and sacrifice has been rejected, the formula, “Receive the Holy Ghost,” no longer holds good, because the Spirit is infused into the soul with the grace of the sacrament, and so the words “for the office and work of priest or bishop,” and the like no longer hold good, but remain as words without the reality which Christ instituted (emphasis mine).

CONCLUSION—THE INVALIDITY OF ORDERS AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

If the post-Conciliar rite, animated by a spirit of false ecumenism, follows the pattern established by its Cranmerian prototype; if it is, as Michael Davies contends, a move in the direction of a common Ordinal; and if it

deletes every phrase which characterizes a Catholic episcopacy, not only from the essential form, but from the entire rite, then it must logically be subject to the same condemnations that Leo XIII promulgated against Anglican Orders. In fact, there is not one statement in the above quotations from his Apostolic Bull which cannot be applied to it. If one adds to this the abrogation of the traditional form as specified by Pius XII's *ex cathedra* pronouncement, and the change in the "substance" or meaning of the essential words specified as its replacement, we are left with the unfortunate conclusion that the bishops ordained by the new rite may be in no way different from their Lutheran and Anglican counterparts.

And if the ordination of post-Conciliar bishops is at best extremely doubtful, what is one to say of the ordination of "presbyters" under their aegis? Insofar as the ordination rite for the priesthood has been criticized on similar grounds, we have a situation where doubt is added to doubt. This in turn places all the other sacraments (except of course Baptism and Matrimony) on equally dangerous ground. The reader is reminded that, in the practical order, for a rite to be doubtful is the same as for it to be invalid. As Francis Clark says: "Probabalism may not be used where the validity of the sacraments is in question," and as Fr. Jone states: "Matter and form must be certainly valid. Hence one may not follow a probable opinion and use either doubtful matter or form."⁷¹

Even worse than placing the various aspects of the sacrament of Orders and their dependent sacraments in doubt, is the question that these ritual changes raise about what is called the Apostolic Succession. The bishops are the descendants of the Apostles and retain all the functions of the Apostles except that of Revelation. If their "descent" is nullified and voided, hopes for reconstituting the Church as we have known it are destroyed. Again, it must be stressed that the true Church cannot be destroyed any more than the Truth itself can be destroyed. But the existence of the true Church will take some other form or will continue to exist in an "underground" manner apart from the organized structure that we have hitherto been used to see. The serious nature of such a situation is well born out by the comments of Monsignor Charles Journet, Professor at the major Catholic Seminary of Fribourg in Switzerland. Writing in 1955, he commented:

To maintain that the true Church is apostolic is to maintain that she depends, as heat on fire, on a spiritual virtue residing in the Holy Trinity and thence descending by stages, first into the humanity of Christ, then into the two-fold power, sacramental and jurisdictional, of the apostolic body, and finally to the Christian people. Where we find this mediation, this chain of dependence, there we find the true Church (composed, it must be added, of the just who are to be saved and of sinners who are to

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

be damned). Where this mediation is lacking there also the true Church is lacking; there may be inchoate [rudimentary] ontological [spiritual] membership, of itself salvific, but certainly not fully achieved ontological membership in the true Church. No link of the chain can be omitted or even changed. The Godhead is eternal; Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever (Heb. 13:8), and to the end of the world He will assist the apostolic body (Matt. 28:19-20). An eternal God, an immortal Christ, an indefectible apostolic body, lastly, the generations of the faithful, that is the evangelical order. . . . But the apostolic body can be indefectible only in virtue of an uninterrupted succession. Suppose it had failed and then been replaced by another institution to all appearances identical: apparently nothing would have been altered, but in point of fact everything would have been subverted; and this would quickly become apparent. Naturally, both God and Christ would remain untouched; but the institution claiming to take the place of the apostolic body and separated from it by a break, would be a new institution, and could not be that indefectible institution set up in the world by Christ. It would therefore inherit none of the mysterious privileges attached by Him to the true apostolic body; it would have but a simulacrum [simulation] of the power of order, a simulacrum of the power of jurisdiction, and any appearance of permanency would be illusory. From this standpoint, the need for an uninterrupted succession in the apostolic body, *apostolicae successionis praerogativa* [the prerogative of apostolic succession] is obvious. Without it, the last link of the chain by which the Church is suspended would be broken, and the divine apostolicity of the Church would have foundered.⁷²

Notes

¹ Baptism can be administered even by a non-believer, providing he uses the correct words and intends to do what the Church or Christ intends. With regard to Marriage, the priest acts as a witness on the part of the Church. In marriage the “matter” is the parties to the “contract,” and the “form” is the giving of consent.

² “If anyone shall say that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord . . . let him be anathema” (Denzinger, 844).

³ It is unfortunate that the modernists used the term “symbol” to specify the reflection in doctrine of the beliefs of the faithful—beliefs which they held arose in the collective or individual subconscious—beliefs which were subject to change as man “evolved” and “matured.” They misused this term because the early creeds were called “symbols.” If one accepts their interpretation, it is obvious that “symbols” would have to change as beliefs changed. (The modernist confuses the meaning of symbols and signs; signs can be arbitrary and can legitimately be used to indicate different meanings.) This idea and misuse of the term “symbolism” was rightly condemned by St. Pius X in his encyclical *Pascendi*, a situation which has given the term a bad connotation. True symbols are material (verbal, visual) representatives of realities that never change, which is the sense in which the Church applied the term to the creeds in post-Apostolic times. Just as natural laws are the manifest

Orders and the Destruction of the Apostolic Succession

reflection of God's will, so all natural phenomena are in one way or another symbolic of higher realities. Nature, as St. Bernard said, is a book of scripture, or to quote the Psalms, "*Caeli enarrant gloriam Dei*" (the Heavens declare the glory of God).

⁴ The Greek Orthodox still use this word to describe the sacraments. The primordial sense of the term is found among the classical Greek writers, and especially as used with reference to the Mysteries of Eleusis. Invested with the stole before Mass, the priest says, "... *quamine indignus accedo ad tuum sacrum Mysterium* . . ." meaning of course the Mystery of the Mass.

⁵ The Latin word *sacramentum* had several meanings: 1) the sum which two parties to a legal suit deposited—so called perhaps because it was deposited in a sacred place. Its meaning was often extended to include a civil suit or process; 2) it was used to describe the military oath of allegiance and by extension, any sacred obligation; 3) Tertullian used the word to describe the neophyte's promises on entering the Church at the time of Baptism; he also used it with regard to "mysterious communications" on the part of what we would now call a religious sister who "conversed with the angels." 4) Finally, he used it with regard to Baptism and the Eucharist.

⁶ Quoted from Elizabeth Frances Rogers, *Peter Lombard and the Sacramental System* (New York, 1917).

⁷ Such would occur if, for example, a layman or a priest not properly ordained were to attempt to say Mass.

⁸ Those seeking a more detailed review are referred to the *Dictionnaire de la Théologie Catholique* (Letouzey: Paris, 1939). Scriptural usage followed much the same pattern. The Greek *mysterion* was translated as *sacramentum* and as such the term is found 45 times—some 20 times in the writings of St. Paul alone. According to Fr. F. Prat, it is used in three contexts: 1) secrets of God relative to the salvation of man by Christ, that is, secrets the meaning of which became clear with the New Covenant; 2) the hidden sense of an institution; and 3) hidden action, as in the mystery of the Resurrection to come.

⁹ *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1908.

¹⁰ An excellent discussion of this topic is available in Fr. Barbara's *Fortes in Fide*, No. 9 (1991 series), available from F.J. Christian, 758 Lemay Ferry Road, St. Louis, Mo., 63125.

¹¹ To avoid any possibility of misunderstanding, it should be clear that one must live a life in accord with the teachings of the Church—Baptism, which wipes away the stain of original sin, in no way guarantees that the individual will not fall from the "state of Grace" produced by this sacrament. The issue of Baptism of Desire is discussed in an article by the present author in a 1992 issue of *The Reign of Mary* (North 8500 St. Michael's Rd., Spokane, WA 99207-0905).

¹² One could say that the sacraments depending on Orders are not necessary in an absolute sense, but that, given the condition of fallen man, they are indispensable by a necessity of convenience or expedience.

¹³ Brother Andre of Quebec likened the priest to a seller of clothes. The salesman's personal morals have no effect on the clothes he sells.

¹⁴ This principle is well expressed by the phrase that members of the teaching Church (the hierarchy) must first of all be members of the believing Church.

¹⁵ In hospitals, nurses often baptize infants in danger of death. However, to baptize outside the case of necessity is to usurp a priestly function.

¹⁶ Strictly speaking, the priest is the witness on the part of the Church to this contractual sacrament. This is further confirmed by the fact that in countries or locations where a priest

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

is not available for long periods of time, a couple can marry, and when the priest arrives, the marriage is “solemnized.” Again, a valid Protestant marriage is not repeated when the parties become Catholic.

¹⁷ There was a bishop in South America who was strongly prejudiced against ordaining “native” clergy. On his deathbed he confessed that when it came to native clergy he had always withheld his intention. The priest who heard his confession refused him absolution unless he gave permission for this fact to be exposed to the proper authorities. This permission was granted. All the native clergy involved were re-ordained. Such episodes are extremely rare in the history of the Church, and for obvious reasons not normally made public.

¹⁸ See *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 13, p. 299.

¹⁹ An illustration of this is the phrase “*Hoc est enim corpus meum*” (For this is my body) from the traditional Mass. The elimination of the word “for” (*enim*) would not change the meaning of the phrase. Hence it would not lead to a substantial change. It follows that “for” is not an “essential” word. The “integrity” of the form, however, requires that it be used, and the priest sins gravely if he intentionally fails to use it.

²⁰ A widower can of course receive Holy Orders. Married individuals who have fulfilled their obligations to the state of marriage, may, with their wife’s permission, by special dispensation (and taking the vow of celibacy), receive Holy Orders. Similarly, older couples may, by mutual consent, both enter the religious state. The Eastern Church allows for married (non-celibate) priests. Eleven of the Twelve Apostles were married. (Cf. St. Paul’s Epistle to Timothy, 3:1-7).

²¹ Patrick Henry Omlor, *Questioning the Validity of the Masses using the New, All-English Canon*.

²² Fr. Henry Davis, S.J., *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, Vol. 2 (Sheed and Ward: London, 1936), p. 27.

²³ “Apostolic Succession” is to be distinguished from “Apostolicity.” The bishops are the spiritual descendants of the Apostles, and hence the “Apostolic Succession” is passed on through them. “Apostolicity,” however, is one of the qualities of the true Church, not only because it preserves the Apostolic Succession, but also because it teaches the same doctrines and uses the same rites that the Apostles did.

²⁴ The phrase “null and void” was used with regard to Anglican Orders by Pope Leo XIII.

²⁵ Sacramentally speaking there is no higher rank than that of bishop. Such a statement in no way denies or repudiates the teaching of the Church on the primacy of Peter.

²⁶ Cardinal Gasparri in *De Sacra Ordinatione*, and Lennertz in his *De Sacramento Ordinis* both hold that the recipient of Episcopal Orders automatically receives—if he does not already have it—the powers of the priesthood. It is difficult to see why this should not be the case since he receives the *summum sacerdotium* or fullness of the priesthood. The issue is discussed in *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention* by Francis Clark, S.J. (subsequently laicized) (Longmans, Green: London, 1956).

²⁷ Those who would question this statement would do well to read the Vatican Instruction entitled *Doctrina et exemplo* on “The Liturgical Formation of Future Priests,” *Documents on the Liturgy*, No. 332. They will find no recommendation that seminarians be taught anything about the sacrificial nature of their function or about the Real Presence.

²⁸ Fr. John Bligh, S.J., *Ordination to the Priesthood* (Sheed and Ward: N.Y., 1956).

²⁹ It is of interest that during the 20th century 12 priests of the Russian Orthodox Church, not wishing to be under state-approved (KGB) bishops, gathered together and ordained a priest.

Orders and the Destruction of the Apostolic Succession

³⁰ Pius XII, *Sacramentum Ordinis* (Acta Apostolicae Sedis), January 28, 1948.

³¹ Section on “Orders,” *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908) (Appleton: N.Y., 1911).

³² Hippolytus was a schismatic bishop at the time that he compiled this text. Subsequently he was reconciled and died a martyr. His situation and the nature of this text are discussed in greater detail below. The reader is reminded that prior to the latter part of the fourth century, the Church was under persecution. Documentations during this era are, as a result, sparse.

³³ Walter B. Clancy, *The Rites and Ceremonies of Sacred Ordination: A Historical Conspectus and a Canonical Commentary* (Catholic University of America: Washington, D.C., 1962).

³⁴ “Tradition” in this context means “passing on” or “handing over.”

³⁵ As Pope Pius XII pointed out in his *Sacramentum Ordinis*, the Church at the Council of Florence did not demand that the Greek Church adopt the tradition of the instruments. Hence it followed that the Decree to the Armenians was not meant to define the tradition of the instruments as being substantial to the rite for ordaining priests. St Alphonsus and Pope Benedict XIV were of the opinion that Eugene IV did not intend to determine the essential matter of the sacrament but desired simply to present a practical instruction to the Armenian Church concerning the use of the delivery of the instruments, and in no way sought to settle the question (Clancy, *The Rites and Ceremonies of Sacred Ordination*). Fr. P. Pourrat comments: “The *Decretum ad Armenos* is the official document of the Church that treats of the binary composition of the sacramental rite. It was, as we know, added to the decrees of the Council of Florence; yet it has not the value of a Conciliar *definition* (Fr. Pourrat’s italics). It is ‘merely a practical instruction’ intended for the United Armenians, and not for the whole Church. Hence, although the decree is worthy of great regard, still it does not impose itself on our Faith.” (*Theology of the Sacraments* [B. Herder: St. Louis, 1914], p. 51). Also see section on “Orders” in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908).

³⁶ It is never the common people—the laity—who desire changes. On the contrary, the majority of people prefer the security of stability, especially in religious matters. And in fact, it is virtually impossible for the laity to have wished for changes in the sacrament of Orders insofar as their use was restricted to those in religion.

³⁷ The Episcopalians use this ordinal. Prior to the American Revolution they were American Anglicans. However, the Anglican Church recognizes the King or Queen of England as the head of their church and such would have been inappropriate in America after 1776. Doctrinally however they are virtually the same ecclesiastical body. Thus for example, Episcopalians adhere to the same “39 Articles” which among other things deny that the Mass is an immolative sacrifice, or that the priesthood is a sacrament.

³⁸ The Reformers “loved” the term *presbyter*, which literally translated from the Latin meant “elder.” This allowed them to use a Latin word meaning priest in an altered sense in English. (The early Church avoided using the term *sacerdos* or priest because of the confusion that might result with the pagan priesthood.)

³⁹ For the sake of completeness the form in the Edwardine Ordinal for the Anglican Priesthood is: “Receive the holy goste: whose synnes thou doest forgeue, they are forgeuen: and whose synnes thou doest retayne, they are retayned: and bee thou a faithful dispensor of the word of God, and of his holy sacraments. In the name of the father and the sonne and the holy goste. Amen.” This was changed in 1662 to: “Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive etc.”

For the Episcopate: “Take the Holy Goste, and remember that thou stirre up the grace of God, which is in thee, by imposition of hands: for God hath not geuen us the spirite of feare,

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

but of power and loue and of sobernesse.” This was altered in 1662 to: “Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of hands; In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. And remember that thou stir up etc.” Several theologians have stated their opinion that the 1662 forms would be valid “if used in a Catholic setting or in orthodox circumstances” (*Why are Anglican (Episcopalian) Orders Invalid?* by Rev. M.D. Forrest, M.S.C. [Radio Replies Press: St. Paul, Minn., 1938]).

⁴⁰ Because the matter has become a contended issue in recent time, it should be noted that while usual practice involves the extension of both hands, it suffices if only one is extended over the head of the ordinand (cf. discussion in *Dictionnaire de la Théologie Catholique*).

⁴¹ Pius XII, *Sacramentum Ordinis* (Acta Apostolicae Sedis, Jan. 28, 1948).

⁴² J.M. Hervé, *Man. Theol. Dog.*, Tom. iv, ed. nova A Orentino Larnicol C.S. Sp. Recognita, 1962: “*Atque Pius XII, in Const. Apostl. ‘Sacramentum Ordinis,’ ut omnino videtur, loquitur ut Pator et Doctor Supremus, et vere definit doctrinam de fide vel moribus (doctrinam de essentia sacramenti Ordinis, quae intime connectitur cum aliis veritatibus revelatis), ab universa Ecclesia tenendum.*” Similarly, Msgr. G.D. Smith argues that when the Church defines what is and what is not sufficient to confer a sacrament, such decisions involve an implied infallibility (“The Church and Her Sacraments,” *Clergy Review*, Apr. 1950, and referred to by Fr. Francis Clark in his *Anglican Orders and Defect in Intention*). Fr. Clancy, *The Rites and Ceremonies of Sacred Ordination*, gives many other authorities that concur in this opinion. To quote Francisco Miranda Vincente, Auxiliary Bishop of Toledo: “This Apostolic Constitution is a true and solemn dogmatic declaration, and at the same time, as the terms used in the fourth and fifth point indicate, it is a doctrinal and disciplinary decree.”

⁴³ Francis Clark, S.J., “Les ordinations anglicanes, problème oecuménique,” *Gregorianum*, vol. 45, 1964. In essence, his address to the Fathers at Vatican II on this topic. See also his review of Michael Davies’ *The Order of Melchisedech* (Augustine: Devon, England, 1979).

⁴⁴ The importance of *significatio ex adjunctis* is a confusing issue insofar as the Church teaches that “form, matter, valid orders, and intention are all that are required for validity of the sacraments” (Council of Florence). Clearly, for a priest to fulfill these criteria in an inappropriate setting (as for example, a Satanic Mass), however sacrilegious, is possible. With regard to Anglican Orders, Leo XIII discussed the importance of the defects of the rite surrounding the form, but left the issue confused. As Francis Clark, S.J. points out, theologians have given seven different interpretations to his words (*Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention*). Francis Clark defines *significatio ex adjunctis* in the following terms: “The sacramental signification of an ordination rite is not necessarily limited to one phrase or formula, but can be clearly conveyed from many parts of the rite. These other parts could thus contribute, either individually or in combination, to determining the sacramental meaning of the operative formula in an unambiguous sense. Thus the wording of an ordination form, even if not specifically determinate in itself, can be given the required determination from its setting (*ex adjunctis*), that is, from the other prayers and actions of the rite, or even from the connotation of the ceremony as a whole in the religious context of the age” (*The Catholic Church and Anglican Orders* [CTS, 1962], quoted by Michael Davies in his *Order of Melchisedech*). The term “negative” *significatio ex adjunctis* is not hallowed by theological usage and is a phrase of convenience. Francis Clark lays great stress on this concept without using the term—compare his *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention*. A clearer way of demonstrating negative *significatio ex adjunctis* is the following: a priest saying the proper words of consecration in the Mass follows them with a statement or intention that negated the meaning of those words. The deliberate removal of all references to the

Orders and the Destruction of the Apostolic Succession

sacrificial nature of the priesthood (or of ordaining for bishops) in the Anglican ordinal is equivalent to denying the purpose for which a man is ordained.

⁴⁵ Cf. the Vatican Instruction entitled, *Doctrina et exemplo*, on “The Liturgical Formation of Future Priests,” where there is no recommendation that seminarians be taught anything about the sacrificial nature of their function or about the Real Presence.

⁴⁶ Taken from his *Order of Melchisedech*, which strongly defends the validity and legitimacy of the new rite.

⁴⁷ Michael Davies, *The Order of Melchisedech*, p. 75. Michael Davies’ “and if,” which he places in parenthesis, is highly significant, for in the new rite the priest is not ordained as a sacrificing priest, but in order to “say the liturgy,” which is of course, the *Novus Ordo Missae*.

⁴⁸ It should be noted that sacramental rites have never been considered valid because they were instituted by a Pontiff, but because they were instituted by Christ. A Pontiff may, when doubt arises, specify what it was that Christ intended. A Pope cannot create a new sacrament. Hence it is important to know whether the claim that the post-Conciliar sacraments are substantially the same as the traditional ones becomes important. If they are, then why the changes; if they are not then are they sacraments? In the second edition of *The Order of Melchisedech* Michael Davies considers it a “fundamental doctrine” that “any sacramental rite approved by the Pope must certainly be valid.” In essence, this means that should the Pope say “green apples” is a valid sacramental form, we must accept it.

⁴⁹ Fr. William Jenkins has discussed this issue in great detail in *The Roman Catholic*, Vol. III, Nos. 8 and 11 (1981), Oyster Bay Cove, N.Y., 11771. Still further confusion results from consulting *The Documents on the Liturgy, 1963-1979* (Liturgical Press Collegeville, Minn.). Document 324 tells us that the Latin taken from AAS is *in hos famulos tuos*, but the current official English translation is, “Grant to these servants of Yours” rather than “confer on these Thy servants.”

⁵⁰ Rama P. Coomaraswamy, “Once a Presbyter, Always a Presbyter,” *The Roman Catholic*, Vol. V, No. 7, August 1983.

⁵¹ The significance of this omission is clarified when we read in Psalm 109 that “the Lord swore and will not repent: thou art a priest for ever after the Order of Melchizedek.” St. Paul refers to this in Hebrews 7:21 when he says, “For those [Jewish] priests were made without an oath by Him who said unto Him the Lord swore . . .” By so much was Jesus made the surety of a better priesthood. It further distinguishes the priesthood of Christ, in which the Catholic priest shares, from the Aaronic priesthood which terminated with the Crucifixion. Cf. Rev. J.M. Neal and R. F. Littledek, *Commentary on the Psalms*, Vol. III (Masters: London, 1874), p. 450.

⁵² It is pertinent that the “bishops” selected for ordaining the priests of the Society of St. Peter (“The Pope’s own traditional Order”) are Ratzinger (now “Pope” Benedict XVI) and Meyer. Both of these received their episcopal “consecration” by the new rites to be discussed in the body of this text. If they are in fact not bishops, all the priests they ordain—even if they use the traditional rites as they state they intend to do—are no more priests than any layman.

⁵³ As Pius XII stated in his Apostolic Constitution: “Those things which We have above declared and established regarding the matter and the form are not to be understood in such a way as to make it allowable for the other rites as prescribed in the Roman Pontifical to be neglected or passed over even in the slightest detail; nay, rather We order that all the prescriptions contained in the Roman Pontifical itself be faithfully observed and performed.”

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

⁵⁴ Pius XII said that the words in his form were “essential” and required for validity. Paul VI states that the words that constitute his form “belong to the nature of the rite and are consequently required for validity.” He further states in the same document that “it is our will that these our decrees and prescriptions be firm and effective now and in the future, notwithstanding to the extent necessary, the apostolic constitutions and ordinances issued by our predecessors and other prescriptions, even those requiring particular mention and derogation” (*Pontificalis Romani, Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, July 29, 1968.)

⁵⁵ *A Vindication of the Bull “Apostolicae curae,”* A Letter on Anglican Orders by the Cardinal Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Westminster in reply to the Letter Addressed to them by the Anglican Archbishops of Canterbury and York (Longmans, Green and Co.: London, 1898); also to be found in Bishop Peter Richard Kendrick’s *The Validity of Anglican Ordinations* (Cummiskey: Phil., 1848).

⁵⁶ “It is not essential to express the word, ‘deacon,’ ‘priest,’ or ‘bishop,’ but the form must at least express some clear equivalent. Thus ‘the order of the Blessed Stephen’ is a clear equivalent of the order of deacon. It is not essential to express the main power of the priest or the bishop in the form, but if this main power were expressed, it too would be an equivalent. However, it is essential to express *either* the order *or* its main power, and if the main power is not only left out, but positively excluded, then the right name, though kept, is not the right name in reality but only a shadow. Now, the main power of a true priest is to offer a true sacrifice, and at least one of the main powers of a bishop is to make priests” (H.C. Semple, S.J., *Anglican Ordinations* [Benzinger: N.Y., 1906]).

⁵⁷ Taken from Semple’s book, *Anglican Ordinations*, the following are the various presumed consecratory forms for bishop (presumed as the Church never so specified prior to Pius XII: Ancient Roman and Ancient Gallican: “. . . and therefore to these Thy servants whom Thou has chosen to the ministry of the *high priesthood*”; Greek: “Do Thou O Lord of all, strengthen and confirm this Thy servant, that by the hand of me, a sinner, and of the assisting ministers and fellow-bishops, and by the coming, the strength, and grace of the Holy Ghost . . . he may obtain the *episcopal dignity*”; Maronite: “Thou who canst do all things, adorn with all virtues . . . this Thy servant whom Thou has made worthy to receive from Thee the sublime *order of bishops*”; Nestorian: “We offer before Thy Majesty. . . this Thy servant whom Thou hast chosen and set apart that he may be a *bishop*”; Coptic: “O Lord, God, Almighty Ruler . . . bestow, therefore, this same grace upon Thy servant N., whom thou has chosen as *bishop*”; Armenian: “The Divine Grace calleth this N. from the priesthood to the *episcopate*. I impose hands. Pray that he may become worthy of the rank of *bishop*”; Liturgy of the Constitutions of the Apostles: “Give O God . . . to this Thy servant whom Thou hast chosen to the *episcopate* to feed Thy people and discharge the Office of *pontiff*”; Canons of Hippolytus: “O God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . look down upon Thy servant N., granting him Thy strength and power, the spirit which Thou didst give to the holy Apostles, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Give to him, O Lord, the *episcopate*.”

⁵⁸ Canon J.M. Hervé, *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae*.

⁵⁹ *Concordantiae Bibliorum Sacrorum quas digessit Bonifatius Fischer, O.S.B.*, published by Friedrich Fromman Verlag Gunther Holzborg, Stutgard-Bad, Germany, 1977. The translation into English is from the Douay version. The Psalm in question is the penitential song of David in response to the Prophet Nathan’s chiding of him for his adultery with Bathsheba. According to Fr. Boylan’s commentary, “*Spiritu principali* is apparently parallel to the *spiritus rectus* of verse 12. *Principalis* represents the Greek *Hegemonikos* meaning princely, leading, or ruling. The Hebrew is *ndibhah*—a spirit of ‘readiness,’ of ‘willingness’—to learn, to do the right and good (cf. Matt. 26:41, ‘the spirit indeed is willing [= ready]’).” St. Augustine understands the verse in the following sense: “An upright spirit renew in my inner parts which are bowed and distorted by sinning” (*Commentary on Psalm 51*).

Orders and the Destruction of the Apostolic Succession

Cornelius Lapse follows Bellarmine in translating the phrase as, "I ask that you stabilize and confirm in the good by means of the governing spirit." Fr. Joseph Pohle, the well-known professor of dogmatics, specifically denies that *Spiritus Principalis* is the Third Person of the Holy Trinity (*The Divine Trinity*, p. 97—translation of Arthur Preuss and familiarly known as Pohle-Preuss).

⁶⁰ *Notitiae* states that the proper translation of the word *principalis* is "governing," and the same issue of this semi-official journal carries the *Declaration on the Translation of Sacramental Formulas* promulgated by Paul VI on January 25, 1974, a document which states that "difficulties can arise when trying to express the concepts of the original Latin formula in translation. It sometimes happens that one is obliged to use paraphrases and circumlocutions. . . . The Holy See approves a formula because it considers that it expresses the sense understood by the Church in the Latin text."

⁶¹ Luther defined the priesthood in these terms: "The function of the priest is to preach; if he does not preach, he is no more a priest than a picture of a man is a man. Nor does it make a man a bishop if he ordains this kind of clapper-tongued priest, or consecrates church bells, or confirms children? Never! These are things that any deacon or layman might do. What makes a priest or bishop is the ministry of the word." Elsewhere he says: "Everyone who knows that he is a Christian would be fully assured that all of us alike are priests, and that we all have the same authority in regard to the word and the sacraments, although no one has the right to administer them without the consent of the members of his Church, or by call of the majority" (Quoted by Fr. W. Jenkins, "The New Ordination Rite: An Indelible Question Mark," *The Roman Catholic*, Vol. III, No. 8, Sept. 1981).

⁶² Fr. Clancy, quoting Johannes Quasten's *Patrology*, tells us in his historical study of the rite of ordination that "the *Apostolic Traditions* had no appreciable effect on the development of the rite of ordination in the West."

⁶³ Burton Scott Easton, *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*, translated into English with an introduction and notes (Cambridge University Press: 1934; republished by Arenon Books: England, 1962).

⁶⁴ According to Fr. (subsequently Cardinal) J. Tixeront, *Holy Orders and Ordination* (Herder: St. Louis, 1928), the consecrating bishop held his hands over the ordinand's head throughout the entire prayer. According to Fr. Semple S.J., *Anglican Ordinations*, after asking God to give the ordinand that spirit which "Thou didst give to the Holy Apostles." Hippolytus continued: "Give to him, O Lord, the episcopate." He adds the following note: "But if a priest is ordained, all is done with him in like manner as with a bishop, except that he shall not sit in the chair. The same prayer shall be prayed in its entirety over him as over the bishop, with the sole exception of the name of episcopate. A bishop is in all things equal to a priest except in the name of the chair, and in ordination, which power of ordaining is not given to the latter."

⁶⁵ Quoted from Fr. Brey's introduction to Patrick Henry Omlor's book, *Questioning the Validity of Masses using the New, All-English Canon*. This is the common teaching of moral theologians.

⁶⁶ Bernard Leeming, S.J., *Principles of Sacramental Theology* (Longmans Green: London, 1955).

⁶⁷ Henry Davis, S.J., *Moral and Pastoral Theology* (Sheed and Ward: N.Y., 1935), Vol. III, p. 10. Dr. Ludwig Ott says much the same: "It is not necessary that they coincide absolutely in point of time; a moral coincidence suffices, that is, they must be connected with each other in such a fashion, that according to general estimation, they compose a unitary sign" (*Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma* [TAN: Rockford, Ill., 1986]).

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

⁶⁸ Strict adherence to this response would require that they reject the heresies of Vatican II. Under such circumstances one can question whether they would be chosen by modern Rome to be “overseers.”

⁶⁹ Some liberal theologians argued that this Bull was not binding. Pope Leo XIII subsequently made it clear that the Bull was “irreformable.”

⁷⁰ Francis Clark, S.J., *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* (Augustine: Devon, 1981). In his second edition of *The Order of Melchisedech*, Michael Davies again reiterates his opinion to the effect that there can be no question about the validity of the new rites for administering Holy Orders, because they have the approval of a Pope. He quotes Francis Clark with special emphasis: “The wording of an ordination form, even if not specifically determinate in itself, can be given the required determination from its setting (*ex adjunctis*), that is, from the other prayers and actions of the rite, or *even from the connotation of the ceremony as a whole in the religious context of the age.*” Such a doctrinal position means that the new Church can ignore 2000 years of sacramental theology and declare anything it wishes to be a valid sacramental rite. It could for example declare “monkey-shines” or “abracadabra” to be a valid sacramental form.

⁷¹ Rev. Heribert Jone, *Moral Theology*.

⁷² Msgr. Charles Journet, *The Church of the Word Incarnate* (Sheed and Ward: London, 1955), p. 526-527.

CHAPTER 15

COMMUNISM, “OSTPOLITIK,” AND LIBERATION THEOLOGY

A priestly rabble which drags the faith and dignity of the Church through the mud of party politics allying itself with revolutionary forces and, by sentimental talk about loving one's neighbor, eggs on the underworld to set about destroying the social order.

Oswald Spengler, *The Hour of Decision*, 1934

The world will march irresistibly towards *the new order and the new man for which we all long*. [Red] Cuba will play its part, joyfully and disinterestedly in this *grand joint undertaking* (emphasis mine).

Paul VI, Special Audience, March 25, 1976

Some of the material in this chapter may seem only of historical interest. However, the facts disclosed provide the necessary background for the development of Liberation Theology, which in various forms is very much with us today. In similar manner, the so-called “liberal agenda” is a reflection of socialist ideology—even though most liberals are not fully aware of this. Socialist ideas are pervasive in our society as well as in the post-Conciliar Church. Hence it is of some importance to understand the historical roots from which they spring.

Prior to Vatican II everyone knew where the Catholic Church stood with regard to communism.¹ Marxism was repeatedly condemned by the Popes as inimical to any kind of traditional outlook. Pope Pius IX called communism “absolutely contrary to the natural law itself,” and added that “once adopted, would utterly destroy the rights, property, and possessions of all men, and even of society itself.” These words, spoken in 1846 have certainly been borne out by subsequent events. Leo XIII, hardly an enemy of the “working man,” called it (in 1876) “a mortal plague which insinuates itself into the very marrow of human society only to bring about its ruin.” Pius XI, in 1937, called it “a pseudo-ideal of justice, of equality, and of fraternity,” thus linking it clearly to the French Revolution. He added that “communism is intrinsically evil, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever” (*Divini Redemptoris*). Pius XII excommunicated all those who “knowingly and with

full consent defend the materialistic doctrines of communism” (Decree of June 30, 1949). Many would have us believe that these condemnations only apply to communism—implying that its precursor, socialism, is somehow acceptable. Leo XIII recognized this ploy and said: “So great is the difference between their depraved teachings [of socialism] and the pure doctrine of Christ that none greater could exist: ‘for what participation hath justice with injustice, or what fellowship hath light with darkness?’” (*Quod Apostolici muneris*). As Pius XI said: “No one can be at the same time a sincere Catholic and a true socialist” (*Quad anno*, 1931).²

And communism for its part has had no hesitation in proclaiming its hatred of all religion. Rousseau, Voltaire, and the Encyclopaedists were all bitterly anti-Catholic. They were anti-religious, but it was Catholicism which bore the brunt of their attack. And once the leaders of the French Revolution came out into the open, the clergy and those that supported them were attacked with unmitigated cruelty. Marx, a secret member of a satanic sect,³ called religion “the opiate of the people” and taught that “the destruction of religion . . . is a requirement.”⁴ Lenin said that his program was “built up entirely on a scientific conception of the world, or more precisely on a materialistic conception. . . . Our propaganda includes necessarily the propaganda of atheism.” He further said that “what constitutes the philosophic basis of Marxism is . . . an absolutely atheistic materialism, resolutely hostile to any religion. . . . Religion and communism are incompatible in theory as well as in practice.”⁵ Lounatcharski, who was the Commissar for Public Education in Russia in 1933, openly said “we hate Christians. Even the best amongst them must be considered as our worst enemies.”⁶ Post-Conciliar attempts to paint socialism as a purely economic theory without metaphysical implications are absurd and play directly into the hands of the enemy.

When communists control a government, they use draconian methods to attack religion. When they are not in control, they take great care to disguise their anti-religious principles. As Lenin said: “It is necessary to learn the art of accepting political compromises, schemes, zigzags, maneuvers of conciliation and retreat, in short all the maneuvers necessary to accelerate the taking over of political power.”⁷ Kakol, the Director of the Office for Worship in Poland, stated publicly in 1976 that,

. . . we shall never accept the religious evangelization of children, of our youth. We shall not permit any influence whatsoever of the Church on cultural and social life. . . . We may avoid all violent aggressions, since otherwise the Church would present itself as a beleaguered citadel, which might increase its popularity. . . . While permitting the Church to carry out its action, we shall never renounce our principles. Even though in

Communism, "Ostpolitik," and Liberation Theology

my capacity of Minister of State I am obliged to smile in order to inspire confidence, as a communist I will fight religion and the Church without respite, from an ideological as well as philosophical point of view.⁸

Finally, it is of interest to quote Chicherin, Foreign Minister of the USSR in 1924:

We communists feel pretty sure we can triumph over London capitalism but Rome will prove a harder nut to crack. If Rome did not exist, we would be able to deal with all the various brands of Christianity. They would all finally capitulate before us. Without Rome, religion would die. . . . The result of the struggle . . . is uncertain.⁹

During the reign of Pius XII attempts were made to make socialism acceptable to the Catholic faithful. Individuals like Fr. Bede Jarret argued that the early Christians were socialists, and that if Marxism was divorced from its atheistic basis, his economic ideas were acceptable to the Church. Indeed, it was a favorite ploy to call Marx "the last of the scholastics."¹⁰ Teilhard de Chardin also dreamed of a utopian State along communist lines, but advocated that "the rational force of Marxism" be joined with "the human warmth of Christianity."¹¹ Yet another advocate of this *mélange* of opposites was Jacques Maritain. Hiding behind his reputation as a Thomist philosopher, he pointed out that the communists were doing a great deal of good in the world—that in fact they were behaving like true Christians while the faithful were doing just the opposite.¹² His theory of cooperation with Marxists was summarized in his book *True Humanism*, which was translated by Paul VI and became a sort of socio-political guide for the post-Conciliar establishment. He said that he dreamed of uniting the feast of Joan of Arc with that of the storming of the Bastille! Educational institutions (and seminaries) throughout the world, increasingly infiltrated by Marxist professors, also did their share in corrupting the minds of students. By the time of the Council both the laity and the middle clergy were well prepared to accept a shift in direction with regard to socialism and communism.

Yet another shift in attitude occurred. Where an earlier generation of Catholics was taught the social and economic doctrines of the Church—principles which fostered the widest possible distribution of private property coupled with the just use of capital—they are now instructed by Vatican II to adopt a Socialist economy.¹³ The Second World War fostered a worldview in which mankind was faced with a choice between capitalism and communism. This opposition is in many ways false, for both systems embrace the principle that man can and does live "by bread

alone.” Communism is not so much opposed to capitalism as it is its natural outgrowth. There is, after all, little difference between “monopolistic capitalism” and “State capitalism.”¹⁴ In such a context the Church’s socio-economic principles seemed irrelevant.

The coup de grace was given to the traditional stance by John XXIII’s encyclical *Pacem in Terris*. Instead of once again insisting that the Western world return to Christian principles, John XXIII advocated those of the French Revolution: “All men are equal by reason of their natural dignity. . . . It is not true that some human beings are by nature superior and others inferior. . . . Consequently there are no political communities that are superior or inferior by nature. All political communities are of equal natural dignity since they are bodies whose membership is made of these same human beings.” Both the communists and the traditional Catholics recognized the deadly nature of this statement. The former characterized it by declaring “no more Crusades” and the latter by stating that it was the end of *la chiesa cattolica romana*.¹⁵

Insofar as the post-Conciliar Church accepts the innate dignity of man without the need for him to conform himself to any divine ideal or model; insofar as she believes in the modernist idea of “progress” and “evolution” as applied to social, political, economic, and spiritual realms; and insofar as she accepts the concept that man is perfectible *qua* man; and that through the manipulation of certain “dynamic forces” and “historical processes” man is capable of creating some sort of “perfect society” on earth in which atheists as well as believers can work together, it accepts three of the fundamental tenets of Marxist theory. Communists for their part see no problem with allowing a certain amount of “religious freedom,” providing the “divinity” involved in no way opposes their plans for world conquest, and as long as believers do not submit themselves to any external authority like that of the traditional Church. To concede that God is responsible for “progress,” that God is the “power” behind the “dynamic forces,” and that God in fact really wants what Russia wants, is simply to use God in the service of the State. (Their attitude can be characterized as saying: if man wishes to retain his religious illusions, then let us paint the early Christians as socialists, and portray Christ and St. Joseph as factory workers.) The price of détente was not that the post-Conciliar Church accept evolutionism, historical determinism, and socialist economics—this she already had done; the price was that she never criticize communism and that she get those traditional bishops who were a thorn in the side of Marxist regimes, out of the way. This she fully complied with. She went further, admitted that “atheistic Christians” may have access to the “Community of Salvation,”¹⁶

and instructed the faithful that "all men, believers and unbelievers alike, ought to work for the rightful betterment of this world."

It is well known that Msgr. Willebrands (now Cardinal), acting on behalf of John XXIII, engineered the presence of the Russian Orthodox Church at the Council. He did this by promising that communism would neither be attacked nor condemned—such was openly admitted at the Pan-Orthodox Conference of Rhodes in 1964 where this silence was admitted to be the *sine qua non* for their participation. Indeed, when Bishop Castro Mayer of Campos in Brazil, introduced such a condemnation signed by over four hundred bishops, it was, contrary to the stringent rules imposed by those who had by then captured the Council, "lost" and ignored. That this Council which so loudly proclaimed its intention to deal with the problems of the Church, should remain silent on this issue was nothing if not extraordinary. What, one wonders, will the millions of victims of communist rule, from the prisoners of the Russian Gulags to the casualties of Pol Pot's regime, have to say to the Conciliar Fathers in some future life?¹⁷

Subsequent to these initial acts of "treason" against truth and the Divine Kingship of Christ, the post-Conciliar Church has made even more compromises to please the Russians than it has to please the Protestants. NKVD (later KGB) agents such as Metropolitan Nikodim, who died in the arms of John Paul I, have repeatedly been welcomed into the heart of the Vatican—men dripping with the blood of martyrs, being wined and dined at the expense of the Catholic faithful. Paul VI actually invited Nikodim to say Mass over the tomb of St. Peter! (When Nikodim died, the Russian Orthodox Church in exile refused to allow his funeral services within their Churches, so the Vatican allowed it in theirs.) Of course, such hospitality was reciprocated. When Pimen was enthroned as the new "Patriarch" of Moscow, Cardinal Willebrands was present as the official representative of Paul VI. When Pimen proclaimed the total destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, and its "triumphal return to Russian Orthodoxy," Cardinal Willebrands made no objection whatsoever. In matters as grave as this, such silence is equivalent to consent.¹⁸

Once again Christ is betrayed. The Ukrainian Church has had a long and bloody history of loyalty to the Holy See. Over the past eighty years its people have, in the face of government-induced famines and repeated massacres, remained steadfast in the Faith. When Bishop Velychkovsky of the Ukrainian Uniate Church was exiled by the USSR, he was treated as a simple priest by Rome. To recognize his rank and heroism, to pay him honor and respect, would have been equivalent to recognizing the existence of the Catholic Church behind the Iron Curtain. The very opposite

occurred when the false Bishop, Exarch Filaret, Superior of the Russian Orthodox Church for the Ukraine and an agent for the KGB arrived. This person, who was responsible for finding, betraying, and arresting Bishop Velychkovsky, was treated with the highest honors; he was a guest of honor at the Pontifical *Collegium Russicum* and of the *Secretariat for the Union of Christians*. Meanwhile, Fr. Mailleux S.J., of the *Vatican Congregation for Oriental Rites* and Rector of the Pontifical *Collegium Russicum* (and known as the “red priest”) declared that the Ukrainian Patriarchate which the Ukrainians had petitioned for should not be instituted because the Soviets would consider it to be a “hostile interference in the internal affairs of the USSR.” It was shortly after this that the Italian police discovered and exposed an international network of Russian communist espionage agents functioning from within the walls of this Pontifical College, a fact which the Vatican used all its influence to suppress. When the Russian Orthodox Church proceeded to set up a “Vicariate” to “govern” (i.e., subvert) the branches of the Ukrainian Church in Western nations, Rome once again remained obstinately silent. Since that time several examples of the use of this “Vicariate” to infiltrate espionage agents into the West have come to light; but then, in the eyes of the new Vatican “ostpolitik,” the NKVD has had a right “to interfere with the internal affairs of Western nations,” and indeed, this right, according to Vatican II, should be guaranteed by the civil authority. Things became so bad that by December 6, 1971 even *Newsweek Magazine* was saying “the Vatican appears to be ready to sacrifice the union of five million Catholics of the Ukrainian Rite within the Soviet Union”! To this day, despite request after request from some seven million Ukrainian Catholics (and their bishops), and despite the fact that Oriental rites with far fewer adherents have been granted the privilege, Rome has not established a Ukrainian Patriarchate. And not satisfied with this, Rome made Cardinal Slipyi, the highest ranking Ukrainian prelate, a virtual prisoner in the Vatican, prohibiting him “under obedience” from leaving Rome to visit the various Ukrainian communities throughout the world and from speaking on the issue. Now, it might be argued that all this compromise was done for the sake of alleviating the persecution of the Ukrainian Catholics under Russian political domination. In point of fact, it has done just the opposite. It has allowed for the unrestricted persecution of these faithful Catholics as has been documented again and again. Throughout his reign, Paul VI, who never hesitated to criticize the abuses imposed upon minorities in Western nations, never once publicly spoke out in defense of the Ukrainian faithful. All this led Cardinal Slipyi to finally speak out—to openly disobey the long silence imposed on him against his will by the Vatican authorities. He stated at the World Synod in Rome in 1971:

Communism, "Ostpolitik," and Liberation Theology

A dead hero is a more powerful stimulus for the Church than a living prisoner in the Vatican. . . . Catholic Ukrainians who have sacrificed mountains of bodies and shed rivers of blood for the Catholic Faith and for their fidelity to the Holy See, even now are undergoing a very terrible persecution, but what is worse, they are defended by no one. . . . Our Catholic faithful are prohibited from celebrating the liturgy and administering the sacraments and must descend into the Catacombs. Thousands and thousands of the faithful, priests, and bishops, have been thrown into prison and deported to the polar regions of Siberia. Now, however, because of negotiations and diplomacy, Ukrainian Catholics, who as martyrs and confessors suffered so much, are being thrown aside as inconvenient witnesses to past evils.

Spoken like a Cardinal Mindszenty,¹⁹ which brings us to consider yet another facet of the new Vatican "Ostpolitik," one which causes every faithful Catholic to hang his head in shame and sorrow. This heroic prelate, the primate of Hungary, was, as the *New York Times* Obituary notice stated, "regarded in the West as a symbol of anti-communism." He had for over thirty-five years refused to submit to the "atheistic and materialistic forces" of fascism and communism. Liberal politicians and clerics openly recognized the greatness of this man. President Ford said at the time of his death that the Cardinal "stood for courage, integrity, and unflinching faith. There was an heroic quality about him that marked this man as a crusader for liberty." Even post-Conciliar Cardinal Cooke of New York praised him as a man who had "endured sufferings far beyond the capacity of most human beings, yet he never ceased to be a symbol of courage, integrity, and hope. He was a man of faith and a deep, uncomplicated, and unswerving belief." (One would have expected Cardinal Cooke to point out that he was a Catholic and that he endured these sufferings for the Catholic Faith—but then, one must be grateful for little things.)

As is well known, Cardinal Mindszenty was released from a communist prison during the abortive Hungarian revolution, and because he refused to leave his country became a virtual prisoner in the American Embassy at Budapest. Here his presence proved to be a thorn in the side of the illegitimate Hungarian government, and, to again quote the *New York Times*, "an embarrassment" to "the Church which was seeking a *modus vivendi* with the Soviet block." (Since when has the Church been embarrassed by her heroes and martyrs?) Because of this the post-Conciliar Church sought to have the Cardinal released from Hungary and Paul VI sent his representative, Msgr. Zagon to the Primate in an attempt to have him agree, in return for his release, to quietly retire from public life—to betray by his silence both his Faith and nation. When the Cardinal refused, the Vatican pressured the American Government to make it clear that Mindszenty was no longer

a welcome guest. He finally left with the understanding that he would be free to speak the truth with the support of Rome. Within two weeks of his departure the Vatican lifted the excommunication on the peace priests (PAX—the priests who cooperated with the Hungarian government) and *L'Osservatore Romano* stated that the Cardinal's departure had "removed an obstacle hampering good relations between Church and State." After his release, all his efforts to support the struggles of Hungarian exiles were thwarted. Despite his age and ill health he embarked on a program of visiting the faithful exiled from Hungary for whom he was spiritually responsible. His criticisms of the Communist party in Hungary were so displeasing to Rome and Moscow that Paul VI demanded under "obedience" that all his public statements, even his sermons, be approved in advance by a "Roman Adviser." To this attempt at thought-control he refused to submit. Paul VI then asked him to resign his office for "pastoral reasons," and then announced that there had been "no working primate in Hungary for the last twenty-five years"! When the Cardinal refused to abdicate his charge, he was relieved of it—the Vatican announcing that he had voluntarily resigned—and this on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the "show trial" that had originally led to his imprisonment by the communists. Cardinal Mindszenty was forced to publicly contradict this distortion of the truth and to deny that he had in any way willingly abdicated. Thus passed the waning years of one of the Church's most staunch defenders, a man who had spent decades in prison under both the Nazis and the communists, a man respected by the entire world, a man whose biography was written by a Jew in gratitude for what he did for the victims of oppression, and a man who is a national hero for the Hungarian peoples. One can do no better than to quote the closing words of his *Memoirs*: "There is nothing more to say. I found waiting to greet me at the end of the road, complete and absolute exile." Paul VI made several attempts to discourage the publication of his *Memoirs*, which provide documentation of all these statements.²⁰

The policies initiated by John XXIII were followed by the even more pro-communist actions of Paul VI. Avro Manhattan calls him a Marxist Pope and calls his *Populo progresso* the most radical encyclical ever promulgated. It was Paul's conviction that the world was going to be communist and that the Church had better join the "forces of history." Throughout the communist world, whenever Paul VI nominated bishops or cardinals, he first made sure they had the approval of the various native communist dictators. In addition, he himself made sure that those he chose for the South American countries had leftist orientation. So much was this the case that Cuba's communist premier, Fidel Castro observed: "The U.S. shouldn't

Communism, "Ostpolitik," and Liberation Theology

worry about the Soviets in Latin America, because they are no longer revolutionaries. They should worry about the Catholic revolutionaries who are."²¹

The words and actions of Paul VI can only be described as incredible. Consider the following conversation between him and Archbishop Helder Camara of Olinda-Recife, Brazil, as reported in *Le Monde* (Sept. 26, 1974):

Opening his arms to Msgr. Helder Camara who approached him, Paul VI exclaimed: "Good morning, my communist bishop, How are you?" The Archbishop retorted: "And good morning to you, Our communist Pope!"

The same reportage continued, Archbishop Camara noting that "it is as if one played the piano with four hands, I start the theme and the Pope finishes it."

"How come one of your predecessors considered himself to be a King?" asked Msgr. Camara. Pope Paul VI took up the refrain: "And that he was head of the Pontifical States." Helder Camara: "Why is it that Pius IX believed that it was the devil who relieved him of these states and why did he not see that Garibaldi had been sent by God?" Pope Paul VI answered: "If one were to go through the archives of the Vatican one would see that Pius IX asked the bishops to deliver him of all that, but that it was the French bishops that forced it on him."

Apart from the fact that this is a re-writing of history, and apart from the fact that Garibaldi was a Freemason who spent his entire life in fighting the Church, this remains a most unusual statement. Either Paul VI was serious in greeting Archbishop Camara as "his communist bishop" (and the Archbishop is well known to be such), or he was acting like a buffoon in public. One may be permitted to wonder which alternative puts him in a better light. But if we have any doubts about his actual thoughts, let us again quote him in a discussion of communist China during the times of Mao Tse-Tung:

The Church recognizes and favors the just expression of the present historical phase of China and the transformation of ancient forms of aesthetic culture into inevitable new forms that rise out of the social and industrial structure of the modern world. . . . We would like to enter into contact once again with China in order to show with how much interest and sympathy we look on their present and enthusiastic efforts for the ideals for a diligent, full, and peaceful life.²²

With John Paul II the same policies continued to be followed. From the start Wojtyla committed himself to the program established by his “spiritual father” Paul VI. Moreover, John Paul II, who had for years traveled freely in the West, must have had the confidence of the Polish government. What, one must ask, would allow a regime that could never tolerate a Mindszenty to tolerate a Wojtyla. Mindszenty himself gave the answer when he said shortly before his death that “of all the Hungarian bishops, I am the only one who did not take the oath of fidelity to the Godless State.”²³ Wojtyla was known to be a close friend of Cardinal Wyszynski “who went so far as to renounce the Church’s right to private property.”²⁴ (How can a Church without any possessions fulfill the charitable command of Christ to feed the poor and succor the weak? And how can they educate the laity? And what right does any prelate have to give the offerings of the faithful to a communist government?) Perhaps this explains why the Metropolitan Nikodim opined that the Catholic Church finds nothing wrong with accepting “a public form of property such as is exemplified by socialism of the Soviet type.”²⁵ On the other hand, perhaps communism has softened its attitude towards the Church because of its own refusal to condemn this “intrinsically evil . . . plague” that has “insinuated itself into the very marrow of human society.” We can only speculate on such matters, but what is beyond speculation are the statements and actions of John Paul II both before and after his assuming the title of “Bishop of Rome.”

Consider the statements promulgated in Vatican II’s document, *The Church in the Modern World*, of which John Paul II was one of the principal authors. This document espouses so many concepts that are basic to Marxist theory: progress; the dynamic forces of history; man *qua* man perfecting himself and building a better world to live in, that, as mentioned before, one of the Protestant “observers” commented that the Council Fathers had listened to the Gospel of Marx as much as to that of Mark! Again, Wojtyla has expressed high regard for Teilhard de Chardin, whose insane ideas also influenced this document and who dreamed of blending Christianity with Marxist theory. Finally, not once has John Paul II, either before or after his election, criticized Marxism as such. While he has occasionally been critical of communist violation of human rights, he has never questioned their right to rule. In a similar manner, his criticism of the “social activism” of priests has never been accompanied by a condemnation of their adherence to the Marxist gestalt.²⁶ And again, while he has spoken out against “class warfare” and “political violence,” he has never clearly condemned the proponents of Liberation Theology.²⁷ Such a persistent pattern of behavior cannot be excused on the basis of necessity or “diplomatic neutrality.” One cannot be “neutral” in the face of evil.

In the early days of his Pontificate, in a speech given at Puebla (Mexico), he stated that he had no objection to the expropriation of private property, "correctly carried out."²⁸ Now, what communist regime has ever carried it out incorrectly? In his encyclical *Laborem Exercens* he speaks of "satisfactory socialization" without ever clearly defining the term. He then proceeds to tell us that "Christian Tradition has never upheld this right [to private property] as absolute and untouchable. On the contrary, it has always understood this right within the broader context of the right common to all of us to use the goods of the whole of creation. The right to private property is subordinated to the right to common use, to the fact that goods are meant for everyone."

Now, one cannot doubt but that the law of Christian charity limits the use of one's private property, and certainly the Church has always insisted that this property be obtained in a legitimate manner. But John Paul II says nothing of all this in his encyclical, as indeed, he nowhere makes clear the fact that there is such a thing as a Catholic Economics based on justice, the application of God's laws, and the building up of the Kingship of Christ.

One of the first acts of John Paul II was to appoint Cardinal Augustino Casaroli as his Secretary of State. *Time Magazine* describes this individual as "loyal, highly skilled, and completely committed to the Second Vatican Council reforms. . . . [He] has been the Vatican's top emissary to communist regimes ever since Pope John XXIII launched negotiations to help the East block churches survive. [What did they do before John XXIII?] Though the appointment is regarded as John Paul's endorsement of this policy, Casaroli modestly shuns his common designation as the 'Architect of Ostpolitik.'"²⁹ Casaroli has no hesitation in assuring the world that "the Catholics who live in Cuba are happy under the socialist regime."³⁰ As is well known, John Paul II has made more than one "pilgrimage" to his native land in support of "Solidarity," which organization accepts a Socialist economy in principle.³¹ As noted before, when a Czech newspaper accused John Paul II of being anti-communist and a "reactionary," an unsigned editorial in *L'Osservatore Romano* expressed strong indignation and called the charge "grossly offensive" and "absurd."³² Prior to the "martyrdom" of Archbishop Romero, John Paul II bluntly told him the Church "is not against communism." Archbishop Lefebvre has openly accused John Paul of "changing the bishops to replace them with communist collaborator bishops."³³

How can we tie together the new "papal" orientations towards Marxism, the teachings of Vatican II, and the political activities of the post-Conciliar Church? The answer is to be found in the amalgam of Liberation Theology.

LIBERATION THEOLOGY

Liberation Theology openly proclaims itself to be Marxist socialism. Fr. Boff tells us it aims “to replace the capitalist system and move towards a new society, a society of the socialist type,” and Fr. Gutierrez speaks of “the concrete historical march forward in the direction of socialism.” Now what does a “society of the socialist type” mean. Does it mean individuals working together to create a more just society? Hardly, for such has been the aim of men of good will since time immemorial. Does it mean a society in which the government limits the greed of its more avaricious citizens and controls some of the means of production? Again, the answer must be no, for governments have always acted in this manner. Liberation Theology means far more; it means the creation of a Marxist society. As the *Primer encuentro por una Iglesia solidaria* tells us: “Christians must be committed both personally and collectively to the building of a new society. This new society must be a classless society in which there is collective ownership of the means of production.” The ownership of private property inevitably leads to oppression and hence to class warfare. The only way to eliminate oppression and to resolve class conflicts is to eliminate private property. As Fr. Ellacuria says, “the task of the Church is to eradicate sin, the cause of which is private property.”

And so we see that what liberation theologians aim at is not just “updating a sluggish old inventory by slapping a new label on obsolete goods,” but the creation of a “new society,” or as Fr. Segundo calls it, “a new humanity.” Fr. Gutierrez openly says that the “goal is the creation of a new man” with a “new universalistic consciousness . . . a new way for men and women to be more human . . . a human being that grows progressively free of all servitude preventing it from being the agent of its own lot in history.”³⁴

And how is this to be brought about? The solution lies in the dialectic of “class warfare.” As Fr. Gutierrez says, “the construction of a different society and a new human being will be authentic only if it is taken on by the oppressed themselves.” One of the first steps in this process is the “conscientization” of the working classes. This means, making them aware of their power and encouraging them to rise against their oppressors—the rich. The next step is for Christians to openly engage in the class struggle. “Class struggle,” says Gutierrez, “is a fact, and neutrality in this matter is impossible. . . . We must avoid getting bogged down in doctrinal analysis—that is, in an attempt to treat the problem outside of the framework of the class struggle.” Indeed, the only way one can be a committed Christian is to engage in the class struggle, for it is in this process, and only in this process,

that we can meet and love God—the “God of history” who reveals himself only in history. Sin is no longer separation from God, but separation from one’s oppressed brothers. Liberation has its beginning in the battle against the established order. The new Parousia does not come from on high; it proceeds from the same process of salvific liberation which is the work of history. “There is only one way to encounter Christ in the poor and to receive the power to become a son of God and a brother of man,” and that is “to enlist sincerely and effectively in the struggle for liberation. . . . Grace is the solidarity of the people, sin consists in failure to cooperate with that solidarity. . . . Class solidarity lived out within this conflict is the sole means of realizing the Christian imperative.” If this results in violence, such is inevitable, for the “rich” will never give up their power willingly. Indeed, as Fr. Jose Miranda assures us, “Jesus was a hardened revolutionary” and “explicitly approved of and defended the use of violence.” And so we find liberation theologians committed to a Marxist analysis of the historical process, and indeed, according to Fr. André-Vincent, Gutierrez openly maintains that Marxism “is the common denominator of all the theologies of liberation.”

Being a historical process, salvation/liberation is for all who “enlist sincerely and effectively in the struggle.” Indeed, Gutierrez tells us God will judge us “by our capacity to create brotherly conditions of life” by which of course he means revolutionary socialism. “Only by loving mankind as he exists in the concrete historical situation can man know and love God.” But Christians, unlike atheistic Marxists, are failing to do this. And so, following the logic of his position, Marxists are certainly to be included in the salvific process. What results is a process which turns Marxists into “Christians” and Christians into Marxists.

In Gutierrez’s view liberation is not limited to the socio-economic sphere. As he states:

Modern man’s aspirations include not only liberation from exterior pressures. . . . He seeks likewise an interior liberation, in an individual and intimate dimension. . . . Man seeks liberation not only on the social plane, but also on a psychological plane. He seeks an interior freedom understood however not as an ideological evasion from social confrontation or as the internalization of a situation of dependency. Rather it must be in relation to the real world of the human psyche as understood since Freud.

Liberation Theology also promises man that he will no longer suffer from penis envy and the Oedipus complex!

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Liberation theologians all—or virtually all—believe in progress and evolution. As Gutierrez says, in phrases reminiscent of the documents of Vatican II:

Various political events have profoundly modified history. The rapid development of science and the consequent mastery of nature; the use of new instrumentation for the understanding of social reality . . . have hastened the maturation of political consciousness. . . . History demonstrates that the achievements of man are cumulative and allow for even greater achievements in generations yet to come. . . . There is only a single process of human development definitively and irreversibly assumed by Christ.

As a result of progress man is also changing. “The scope of our radical challenge to the prevailing social order would escape us, were we unaware of the change that has taken place in human self-understanding—the change that has occurred in the approach to truth.” And more:

God reveals Himself only in history and salvation is a historical process. There is only one single history, one single process adding up to the evolution of the species, and in that process, the genesis of humanity is the central axis, a genesis realized through the energy of conflict in the struggle for liberation, class against class. This truth is the primary object of faith.

The culmination of this process will be the acceptance by man of the socialist “truth”—“the break with the social order of oppression and the erection of a classless society.” And so it is that Gutierrez “affirms a utopia on the way to becoming a historical reality.” And this utopian society will, he also assures us, be a scientific machine age and an industrial one. When this is achieved, mankind will be liberated. This is the praxis of liberation, the manifestation of salvation history in its concrete reality.

So much for “liberation,” but what of theology? According to Gutierrez this science comes from the people, or more precisely, from society. It is his contention that the theology of St. Thomas Aquinas reflected mediaeval and feudal society, while liberal theology—the musings of modernists over the past three-quarter of a century—reflected the ideas of the French Revolution. (With regard to the latter he is obviously correct.) And currently he promises us his own special brand: “a different analysis of reality” and “a new way to do theology based on praxis”³⁵—that is practice or action—“praxis first, and then reflection. . . . The pastoral activity of the Church,” he tells us, “does not flow as a conclusion from premises . . . rather it reflects upon it. . . . The only future theology has . . . is to become the theology of the future. . . . Our approach is to reflect critically on the praxis

of liberation and not to limp after reality." An extraordinary statement! The praxis of liberation creates reality and we are obliged to derive our theology from it. But then, such is to be expected if "the Church springs from the people."

How does the Church "spring from the people"? The answer is that history is "the locus of revelation." Christ reveals Himself in history; all of Scripture is historical. Christ became, not man, but "poor." Liberation praxis is the transforming action taking in the entire world and all mankind—a manifestation of the creative and redemptive action of God. The discernment of this historical process is what Liberation Theology is all about. (This is reminiscent of John XXIII's theory of history, of determining the activity of God by understanding the "signs of the time.") Does it have God for its object? Yes, because "God reveals himself only in history and salvation is a historical process" (Vatican II once again). Not only does theology and the Church spring from the people, but also virtue. "Our new vision, attentive to structural factors, will help Christians to avoid the fallacy of proposing a personal change detached from concrete conditions, as a necessary prerequisite to any social transformation. . . . Changing the social and cultural structure is a way of changing the human heart."

Another favorite theme of liberation theologians is that throughout history religion has supported the power structure of self interest. The accusation is false, tiresome, and hypocritical. The only time the Church has supported the power structure is when it is convinced either that such a structure was itself Catholic and acting in the best interests of society, or when it applied the doctrine of lesser evil. Did the early Popes who were jailed and martyred support the existing power structure in Rome? Did the Popes of a later era support the Byzantine Empire? Did the Church that produced a St. Thomas More and a St. John Fisher support the power structure during the Reformation? Did Popes Pius IX, Leo XIII, and St. Pius X support the international financial powers? All this is not to deny that there were individual examples of men who fell short of their high calling as followers of Christ. But what makes this particular theme of the liberation theologians most offensive is their desire to see the Church support communist regimes such as Cuba and Nicaragua, and indeed to introduce similar regimes throughout the rest of the world. Will not the future victims of such regimes look upon the Church which helped to establish them with more than a jaundiced eye?

Throughout the rest of the world! The reader should not be deluded into thinking that Liberation Theology is a South American phenomenon. The Columbian Fathers speak of the "Reverse Mission" of bringing such ideas back to Ireland. The Jesuit Order in its 32 General Congregations committed

all Jesuits throughout the world to the spreading of “liberal theology.”³⁶ The *National Jesuit News* subsequently published a document entitled “National Planning and the need for a Revolutionary Social Strategy: A Christian-Maoist perspective,” in which their members are told the Society “must purge itself of its bourgeois social consciousness and identify with the proletariat.” No wonder that Fr. Juan Alfaro, who teaches at the Pontifical Gregorian University of Rome, instructed the International Theological Commission that “Christ was a kind of Palestinian Che Guevara.” No wonder priests in South America are reported as active participants in guerrilla bands. No wonder that the American bishops are trying to convince the faithful through their “Peace Pastoral” to accept John Dewey’s famous principle “better red than dead.” *Novus Ordo* Catholics who donate money to the missions should know that such funds not infrequently go to support communist guerrilla activities throughout the world.

Consider Cuba: Paul VI was effusive in praise of this sad nation. In April of 1976 he said “the world will march irresistibly towards the new order and the new man for which we all long. Cuba will play its part, joyful and disinterestedly in this grant joint undertaking.” And Evaristo Cardinal Arns, Archbishop of Sao Paulo in Brazil (the largest diocese in the world) wrote to congratulate Cuban president Fidel Castro on the 30th anniversary of the Revolution, stating: “The Christian faith discovers in the conquests of the Revolution the signs of the Kingdom of God that manifest themselves in the hearts and structures that permit and make of political conviviality a work of love. . . . We know that this victory doesn’t mean yet our freedom and that we will have to face all types of pressures and difficulties from the owners of Great Capital. I hope, however, that our *comunidades iglesias de bas* will know how to preserve the seeds of life that have been sown” (Christmas, 1988).

Comunidades iglesias de bas in Brazil or “base communities” established in North American parishes have the same goal in mind: the “wholesome socialization” of their members. Consider the statement of the Catholic International Center of Research and Information under the title of *Pro Mundi Vita* (University of Louvain in Belgium):

The rejection of a pseudo-Christianity is not necessarily a rejection of Christ Himself. . . . It would appear that China accepted the spirit of Christ from another source . . . that is, from Marxism. If the Chinese have, in fact, created a society with more faith, more hope, and more life than the “Christian” Apostles of Christ, we must follow where the spirit blows. The Chinese society today . . . is, I believe, further along than our own on the way to the true human society, the Kingdom of God, if you will. I believe China is the only truly Christian nation in the world in our days. .

Communism, “Ostpolitik,” and Liberation Theology

.. Through Marxism, the Christian ideas have reached China, ideas which were new to her. . . . A mystique of disinterested work and service for others; an aspiration for justice; exaltation of a simple and frugal life; the elevation of the peasant masses and the disappearance of social classes—these are the ideals towards which the China of today is oriented. But are not these the ideals that have been incomparably expressed in the encyclicals *Pacem in Terris* and *Populorum Progressio* and in the Synodal document *Justice in the World* [Vatican II]? Today Chinese children are being taught to have a sense of responsibility to the community, but isn't this exactly what the Second Vatican Council has asked so insistently of the People of God?³⁷

Or again, one must wonder how the “boat people” from Vietnam felt when Msgr. Nguyen Van Bihn, the Archbishop of Saigon, agreed to “cooperate” with the communist regime, or when seventeen bishops in Brazil published a document entitled, “The Church in Vietnam is Disposed to Survive” (April 25, 1976) stating:

What difference does it make if the regime expels foreign missionaries. . . . In the final analysis, were not the missionaries and the Churches also the symbol of the misery and the domination of our people? The regime which “liberates” our people can now enslave our Church.

It is ideas like this that led Bishop Helder Camara to appoint his personal friend and adviser, Fr. Joseph Comblin, as a professor in his seminary. This infamous Belgian priest is the author of the “Comblin document,” a blueprint of communist plans for a takeover of Brazil. To quote a pertinent passage:

Social reforms will not be made through persuasion, nor through platonic discussions in congress. How will these reformers be installed? It is by a process of force . . . the power will have to be authoritarian and dictatorial . . . the power must neutralize the forces that resist: it will neutralize the armed forces if they are conservative; it will have to control radio, TV, the press, and other media of communication and censor the destructive and reactionary criticisms. . . . In any case, it will be necessary to organize a system of repression.³⁸

Lenin could not have said it better!

Consider also the statement of the bishops of Mozambique, who voiced their support for Samora Machel, the erstwhile Marxist president of this unfortunate country which, according to *The Wanderer*, was a “palm fringed Gulag” in which “baptism was forbidden by law”:

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

We pledge ourselves to the revolution which intends radically to transform society in Mozambique into a community for solidarity of all people of good will, whether believers or non-believers.³⁹

And in America the “new Economy of the Gospel” and Liberation Theology is being spread, not only through sermons (when did you last hear communism condemned from a *Novus Ordo* pulpit?), but also through such programs as Cursillo and Renew⁴⁰—though in slightly less blatant form. Bishop Basil Losten of Philadelphia has attempted to draw attention to the problem. Speaking at a Bishop’s Meeting in Chicago in 1977 he stated:

It is evident that communism finds in religion today invaluable allies in its quest for global power and empire. The fantastic plan to turn the Church into an instrument of communist conquest would be unbelievable if we did not see it all happening before our eyes. . . . There are people on our staff of so-called consultants who take many trips to the Soviet Union or atheistically-dominated countries. They receive a certain amount of indoctrination and then return to poison our minds and the minds of the American Catholic public. Perhaps it is too late to “turn the tide.”

Certainly one won’t turn the tide by addressing the bishops! And so it is that the process of “wholesome socialization” continues unopposed by Western governments and unopposed by the Church. Recalling the words of Comrade Chicherin quoted in the opening paragraphs of this chapter: “If Rome did not exist, we would be able to deal with all the various brands of Christianity. . . . Without Rome, religion would die.” One is led to ask if in fact such is not what we see before our eyes today.

Conservative *Novus Ordo* Catholics claim that John Paul II and Benedict XVI (Cardinal Ratzinger) have condemned Liberation Theology in more recent statements. Such is by no means the case. What they have done is condemn the excesses of those who advocate either violence or class warfare. The rest of the program—the plans for the progressive socialization of society—continue to have their full approval.⁴¹ The old Teilhardian dream of uniting the “rational power” of Marxism with the “warmth” and more human nature of the Christian religion persists. Once again however, one sees the naiveté—if not outright complicity—of the post-Conciliar establishment. One cannot assume a Marxist analysis without drawing the logical conclusions that such an analysis inevitably brings in its train: the creation of a new kind of man; progressive evolutionism and historical determinism; a classless society; the elimination of private property; authority placed in the hands of the people, or more exactly, in the hands

of those who control what the people think; and coercive utopianism are inseparable from such premises. As for the atheistic and materialistic ideation, even if such is not actively pushed: it will inevitably result if all the other goals are achieved.

Consider the issue of private property. The propaganda of communism, the statements of liberation theologians, and the teaching of the post-Conciliar "Popes" obscure the vital distinction between the voluntary surrender of one's wealth and the compulsory expropriation of other people's property. The early Church in Jerusalem had many aspects of a religious community. Yet Ananias and Sapphira were not punished by Christ because they refused to surrender their property, but because they lied. "Whiles it remained, was it not thine own?" said St. Peter, "and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?" (Acts 4:35; 5:4). There is no evidence that the Christians in Rome, Ephesus, Corinth, or Philippi "had all things in common." Indeed, they were appropriately reprimanded for not voluntarily supporting their religious brethren. Nowhere does Scripture condone "expropriation, properly carried out." It is not without reason that the bad thief crucified with Christ has been labeled "the first communist." Rather consider what Scripture says: "What soldier ever serves at his own expense? Who plants a vineyard and does not eat of its fruit? Who feeds the flock and does not eat of the milk of the flock? Do I speak these things on human authority? Or does not the Law also say these things? . . . He who plows should plow in hope and he who threshes, in hope of partaking of the fruits" (1 Cor. 9:7-13). It is one thing for monks who are "dead to the world" to give up private property, and quite another for those who remain in the world and assume the responsibilities thereof.⁴² By controlling all access to food, clothing, and shelter, a socialist regime reduces its citizens to an actual state of slavery—as long as they do the bidding of the State, they are rewarded materially; but if they oppose the State they are either murdered, enslaved in "corrective labor camps," or incarcerated in psychiatric institutions. It is well known that in Russia a person who fell out of favor with the Party lost his apartment and his job. Unemployed for over three months, he was declared a "parasite on society," arrested, and sent to Siberia.

Consider the classless society in which all men are equal. We pray each day, "Thy kingdom come . . ." Now Heaven is a hierarchical society where Divine Law and Order prevail. Its reflection on earth is also a hierarchical society where those in authority have the responsibility to enforce God's laws in such a manner as leads to the greater good of society—the ultimate, greatest good being the sanctity of its members. As to the much-vaunted socialist equality, one can do no better than to quote a passage from Taylor

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Caldwell's *Dialogues with the Devil*. A soul, recently entering Hell, is asked what his greatest desire was on earth. He answered with a very righteous expression "justice for all." The Devil continued:

That was admirable, for who does not admire justice, even I? But I probed him. He declared that in his earthly view all men deserved what all other men possessed, whether worthy or not. "They are men, so they are equal and being born they have a right to the fruits of the world, no matter the condition of their birth or the content of their minds, or their capacities." I conducted him through the pleasures of my hell, and he was delighted that no soul was lesser in riches than another, and that every soul had access to my banquets and my palaces, no soul was distinguishable from another, none possessed what another did not possess. Every desire was immediately gratified, he discovered. He smiled about him joyfully. He said, "ere justice is attained!"

Then he saw that no face was joyful, however mean or lofty its features. He remarked, wonderingly, on the listlessness of my damned, and how they strolled emptily through thoroughfares filled with music and through streets wherein there was not a single humble habitation. He heard cries of pleasure over my laden tables, and then heard them silenced, for there was no need now for food and where there is no need there is no desire and no enjoyment. He saw that the poorest on earth were clothed in magnificence and jewels, yet they wept the loudest. He was no fool. He said, "Satiety." True I answered him, but satiety can live only in the presence of total equality. That night he came to me on his knees and begged for death. I struck him with my foot and said, "O man, this was the hell you made, and this was the desire of your heart, so eat, drink, and be merry." He attempted to hang himself like Judas and I laughed at his futility.⁴³

The idea of progress, evolution, and historical determinism directing society towards some socialist utopia is pure illusion. If the nature of society is pre-determined, then man has no free will and no responsibility. Moreover, if such is the case, how can one rationally condemn the bourgeoisie for their failure to join the dynamic forces of history dragging us inevitably into the future? Coercive utopianism that would create a new society and a "new kind of man" who is "socialist" by nature is equally absurd, for man, made in the image of God, has a fallen nature, and no socialist regime will ever "put humpty dumpty together again." And if man is not perfectible apart from his divine vocation, then society is not perfectible apart from God.

The socialist and Rousseauist dream places man at the center of creation, that is, man independent of God and any higher authority than himself. (This is what the "innate dignity of man" advocated by Vatican II is all

about.) It follows from this premise that all authority is said to derive from man and not from God. In practice, however, the leaders of such a society control the thinking of its members through education and the control of communications media. Hence it follows that socialist man, no longer able to adhere to fixed and divine criteria of right and wrong, justice and injustice, becomes once again the slave of his own passions—of the passions of his leaders. The placing of authority in man and giving him inalienable rights that are in opposition to God is nothing other than another version of Lucifer's *non serviam*, I will not serve.

In light of these facts, the acts and statements of the post-Conciliar "Popes" about communism, and their claim that such regimes govern legitimately, leaves the Catholic soul in a state of mild shock. How can such be possible? Even the man on the street is aware of the fact that all communist regimes control the education of children and by a variety of overt and covert techniques subvert their religious belief, replacing it with the false tenets of Marxist-Leninism. Those who believe that communists are capable of changing their attitudes towards religion simply delude themselves. They have but to read the publications of the communists to see their error. How can anyone say that a band of atheistic, murdering revolutionaries dedicated to the destruction of the Church, the dethronement of Christ, and the spreading of the Kingdom of Satan on earth, ever have the authority of God (the source of all authority) to carry out such a program? (God may allow such to happen because of our sins, but He can no more approve it than He can approve the acts of Judas.) And how can a man who claims to be Peter's successor ever act in such a manner as to lend support to such regimes? To admit that communist governments rule legitimately is to claim they derive their right to do so from God and therefore to proclaim that God is "divided against Himself."

Communism is but the clearest manifestation of that rebellion of the Angels against God, of those forces who falsely promise to man that he can be "like the gods." In principle Marxism is the total inversion of Christian metaphysics which is why it has "no enemies on the left"—no groups that would or could carry the rebellion to greater extremes. If it appeals to the innate sense of justice in the human soul, it does so only to use it for its own purposes, for it by its very nature denies that there is any such thing as a human soul or justice⁴⁴—justice is for Marxism-Leninism what promotes the Revolution. It can never be other than anti-religious because, as Marx himself said, "the critique of religion ends up with the doctrine that Man is the supreme Being for Man."⁴⁵

This is why Pius XI called communism a "pseudo-ideal" and said that "no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

any undertaking whatsoever.” Pius XII also described the kind of Church the communists would find acceptable:

A mute Church which consents to change the law of God, when its mission is to proclaim and defend it. . . .

A Church which discards its intangible doctrinal foundations on which Christ has established it, in order to willingly submit itself to the caprices of the opinion and instability of the crowds. . . .

A Church without the energy to resist the oppression of consciences, to defend the legitimate rights of the people and their liberty. . . .

A cowardly and servile Church . . . betraying the mission entrusted to it: “Go to all the thoroughfares and preach . . . go and teach all the nations”

And has not Pius XII described the post-Conciliar Church with accuracy? He continues and asks a question that should be posed to all those who have followed in his high office.

May the Pope remain mute when the rights of teaching the children is denied to their parents, according to the orders of a minority regime which wishes to move them away from Christ? And when this State, overstepping the limits of its competence, assumes the power of suppressing the dioceses, deposing the bishops, ransacking the Ecclesiastical organization and removing from the latter the means indispensable for the well-being of souls?⁴⁶

There are some who will consider the inclusion of this chapter as dated. We no longer hear much of communism as such. However, one has only to look at the present state of the world to see that Teilhardian ideation and socialist thinking pervades us in almost every area of education and governance. Names are changed, but the principles remain constant. It is the function of the Church to speak out against these errors and provide guidance for both the faithful and also for those who remain outside her Sacred Body. The current emphasis in which the post-Conciliar Church has lent her support is the creation of a one-world government along socialist lines (the United Nations, which the “Popes” have called the “hope of the world”; a one-world economy; and above all a one-world religion, which is the fundamental thrust of ecumenism.) This chapter hopes to provide some of the roots of these ideas that have become so pervasive.

Communism, “Ostpolitik,” and Liberation Theology

Notes

¹ One should not be taken in by those who would have us believe that socialism is communism divested of its more cruel aspects. There is no fundamental difference between socialism and communism. Both are based on atheistic Marxism. Both aim to create a classless society in which all property is State-owned and controlled. Socialism is but the necessary precursor of the ideal condition being strived for, which is called communism. Thus Russia calls herself “The Union of Socialist Republics.” This relationship is made quite clear by Tage Lindbom, party theoretician and director of the archives of the “Social Democratic Party” in Sweden for 35 years. See his book *The Tares and the Good Grain* (Mercer: Macon, Ga., 1983).

² It should be quite clear that the traditional Church, in condemning communism, in no way gave a *carte blanche* to rampant capitalism. (The encyclicals of Leo XIII, especially *Rerum Novarum*, make this quite clear.) She, however, defended the “right” to private property because she knew that there could be no political or social freedom—to say nothing of religious freedom—on the part of those who live under a system where the State controls food, clothing, and shelter in an absolute manner. On the other hand, she has never failed to promote Justice and Charity—as witness her teaching that all wealth is held in “trust” and that the individual is responsible and answerable to God for how he uses the gifts of this world. As R.H. Tawney has said, mediaeval society was one in which men “had not learned to persuade themselves that greed was enterprise and avarice economy” (*Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* [Transaction Publishers: London/New York, several editions]). The mediaeval serf who paid the State (or “baron”) one or two days a week of free labor, was infinitely better off than modern man who pays two to four times as much in the form of “taxes” to progressively socialistic governments. Moreover, the serf could never be taxed on his home and small private holdings, but only on what he took off his land to sell at market. In addition, he could not be dispossessed of his lands under any circumstances. His children were educated at the local monastery and hospitals were well endowed as caring for the “poor” was considered both a privilege and an obligation. The serfs were not freed from their bondage as our history books would have us believe, but rather had their lands expropriated from them so their fields could be turned into pasture lands. All this is not to state that mediaeval society was “perfect,” for even in the Garden of Eden a snake was to be found. It was, however, a Christian society, and one that guaranteed the “freedom” and economic security of its members.

What is forgotten in the polemic between capitalism and communism is that there is a Christian theory of economics. (The New Church also seems to have totally forgotten this.) It is not a question of turning back the hands of the clock (which is not perhaps such a bad idea), but of re-establishing society on the same principles that underlay mediaeval society.

One must also dispel the error that “the early Christians were communists.” It is true that those living in religious communities shared their goods—they still do. But people living in religious communities are “dead to the world,” and have no worldly responsibilities. Those living in the world only shared their goods when their possessions were in excess of their own present and future needs. Those interested in the facts relating to this issue are referred to Fr. John Ryan, *The Alleged Socialism of the Early Church Fathers* (Herder: London, 1913).

³ Rev. Richard Wurmbrand (Lutheran), *Was Karl Marx a Satanist?* (Diane Books: Calif., 1985).

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

⁴ “It is the opium of the people. The destruction of religion, as an illusory good fortune of the people, is a requirement of its real good fortune. To demand the renouncement of his illusions in his situation is to demand the renouncement of the situation which needs illusion” (Quoted in Hagel, *Contribution to the Critique of Philosophy of the Right*). The true opium of the people are the false philosophies of “progress” and evolution.

⁵ *Works*, Vol. X; Vol. XV; and *The ABC of Communism*.

⁶ *New Anti-Religious Manual*.

⁷ *Lenin, Socialism, and Religion, Collected Works* (Progress Publications: Moscow, 1965).

⁸ Press conference, May 5, 1976. Quoted in *Communism and Christianity in Theory and Practice*, by Aid to the Church in Need (Chichester, England).

⁹ *German Foreign Office Report*, Vol. 1, 1925. Quoted in *Lenin, Socialism, and Religion*.

¹⁰ Fr. Bede Jarret, *Social Theories of the Middle Ages* (Brown: Boston, 1926). Marx denied the fecundity of money and hence was in agreement with the Scholastics on this point; but only this point.

¹¹ Mary Lukas and Ellen Lukas, *Teilhard the Man, the Priest, the Scientist* (Doubleday: N.Y., 1977). For a full discussion of Teilhard, see Wolfgang Smith, *Teilhardism and the New Religion*.

¹² This is the origin of the concept of the “anonymous” or “atheistic” Christian which is so dear to the heart of liberation theologians.

¹³ The encyclicals of Leo XIII deal with this in great detail. Space does not allow for any proper discussion of Catholic socio-economic principles. The reader is referred to Fr. Denis Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ and the Reorganization of Society* (Regina: Ireland, 1945), and to R.H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*.

¹⁴ Capitalism can of course mean many things. If communism—the complete economic enslavement of man—is the end point of monopolistic capitalism, it clearly is better to live under the latter where economic enslavement is only partial.

¹⁵ See Chapter 9. The subsequent effects on Italian and world politics are documented by Avro Manhattan, *The Vatican-Moscow Alliance*. He refers to John XXIII as the “pink Pope” and Paul VI as the “red Pope,” and says that when John XXIII died “San Petri, instead of putting out a white and yellow papal flag from the Vatican balcony, should have hung the red flag, with the sickle and the cross well displayed on it—the true symbol of the revolution which John XXIII had started within and outside the Roman Catholic Church.”

¹⁶ Documented in Chapter 11.

¹⁷ These facts have been confirmed by several authors, including Fr. Wiltgen, *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber*, and Avro Manhattan, *The Vatican-Moscow Alliance*.

¹⁸ “Ukraine: A Tragedy Without Frontiers,” in *Crusade for Christian Civilization* (Jan-Feb, N.Y., 1977). The reader is also referred to Vytautas Skuodis, “Spiritual Genocide in Lithuania” (*The Wanderer*, June 3, 1982). The author of this *samizdat* (clandestine) publication was caught and given a five year jail sentence for telling the truth. Fr. Charles McFadden, who has totally changed his attitude towards communism since Vatican II, documents the “unfortunate tension between the leaders of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the Holy See.” He states that “the Ukrainian bishops, led by Cardinal Slipyi, contend that this is one more case of misdirected ‘ostpolitik’ of the Vatican. They feel that, at best, the Vatican’s views are based on naiveté . . . at worst, they represent an abject surrender to those who have persecuted the Church, a ‘squalid’ desire to fraternize with the heretical Orthodox Church (in the ecumenical hope of bringing it into unity with Rome) and even to dialogue with the atheists of the Kremlin” (*Christianity Confronts Communism* [Franciscan: Chicago, 1981]).

Communism, “Ostpolitik,” and Liberation Theology

¹⁹ Given the “red hat” by Pope Pius XII. Some of the material in this and the preceding paragraph may seem dated, but one should remember that John Paul II considered Paul VI to be his spiritual master, and while the fall of the communist regime has changed points of emphasis, the principles remain the same.

²⁰ Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, *Memoirs* (MacMillan: N.Y., 1974).

²¹ Avro Manhattan, *The Vatican-Moscow Alliance*. The Castro quote is from *U.S. News*, Dec. 11, 1972.

²² Talk to the Congregation for the Evangelization of the Peoples, 1976. One must remember that at the time such a statement was shocking. Today, for post-Conciliar Catholics brought up to accept socialism and communism as compatible with the teachings of the Church, the statement loses all its force.

²³ For a bishop to give his oath of loyalty to an atheistic government is to excommunicate himself. During the French Revolution the priests who gave their oath of fidelity to the new government were not persecuted. The Church however responded by excommunicating them.

²⁴ This of course means that schools, hospitals, and universities were “expropriated” from the Church with the approval of her prelates. According to Mary Craig (*Man From a Far Country* [Morrow: N.Y., 1979]), Cardinal Wyszynski “was a pragmatist. . . . In 1950 he concluded an agreement with the [communist] government in which he accepted the loss of Church property [except for actual churches and priests’ houses], agreeing that in a socialist country, the Church must renounce its rights to private property. This agreement incurred the grave displeasure of Pope Pius XII, and in any case was soon broken by the Government.” This same source states that Fr. Wojtyla—John Paul II—“steered clear of politics” in his sermons. “Even to mention ‘good’ and ‘evil’ could bring down the wrath of the authorities.”

²⁵ Fr. Charles McFadden, once well known as a Catholic writer against communism, now tells us that “a constant theme running through the teaching of Christ is that the Christian moral ideal is achieved by man in proportionately higher degrees precisely to the extent that he abandons private ownership.” His latest book, *Christianity Confronts Communism*, reaches the height of intellectual dishonesty—but then, this unfortunate man is tied to the principles established by the post-Conciliar Church and is forced to grovel for his prior “errors” in defending private property and other Church principles.

²⁶ To speak out against the “political activism” of priests in South America cuts two ways. Clearly, the communist rulers in Eastern Europe would have been delighted to have had such a prohibition on the books. Cardinal Mindszenty could then have been silenced “under obedience” for “political activism,” since this term can mean almost anything from speaking the truth to carrying a gun.

²⁷ His “silencing” of Fr. Boff for a year was a joke. Fr. Boff was never required to retract a single statement.

²⁸ The activities of John Paul II in Mexico were cause for confusion. Peter Hebblethwaite, in his article entitled “Pope” (*Esquire*, May 1979), stated: “First reports from Puebla were most confusing. The Pope was—depending on the paper you read—said to have attacked or defended Liberation Theology. Until one had the complete text, it was impossible to say. When it became available, the reason for the misunderstanding was clear: John Paul II had recognized the validity of the aspirations of Liberation Theology, while criticizing some of its methods. At the same time, his energetic statements against the abuse of human rights would have brought no comfort to Generals Videla and Pinochet.” At a later date, his attitude

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

towards the government of Argentina, when he was on “pilgrimage” there, compared to his attitude towards the leaders of Poland on similar occasions, speak volumes.

²⁹ Casaroli is also a great admirer of Teilhard. On the occasion of the centenary of his birth (simultaneously celebrated at both UNESCO and Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris), Casaroli sent a letter to Bishop Poupard, rector of the highly modernist *Institute Catholique* in Paris in which he praised the “powerful poetic insight,” and the “profound perception” of this man who was “a witness of the unified life of a man seized by Christ in the depths of his being.”

³⁰ *Fatima Crusader*, April, 1987.

³¹ One does not have to be a political genius to know that this will give a clear message to the South American nations that Cuba has Rome’s approval.

³² Traditionally, unsigned editorials in this publication were written by the Pope or at his direction.

³³ Paris Press Conf., Nov. 21, 1983.

³⁴ We have chosen Fr. Gustavo Gutierrez as representative of Liberation Theology because 1) we have known him personally; 2) he is a recognized world authority on the subject; 3) while he lives in Peru, he teaches in American seminaries; 4) his books are available in English (*A Theology for Liberation* [Orbis: New York, several printings]) and *We Drink from our Own Wells* [Orbis: New York, 1973]); and 5) he has never been criticized or condemned by Rome.

³⁵ “Praxis,” a favorite term of current theologians, literally means “practice.” It is a cry for “doing” rather than thinking and another manifestation of the heresy of “activism.”

³⁶ Hamish Fraser, “Society of Jesus . . . or Judas?” (*Approaches*, Supplement No. 73).

³⁷ They also stated that Mao Tse-Tung was “a new Moses who took his country out of the oppression of feudalism and capitalism, as formerly the chosen people were taken out of the captivity of Egypt.” Some will claim that the meeting was an “Ecumenical Colloquium,” but it was a colloquium at which the majority of the participants were Catholics of high standing such as Cardinal Jusef Suenens, Angelo Hernandez (Archbishop of New Delhi in India), and Bernard Jacqueline, vice-secretary of the Secretariat of Non-Believers.

³⁸ Published by the Govt. of Brazil to expose their internal enemies.

³⁹ *The Wanderer*, August 9, 1979: in this small country “estimates of people in detention range between 60,000 and 100,000; many are scattered across the country in concentration camps labeled ‘re-education centers.’” The naiveté of the post-Conciliar hierarchy is beyond belief. Every exponent of Marxist doctrine has made it clear that religion—any religion—is an enemy. According to the *World Press Review* of May 1981, “the anti-religious nature of communism has once again been demonstrated in Cambodia where only 600 of 82,000 Buddhist monks survived.” Now surely, even the most ardent liberal in America cannot accuse Buddhist monks of being anti-revolutionary agents, much less minions of the CIA!

⁴⁰ Dr. John H. Detar and Thomas M. Manion, *Cursillo: To Deceive the Elect* (Athanasius: Reno, Nevada, 1984). The entire RENEW program, with its emphasis on “base communities,” has been exposed by *The Wanderer* (Oct-Dec., 1983), *The Remnant* (1989), and *Approaches* (Supplement No. 90).

⁴¹ As mentioned above, Fr. Boff was silenced for one year and never asked to retract a single statement. No other liberation theologian has been condemned.

⁴² Who will support the clergy in a society where all property is in the hands of the State—a State which believes that religion is the opium of the people?

Communism, "Ostpolitik," and Liberation Theology

⁴³ Taylor Caldwell, *Dialogues with the Devil* (Fawcett: N.Y., 1967). Taylor Caldwell was a traditional Catholic.

⁴⁴ There is little new under the sun. Consider the words of Aristotle (*circa* 350 B.C.): "This style of legislation [socialism] wears a face and air of philanthropy. No sooner is it heard than it is eagerly embraced, under the expectation of a marvelous love to grow out of it between man and man, especially if the proposer goes on to inveigh against the evils of existing institutions, setting all down to the want of a community of goods [i.e., private property]. These evils, however, are due not to a want of community or property, but to the depravity of human nature. For experience teaches that disputes are far more likely to occur among people who possess property in common and live as partners than among those who hold estates in separate tenure. The life proposed appears to be altogether impossible."

⁴⁵ Quoted in Rev. Wurmbrand, *Was Karl Marx a Satanist?*

⁴⁶ Speech to the Romans concerning the sacred rights of the Church, February 20, 1949.

CHAPTER 16

**MODERNISM IN THE CHURCH:
THE ROAD TO HELL IS PAVED WITH GOOD
INTENTIONS**

In the Gospel also we read that it was foretold that our foes should rather be of our own household, and that they who have first been associated in the sacrament of unity shall be they who shall betray one another.

Epistles of St. Cyprian, LIV

Men have rebelled against that Christianity which is true and faithful to Christ and His doctrines. In its place they have fashioned Christianity to their own liking, a new idol which does not save, which is not opposed to the passions of carnal desires nor to the greed of gold and silver which fascinates, nor to the pride of Life; a new religion without a soul, without religion, a mask of a dead Christianity without the spirit of Christ.

Pope Pius XII¹

One must assume that those responsible for the changes in the Church acted with the best of intentions. Like the High Priest who justified the crucifixion of Christ on the grounds that “it is meet that one man should die for the people,” the current hierarchy feels that the old Church must be allowed to die so that the new Church—the Church of the “new Pentecost,” the “Church of today” can live. As William Blake put it: “Caiaphas was, in his own mind, / A benefactor to mankind.”²

What led men who presumably were “sincere” and of “good will” to break with the traditions established by the Apostles and the teachings held by the Church throughout the ages? What induced those responsible to follow the suggestions of the excommunicated Jesuit Tyrrell and inject “a liberal infusion of Protestant ideas” into the Body of Christ? Why has the “fort” been abandoned “by those even of whom it should have been guarded”?

Undoubtedly, one could point to a variety of causes. Many of the reformers felt the Church—which they still loved in a sentimental sort of way—was dying.³ They were convinced that the modern world, with

its enlightened ways of thinking and its technological successes, had irreparably and justifiably established itself. The old Church was suitable to a former and more “primitive” time, but the modern world and the future world—their world—had little use for the old established Order. The only way for the Church to “survive,” was for it to accommodate itself to, and become part of, the modern world. They thought that by making the Church relevant to themselves, they would make it relevant to modern man. They envisioned themselves as saving the Church by bringing it up to date. Still others, having accepted the philosophical premises of the modern world and, having accepted evolution and the Marxist dialectic as true, felt that the *sine qua non* for the Church’s survival was for it to join the forces of “historical determinism.”

Be this as it may, what modernists, liberation theologians, and others of similar ilk do not see is that they have lost their faith and wish to share—indeed, foster—their disbelief on others. What they do not understand is that the Truth can never die nor the “Gates of Hell prevail.”⁴

It was perfectly obvious to those brought up in the traditional Church that her mind and thinking was diametrically opposed to that of so-called “contemporary man.” The innovators felt that “if the Church did not speak to modern man” (they themselves being modern man), it was clearly the Church that was at fault. Imbued with the false ideas of liberalism and progress, they forgot that it was “modern man who would not listen to the Church.” Despite their denials, they were “modernists” who sought to bring the Church—essentially a “timeless” structure—into the modern world; not as something inimical to the modern world, not as an entity whose function it was to instruct and guide the modern world in God’s ways, but as part and parcel of that world—in the “avant-garde” and “forefront” of its deviations from the norm which Christ established. They wished to make the Church “relevant” in a world that itself had lost all relevance and was *entleert* (empty) of meaning, a world that was “alienated” and had lost sight of “the one thing necessary.” This is why the post-Conciliar Church has abandoned its role of “master” (*magister*) and declared itself to be the “servant.”⁵ And what is all this talk of “serving the world,” but the rendering unto Caesars of what belongs to God? Modernists are not the first to cry, “We have no king but Caesar!”

If the Church was to be “changed,” what guidelines and what authority was to be appealed to? In the last analysis the only alternative to “Tradition” (which is Revelation “transmitted”) is “immanentism” (that is, private judgment), or the “collective” private judgment of those whose souls had been corrupted by the “collective” errors of our times. More simply stated, this implies a choice between God’s judgment and man’s judgment. The

rejection of the former in favor of the latter is rebellion. What has resulted has been described by Malcolm Muggeridge as “suicide.”⁶

Aggiornamento—literally, a “bringing up to date,” became the battle cry of the innovators. But this requires a continuous process of change and hence we must seek some underlying principle by which to identify it. In the practical order this means a continuous choosing of man’s judgments over God’s. It is ultimately the Luciferian declaration *non serviam*—I will not serve. The manifestation of this rebellious principle is none other than the Revolution.⁷ By “Revolution,” I do not mean the French Revolution as such—but the forces and ideas, “the powers and principalities” behind this disastrous event which continue to exist and rule the “world.”⁸ As the French newspaper *La Revolution Francaise* said in 1789: “The modern world is placed in front of two options: either the completion of the revolution or a simple return to Christianity.”⁹ Those who object to *aggiornamento* being characterized in such terms should consider the innumerable statements of post-Conciliar prelates to the effect that Vatican II is the “French” or the “October Revolution in the Church,” or that the *Novus Ordo* liturgy is the “*conquista della chiesa*.”

What is the real nature of this revolution? Let it speak for itself:

I am not what people think. Many talk about me, and very few know me. I am neither Carbonarism . . . nor riots, nor change from Monarchy to Democracy . . . nor the temporary disturbance of the public order. I am neither the screams of the “Jacobins,” nor the rage of the “Montagne,” nor the fight on the barricades, nor looting, nor fire, nor guillotine, nor drownings. I am neither Marat, nor Robespierre, nor Babeuf, nor Mazzini, nor Kossuth. These men are my sons, they are not me. These things are my works, they are not me. These men and these things are passing events and I am a permanent event.

I am the hatred of any order that man did not establish and in which he is not king and God all together. I am the proclamation of the rights of man free from the care of the rights of God. I am the establishment of the religious and social State on the will of man instead of the will of God. I am God pushed out of the world and man placed in his place. This is why I am called Revolution, that is to say, the turning upside down.¹⁰

LIBERALISM AND THE ORIGINS OF MODERNISM

In order to come to a fuller understanding of modern ways of thinking one must go back to the philosophical ideas embraced by liberalism. The fundamental premise of liberalism is that each individual human being is free to decide for himself what is true and false, what is right and wrong;

that man can be bound by no higher law than his own reason and will.¹¹ Tied to liberalism are naturalism (the idea that human nature is essentially perfect and that its distortions are occasioned only by external forces) and Rationalism (the idea that reason is the highest faculty in man and that our own individual human reason is essentially perfect). These are the ideas of the so-called “Enlightenment,” and are summarized by the catchphrase of the French Revolution: “Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.”¹²

Paramount and basic—indeed, at the root of all the other errors—is the concept of “liberty.” In its clearest form, this false idea proclaims the absolute sovereignty of the individual and his entire independence of God’s authority. The absolute autonomy of man carries in its train the autonomy of society, of economics, of morality, and ultimately his autonomy in religious matters. Rejecting the divine truths of Revelation, modern man holds that every individual has the right to follow the dictates of his private judgment in religious matters.¹³ For a man to submit to any authority higher than, or outside himself, is for him to forfeit his “dignity.” A person who does so is often described as “rigid,” “old-fashioned,” “superstitious,” “immature,” and “unwilling to be a responsible person.” Those who wished to avoid such epithets often described themselves as “liberal Catholics,” but as Pope Pius IX pointed out, these two words cannot be placed in juxtaposition as they are mutually contradictory.

Fr. Felix Sarda summarizes all this well. Liberalism calls for:

- 1) The absolute sovereignty of the individual in his entire independence of God’s authority.
- 2) The absolute sovereignty of society in its entire independence of everything that does not proceed from itself.
- 3) Absolute civil sovereignty in the implied right of the people to make their own laws in entire independence and utter disregard of any other criterion than the popular will expressed at the polls and in parliamentary majorities.
- 4) Absolute freedom of thought in politics, morals, or in religion. The unrestrained liberty of the press.¹⁴

All these false ideas were repeatedly condemned by the Holy Pontiffs. Pius VI (in 1775) referred to them as a “pestilent disease which the wickedness of our times brings forth,” and as “impiety concealed with the honorable name of philosophy.” Those that propagated such ideas were characterized as “accursed philosophers” (*Inscrutable*). Pius VII (in 1800) called them a

“defiling plague of false philosophy” (*Diu Satis*). Leo XII (in 1824) spoke of the “mighty conflicts” that “continue to rage against the Catholic religion” and criticized those that “arrogated to themselves the name of philosophy” and “aroused from the ashes the disorderly ranks of practically every error.” He spoke of their attempt to “produce a gospel of man, or what is worse, a gospel of the devil!” (*Ubi Primum*). Pius VIII (in 1829) complained against those that taught “numberless errors and perverse doctrines.” He specifically mentioned “among these heresies” one that “belonged to the foul contrivance of the sophists of the age who do not admit any difference among the different professions of faith and who think that the portal of eternal salvation opens to all from any religion,” and complained bitterly of their infiltrating the educational system—“its cunning purpose [being] to engage evil teachers to lead the students along the paths of Baal by teaching them un-Christian doctrines” (*Traditi Humilitati*). Gregory XVI (in 1832) promulgated one of the most remarkable documents of the Church in his *Mirari Vos*—described as a “forerunner of the *Syllabus of Errors* of Pius IX”; this document exposes the liberals for what they truly are, and should be read by all.

Pius IX started out as a “liberal” Pope, hoping to find a *via media* with revolutionary ideas. As long as he compromised, he had the support of the then modern world. But he soon realized they were using him for their own ends and that no compromise was possible. He described what followed as a “horrid tempest stirred up by so many erroneous . . . , monstrous, and portentous opinions.” Among these he especially listed the separation of Church and State; the absence of any duty on the part of the State to protect the Church; the liberty of conscience and worship as an inalienable right belonging to every man and one that should be proclaimed by law; that the will of the people, manifested by what was called public opinion, constitutes the supreme law; that the elimination of the religious orders was of benefit to the State; and that education should be an entirely secular affair. After listing the entire program of modern liberalism in the province of religion and politics, he unequivocally condemned socialism, communism, and pantheism (*Quanta cura*). He followed this up with his *Syllabus* in 1864, which specifically listed and proscribed a series of opinions ranging from absolute Rationalism to modern liberalism.

Immediately there was a huge outcry of protest. He was accused of “erecting a lasting monument of the Church’s enmity to civilization.” It was said that the *Syllabus* was an “ex cathedra condemnation of the freedom of science,” and that it “cursed modern culture.” And what is sad is that much of this outcry came from self-professed Catholics. But the *Syllabus* was completely consistent with the traditional practice of the Church. In

characteristic manner, and with a fearless love of truth, the then reigning Pontiff condemned the very errors of modern rebellion against the supernatural order that would, six years later, place him in prison. And to be sure that he was listened to, this same Pope in 1878 promulgated the doctrine of Papal Infallibility.¹⁵

Every pope from 1775 onwards has spoken out against these errors. And after Pius IX, Leo XIII again did so in his encyclicals *Immortale Dei* and *Libertas*.¹⁶ Thus we are brought up to the time of Pope Saint Pius X.

MODERNISM

Modernism, so clearly condemned by Pope St. Pius X as the “synthesis of all heresies,” is nothing other than the application of liberal principles to the realm of Doctrine, Theology, History, and Apologetics; that is to say, to the whole field of religion. What was liberalism outside the Church becomes modernism within it.¹⁷ Moreover, it is the most vicious form of liberalism, for it masquerades under the cover of “defending religion” and of being “spiritual.”

The “liberal Catholic” or modernist: 1) believes that progress and evolution are universal laws applicable to all of reality, above all to man and hence to truth; 2) is anthropocentric, believing man rather than God is at the apex of creation and hence a self-validating source of truth; 3) has a hatred of metaphysics as is manifested by his denial of Revelation as a source of truth; and 4) has no sense of the supernatural because he denies man is made in the image of God and that he has fallen from his high estate. Hence he sees nothing in nature that can be perfected by grace.¹⁸

VATICAN II—THE MODERNIZATION OF THE CHURCH

What happened at Vatican II is that all these liberal ideas were adopted as Catholic. Maritain’s impossible dream of uniting the Feasts of Joan of Arc and the storming of the Bastille became a reality.¹⁹ Man—every man—was said to be dignified by his very nature, a dignity that persists in him even in the absence of his conforming himself to any divine model.²⁰ “Religious freedom” is said in turn to have “its foundation in the dignity of the human person” and hence, “in religious matters man is to be guided by his own judgment.” This means that every individual has the right to choose for himself what is true and false; what is right and wrong; what he will believe or not believe. And what is this other than the absolute sovereignty of the

individual and his independence of God's authority? Vatican II does not limit itself to teaching that man has the "right" to believe anything he wants, but also adds that no one should hinder him in teaching what he believes to others.²¹ Further, this right is to be recognized "in the constitutional law whereby society is governed and thus it is to become a civil right." Teachers of false religions do not even have to be sincere and of good will, for this right "continues to exist even in those who do not live up to their obligation of seeking the truth and adhering to it." Finally, we are told this "right" was revealed by God to the Church—that it is part of Divine Revelation!

What, in the practical order, does this mean? It means that a person can propagate any error he wishes—no matter how harmful—and even if he knows it to be wrong—and that the State must safeguard him in his right to do so. He could, for example, teach Marxism (is this not indoctrination?) in the schools, or advocate that every child have a homosexual experience so as to freely choose his lifestyle. But that this principle is declared to be part of Divine Revelation is even more unbelievable. This means that Christ, who lived and died to bring us the Truth, Christ who said "go and teach all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" also taught that it was perfectly fine with Him if mankind ignored everything He said. It means that mankind is free to tell lies about God (i.e., to blaspheme God) with impunity. If the principle of religious liberty is true, if man is to be his own judge in religious matters, what need is there for the Church? No wonder Pope Gregory XVI called this idea "insane."

Consider some of the consequences: This principle, impelled by its own impotence, inevitably gives birth to endless differences and contradictions. In the last analysis, one is forced to recognize as valid, any belief that springs from the exercise of private judgment, be it collective or individual. Dogma becomes replaced by mere opinion and religious opinion is in turn reduced to matters of "feeling." As a result, the modernist inevitably sees doctrines, not as "fixed," but rather as "fluid" historical expressions of Catholic belief. Individuals grow and develop; are influenced by their experiences and the changes wrought in society by an ever increasing technology. Man has, over the course of time, come to a deeper understanding of his own nature and of God. Hence it is only natural that doctrines or beliefs should also "develop" or "evolve." As Paul VI expressed it: "If the world evolves, should not man's religion also evolve?" In the last analysis Faith becomes the expression of one's religious sense and religion the expression of a collective religious experience.²²

One might ask why the modernist is not an atheist. The answer lies in the fact that radical atheism raises as many problems as does the traditional Faith. Not, of course, difficulties of a metaphysical nature, for nothing is more foreign to modernism than metaphysics; but difficulties on the psychological and historical plane, which is to say, those that pertain to the human order. How does one explain religiosity whose universal presence is ascertained by the historian and how can one remove all significance from such an important part of human life?²³

There are only two possibilities open to the Catholic modernist. Either indifferentism or the fostering of some kind of universal religion based on the least common denominator (Syncretism). The post-Conciliar hierarchy desires the latter, but the erstwhile faithful have chosen, or rather been driven, to the former.

Indifferentism: Surely it is clear that a man, who under the plea of rational liberty has the right to repudiate any part of Revelation that may displease him, cannot logically quarrel with another man who, on the same grounds, repudiates the whole! Not only is one creed as good as another; no creed is as good as any other. Modern man is tired of all the individualistic and subjective religious controversy that has resulted, and being totally unfamiliar with traditional concepts, cannot understand religious exclusivity. For him the supernatural is vaguely identified with the superstitious, faith with credulity, firmness with fanaticism, the uncompromising with the intolerant, and consistency with narrowness of outlook. The very idea that a given religion should have the “fullness of the truth” appears to him both incongruous and offensive. Hence he not only holds one religion to be as good (or bad) as another, but that all religions should be relegated to the “private sector” of our lives. They may be psychologically useful, even uplifting, but they have no role in the public forum. All he asks of his fellow man is a modicum of “sincerity” and “good will,” and that he keep his religious views to himself. Modern man has become completely indifferent to metaphysical principles.

Syncretism: On the other hand, man’s need for belief and ritual seems to be inborn. And hence, in line with modernist principles, the coming world religion can be envisioned as a combination of the different religious senses in a new synthesis. Inevitably such a synthesis must smooth off all the sharp edges and distinctions. Hence we have the whole idea of the people of God—defined variously as those “baptized in Christ,” and as “all men of good will.”²⁴ This is the basis of the entire post-Conciliar ecumenical effort.

FURTHER SEQUELAE OF A MODERNIST OUTLOOK

It further follows that no religion and no code of morality can be allowed to hold a position of prominence in the State. Civil authority is obliged to treat all denominations and points of view, be they good or bad, as equal. Religion and the Divine Law are no longer able to influence society because the modernist State cannot give it any more recognition than it does to Satanism. Authority is no longer seen as derived from God, but rather from “the people” who are in turn easily manipulated.²⁵ Now, in point of fact, no State can exist without laws; and laws will inevitably reflect a code of morality. By exiling the Church a vacuum is created which is readily filled by secular humanists, socialists, Freemasons, and other groups capable of influencing the vote.

One of the most shocking aspects of the post-Conciliar Church is its rejection of the idea of a “Catholic State.” It is not only rejected, but seen as an “evil” to be destroyed.²⁶ This is why the “Pope” and hierarchy, with a “mandate from Vatican II,” have actually gone to such Catholic countries as Spain and Portugal and Bolivia and induced them to change their constitutions—to declare that Catholicism is no longer, and can no longer be, the religion of the country. And it naturally follows from such attitudes that there should be absolute freedom of worship, the blatant spread of communist ideas, the supremacy of the State, secular education,²⁷ civil marriage and divorce,²⁸ abortion and euthanasia.²⁹ The net result is that the Moonies, Freemasons, Rastafarians, and atheists are treated on an “equal footing” with those who adhere to Divine Revelation.

Even more extraordinary is the post-Conciliar Church’s bland acceptance of Marxist economics and ideology, which is nothing other than liberalism on the social and economic plane. John XXIII is said to have “baptized” socialism; Vatican II refused to condemn this demonic form of government; Paul VI praised the Chinese and Cuban experiments; John Paul I embraced Nikodim as he died, and had his funeral services said within the Vatican precincts after the Orthodox Russian Church in Rome refused to have anything to do with this KGB agent; John Paul II has denied that the right to “private property” is part of the Church’s teachings; refuses to condemn Liberation Theology which is playing havoc throughout the world; and recognizes and cooperates with the atheistic government of Poland, which has imposed endless horrors on his own people. Not one of these “Popes” has criticized Marxist doctrine, and all of them dream and advocate some kind of amalgam with communism.

Again, in the realm of morality, no absolute values are to be embraced. Hell³⁰ and sin are virtually banished from the post-Conciliar vocabulary.

What is considered to be convenient for most people (again, often in practice a well organized minority) is legislated by the “neutral” State, a process that allows such abominations as abortion and euthanasia to become the “law of the land.” Private morality is only limited by the need to protect others from the ravages of any one individual’s passions. This new moral outlook is propagated under the title of “situation ethics,” and we find the Catholic Theological Society of America stating that homosexuality and adultery can be considered acceptable, so long as they are (in the pseudo-scientific terms of modern psychology) “self-liberating, other-enriching, honest, faithful, socially responsible, life-serving, and joyous.” Those that argue that this statement was condemned by the Vatican should explain why this condemnation only occurred after the laity had raised noisy objections; why none of these individuals had to make a public recantation; and why they all continue to be priests “in good standing” teaching in post-Conciliar seminaries. Those who explain away this inactivity as an “abuse” should consider the teaching of Vatican II which Paul VI insists is part of the Supreme Magisterium:

The faithful should blend modern science and its theories and the understanding of the most recent discoveries with Christian morality and doctrine. Thus their religious practice and morality can keep pace with their scientific knowledge and an ever advancing technology (*Gaudium et Spes*).³¹

Beyond this, all hierarchy in values, in person, and in function, has been eliminated. Just as in the intellectual order, the “shackles” of Revelation were rejected in the name of “free thought” and “untrammelled reason”; and just as in the social realm kings who ruled by divine right (i.e., by the laws of God) have been replaced by “peoples” democracies ruled by the basest of men, so also in the spiritual realm, “shudras” have become theologians and a false egalitarianism is foisted on the laity.³² Thus for example, the fact that a priest is a man set apart with special privileges and even greater responsibilities is decried. Under the banner of “collegiality,” the bishops encroach upon Papal authority. Priest’s “senates” are created to vie with the authority of bishops. The laity have preached to them a false concept of “the priesthood of the People of God” (a favorite theme of Luther) which allows them to claim the authority of the clergy, and they are even told that it is they who “confect” the sacrament at Mass—for the priest only presides. And to bring all this home, the “hierarchical” structure of the sanctuary is destroyed at great expense; the laity are invited to handle the sacred vessels, and to “sit around” the “table” rather than to kneel at the altar rail, thus to better join the “president” in the “eucharistic meal.”

Nothing will satisfy the forces of rebellion until they rule the world under the cover of the “lumpen-proletariat,” and the base concepts of brutalized man (such as Russia’s “Gulags,” Hitler’s death-camps, or for that matter, the acceptance of abortion and euthanasia) become the statistical norm for proper thinking. As Proudhon said, “Satan is the first revolutionary,” and his theme song will always be “release Barabbas and crucify Christ”—a perfectly “democratic” legalism that allows for his ends to be achieved.

THE RESPONSE OF PIUS X

Despite the continuous and repeated condemnation of liberalism by every Pope from Pius VII to Leo XIII, liberal ideas continued to spread within the bosom of the Church. Things became so serious that in 1907 Pius X was forced to once again condemn these false ideas under the heading of modernism in his *Syllabus, Lamentabili Sane* (July 3, 1907) and the encyclical *Pascendi Dominici gregis* (Sept. 8, 1907). Because his terminology differs slightly from that used above, an analysis of this important document is pertinent.

According to Pius X modernism consists of: 1) agnosticism, defined by him as that philosophy which holds that “human reason is confined entirely within the field of phenomena.” This is equivalent to a rationalism which rejects both intellection and Revelation.³³ It follows that natural theology, the motives for credibility, the preambles of the Faith, and all that pertains to the higher intellect is swept aside. The acceptance of such a philosophy means that one cannot ever really know the truth because the phenomena each person experiences are different. Thus it follows once again that each person’s beliefs are of equal value and should be given equal respect; 2) since God can neither be inferred nor conceived in such a system, and since many modernists believe in God, it becomes necessary to explain the source of religious ideas. Modernists attempt to get around this problem by appealing to terms they think the Church will find acceptable. Faith is said by them to be based on an internal sense which arises from man’s need for God “welling up from the depth of the unconscious under the impulse of the heart.” Pius X called this “vital immanence,” and in the last analysis this is nothing other than a “gut feeling,” or in current theological terminology, “experiential Christianity”³⁴; 3) everything is in a state of flux. All creation is evolving towards some higher “point Omega.” Truth or dogma, being reflections of man’s religiosity, also evolves. This is called by the modernist, “development of dogma” or “ongoing revelation.” Dogmas are explained away as “symbols” and the sacraments as “faith-nourishing

signs”³⁵; 4) history, Biblical exegesis, and indeed all of religion must be judged by science and the modern outlook, which is to say, by modernist principles. This is nothing other than a complete inversion, for it is science and the modern world which should be judged by the true religion.

We see in these four principles the essence of *aggiornamento*, the program advocated by the post-Conciliar Church. Bernard Reardon defined modernism as “the attempt to synthesize the basic truths of religion and the methods and assumptions of modern thought, using the latter as necessary and proper criteria. Hence a modernist interpretation of Christianity . . . will be one which seeks to reconcile the essentials of doctrine with the scientific outlook characteristic of the modern world.”³⁶ As M. Loisy said: “The avowed modernists form a fairly definite group of thinking men united in the common desire to adapt Catholicism to the intellectual, moral, and social needs of today.”³⁷ In a similar manner, *Il Programma dei Modernisti* stated: “Our religious attitude is ruled by the single wish to be one with the Christians and Catholics who live in harmony with the spirit of the age.” Much more insightful is the definition of the philosopher George Santayana: modernism is “the love of all Christianity in those who perceive that it is all a fable. It is the historic attachment to his Church of a Catholic who has discovered that he is a pagan. . . . It is the last of those concessions to the spirit of the world which half-believers and double-minded prophets have always been found making; but it is a mortal concession. It concedes everything; for it concedes that everything in Christianity, as Christians hold it, is an illusion.” No wonder Pius X said these “schemers . . . are proposing a universal apostasy” (*Editae saepe*), and that “they should be beaten with fists.”

So extensive was the problem that Pius X had to dismiss all but two professors from the Pontifical Catholic University in Washington which now “forbids” the making of the sign of the Cross because it is unecumenical. He followed a similar pattern in other Catholic institutions and seminaries, excommunicated those who would not accept the Church’s constant teaching, and placed a host of books on the Index. When shortly thereafter a friend told Pius X that modernism in the Church had been destroyed, the Pontiff disagreed and prophesied that it would soon be back, and in stronger form than ever. Needless to say the modernists immediately went “underground” while doing everything possible to undermine *Pascendi* and *Lamentabili* by denying that they were binding on the Catholic conscience (*de fide*). Because of this Pius X promulgated the *Motu Proprio Praestantia Scripturae* (Nov. 1907) in which, using his “full Apostolic authority,” he declared that anyone who dared to defend any of the condemned propositions of modernism as outlined in these documents was *ipso facto*

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

excommunicated, *latai sententiae*—with lifting of this excommunication simply reserved to the sovereign Pontiff. Then in September of 1910 he promulgated his “Oath Against Modernism” which every prelate from sub-deacon to cardinal had to repeat every time he received a promotion, and which every professor and seminary rector was obliged to repeat before being given his appointment. Obviously, the Council Fathers at Vatican II had repeated the oath innumerable times. Among other things this Oath required them to state:

I . . . firmly embrace and accept all and everything that has been defined, affirmed, and declared by the unerring Magisterium of the Church, especially those chief doctrines which are directly opposed to the errors of this time. . . . I reject the heretical invention of the evolution of dogmas, passing from one meaning to another, different from that which the Church first had. . . . I hold most certainly and profess sincerely that Faith is not a blind religious feeling bursting forth from the recesses of the subconscious, . . . but the true assent of the intellect to the truth received extrinsically *ex auditu*. . . . I adhere with my whole soul to all the condemnations, declarations, and prescriptions which are contained in the encyclical letter, *Pascendi*, and in the decree, *Lamentabili*.³⁸

The “Oath Against Modernism” was abrogated (that is to say, eliminated) by Paul VI, along with the Index.

* * *

The idea that the Church and the modern world can somehow come to terms is an impossible dream. Its paradigm is that of the Father seeking to join the Prodigal Son in desiring to eat of the swill that he was feeding to pigs. One cannot play with fire without the risk of being burnt. “What fellowship hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever?” (2 Cor. 6:14). How can the true Church embrace a world, that in the language of the historian, is “post-Christian” and in that of the psychiatrist “alienated from God”? Those who would “revolutionize” the Church would do well to remember the warning of the Jacobean Illuminato (Freemason) and leader of the French Revolution named St. Just: “Whoever stops half-way in revolution digs his own grave!”

A modernist Church, however, has a problem. A Church that proclaims the absolute dignity of the human person and that every individual is both capable of and has the “right” to choose what he will believe; a Church

that bestows on error the same rights as truth; a Church that believes that truth itself evolves and that she has no mission to teach what Christ taught; a Church that has lost the sense of the sacred and believes that the Church which Christ established only “subsists” in her to the same degree as in other ecclesiastical bodies; a Church that teaches that other religious communities have access to salvation without her, is a Church that has lost her *raison d'être*.

It boggles the mind to find the “Vicar of Christ” proclaiming that his Church “is seeking itself. . . . With a great and moving effort, it is seeking to define itself, to understand what it truly is,” or that the Council itself should state that “Christians are joined with the rest of men in the search for truth.”³⁹ Given such statements, what role has the New Church chosen to play? The answer lies in being the “servant of the world,” in being the “*avant-garde*” of a “new humanism” and “universal culture” based on “wholesome socialization” so that man can act in consort to build a “better world” in the future. But first mankind must be united.

The function of the New Church is to be the “catalyst” of this unity: “The Church is a kind of sacrament of intimate union with God, and the unity of all mankind, that is, she is a sign and an instrument of such union and unity. At the end of time, she will achieve her glorious fulfillment. Then . . . all just men from the time of Adam will be gathered together with the Father in the Universal Church.” In these statements taken from the documents of Vatican II, one recognizes a thinly disguised millenarianism. They continue: Of course the Church “recognizes that worthy elements are to be found in today’s social movements, especially in an evolution towards unity, a process of wholesome socialization and of association in civic and economic realms” and hence she must join and encourage all such elements, and she must “wipe out every ground of division so that the whole human race may be brought into the unity of the family of God.” Her priests are instructed that “every type of discrimination, whether social or cultural, whether based on sex, race, color, social condition, language, or religion, is to be overcome and eradicated as contrary to God’s intent.” Elsewhere we are given further insights into this proposed unity. “Recent psychological research explains human activity more profoundly. The human race is passing from a rather static concept of reality to a more dynamic, evolutionary one. . . . Thus little by little, a more universal form of human culture is developing, one which will promote and express the unity of the human race. . . . It is a fact bearing on the very person of man, that he can come to an authentic and full humanity only through culture, that is, through the cultivation of natural goods and values. . . . The Church believes she can greatly contribute towards making the family of man and

its history more human. . . . Thus we are witnesses of the birth of a new humanism, one in which man is defined first of all by his responsibility towards his brothers and towards history” (All quotes from Vatican II documents).

How can the hierarchy expect the modern mind to be impressed with this type of sophomoric rambling? How can the Church retain its self respect in declaring such to be either the “supreme Magisterium” (Paul VI) or “the authentic teaching of the Magisterium” (John Paul II)? All these statements falsify the nature of man, the true ends and purposes for which he was created, and the *raison d'être* of the Church. Further, they are based on a variety of parochial and theoretical sociological assumptions that have no basis in reality. The concept of man’s inevitable “progress,” his “dynamic” and “evolutionary” character, and the idea that through a “process of wholesome socialization” we are “building a better world” is nothing but disguised Teilhardianism and Marxism. To expect people who think like this to be concerned with metaphysical principles, spiritual values, or even the validity of the sacraments, is absurd.

Yet it is on just these false bases that the new Church would foster the creation of a “new humanism” and found its concept of “unity.” As Paul VI has said: “The time has come for all mankind to unite together in the establishment of a community that is both fraternal and worldwide. . . . The Church, respecting the ability of worldly powers, ought to offer her assistance in order to promote a full humanism, which is to say, the complete development of the entire man, of all men . . . [and] to place herself in the avant-garde of social action. She ought to extend all her efforts to support, encourage, and bring about those forces working towards the creation of this integrated man. Such is the end which the [New] Church intends to follow. All [post-Conciliar] Catholics have the obligation of assisting this development of the total person in conjunction with their natural and Christian brothers, and with all men of good will.” This is what Paul VI elsewhere calls “the New Economy of the Gospel.” And why did Montini throw in his lot with such ideas? “Because,” as he said on more than one occasion, “we have confidence in man, because we believe in that fount of goodness which is each and every heart.” Rousseau could not have said it better!⁴⁰

According to Brian Kaiser, John XXIII saw Christian unity as a necessary precursor to the “unity of all mankind.” It is as it were, the first step to be achieved. Thus the *periti* at the Council developed the concept of “imperfect communion.” The various Christian communities that are “outside full communion” with the Catholic Church must be integrated with her. “All those who believe in Christ [whether as God or as an ‘ethical

leader' is never specified] and have received baptism are in a certain communion with the Catholic Church, though not a perfect one." They contain elements such as "the written Word of God, the life of Grace, the theological virtues, and the interior gifts of the Holy Spirit," and hence, with them "the Church is linked for various reasons." It is with these groups that "unity" is first of all to be established.

What is lost sight of is that the reason the Protestants lack "perfect" unity is because they reject the fullness of the Faith, and accept, in various degrees, the whole liberal spectrum of false ideas that we have outlined in the preceding paragraphs.⁴¹ In any event, in its desire to foster a one-world religion, the new Church attempts to accommodate her doctrines to such groups as the Protestants, as well as to a whole host of cults ranging from various New Age groups, to Rosicrucianism, to the Theosophists. It is to accommodate such groups that the post-Conciliar Church has changed her doctrines and her liturgy. Let us note however that these changes have all been in a one-way direction. What doctrine of the traditional Church have the various "ecclesiastical communities" accepted that they formerly rejected? Absolutely none. What Ecclesiastical Traditions have our "separated brethren" adopted? Again, absolutely none. Yet look at the many that the neo-Protestant Church of Vatican II—the "Church of the latter-day modernists"—has abandoned, or if not positively rejected, at least allowed to fall into disuse. What Protestant "house of worship" resembles the sanctuaries we knew as children, and what neo-modernist Church of the post-Vatican II era cannot be confused with that of a Reformation sect? As Michael Davies has pointed out with regard to the various "agreed statements" made with the Anglicans: "The agreement on the Eucharist and the Ministry does not affirm the Catholic position in a single instance where it conflicts with Protestantism." And yet we must concede that a certain kind of "unity" has been achieved between the post-Conciliar church and the various Reformed "Ecclesiastical Communities." The reason is clear. The post-Conciliar Church is itself a "Neo-Protestant" Church. It is more at home with the Reformers than it is with its own parents.

* * *

Aggiornamento is truly and appropriately the foundation and leitmotif of the post-Conciliar Church. At heart it is nothing other than the Church coming to terms with liberalism and modernism, or more exactly, adopting liberalism and modernism as its own. This is why it manifests itself as the desire to change the Church and to bring her thinking into line with that of the modern world—a world that has for centuries rejected the Church that Christ established—a world in rebellion against the Divine Order.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

And ultimately, what is this desire to change the Church other than the rebellion of man against God—the refusal of man to submit to the Divine Order? Thus we are brought back to the fact that Satan was the first revolutionary conspirator, the first to cry out for *aggiornamento*. It was he who induced Eve to reject (disobey, or refuse to submit to) the Divine Order established by God in the Garden of Eden. The powers and principalities of this world make the same offer to rebellious man: reject the Divine Order, establish a human order, and ye shall be as gods.

Notes

¹ *The Major Addresses of Pope Pius XII*, Vol. II, ed. Vincent Yzermans (North Central Publ.: St. Paul, Minn., 1961).

² *The Everlasting Gospel*.

³ As one Benedictine monk said to me, the only thing in the Creed which he really believed was the phrase the “Holy Catholic Church.”

⁴ A changing truth can never satisfy the soul’s need for absolute values nor command the adherence of man. Believing Catholics may be reduced to a remnant, the sacraments and priesthood itself may be destroyed, but the Catholic Faith, being true, can never be destroyed. If there were only to be one believing Catholic left alive, the Church would reside in him.

⁵ Those who so loudly proclaim that the function of the Church is to serve would do well to consider the words of Chesterton: The problem with “the cult of service is that, like so many modern notions, it is the idolatry of the intermediate, to the oblivion of the ultimate. It is like the jargon of the idiots who talk about Efficiency without any criticism of Effect. The sin of Service is the sin of Satan: that of trying to be first where it can only be second. A word like Service has stolen the sacred capital letter from the thing which it was once supposed to serve. There is a sense of serving God, and even more disputed, a sense of serving man; but there is no sense in serving Service. . . . The man who rushes down the street waving his arms and wanting something or somebody to serve will probably fall into the first bucket-shop or den of thieves and usurers, and be found industriously serving them.”

⁶ “In my opinion,” says Malcolm Muggeridge, “if men were to be stationed at the doors of the Church with whips to drive worshippers away, or inside the religious orders specifically to discourage vocations, or amongst the clergy to spread alarm and despondency, they could not hope to be as effective in achieving these ends as are the trends and policies seemingly now dominant within the Church” (*Something Beautiful For God* [Doubleday: New York, 1977]).

⁷ Being “up to date” implies a continuing process of change. The only way to come to terms with the concept of *aggiornamento* is to relate it to some fixed principle.

⁸ It is an ancient principle enunciated, among others, by St Augustine, that man must choose between “the love of self reaching to the contempt of God, an earthly city; and the love of God reaching to the contempt of self, a heavenly one.” It is what Leo XIII called the ceaseless warfare between naturalism and the supernatural life of Grace.

⁹ Both the Church and the Revolution recognized that the choice lay between Christianity and the Revolution. Modernists like Lammenais and Maritain have always dreamed of

Modernism in the Church

blending them. Consider Maritain's desire to blend the Feast of St. Joan of Arc with that of the storming of the Bastille.

¹⁰ Msgr. Gaume, *Catechism of Perseverance* (Benzinger: Dublin, 1888).

¹¹ Liberalism holds that man's dignity lies in this absolute and self-centered "freedom." In order to realize his true dignity man must cast off all the restricting shackles of Tradition (i.e., of Revelation, and hence the Church). Satan has always promised his followers a false "liberty." As the serpent said to Eve, "Ye shall be as gods." St. Paul warns us against those who "would promise men liberty, while themselves the servants of corruption" (2 Pet. 2:19). St. Thomas Aquinas teaches us that "the end at which the devil aims is the revolt of the rational creature from God. . . . This revolt from God is conceived as an end, inasmuch as it is desired under the pretence of liberty (or autonomy)" (*Summa*, III Q. 8, A. 1). Christ promised us the Truth—His Truth—would make us free. Nowhere in Scripture does it say that freedom, as modern man understands the term, would bring us to the Truth. As Jean-Paul Sartre and the anarchist Bakunin have both said: "If God exists, I am not free. But I am free, therefore God does not exist!"

¹² If all men are free to decide for themselves and if no external authority exists, then it follows that not only are they free, they are also equal. Fraternity or "brotherly love" is promised to those who buy this illusion. From a Catholic point of view man is neither created in a vacuum nor autonomous. Rather, he is created by God for a purpose, and his true dignity and liberty lies in fulfilling that purpose which is the Glory of God. His dignity lies in conforming to that Image in which he was created; hence in knowing the truth of God and in obeying the laws of God. When he departs from these his dignity is shattered. This is why Cardinal Pie stated that the Rights of Man are the denial of the Rights of God. The trilogy in question has been condemned by a whole series of Popes starting from Saint Pius V and including Pius VII, Gregory XVI, Pius IX, Leo XIII, and Pius X. Despite this John Paul II declares: "1789 and its Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizens developed the conditions for a responsible society which still remains a goal for our generation of Christians." The French hierarchy goes even further and declares that "fundamentally, the concepts of Liberty, Equality, and Brotherhood are Christian ideas" (*Didasco*, Belgium, Jan-Feb. 1969). Fr. Avril, in an article violently attacking Archbishop Lefebvre, stated that "the slogan 'Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity' is magnificently Christian" (*L'Express*, Paris, Sep. 6, 1976).

¹³ Vatican II teaches that "in religious matters man is to be guided by his own judgment." I have avoided the use of the word "conscience," because the word is subject to multiple interpretations. For the modern this "still small voice" is equivalent to his private judgment or "feelings," and hence it can be in opposition to the laws of God. ("I feel women have a right to abort their children.") For the Catholic theologian, conscience is what guides man in the application of God's laws to specific circumstances. God's laws cannot err, but conscience can. Therefore the Church seeks to "properly form" the conscience of its members.

¹⁴ The most important discussion of this topic can be found in Rev. Dr. Felix Sarda y Salvany, *Liberalism is a Sin* (TAN: Rockford, Ill., 1986). This book cannot be too highly recommended. This book has an interesting history. The local hierarchy tried to have it placed on the Index, but when the Pope Pius X read it he praised it to the skies.

¹⁵ See Chapter 2 on the Magisterium.

¹⁶ "Americanism" was a North American variant of liberalism condemned by Leo XIII in his encyclicals *Longinqua* (1895) and *In Amplissimo* (1902). Americanism was an attempt on the part of some members of the hierarchy to reassure Protestants that Catholics were truly American and without obligatory obedience to Rome, and that the Church in America had a special character all of its own. Old-world Catholicism was unenlightened, superstitious,

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

and bogged down with external practices. It was overly concerned with the “Passive Virtues” such as poverty, chastity, and obedience. American Catholicism was different: it was “dynamic” and “red-blooded”; it was not concerned with doctrinal details that divided them from Protestants. These could in the practical order be ignored. And hence it could easily fit into the Protestant American scene. Leo XIII noted that the “watering down” by Catholics of doctrinal differences was nothing other than hypocrisy. (See, Abbé Felix Klein, *Americanism: A Phantom Heresy* [Aquino: Kansas, 1951]; Robert Cross, *The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America* [Harvard: Mass., 1958]; and Charles Maignen, *Father Hecker: Is He a Saint?* [Burns Oates: London, 1899].)

¹⁷ Liberalism as a philosophy was created by individuals who were outside the Church, and which, in the practical order, gave birth to secular democracy (a government “from below” rather than “from above”), and to an economic system, which as Leo XIII said, “laid on the toiling millions a yoke little better than slavery.” Modernism arose within the Church (both Loisy and Tyrrell were priests who claimed, even after their condemnation, to be “Catholic”). To understand their agenda the reader is referred to the second half of Malachi Martin’s *The Jesuits*.

¹⁸ The modernist denies intellection. For him man cannot arrive at the “preambles of the Faith” by the use of his intellect. In essence, he denies both the transcendence of God and His immanence in creation. He denies the transcendence of truth, and the immanence of truth in man (that man can be enlightened by Grace). This is nothing other than to deny that man is capable of the supernatural life of Grace.

¹⁹ A “reality” in the post-Conciliar Church, but not in the “Church of All Times.”

²⁰ “Human nature, by the very fact that it was assumed, not absorbed, in Him, has been raised in us to a dignity beyond compare, for by His Incarnation . . . the Son of God, in a certain way united Himself with each man” (*The Church in the Modern World*).

²¹ Man may be free to believe error, but he can never have the right to do so. (Similarly, just as man has the freedom to murder, he can never have the right to do so.) One does not have the right to abuse one’s intellect which is given one to know the truth. Error can never have “rights”; only truth has rights.

²² One readily comes across such expressions as “visceral” and “experiential” Christianity. As Fr. Greeley’s study pointed out (see Chapter 5), “69% of the bishops and only 45% of the priests agreed that ‘faith means essentially belief in the doctrines of the Catholic faith,’ whereas 46% of the bishops and 69% of the clergy would agree that faith is ‘primarily an encounter with God and Jesus Christ,’ rather than an assent to a coherent set of defined truth” (*Priests in the United States, Reflections on a Survey*).

²³ Jean Borella, *Le Sens du Surnaturel* (La Place Royale: Paris, 1986, and English translation, T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1998).

²⁴ It is this synthesis that the post-Conciliar Church hopes to bring about. See John Cotter, *A Study in Syncretism* (Canadian Intelligence Publication: Box 130, Flesherton, Ontario, Canada).

²⁵ Inevitably Barabbas is chosen over Christ. History is replete with examples of how small pressure groups can manipulate the “popular will.” Revolutions never come from “the people,” but from small numbers of conspirators. The new Church is a perfect example. The number of people who wanted change was miniscule. Modernists, having infiltrated and captured the “organs” of the Roman Church, proceeded to proclaim that they were “democratizing” its character in accordance with the “will of the People of God.” All protests were ignored and every psychological method known to man—short of physical violence—was used to make the faithful comply.

Modernism in the Church

²⁶ This is a clear-cut rejection of the Kingship of Christ, of the necessity of patterning Christian society on divine principles.

²⁷ The assumption that “secular education” is in any sense of the word “neutral” is absurd. Children are inculcated from infancy with the pseudo-religious ideas of the liberal philosophers, and prepared in every way to accept a world that is insane and even stupid. “Success,” not “sanctity” becomes the “ideal.” By the time they complete a college education, they either join the “system,” or are spewed forth as “misfits.” Few escape the devastating effects of a secular education, whose avowed aim is to teach men to “think for themselves” rather than to “think correctly.” The end result is that the great majority do not think at all. (The average American is said to watch television 60 hours a week!) By traditional standards, modern man is probably the least educated collectivity that has ever lived upon the face of the earth. He may be “literate,” but he is “ignorant.” In passing, one would like to call attention to the almost total destruction of the Catholic educational institutions that has followed in the wake of Vatican II. They have indeed “self-destructed” by achieving an *aggiornamento* with the secular institutions around them.

²⁸ Attention must be drawn to the continuing scandal of divorce annulments granted on “psychological grounds.”

²⁹ It is amusing to note that John Paul II, who delighted in the establishment of a socialist government in Spain, was upset when they made abortion legal.

³⁰ Recent statements by John Paul II to the effect that “Hell is not a place,” are, to say the least, surprising.

³¹ According to several polls, 80% of post-Conciliar Catholics use artificial means of birth control. Traditional Catholics who use birth control recognize it as a sin against God, but post-Conciliar Catholics believe they have a right to decide such things—once again based on their innate dignity and religious freedom. And this attitude is encouraged by the greater majority of their clergy. There is no longer any difference in the moral practice of Catholics and non-Catholics.

³² “Shudra” is a Hindu term referring to individuals who lack any religious beliefs and follow no religious practices. It is true that all men are equal in essence; that all will be judged by God; and that each and every soul is precious to its Maker. But individuals are not equal in merit and will not be equal in glory; and they are not equal in knowledge, in intelligence, in common sense, and in wisdom. As Nesta Webster points out in her excellent book on the *French Revolution* (Omni: Calif., 1958), “it is doubtful indeed whether liberty and equality can exist together, for whilst liberty consists in allowing every man to live as he likes best, and to do as he will with his own, equality necessitates a perpetual system of repression in order to maintain things at the same dead level.” As Leo XIII said: “That ideal equality about which they (the modernists) entertain pleasant dreams, would be, in reality, the leveling down of all to a condition of misery and degradation.” The Church’s teaching is well summed up by Pius XII: “In a people worthy of the name, those inequalities which are not based on whims, but on the nature of things . . . do not constitute an obstacle to . . . a true spirit of union and brotherhood. On the contrary, so far are they from impairing civil equality that they show its true meaning, namely that . . . everyone has the right to live his own personal life honorably in the place and the condition in which . . . Providence has placed him” (Christmas Message, 1944).

The only way for equality to become a reality in the social realm is for men to be subjected to the severest form of despotism. The only way in which the conflicting ideals of liberty and equality can be resolved is on the basis of “justice.” Now justice in turn, unless we allow it to be defined by the “private judgment” of individuals or groups (despots or the State), if it is to have any “objective” character at all, brings us back to the teachings of the Church

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

relative to the social order. Either we strive to “build the city of God” on earth, or we submit ourselves to what must eventually become an unmitigated slavery. If we buy the ideologies of the modern world, as Vatican II does, then we have “nothing to gain but our chains.”

It is of interest to quote the views of those primarily responsible for fostering these false ideas on humanity: “Far back in ancient times we were the first to cry among the masses of the people the words ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,’ words many times repeated since those days by stupid poll-parrots who, from all sides round flew down upon these baits and with them carried away the well-being of the world, true freedom of the individual, formerly so well guaranteed against the pressure of the mob. The would-be wise men the intellectuals, could not make anything out of the uttered words in their abstractions; did not note the contradiction of their meaning and inter-relation; did not see that in nature there is no equality, cannot be freedom: that Nature herself has established inequality of minds, of characters, of capacities, just as immutably as she has established subordination to her laws: never stopped to think that the mob is a blind thing, that upstarts elected from among it to bear rule are, in regard to the political, the same blind men as the mob itself, that the adept, though he be a fool, can yet rule, whereas the non-adept, even if he were a genius, understands nothing of the political. . . . In all corners of the earth the words ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity’ brought to our ranks, thanks to our blind agents, whole legions who bore our banners with enthusiasm. And all the time these words were canker-worms at work boring into the well-being of the goyim, putting an end everywhere to peace, quiet, solidarity, and destroying all the foundations of the goyim states. As you will see later, this helped us to our triumph; it gave us the possibility, among other things, of getting into our hands the master card—the destruction of privileges, or in other words of the very existence of the aristocracy of the goyim, that class which was the only defense peoples and countries had against us. On the ruins of the natural and genealogical aristocracy of the goyim we have set up the aristocracy of our educated class headed by the aristocracy of money. . . . The abstraction of freedom has enabled us to persuade the mob of all countries that their government is nothing but the steward of the people who are the owners of the country, and that steward can be replaced like a worn-out glove. It is this possibility of replacing the representatives of the people which has placed them at our disposal and, as it were, given us the power of appointment” (*Protocol of the Elders of Zion*).

³³ Reason is a discursive faculty which requires both correct premises and proper logic to come to a valid conclusion. Truth does not depend on reason but rather, reveals itself and becomes explicit with the help of reason. This is why reason is called a “handmaid” of the Intellect. Now reason receives its “food,” what it reasons about, from above and from below. From above by means of intellection or Revelation; and from below from observed phenomena or from psychological experience. To place reason at the apex of the human being is to deny both intellection and Revelation.

³⁴ As John McKee said: “If theology is faith seeking understanding, modernism is disbelief seeking repose. A modernist is a man who has lost it: therefore he has to fill the traditional dogmas with new content” (*The Enemy Within the Gate* [Lumen Christi: Texas, 1974]).

³⁵ The use of the word “symbol” in the context of modernism can give rise to confusion. According to Pius X, for the modernist, dogmatic “formulas stand midway between the believer and his faith; in their relation to the faith they are inadequate expressions of its object and are usually called symbols. . . . In so far as they are symbols it is quite impossible to maintain that they absolutely contain the truth.” To speak of the Scriptures or traditional art as being “symbolic” in this sense would be quite wrong.

³⁶ *Roman Catholic Modernism* (Stanford Univ. Press: Calif., 1970).

³⁷ “The essential object of the movement . . . was, above all to remain on Catholic ground . . . to destroy the absolutist character of her theology and above all, to remold the intellectual

Modernism in the Church

system and teachings of the Church” (*L’eglise et la France* [Emile Nourry: Paris, 1925]).

³⁸ The contents of this oath are *de fide*, oaths being, according to Fr. Tanqueray, part of the Extraordinary Magisterium. The Church could never ask a person to swear an oath to error.

³⁹ Address to Priests at Varese, Feb. 6, 1963, and *The Church in the Modern World*, Para. 16.

⁴⁰ *Cath. Doc.* 1576 and 77.

⁴¹ It is not my intention in this book to deal with Protestantism as such, except in so far as the defense of “sound doctrine and pure faith” demands. On the other hand, to quote Chesterton, I have no intention of using “that peculiar diplomatic and tactful art of saying that Catholicism is true, without suggesting for one moment that anti-Catholicism is false.” Saint Peter Julian Eymard expresses well the thought of the Church when he states: “People often say, ‘It is better to be a good Protestant than a bad Catholic.’ This is not true. That would mean at bottom that one can be saved without the true Faith. No, a bad Catholic remains a child of the family, although a prodigal, and however great a sinner he may be, he still has a right to mercy. Through his Faith, a bad Catholic is nearer to God than a Protestant is, for he is a member of the household, whereas the heretic is not. And how hard it is to make him become one!” While much of what passes for Protestantism can hardly be labeled religious, one must be careful to distinguish the genuine religious attitude of pious Protestants who, while from the Catholic point of view lack the “fullness of the Faith,” are nevertheless great lovers of Christ and who follow the Scriptures with remarkable devotion. I well remember seeing Mel Gibson’s film, *The Passion*, when a Baptist woman in front stood up with tears in her eyes and cried out, “Lord, let me help you carry that Cross.”

One of the great shibboleths of today is: “It does not matter what a man believes, it is what he does that matters. Give me a man who lives for his fellow men! That is Christianity!” It follows that the creedal beliefs of many Protestant groups are highly variable. Yet the post-Conciliar Church’s attempts to blend with them are quite extraordinary. So completely have most Protestants lost faith in the creeds of Calvin and Luther that they have almost forgotten what it was they said. (Both, for instance, denied free will). In practice, included under the term Protestantism would be those who are in fact agnostics, atheists, hedonists, investigators, theists, Theosophists, followers of eastern cults, and jolly good fellows living like beasts that perish. Finally, many Protestants (meaning Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, etc.) live lives that are in fact far finer than their theology or ideals would inculcate, for their lives are manifest with many “good works” that they do for no conceivable reason (if we take their theology seriously). Catholics on the other hand, to use the words of St. Thomas More, see “man’s duty to God as so great that very few serve Him as they should do.” Only the saints in any way approach in their lives the ideals to which a Catholic aspires (again, if we take his theology seriously).

CONCLUSION

Under the name of the New Church, the post-Conciliar Church, a different Church from that of Jesus Christ is now trying to establish itself: an anthropomorphic society allowing itself to be carried away in a movement of wholesale capitulation under the pretext of rejuvenation, ecumenism, and adoption.

Fr. Henri de Lubac, S.J.¹

A day will come when the Pope, inspired by the Holy Spirit, will declare that all the excommunications are lifted, and all the anathemas are retracted, when all Christians will be united within the Church, when all Jews and Moslems will be blessed and called back to her. While keeping the unity and inviolability of her dogmas she will permit to all sects to approach her by degrees, and will embrace all mankind in the communion of her love and her prayers. Then Protestants will no longer exist. Against what will they be able to protest? The Sovereign Pontiff will then be truly king of the religious world, and he will do whatever he wishes with all the nations of the earth. It is necessary to spread this spirit of universal charity.

Freemason Eliphaz Levi, 1862

For an increasing number of “Catholics” the various issues raised in this text hardly seem of importance. How many today really care about such issues as religious liberty or what Vatican II teaches about socialization or about the centrality of man over God? Many continue to see themselves as Catholic without ever asking themselves just what being such means. Faith has become much more a matter of “feeling” than of belief. However, this is to forget that “without Faith it is impossible to please God,” and Faith for the Catholic is objective and concrete. It means knowing and adhering to what Christ taught. Adherence to the post-Conciliar Church carries with it—whether people are aware of it or not—the acceptance of what this Church teaches. Hence it is important to compare the beliefs of this Church with those of the Catholic Church as it has existed over the past 2000 years.

TWO CHURCHES COMPARED

It should be abundantly clear that the “New” and “post-Conciliar” Church is both strikingly new and strikingly different from the Church as it has existed through the ages. The old Church was and is unabashedly

Conclusion

“triumphant,” felt it had the fullness of the truth, and proclaimed it with a “militarism” that seemed at times both offensive and arrogant. The New Church, having achieved an *aggiornamento* with the modern world, is more “open,” “gentle,” “lovable,” and “accommodating”; it is one that is “free of mediaeval rigorism” and “makes no demands.” The traditional Church saw its function as one of teaching mankind the truths entrusted to it as “a precious pearl” by Christ; the New Church is trying “to define itself” and proclaims it is seeking the truth along with the rest of mankind. The old Church called those who disagreed with her teachings on even a single point “heretics,” while the New Church sees them—even if they deny the very existence of God—as “separated brethren” having equal “access to the community of salvation,” and hence seeks to “dialogue” with them “on an equal footing.”

In a similar manner, the old Church saw itself as “static” and unchanging while the New Church considers itself “progressive,” “evolutionary,” and “dynamic.” Hence where the old Church claimed to exist in *saecula saeculorum*—throughout the ages, the new one repeatedly emphasizes her “contemporaneous” character and proclaims in the words of her “Popes” that she represents a “new Advent,” a “new Epiphany,” and a “new Pentecost.” In a similar manner, where the old Church saw herself (as distinct from her members) as a perfect society—the spotless “Bride of Christ,” the new one declares she has “the mark of Cain” stamped upon her forehead, and that she has been deficient in her doctrinal teachings.

Where the old Church saw man as created in the image of God, but deformed and stained with original sin, the New Church sees him as having progressed from some primitive condition, as ever advancing towards some higher state of existence, as more mature, more informed, and hence as more intelligent than his predecessors. Where the old Church saw man’s dignity as dependent upon his conforming himself to his divine prototype, the New Church declares that man by his very nature is dignified. The consequences of this shift are enormous. Where the former view sees man’s intellect as clouded by his “fall,” and hence in need of a Revelation in order to know the truth, the new one declares that man is himself, because of his innate dignity, the source of truth, and that he is, in religious matters, “to be his own judge.” (This is what “religious liberty” is all about.) But if man is no longer envisioned as fallen in nature and possessed of a “clouded” intellect, he has no need for Redemption and for a Revelation to know the truth. The “fall” has been replaced by an “ascendancy,” and man instead of God becomes the source of truth.

The old Church saw its function as facilitating every individual soul’s

entry into Heaven. She encouraged the faithful to strive for personal perfection: "Be ye perfect even as your Father in Heaven is perfect." The New Church, while not denying such (that is not her way, for as John XXIII said, "the Church should not be against anything"), stresses her obligation and desire to be of "service and fellowship" to the world, of helping mankind to "to be more human," and of fostering those elements in the world which are leading towards "wholesome socialization," a "universal culture," and a "new humanism." Her "internal mission" is one of "uniting" mankind so that all men of good will can work together towards some utopian future in this world. For her salvation inevitably becomes a "communitarian" rather than an individual affair. This has its reflection on the social and political plane. Where the old Church was unequivocally against Marxism in all its forms, the New Church clearly favors socialism and communism. Where the old Church desired a theocracy in which the spiritual authority, vested in the Papacy, cooperated with the State in the governance of the world, the new one favors some kind of world government under the United Nations or some parallel secular organization. The "future above" has been replaced by the "ahead below." Supernaturalism is replaced by Naturalism, the Kingship of Christ by that of the Kingship of Man.

Similar shifts in attitude occurred in liturgical areas. Where the old Church wished by means of her rites to make the sacred present to man, the new one desires to declare that man himself is intrinsically "sacred." This is why in the New "Mass" the priest turns away from God and towards the congregation. This is why the old liturgy "accommodated" itself to God, while the new one, according to Paul VI, "accommodates" itself to modern man. This is why the old Church so carefully preserved the manner of prayer established for her by Christ and the Apostles, while the new one prefers a liturgy written by a Freemason with the help of non-Catholic "observers." In the old Church nothing was more sacred than the Words of Consecration used in the Mass and bestowed on her in detail (*in specie*) by Christ Himself. In the New Church these words were changed—the very words of Christ were altered, thus rendering the "confection" of the sacred species dubious if not invalid. All the changes make man rather than God the "ontological" center of the action. Altars turned into tables, the sacred enclosure into naves, priests into presidents, and the true immolative sacrifice into a Protestant "memorial." Similar changes for similar reasons have been made in all the other sacraments. And in order to minimize the possibility of a return to sanity, the New Church has so drastically changed the rite of Episcopal Ordination as to render the Apostolic Succession itself most dubious. Where the old Church was surrounded with the beauty and

Conclusion

the mystery of the sacred, the new has surrounded herself with the ugliness and banality of modern man.²

THE OPEN CHURCH

These changes, despite the gradual manner in which they were introduced, produced chaos. The Church lost her monolithic character. The old Church was a “closed” society. One accepted its teachings *in toto* or one excluded oneself from membership. The New Church became an “open” society frankly describing itself as “pluralistic.” It accepted a spectrum of beliefs not dissimilar to the Anglicans with their “High,” “Low,” and “Middle” categories, or the Jews with their “Orthodox,” “Conservative,” and “Liberal” synagogues.

Initially Catholics divided themselves into groups—the traditionalists, who rejected the doctrinal and liturgical changes *in toto*; the conservatives who disliked the changes and interpreted everything in the best (i.e., most conservative) possible light; the liberals who, while often impatient at the slow rate of change, were nevertheless delighted; and the greater majority of Catholics, used to trusting their clergy, who went along with all the changes in “obedience.”

After 45 years these groups continue to exist, though their makeup and attitudes have shifted. The traditionalists have remained a fairly stable, small, but slowly increasing group. In almost every city of the world one can find a priest who says the old Mass and who is supported by a congregation ranging from a handful to hundreds. The number of young people with large families at such masses is remarkable.

The second group, the “conservative *Novus Ordo* Catholics,” tend to be older, brought up in the traditional Church, and accepting with reluctance the changes mandated from Rome. They tend to pick out conservative priests and parishes where their sensibilities are least offended. Their attitudes however have undergone considerable change over the years. Exposed as they constantly are to innovative doctrines and changes their parents would never have tolerated, they have become immune to heresy and often adopt modernist attitudes without being aware of them. They take great solace in actions of the hierarchy such as getting nuns and priests to dress in an appropriate manner or speaking out against abortion, and entertain the dream that the New Church is “returning to Tradition.” They ignore the fact that fundamental doctrinal and liturgical changes (Vatican II and the *Novus Ordo Missae*) remain unchanged. The catchword for this group is “obedience.” It is this intrinsically Catholic attitude, coupled

with a false understanding of the principles of obedience, that keeps these people from being fully traditional. Consisting mostly of older priests and parishioners, this group is bound to diminish due to attrition associated with age.

The most significant change has occurred in the Catholic for whom religion has been more a social and cultural matter than a spiritual one. This represents the greater majority of modern day “Catholics” and includes both those who accepted the changes because they found them satisfying and pleasant,³ and the children brought up within the New Church. In essence this group has, from the traditional point of view, been totally “de-Catholicized.”⁴ Should they seek to become traditional they would require the same catechetical training that any non-Catholic or “pagan” would.

The liberal group remains strong. The fact that many of the more extreme liberals have seemingly left the Church is misleading. Most of the hierarchy still fall within this category, including those in Rome from whom authority emanates and who believe they are leading the Church in the “avant-garde” of social change (the phrase is Paul VI’s). In some parts of the world they represent the dominant Catholic presence under a variety of names, the most well-known of which is Liberation Theology.

Finally mention must be made of the drop in conversions and the enormous exodus that has occurred: priests and nuns in the thousands and laymen in the millions. Here figures are hard to come by as many of the “lapsed” when polled still claim to be Catholic. But the number of Masses, Communion (despite the fact that the “faithful” are no longer taught the need to be in a state of Grace), Baptisms, etc., has fallen off precipitously. Several studies show that the children of former Catholics no longer even identify themselves as “lapsed.” All this is hardly surprising when one considers the banality of the New Church. Those who initially declared that Vatican II and the New “Mass” would bring millions into the Church, now tell us that they are not engaged in a “numbers game.” Despite this, one should not think the New Church is in the process of disappearing. It fulfills a certain psychological need and while allowing (tolerating) those who take their religion seriously, provides others with the illusion that they can please both God and man with a minimum of effort.

This brings us back to the basic problem. Is the post-Conciliar Church the Church that Christ established? Does it teach what He taught and obey what He commanded? A Catholic believes that “without [the] Faith it is impossible to please God,” and hence that he must be in “Communion” with the Church that Christ established if he is to save his soul. How is he to recognize that Church with certainty?

HOW TO IDENTIFY THE TRUE CHURCH

For those who believe that Christ is God; that He founded a visible Church; that He entrusted this Church with all things necessary for our salvation; and that all Revelation ceased with the death of the last Apostle—principles which are the *sine qua non* for being Catholic—the problem is somewhat simplified. It is but a matter of finding that Church which He established, the Church that teaches and worships in the manner that He taught, *the* (not “a”) Church which has added and subtracted nothing from the original content, from the “precious pearl” with which He entrusted it. Such a Church is obviously unchanging. It is, as the earliest of Creeds attests, “One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic.”

Immediately we have a problem. Almost every sect in existence, including the post-Conciliar establishment, uses the Apostles Creed and claims to have these qualities. Hence it is that we must examine the meaning of these terms with care and see precisely how they apply.

MARKS OF THE TRUE CHURCH

Unity

The quality of *Unity* demands that the Church that claims to be Christ’s must be “one” with the Church He established 2000 years ago. The post-Conciliar or New Church, if words have meaning, denies by definition its identity with the pre-Conciliar or old Church. The earlier establishment always claimed that her teachings, her practices, and her governance were those established by Christ and the Apostles. Indeed, a necessary criterion for any teaching to be considered Magisterial was such an identification.⁵ Thus it is with justice that Vatican II teaches that the Church which Christ established “subsists” in the post-Conciliar communion: the word *subsist* excludes identity and exclusivity.

This principle of unity is so critical that, as the Holy Office stated, it is part of the Faith itself: “The Unity of the Church is absolute and indivisible, the Church has never lost its unity, nor for so much as a time, ever can.” To deny it is to deny that one is speaking of the Catholic Church. As the Blessed Anne Catherine Emmerich said, “Even if there was only one believing Catholic left alive, unity would reside in him.” Unity is an intrinsic quality of the Church.

The post-Conciliar Church teaches she has lost her unity. She blames herself rather than those who departed from her bosom for this “scandal.” Indeed, the re-establishment of this lost unity is her “internal mission”

and the basic thrust of her ecumenical effort. The point is critical. If she believed she possessed unity, she would insist that the other “Ecclesiastical Communities” return to her fold and she would concede nothing to their errors. But now, convinced she has lost her unity, she concedes everything. What principle have any of the Protestant sects given up in order to foster unity with her? Absolutely none. And what principle has she not sacrificed, what doctrine has she not subverted, on the altar of ecumenism? She has prostituted her liturgy, destroyed her sacraments, and even altered the very words of her Founder to achieve this goal. In no clearer way could the post-Conciliar Church announce that she has radically separated herself from the Church established by Christ.

Apostolicity

If the Church is defective in *Unity*, it follows that it is also defective in *Apostolicity*. It has not only abandoned the Apostolic doctrines, it has also abandoned the Apostolic “rites,” and replaced them with rites of purely human origin. It has not replaced them with other and alternative Apostolic rites such as those to be found in the Eastern Churches, but with rites that for all intents and purposes are a mixture of the Lutheran and Anglican services created to deny her fundamental doctrines, rites the development of which were under the direction of a known Freemason. It has even presumed within these rites to change the very words of Christ, her founder.

But her lack of Apostolicity goes even further. The Apostolic Succession which is passed down through her bishops—the “descendents of the Apostles”—has been tampered with. If it has been rendered invalid, as indeed is most likely, then her priests are not ordained and their sacraments in turn, little more than “faith supporting” ceremonies. The only sacraments left intact—and this only potentially since her clergy feel free to change things at will—is Marriage (where the priest is only a “witness”) and Baptism, which she shares with almost every Christian community. Thus she constantly speaks of the unity of the People of God baptized in Christ. Individuals like Schillebeeckx and Hans Küng openly deny this doctrine and more recently we even have a recent cardinal teaching that the whole idea of the Apostolic Succession is absurd!

Catholicity

The Church is called *Catholic* because the truths she teaches are universal. As such, all creation must bow to such truths, as to the Divine Name itself—in Heaven, on earth, and in Hell. Consequently, these same doctrines are taught throughout the entire world, and no Catholic can deny any teaching

Conclusion

which the Church declares or has declared to be true. Truth not only partakes of universality in space, but also in time—or more precisely, its essence is timeless and eternal. Such being so these doctrines can in no way change. Thus, as St. Albert the Great said: “The faithful can develop in the Faith, but the Faith cannot develop in the faithful.” The proper Grace assured to the Magisterium is by no means the Grace of substituting a new revelation for what has been once and for all revealed, but, quite on the contrary, the Grace of never wandering or allowing the faithful to wander from its true meaning.

Now here again the post-Conciliar Church is defective. She has declared as Magisterial, and therefore as true, the entire contents of Vatican II. But Vatican II clearly contains doctrines that are entirely new and different. Not only new and different, but in direct contradiction to those taught by the traditional Church prior to the Council. Now either Truth can contradict itself or God and the Church have lied to us. The universality of truth precludes self-contradiction, for God cannot be divided against Himself. Hence we must conclude that either the New or the Old Church is false.

Holiness

Holiness in the Church is not only dependent upon her sacred “rites” and “Christ-given” doctrines, but also by the “fruits” of her adherents as manifested in the sanctified lives of the faithful. When we look to the “fruits” of the post-Conciliar Church, we can only express great sorrow. The hierarchy vie with each other to openly teach heresy. Thousands upon thousands of priests have abandoned their sacerdotal function. Nuns have left the orders in unbelievable droves. The laity have become like sheep wandering in the desert, virtually indistinguishable in their religious and moral lives from pagans. Catholic children are no longer taught the Faith and many—perhaps the majority—no longer even consider themselves as members of the Mystical Body of Christ. The Churches are desecrated and the altars stripped, the tabernacles removed, and the perpetual sacrifice abandoned. After the Council of Trent we had a virtual plethora of saints, both canonized and un-canonized. After Vatican II—*res ipse loquitur*.

Now Holiness requires that Grace build on nature. If the New Church denies—she actually “denies” nothing, but simply fails to *affirm* eternal truths—that we are both made in the image of God and that we are stained with original sin, what “nature” is left in us for Grace to work on? Either we are made in the image of God, or we are made in the image of an amoeba. Either we have immortal souls by means of which we can be made sons of God and heirs of Heaven, or we must be satisfied with some evolutionary thrust towards “point Omega.” While unquestionably there are individuals

in the New Church that live lives of sanctity, one cannot avoid the conclusion that they do so in spite of, and not because of, what she teaches.

Finally, all these qualities hang together. Lose one and you lose them all, and even here the post-Conciliar Church has outdone herself. She has lost them all, and hence each one. This is not a matter of private judgment, but rather of looking facts straight in the face. In the words of John XXIII, it is a matter of “reading the signs of the times.” After all, if God works through history, so does Satan.

THE LOSS OF SPIRITUAL AUTHORITY

The traditional Church spoke with unquestioned authority, and not as the Scribes and the Pharisees. Her Magisterium came from Christ and the Apostles and functioned to preserve the “Deposit of the Faith” unadulterated. The New Church, having declared that human dignity inheres by nature in each individual, regardless of whether or not he conforms to the divine prototype; that every man has the right to judge for himself in religious matters; and that “religious liberty” is a divinely revealed principle, can no longer speak with authority.

And indeed, instead of witnessing to the eternal truths, this Church “dialogues on an equal footing,” not only with the “separated brethren” and the “world,” but with agnostics and atheists. Given her principles, how can she do otherwise? How can those who speak with the words of St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas “dialogue on an equal footing” with liberal Protestants, agnostics, communists, and village idiots? Did Christ ever go out and “dialogue on an equal footing” with the Pharisees and Sadducees? Did St. Peter carry on such an absurd relationship with Simon Magus? Did John the Apostle dialogue on an equal footing with the heresiarch in the bath house?

If man “is to be guided by his own judgment and enjoy freedom” in religious matters, “private judgment” is placed on the same plane as Divine Revelation. It was of course essential that the New Church do this if she hoped to embrace the modern world and seek “unity” with those who rejected the traditional teachings. But, once she recognized this “bastard” authority in those outside her fold, she had to concede the same privilege to those within. Thus she has become an “open” Church, a Church that admits and accepts a “plurality” of differing opinions within her bosom. It follows then that her teachings can no longer reflect an unchanging Magisterium, a “Deposit of the Faith,” but only a variety of “private opinions.” Unfortunately, the majority of those who base their beliefs on

Conclusion

this principle are unable to agree on very much and so it follows that the post-Conciliar Church accepts as “the people of God” those who accept Baptism and some sort of belief in Christ, while holding the door open to even “atheistic Christians.”

In the practical order most people’s beliefs are the product of their “feelings,” rather than clearly thought out positions. Thus the post-Conciliar Church, insofar as it speaks for religion at all, must unite and represent a conglomeration of such “feelings.” Unfortunately feelings are easily influenced by communications media and the “spirit of the times.” What inevitably results is that the “New Magisterium,” the “Pope and the bishops in union with him,” is often little more than the “voice-box” of currently fashionable, and politically correct “public opinion.” This is why the New Church speaks much of “peace” and “unity”; of the need for the “economic development of backward nations” (usually those “raped” by the modern world, be it capitalist or communist); of “equality” and “progress,” of “human dignity,” and “freedom,” and of “defending the ‘rights’ of modern man” (usually the “right” to ignore prescriptions placed upon him by God). Now, none of these concepts requires a religious outlook, or even a belief in God! This same Church speaks little (and always in embarrassed tones) of sanctity, of the ascetical and spiritual life, of prayer and sacrifice. (They are not denied, for such is not the current methodology of the revolution.) Even the most flagrant heretics and the wildest liturgical abuses are allowed without reprimand, for every person must now be allowed to “do his own thing.” The only thing forbidden is Tradition.

There is of course nothing wrong with a concern for the social order, but here again the New Church betrays truth by virtually limiting her outlook to that of modern man. Doing good rather than being good becomes the goal. Once again, she has abandoned her teaching role. She sees the choices before the world as between capitalism and communism (clearly favoring the latter) and has abandoned all attempts to teach a traditional Christian economics. While lip service is sparingly given to the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII, Marxist analysis is pushed in thinly disguised socialist tracts like Paul VI’s *Progressio populorum*. No wonder Liberation Theology is the wave of the future. No wonder Fidel Castro tells us that we should fear the Jesuits more than Russians!

She has in effect chosen the City of Man over the City of God; organized naturalism over supernaturalism. (Is this not what the modern world has done—that world with which she so earnestly seeks an *aggiornamento*, that world to which she desires to offer herself “in service and in fellowship”?) She has, in essence, abandoned the concept of the Kingship of Christ.

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Witness is borne to the justice of this statement by comparing the old and the new liturgies associated with the Feast of Christ the King. In the Collect, where the Church formerly prayed, “Grant in Thy mercy that all the families of nations, rent asunder by the wound of sin, may be subjected to Thy most gentle rule,” she now prays, as any Protestant might, “May all in Heaven and earth acclaim your glory and never cease to praise you.” In similar fashion, following her innovative teaching on religious liberty and the obligations of the State to give equal protection to every possible belief system, the hierarchy has insisted that Catholic countries like Spain, Portugal, and Bolivia, change their constitutions. No longer may such governments adhere to an official Catholic morality; no longer may they proclaim that Christ is the source of their authority; no longer is the Crucifix to be carried before the flag! As “Pope” John Paul I said: “We used to teach that only the truth has rights, now we know that error also has rights.”

But even worse is the New Church’s abandonment of her authority on the spiritual and moral plane. By this I do not only refer to such things as her abrogation of the Index, her refusal to excommunicate the most notorious heretics, and her abandoning of the “Oath Against Modernism.” Rather, I refer to what is of far greater importance: her inability to take a moral position that the world will listen to. Throughout history and up until the time of the Council, whenever the traditional Church spoke out, the faithful obeyed and the world listened. This is no longer the case. In the end this defect will lead to the most drastic enslaving of man conceivable. Who is left to speak out against the naturalistic forces, the powers and principalities that increasingly dominate the world? Today, when the “Pope” speaks, even his closest bishops hasten to contradict him. His own followers decry his words before others have even had a chance to read them. And the bishops with their interminable declarations and “National Conferences” are (with justice and reason) totally ignored. Consider the recent bishops’ meeting to discuss the issue of giving Communion to politicians who voted for abortion. 186 “bishops” gave such practice their approval while only 6 voted against it.

When the Church is no longer a force for truth and morality, then governments will become the means of legislating in this area. Once this happens, those who cannot accept the “new morality” will be “obstructionists.” If euthanasia is proclaimed a government policy—and it was by the Nazis in Germany, a so-called “Christian” country, and it will be again—then those who refuse to accept this “good” will have to be “re-educated.” Our religious beliefs will be allowed only if we keep them to ourselves, and do not teach them to our children. When we feel called upon

Conclusion

to speak out against the prevailing tide—to witness to the truth—when we refuse to accept the “rulings” of a numerical majority or reject the demands and directives of any power group that happens to control the government, then we will be labeled as “obstructionists” and will be declared “enemies of the State.” The recent jailing of six priests in Canada for speaking out against homosexuality is an example of this. And when this happens, where will the “visible” Church be? Who will speak for us? We shall have to stand alone and accept the consequences. As soon as the hierarchy abandons its traditional role of defending the “Deposit of the-Faith,” and of teaching what Christ taught, it abdicates its spiritual authority. When the sheep are abandoned by the shepherds and led by hirelings and wolves, “weeping and gnashing of teeth” inevitably follow. And if not in our day, then in the days of our children. A Church which achieves an *aggiornamento* with the modern world can hardly oppose that world.

PROGRESS AND EVOLUTION: THE REAL OPIATES OF THE PEOPLE

The New Church has done these things in greater part because she believes in “progress,” and because she would unite herself with the “dynamic” and “evolutionary forces” that she believes will go to create a better world for all mankind—a sort of utopian “kingdom of man on earth.”⁶ She dreams of a world so perfect that, as T.S. Eliot has said, “no one would any longer need to be good.” I would like once more to make it clear that the traditional Church is not against “progress,” if by this term we are referring to the advances of modern science.⁷ The designing of “better mousetraps” is clearly of advantage to society, providing of course that justice is not violated, and the true and proper ends of man not hindered. As to the creating of a perfect society on earth, the traditional Church knows this is an absurd dream. She knows that no progress and no tyranny will ever make an end of suffering,⁸ for, even in the Garden of Eden a “snake” was to be found. Moreover, she cannot accept evolutionary theory even in its mitigated form: the evolution of man from lower forms of life and the Fall of man from an Edenic Paradise are mutually contradictory.⁹ If man is made in the image of an amoeba rather than the image of God, there is not only no Fall, there is also no need for Grace, no nature for Grace to build on, and no need for Redemption.

Yet all this does not mean that man should not, in conformity with his nature and with simple good sense, attempt to overcome the evils he encounters in the course of life—for this however, he requires no

injunctions, either divine or human. But to seek to establish a certain state of well-being with God in view is one thing, and to seek to institute a perfect state of happiness on earth apart from God, is quite another. In any event, the latter aim is foredoomed to failure, precisely because the lasting elimination of our miseries is dependent upon our conforming to the Divine Equilibrium, and upon our establishing the Kingdom of God within our souls. As long as men have not realized a sanctifying “inwardness,” the abolition of earthly trials is not only impossible, but undesirable, because the sinner, “exteriorized man,” has need of suffering in order to expiate his faults and in order to tear himself away from sin; in order to escape from that very “outwardness” from which sin derives. From the spiritual point of view, which alone takes account of the true cause of our calamities, a society “perfect” in every worldly sense, a society with the maximum of comfort and so-called “justice,” would, if the final and true ends of man are frustrated, be one of the most evil societies conceivable. Hence it is that the traditional Church teaches that to combat the calamities of this world without regard for the total truth and ultimate good, would be to create an incomparably greater calamity, starting off, in fact, with the denial of this truth and the elimination of this good. Those who dream of liberating man from his age-old “frustrations” are in fact the ones who are imposing on him the most radical and irreparable of all frustrations. The *Civitas Dei* and the worldly progression as envisioned by modern man and the post-Conciliar Church, cannot converge, and those who strive to accommodate the religious message to profane illusions and agitations are among those whom Christ would label as “scatterers.” The idea that the world in which we live today is in any way “Christian” is totally absurd, and any attempt to adapt the Christian Tradition to it can only result in the betrayal of Christ. The modern world, the “post-Christian” world, dreams of abolishing evil by organizing sin. The dream of the New Church that “all may be one” with the kind of “unity in diversity” that she has in mind, can only be achieved at the price of distorting Christ and the message he revealed beyond all recognition.

It is not supernatural religion that is the opiate of the people, but rather these false ideas of progress and evolution. It is they that provide modern man with a false faith (in evolution and the future superman), a false hope (in a worldly utopia), and a false sense of charity (in doing good unto others).

PEACE AND ECUMENISM?

Ecumenism, which John Paul II has repeatedly said is the fundamental thrust of the new Church, essentially places truth on the bargaining table. Once, Christians considered the truths they adhered to so important that martyrs eagerly offered up their lives, Church Fathers accepted exile, and the faithful mutilation, rather than abandon even an iota of the Faith. A modernist Faith renders such attitudes irrelevant. “Truths” which are merely expressions of the collective consciousness of the people are rendered unimportant and unworthy of suffering for.

Our age is an age of apostasy. The terrible apostasy of our era is not due to the fact that the world is filled with heretics and atheists. All things being equal, they cannot but strengthen the Faith of the pious, no matter how many they may be. Our contemporary apostasy, which the acceptance of the Ecumenical Movement exemplifies, is due to the fact that most of us have stopped believing in the Truth; have ceased believing in the existence of Truth and that it is worth struggling for. Even heretics who believe in their heresy have become a rare species. Today people have lost every conviction. Everything is relative, doubtful, and hence indefinite. Little exists that is worth fighting for. Little appears worthy of support except the pleasures of this fleeting life. In such a world, even the convinced heretic is a breath of fresh air.

And it is this that explains the close relationship between the Peace movements and ecumenism. In order to have pleasurable pastimes, the peaceful coexistence and cooperation of all peoples is absolutely essential. Without this it is impossible to assure the procurement of material goods. In order for this to be realized, all boundaries must fall. Religions, ideologies, and nations must unite. Every cause of war, battle, and counter-opinion must cease to exist. The policy of “coexistence,” the idea of establishing a one-world Government, Masonic syncretism—these are all at heart nothing but the expression of man’s inordinate thirst for undisturbed pleasurable living.

Ecumenism teaches that Truth is nowhere to be found. It is the assassination of the hope that has lived in the heart of man from time immemorial. It is the rejection of Truth and its supplantation with man-made “truths.” These man-made truths, of necessity, must make concessions, one to another, for the common good. It is not Christ who asks for the so-called union of Churches, but the world. Christ does not ask for the union of falsehood and truth; it is the world that seeks to adulterate the truth, to make it relative and partial. This is why so many who have absolutely no interest in religion as such, so vigorously support the

Ecumenical Movement. Ecumenism is the best possible way of neutralizing Christianity. It is the last and most perfect trap that the Devil can set for mankind and his most terrible, underhanded attack against the Church of Christ. It is that poison which paralyzes the soul and renders it incapable of believing, of seeing the light, incapable of even thirsting for the truth. It darkens the mind of the Christian and affects him, so that instead of loving the sick and laboring to cure the illness, he ends up loving the very sickness; instead of loving the heretic, he ends up loving his heresy. The real target of ecumenism or pan-religious syncretism is the Church of Christ, the hope and salt of the world. And so it is that the post-Conciliar Church is not just a new Church, another Protestant denomination; it is in fact an anti-Church, for its ultimate aim is the destruction of that Church which Christ established at the very cost of His life.

**THE “SIGNS OF THE TIMES”—THE BELIEVING “REMNANT” OR
“THE PEOPLE OF GOD”?**

Let no one at that day say in his heart . . . “unless God willed it, He would not have permitted it.” No: the Apostle forewarns you, saying beforehand, “God shall send them a strong delusion,” not that they may be excused, but condemned.

St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Catech.* XV, 16-17

The new Church is promising us a social and religious utopia. Let us consider what Scripture has to say about the latter days, presumably those in which we live today. St. Paul warned us in his second letter to Timothy that “the time will surely come when men will grow tired of sound doctrine” (2 Tim. 4:2), and Christ Himself said, “I know that, after my departure, ravening wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock . . . men speaking perverse things” (Acts 20:19). Such has occurred throughout the course of history, so we must look for further guidelines. We know that at some time in history an “Antichrist” will arise and reign supreme. Indeed, his reign will only be terminated by the Second Coming of Christ in glory. But we are told even more. St. Paul warns us in his letter to the Thessalonians: “Let not man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first” and “now ye know what withholdeth, that he [Antichrist] might be revealed in his time. . . . He that now withholdeth will withhold, until he be taken out of the way” (2 Thes. 2:3-10). There are certain other indications of the events that will precede the Second Coming. Thus Christ warns us in Matthew 24 that there will

Conclusion

be “false Christs,” and “false prophets . . . showing signs and wonders,” “iniquity abounding,” and “love waxing cold.” He adds further: “When ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. . . . When ye shall see the abomination of desolation . . . stand in the holy place . . . then let them that be in Judea flee into the mountains.”

It would seem then that the coming of Christ will be immediately preceded by a very awful and unparalleled outbreak of evil, called by St. Paul an apostasy, a falling away in the midst of which a certain terrible Man of Sin and child of perdition, the Antichrist, the special singular enemy of Christ, will appear; that this will be when revolutions prevail, and the present framework of society breaks into pieces; and that prior to this happening, the spirit which he will embody and represent will be kept under “the powers that be”; but that on their dissolution, he will rise out of their bosom and knit them together again in his own evil way, under his own rule, to the exclusion of the True Church.

Remembering that the Old Testament prefigures the New, let us look to this source for further help: One of the particular signs of this time will be “the abomination of desolation” which we are warned of in both the Gospel of Matthew and Mark. This phrase occurs in several places in the Old Testament. Thus in Daniel 9:27 we read that, “The victim and sacrifice shall fail: and there shall be in the Temple the abomination of desolation”; and in Daniel 11:31: “And they shall defile the sanctuary of strength and shall take away the continual sacrifice, and they shall place there the abomination unto desolation.” Now, what else can “the continual sacrifice” be but the Mass? And are we not warned that the Mass will be taken from us? Listen to Malachi 1:7: “You offered polluted bread upon My altars, and you say: wherein have we polluted Thee?” Does not Jeremiah speak in God’s Name when he says, “My Tabernacle is laid waste, all My cords are broken: My children are gone out from Me, and they are not. . . . Because the pastors have done foolishly, and have not sought the Lord: therefore have they not understood, and all their flock is scattered” (10:20-21). Indeed, history repeats itself, for we have the words of Ezechiel, who says, “Her priests have disposed My law, and have defiled my sanctuaries: they have put no difference between holy and profane” (22:26).

In Maccabees we have the story of Antiochus, the savage persecutor of the Jews, who is often taken as a type of Antichrist. Let us consider a few passages from this text that might well apply to the present situation. “In those days went there out of Israel wicked men, who persuaded many, saying, let us go and make a covenant with the heathen that are round about us; for since we departed from them, we have had much sorrow. Then certain of the people were so forward herein, that they went to the

King, who gave them license to do after the ordinances of the heathen . . . and [they] made themselves uncircumcised, and forsook the holy covenant and joined themselves to the heathen, and were sold to do mischief.”

And after these events, Antiochus returning from Egypt, attacked Israel. “And he [Antiochus] entered proudly into the sanctuary and took away the golden altar, and the candlestick of light and the vessels thereof, and the table of the shew-bread, and the pouring vessels, and the crowns.” Still later, when he had returned to his own country, “King Antiochus wrote to his whole kingdom that *all should be one people, and every one should leave his [own] laws*; so all the heathen agreed according to the commandment of the king. Yea, many also of the Israelites consented to his religion and sacrificed unto idols and profaned the Sabbath” (emphasis mine). Eventually, the continual sacrifice having been abandoned, he set up “the abomination of desolation upon the altar, and built idol altars throughout the cities of Judah on every side. . . . And when they had rent in pieces the books of the law which they found, they burnt them with fire.” Even then there were those who refused to comply: “Many in Israel were fully resolved and confirmed in themselves not to eat any unclean thing, wherefore they chose rather to die.”

St. Paul also tells us that Antichrist will “sit in the temple of God.” While the early Fathers interpreted this as the synagogue, and some spiritual writers such as St. John of the Cross teach it refers to the individual soul, there is nothing to preclude the possibility that it can refer to some part (in place or time) of the Roman Church itself. Such a suggestion is far from remote when one considers the statements of the Blessed Virgin who told us at La Salette that “Rome will become the seat of Antichrist.”

But even more, according to the visionary Melanie:

The Church will be eclipsed. At first, we will not know which is the true Pope. Then secondly, the holy sacrifice of the Mass will cease to be offered in Churches and houses; it will be such that, for a time, there will not be public services any more. But I see that the holy sacrifice has not really ceased: it will be offered in barns, in alcoves, in caves, and underground.¹⁰

And at Fatima:

Even in the highest places, it will be Satan who rules and decides the march of events. He will even insinuate himself into the highest summits of the Church. It will become a time of difficult trials for the Church. Cardinals will be opposed to Cardinals, Bishops against Bishops. . . . Satan will be entrenched among their ranks. . . . The Church will be hidden and the world plunged into disorder.

Conclusion

And what do we see in these times when the “continual sacrifice” is but rarely performed. And what is the “auto-destruction of the Church” but the “destruction of the Vineyard”? “O God, they have defiled Thy holy Temple” (Ps. 78:1) with “dance liturgies” and “picture-slide services.” “Thy Holy Places are come into the hands of strangers” (1 Maccabees 2:8-12) in the manner of heretics and “separated brethren” preaching from our pulpits. “Behold our Sanctuary and our glory is laid waste” (*ibid.*), for the tabernacles have been removed and the altars turned into tables. No wonder “My people have forsaken Me” (Jeremias 2:13).

One could of course search the Scriptures for still more clues—but we shall rest with one, the Apocalyptic “mark of the beast.” This is usually assumed to imply that man will worship some “animal” such as the “golden calf.” However, one possible understanding of the “beast” is *man himself*, that is man *qua* man which is so strongly stressed in the Documents of Vatican II. This is man who is “the author of his own culture,” man who “is striving to come to an authentic and full humanity.” After all, the curse of the angel in 16:2 is “upon men who had the character of the beast.” This is man who no longer prays and acknowledges God in other than vague and sentimental terms that have no meaning in reality. This is man whose relationship with the supernatural is one of personal “feeling” and “encountering” rather than one of “knowing” and “accepting Revelation.” This is man who “through his dealings with others, through reciprocal duties, and through fraternal dialogue develops all his gifts and is able to rise to his destiny” (Pastoral Constitution on the Church, Para. 25). This is man whose faith is a “simple sublimating aspiration” rather than a “belief in the doctrines of the Catholic Church.” This is man who no longer needs God or His Church, and who, if he does not proclaim that “God is dead,” at least relegates Him to a “nursing home.” This is modern man who has divorced himself from all Tradition and is convinced that he can “make it on his own.” This is man who has reduced himself to the level of a “beast.” This is man who needs no special “mark,” but rather leaves his mark on every thing he touches.

Finally, Christ repeatedly tells us that when He comes again, He will find but a small “remnant” that is faithful (Luke 18:8)—a remnant upon which Antichrist will visit persecutions—a remnant that “shall call upon His Name.” “Two parts in all the earth shall be scattered, and I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined: and I will try them as gold is tried. They shall call on my Name and I will hear them. I will say ‘thou art my people’: and they shall say, ‘the Lord is my God’” (Zacharias, 13:8-9). To quote St. Paul: “God hath not cast away his people. . . . God forbid. Know ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias; how

he calleth on God against Israel? 'Lord, they have slain thy prophets, they have dug down thy altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life' but what saith the divine answer to him? I have left me seven thousand men that have not bowed their knees to Baal. Even so then, at this present time also, there is a remnant saved according to the election of Grace" (Romans, 11:1-5).

Scripture and Vatican II are obviously in direct contradiction with regard to what the end of times will bring—or are they? The destruction of the Mass, the great apostasy, and the small persecuted remnant are hard if not impossible to reconcile with the "unity of the People of God" under the aegis of the United Nations. The promised "conversion of the Jews," the "restoration" before the final coming, are things remote to our understanding. But as always, mankind is faced with choices. Man's freedom is bound to his responsibilities and he must accept the consequences of his acts.

HAS THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN THE RIGHT TO JUDGE THESE MATTERS?

One constantly hears the statement that it is not within the capacity of the average Catholic layman to judge such issues, and that one must be a trained theologian to understand them. Such is false. If an individual is unable to judge of such matters, not only would there be no conversions to the Church; there would also be no guilt incurred in embracing heresy or apostatizing from the Faith. What the Church condemns is our making judgments about souls, for only God really knows the "bowels" of a human being. As to discerning between truth and falsehood, that is our obligation.

As for current training in theology, if one is to judge by the post-Conciliar hierarchy, this is a prescription for damning one's soul. Theology has never been the sole prerogative of those in holy orders, and it is perfectly conceivable that a given layman may be more intelligent and discerning than many priests; indeed the times would seem to supply more than ample evidence of such. In point of fact, the laity have an obligation to know their catechism and to judge innovations and doctrinal changes by it. It is Tradition and orthodox doctrine that provide the laity the means of making such judgments. By following these infallible guides they will neither be led astray, nor will they be guilty of presumption.

THE FINAL SOLUTION

What then can the traditional Catholic do? (How could any Catholic declare that he didn't wish to be traditional?) Faced with the present situation, he must still be primarily concerned with the salvation of his own soul. No man can offer his neighbor what he does not himself possess, and no man can change the world without first changing himself. The kingdom of God, modernist opinion to the contrary, is still within us. Let us turn to St. Vincent of Lerins for advice in the present circumstances.

So what shall the Catholic Christian do if part of the Church should come to detach itself from the Communion, from the Universal Faith? What other side could he take than to prefer to the gangrenous and corrupted member, the body which is whole and healthy? And if some new contagion should seek to poison, not only a little part of the Church, but the whole Church at once, then his greatest care should once again be to adhere to antiquity, which obviously cannot be seduced by any deceitful novelty.

This has always been the attitude of the true Church. St. Athanasius was willing to stand alone against all the bishops of the world—even to the point of having his excommunication confirmed by a Pope who allowed himself to be pressured by the “power structure” of the then existing “world.” Yet today he is a canonized saint. Witness the words of St. Hilary of Poitiers, who advised the Catholics of Milan to abandon their churches and assemble in the woods and caverns, rather than to remain under the Arian Bishop Auxentius: “Of one thing I bid you beware—of Antichrist. The love of walls ill possesses you; ill do you venerate the Church of God in roofs and edifices. Ill do you bear under these for the sake of peace. Safer to me are the mountains, the woods, lakes, prisons, and deep caverns; for in these the prophets, either remaining or thrown, prophecy with the Spirit of God.” Witness the words of St. Thomas More who said: “I do not care if I have against me all the bishops; I have with me the Saints and all the Doctors of the Church.” As St. Athanasius said, when he was informed that all the bishops disagreed with him—“This only proves that they are all against the Church.”

In a certain sense, the faithful Catholic has no choice. He cannot ask with Pilate “what is Truth?” but must accept that “infallible Truth” that Christ revealed to His Church. Now there can be no doubt but that the post-Conciliar “Popes” and the bishops in union with them have abandoned the Faith. (Even on the human plane they have abandoned mankind by their acceptance of socialism.) There can be no doubt but that Vatican II is a modernist and hence an heretical (theologically a “robber”) Council,

that places man on a par with God. There can be no doubt but that the validity of the sacraments and even of the Apostolic Succession has been undermined if not destroyed. Given this situation, and even granting that some of the issues can be debated, the faithful Catholic has no choice but to adhere with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his mind, to that same body of Truth which is the Truth of All Times. It is not just our “right,” but our “obligation” to do so.

One cannot expect the average Catholic to be a well-read theologian or Canon lawyer. But one can expect him to reject anything in the Second Vatican Council that in any way departs from the “Deposit of the Faith” as taught in any standard traditional catechisms.¹¹ He must also reject any ambiguous manner or equivocal way of stating the Truth, as well as anything that in any manner even slightly suggests innovation. He must refuse obedience to anyone who attempts to Protestantize his religious beliefs and practices. He cannot accept “dubious” sacraments, for as the theologians say, a dubious law/sacrament/Pope is no law/sacrament/Pope at all. If the traditional “Canon of the Mass” is of “Apostolic origin,” there is no way in which he can accept an ersatz canon of purely “human origin.” All this is *not* a matter of his exercising “private judgment” or of his personal “freedom of conscience”; it is a matter of an *obligation* in conscience—a well-formed conscience—a conscience molded by that traditional body of doctrine which has been “believed by all, believed always, and believed everywhere” since the time of Christ. Any attempt by the New and post-Conciliar Church to hinder him in this is a direct attack on his soul.¹²

Nor can the Catholic hide behind the mask of ignorance. No one can claim that it is not his responsibility to know his Faith. To do so is to liken oneself to those who were unable to come to the “marriage feast” because they had to care for their oxen. As St. Augustine said: “It will not be imputed to you as a fault that you are ignorant; but that you neglect to seek that of which you are ignorant.” Indeed, it is only in the face of an overwhelming ignorance of the Faith that the new theologians are heard at all. It is only in a society, the members of which are satisfied with television shows and picture magazines, that the modernists can even hope to gain an audience. The almost absolute lack of any internal consistency makes the sophisms of the new Church totally indefensible. It takes a prodigious lack of spiritual perception for anyone to take the contemporary theological thinking of such individuals as Karl Rahner, Bernard Haring, or the recent “Popes” as in any way being a “crystallization” of sacred or even worldly wisdom. If one seeks any intellectual integrity in one’s beliefs, if one wishes to have a Faith that is more than a “feeling” and “a simple sublimating aspiration,” one must return to the hallowed authors that have throughout history been

Conclusion

given us as “exemplars” by the Church of All Times. In this regard it is worthy to note once again that, since the Council of Trent, only two Popes have been canonized: Pope Pius V who spoke out clearly on liturgical issues and promulgated the Bull *Quo Primum*; and Pope Pius X who did the same in the realm of doctrine. To reject what these remarkable men have said is tantamount to apostasy!

Every post-Conciliar Catholic brought up in the traditional Faith knows that something is very wrong. Every parent who sends his children to the services of the New Church knows that they are being taught a different Faith. And hence it follows that no Catholic can evade the central issue raised by this book. He must either show that its contents are inconsistent with the teaching of the Church, or he must accept the logical consequences that its thesis demands.¹³ Be he a “simple layman” or a priest, he has an obligation to believe, and he must therefore accept the responsibility of “discerning” what it is he should believe. To argue that such is not incumbent upon us is to claim that no one has any obligation to be a Catholic, that all conversions are based on fortuitous or emotional circumstances, and that there is no sin in apostasy—a thesis not far from the heart of Vatican II’s declaration on religious liberty.

While I have by no means covered the entire scope of the post-Conciliar deviation, nor marshaled all the available evidence, it can honestly be stated that nothing in this book is either “new” or “original.” All these things, as is obvious from the innumerable quotations, have been said before. Just as the New Church has never answered the challenge of the *Ottaviani Intervention*—but only ignored it, so also she has refused to discuss or debate these issues when raised by numerous other individuals. Her entire attitude towards traditional Catholicism is to pretend it doesn’t exist while doing all it can to seduce the real faithful by offering conservative masses and demanding their “obedience.”¹⁴

AVOIDING THE ISSUES

Some would-be loyal Catholics have attempted to avoid these issues by taking a “conservative” stand. They accept Vatican II as a “legitimate” Council and stretch its statements to force them into an orthodox mold. They accept (admittedly with regret) the *Novus Ordo Missae* and seek out priests who will say it “properly” and with some modicum of dignity. They stress the intermittently orthodox statements of the post-Conciliar “Popes” and ignore those that conflict with Tradition and the Faith. Such is not an acceptable stance for a traditional Catholic.

Others insist on declaring that the post-Conciliar “Popes” are true and valid Popes, and advocate a policy of disobeying them, not only on doctrinal issues, but also on the administrative level. For them Vatican II is legitimate when “interpreted in accordance with Tradition.” Since they insist on deciding what is and is not traditional, they assume to themselves Magisterial authority. While declaring that the post-Conciliar sacraments are *in se* valid (another Magisterial statement), they administer pre-Conciliar sacraments in clear-cut disobedience to those whose authority they proclaim. And further, while declaring that the new Canon law binds, they refuse to follow its commands. Such an attitude is far from being Catholic. It is one thing to adhere to traditional forms while holding that one doesn’t know whether a given “Pope” is a true and valid pontiff, and quite another to declare him valid and disobey him. Such a position not only lacks logic; it is, if not heretical, clearly schismatic.

Still others avoid the issue by attending Eastern Uniate Churches. Such is only a delaying action, for these Churches are also under attack. Those in the United States are usually too small to have their own teaching staffs and hence their clergy are trained in the post-Conciliar seminaries which is a prescription for spiritual disaster. Moreover, their Liturgies are in the process of being brought into line with the *Novus Ordo Missae*. Uniate Churches are highly vulnerable because most of them are quite unfamiliar with the modernist enemy and hence, even apart from their adherence to Rome, provide a most unsafe haven for the Roman Catholic.

There is another group of Catholics that admit all we have said is true, but who stay within the New Church because they hope to reform it from within. They see themselves as “infiltrators” whose function it is to preserve the “True Faith.” The problem with such an attitude is that they give witness—however regretfully—to all that Vatican II teaches and all that the *Novus Ordo Missae* implies. Examples of such are priests who say the New Mass with the proper Words of Consecration (is this not disobedience?), or who provide the laity with “benediction” or rosary services. Such individuals do a great deal of harm for they lend “respectability” to what they claim to abhor. There are two fundamental errors involved. First, they are seemingly (if not in fact), denying the true Catholic Faith, which no Catholic can do. What saint of the Church has ever infiltrated the Lutheran or Anglican bodies to bring them back to orthodoxy? What martyr ever became a follower of the Roman gods to convert Caesar? The second error is to suppose that it is possible for Truth to infiltrate error. The very act involves a dissimulation and a lie. It is a “freedom” given to Satan that he can act in this manner, for he is not bound by the rules of morality. The modernists, the Albigensians, the communists, and the Freemasons do

Conclusion

such things. Catholics never can, for they must declare their Faith—and if they are not obliged to do so under every circumstance, they can never deny it or give witness against it. To act in such a manner is to give support to the enemies of the true Church, and hence to the enemies of Christ.

To admit that there is room within the new Church for conservative priests (and for a conservative laity) is to admit in one and the same breath that there is also room—and on an equally legitimate basis—for “liberal” priests, a “liberal Mass,” and a “liberal theology.” One might well ask if Christ was a “conservative” or a “liberal” priest—recognizing, of course that various answers would be given by *Novus Ordo* Catholics. One must remember that if there are those who travel at great pains to attend a service that is faintly recognizable as “Catholic,” there are also those who attend a variety of bizarre “masses” who can claim and who are recognized as being just as “Catholic.” If the Latin *Novus Ordo* is approved, so is the “clown mass,” or whatever enthusiasm will replace it in an attempt to keep the attention of the congregation. For a Catholic to take a “conservative stance” is for him to admit (and indeed, to connive at) the fact that the New Church is in fact a “pluralistic” and “open” Church. He is, within this framework, simply “picking and choosing” what seems right to him. The conservative Catholic in fact is one who leans towards orthodoxy, but one who refuses to make the necessary commitment. As St. Jerome said many years ago:

If you wander off the track a bit, it makes no difference if you veer to the right or to the left; the important thing is that you are not on the right road (*Commentary on St. Matthew*).

Many dream and claim that the post-Conciliar Church is returning to tradition and point to miniscule concessions as evidence of such. Others beg for patience and charity. What they do not understand is the revolutionary principle of two steps forward, one step back. Every revolutionary stage has embraced this principle and the New Church is no different. To those who assure us of a return to tradition a simple answer is to be given. When Vatican II is thrown out, when the *Novus Ordo Missae* is discarded and condemned, when the true and unequivocally valid sacraments are returned to the faithful, then we will believe the leopard has changed its spots. When that occurs the post-Conciliar Church will have returned to unity where traditional Catholics already are. Till then, we owe no charity to error.

WHAT IS A TRADITIONAL CATHOLIC?

A traditional Catholic (can there be any other kind?) is one who adheres to the teachings of the Church as they have always been. He insists upon the traditional sacraments administered by validly ordained priests, as he rejects the teachings of Vatican II, the *Novus Ordo Missae*, and all the other post-Conciliar sacraments.¹⁵

The argument that Vatican II contains many orthodox statements does not impress him. He knows the Church has never mixed poison with her medicine; that error and truth make poor bedfellows. The only traditional attitude towards ambiguous and inconsistent teachings is to reject them *in toto*.

Traditional Catholics avoid making Magisterial statements. Only the true Church can speak with the authority of Christ. This in no way precludes their having strong and reasonable theological opinions. Hence they will not say absolutely that the New Mass (or any given sacrament) is invalid, but simply that its validity is highly doubtful or almost certainly absent. Now it is a principle that to accept dubious sacraments is a sacrilege. Hence it is that a traditional Catholic insists upon priests ordained before 1968, or conditionally reordained by traditional bishops with the ancient rites. It is a farce for a minister ordained by the new rites to say the ancient Mass. It is also a farce to accept the Mass of John XXIII, the so-called Indult Mass, which while valid (if said by an ordained priest), is only allowed on condition that one accepts the validity of the *Novus Ordo Missae* and the contents of Vatican II. If a true Mass is not available, the traditional Catholic will either say his rosary or read the Missal. If his heart is pure, God will provide him with the necessary Graces. Those who attend the New Mass will have their Faith slowly corrupted as experience has been proven time and again.

And what of the post-Conciliar “Popes”? Here various positions are held. Once again, individuals cannot claim Magisterial authority, and hence, no one can say with absolute certainty what these individuals are. But if we cannot speak for the Magisterium, we are not obliged to abandon all logic. Hence it follows that one can say that these individuals, on the basis of their statements and actions, are not Catholic. And knowing that a non-Catholic cannot be a Pope, one can hold to the firm theological opinion that these men are not Popes. Such is the essence of the *Sede Vacante* position. On the other hand, one can also hold as a “theological position” that they have some “material” function, without any “formal” or spiritual authority. *The important point is that they have no authority*. Finally, one can simply say that one is unsure of their status, but regardless of what it is, one is going

Conclusion

to remain Catholic in one's beliefs and practices. What one cannot do is declare they are Popes, that they are Christ's Vicars on earth, and then disobey them with impunity.

With regard to those who claim these individuals are true Popes, and at the same time claim to be Catholic, a fundamental problem exists. If he or they are true Popes, they must be obeyed, for a true Pope is "one hierarchical person with our Lord," and when he speaks, teaches, commands, or governs, it is Christ who speaks, teaches, commands, and governs. To such individuals I say your Catholic Faith commands that you obey the Pope and the obvious consequence that follows such obedience is that you can no longer remain Catholic. Unfortunately, we cannot have our cake and eat it.

Now there are many who will not accept such criteria for being a traditional Catholic. Knowing that an "untraditional Catholic" is a contradiction in terms, they appropriate to themselves the designation regardless of where they stand on the issues. There is a spectrum of belief in the New Church and most unlikely segments claim the designation. Paul VI asked us to accept his New "Mass" in the name of Tradition and even liberation theologians claim the designation. Hence, to find out where a given Catholic stands, one must ask him his position on the Mass, on the teachings of Vatican II, and on the individuals who currently sit on Peter's chair. These are and will remain the issues that unite and divide the faithful. A Catholic who adheres to the traditional position cannot be accused of turning his back on the "existing" Church. On the contrary, in opposing the New "Mass" and the doctrinal changes introduced by Vatican II, he is only remaining faithful to what the Church has always taught. There is no such thing as the "existing" Church in opposition to "the Church of the past." There is only one Church, a Church that traces its origin back to Christ, and those of modernist or "Conciliar" persuasion have apostatized from it. This is something we dare not do. Using the analogy of the "bark of Peter": we are not "rebels"; we are faithful to the "owner" and refuse to join with those who would "mutiny" and steer the ship into unknown and perilous waters. The accusation that traditional Catholics are "rebels" is as absurd as labeling Thomas More and Cardinal John Fisher rebellious to God because they refused to obey the legitimately crowned king of England. Was Christ a "rebel" for refusing to bow down to Satan?

Nor for the same reason are traditional Catholics schismatics. There is no doctrine of the Church that we deny—not even that of the primacy of Peter. It is not the traditional Catholic that is schismatic, but the post-Conciliar Church; and that body is not so much schismatic—that would be to place it on a par with the Greek Orthodox—as it is heretical. Equally

offensive is the post-Conciliar practice of labeling us “Protestants” because we choose to reject their modernist beliefs. We are not picking and choosing because we adhere to the constant teachings of the Church; rather, we are choosing to be Catholic. It is not our Mass the Protestants use, but the “Mass” of those who would tar us with this brush.

Nor are traditional Catholics in “disobedience.” No one can command one to sin, and to go to the New “Mass” is a sin and a sacrilege. No one can command one to deny the teachings of Christ, and to accept Vatican II is to deny His teachings. That those who insist on being Catholic are in disobedience is an absurdity. And what makes this accusation both hypocritical and offensive is that it comes from those who have made a virtual profession of being disobedient. Threats of excommunication by the post-Conciliar Church are also a “joke.” A traditional Catholic is delighted to be outside the New Church, for that Church is not the Body of Christ. Such threats mean no more than if they came from some other Protestant sect or from the Freemasons. No traditional Catholic can be in communion with the New Church because that would place him in communion with a host of heretics.

HAVE THE GATES OF HELL PREVAILED?

No indeed. The fact that in every city and every nation of the world traditional Catholics abound is proof to the contrary. And indeed, the Gates of Hell can never prevail, for even if Catholics are reduced to a handful, it is with them that the Faith will exist. One does not need the sacraments or even priests in order to remain Catholic. The Japanese managed to do so for three hundred years with neither. St. Anthony of the Desert lived for years without the administration of a priest. (Of course, it goes without saying that one is obliged to have recourse to the sacraments when and where they are available.) One must remember that Christ said that when He returned, He would only find a remnant faithful—but it is that remnant that will stand out against the Gates of Hell. Nor are we tried beyond our strength—for such is a *de fide* teaching of the Church. There is nothing that has ever prevented us from being Catholic but our own cowardice or ignorance.

The fact remains that the true Church has become an underground Church, much as happened during the time of the Reformation in England, or again in France where Catholics refused to accept the “constitutional” priests. Throughout the world traditional priests and bishops can be found who are dedicated to providing us with true doctrine and true sacraments.

Conclusion

We must seek them out and support them. Many of them are themselves confused on these issues, and so we must often content ourselves with demanding of them that they be validly ordained and that they provide the true and valid sacraments.

CONCLUSION

The most important issue to keep in mind is that there is nothing going on today which prevents an individual from being Catholic. Granted, one can no longer count upon being spoon-fed by a legitimate and orthodox clergy. But perhaps this is well within God's intent. We must now seek out the truth. We must study our Faith if we wish to live it fully. God does not ask the impossible. He does ask that we be Catholic and that we live our Faith to the fullest degree possible. He doesn't ask that we solve the problem of the Pope. We must have Faith—as Abraham had Faith—that all that happens, and that the future of the Church itself, are within His disposition. But for us as individuals there is only one option. And that is to become or remain a fully traditional Catholic, for as God promised us through the mouth of Matthew, “he that shall persevere to the end, he shall be saved.”

To the post-Conciliar Church, to its “Popes” and “the hierarchy in union with them,” and to the “world” which they have embraced, I say with St. Jerome:

Whosoever you be who assert new dogmas, I beg you to spare Roman ears, spare that Faith which was praised by the mouth of the Apostle. Why, after four hundred years do you try to teach us what we knew till now? Why do you produce doctrines which Peter and Paul did not think fit to proclaim? Up to this point the world has been Christian without your doctrine. I will hold to that Faith in my old age in which I was regenerated as a boy.

Notes

¹ Fr. Lubac is a great admirer of Teilhard de Chardin and was once considered a “progressive,” but found himself outpaced by the *periti* at the Council. He made these comments at the International Congress of Theology in Toronto, Canada, in 1967.

² A religion can be defined by its creed, cult (manner of worship), and governance. I have said little of the latter, for the new Code of Canon Law functions to bring her governance into line with the new doctrinal and liturgical principles.

³ Many of these were already “liberalized” by their education, and were uncomfortable in the traditional Church. They welcomed the changes as a “liberation.”

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

⁴ If one were to ask a group of ten such “Catholics” what they believed, one would get ten different answers.

⁵ That is, for something to be *de fide*, it had to trace its origins back to Christ and the Apostles.

⁶ As an editorial in the *L'Osservatore Romano* (March 3, 1977) stated: “No one today any longer believes in Tradition, but rather in rational progress. Tradition today appears as something that has been bypassed by history. Progress, on the other hand presents itself as an authentic promise inborn in the very soul of man—so much so that no one today can be at home with Tradition which represents what has passed, but only in the future with an atmosphere of progress.” Not everyone is so enamored with progress however. As William Morris said at the end of the last century, “I have no more faith than a grain of mustard seed in the future history of ‘civilization,’ which I know is doomed to destruction: what a joy it is to think of!” Even a recent editorial of the *New York Times* states: “It takes a touching faith in ‘progress’—and a certain cultural arrogance—to believe that western science and technology are bound to improve the lot of Third World Peoples. It doesn’t work out that way.” The “literature of indictment” is full of condemnations of this false “superstition.” Why is it however such a powerful “opiate”? Why do those who have placed their faith in the present order of things put so much stress on this concept? The answer is simple. The present state of affairs, as is obvious to any thinking person, is so terrible, and so clearly fraught with danger on every plane, that it is necessary to provide some “hope” for future improvement. Progress has been touted as an aphrodisiac for the discontented masses ever since the Reformation. This, along with the falsifying and rewriting of history that presents mediaeval times as the “Dark Ages,” convinces modern man that things were far worse in the past and will be far better in the future. (For a more realistic perspective, see William Cobbett, *A History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland* [TAN: Rockford, Ill., 1988]). If modern man were convinced that the present situation was permanent, deprived of the consolations of religion, he would openly revolt and destroy his present masters. God spoke through Jeremiah: “You of this generation, take not of the word of the Lord: Have I been a desert to Israel, a land of darkness? Why do my people say ‘we have moved on’” (Jeremiah, 2:13-17).

⁷ It is entirely false to say that the Church is against science as such. Some of the world’s greatest scientists have been devout Catholics. Empirical science as a subject is restricted to the realm of measurable facts. Religion is not. It is only when modern science claims to encompass the whole of reality—to be in effect, a religion; or when science is allowed to run amuck without moral restraints—that the Church rightly protests.

⁸ The story of SS. Balaram and Josephat are pertinent. Suffering, illness, old age, and death are the lot of man that no utopian society can remove. Even in Purgatory there is suffering.

⁹ Of course many Catholics have accepted evolution despite the fact that scientists consider it a far from proven theory; despite the fact that Scripture tells us all things reproduce “after their own kind”; despite the fact that Monogenism—that we all descend from Adam and Eve—and creation *ex nihilo* are *de fide* teachings of the Church. Biological evolution violates every scientific and rational principle, for it claims that the greater can come from the less. In point of fact, there is absolutely no scientific evidence that can be brought forth in favor of it, and those scientists who do believe in it do so with a “blind faith.” (For a fuller discussion see: Douglas Dewar, *The Transformist Illusion* [Dehoof: Tenn., 1957]; Evan Shute, *Flaws in the Theory of Evolution* [Teamad: Phil., 1961]; and Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* [Anchor Brendon: Essex, Eng., 1985]).

Mitigated Evolution, or the idea that God works through the evolutionary process, is also absurd. If such is the case then prayer (to change the forces of evolution), charity to

Conclusion

our neighbor (interfering with natural selection), and sanctity (a matter of our choice) are absurd.

It is sad to note how frequently *avant-garde* Churchmen are behind in their scientific thinking. Just as they embrace Protestant theologies at a time when the Reformation sects are recognizing their own bankruptcy, so also they embrace scientific theories as fact when they have been all but discredited. John Paul II was a firm believer in Evolution. To quote him directly: "All the observations concerning the development of life lead to a similar conclusion. The evolution of living things, of which science seeks to determine the stages and to discern the mechanism, presents an internal finality which arouses admiration. This finality which directs beings in a direction for which they are not responsible or in charge, obliges one to suppose a Mind which is its inventor, its Creator" (General Audience, July 10, 1985.) Believe this, and you will believe anything.

The prophet Daniel tells us of the Antichrist, that "in *his estate* he shall honor the 'god of forces'; and a god whom his fathers know not shall he honor" (Dan. 11:39; emphasis mine). What better definition could one give of the "god of forces" than the current belief in Evolution?

¹⁰ Abbot Paul Combe, *The Secret of Melanie and the Actual Crisis* (Rome, 1906, p. 137).

¹¹ *The Catechism of the Council of Trent*, and *The Catechism of Pius X*.

¹² *Quo Primum* guarantees the right of a Catholic to say and/or attend the traditional Mass, and anyone who denies him this privilege will incur the wrath of SS. Peter and Paul. The new Church has "abrogated" this Bull as explained in earlier parts of this text, but for Catholics the Bull still stands.

¹³ No one has demonstrated that the first edition of this book, published in 1978, was heretical or in any way departed from the teaching of the Church.

¹⁴ The reader is referred to "A Correspondence with Mother Theresa," available on my web page: Coomaraswamy-catholic-writings.com.

¹⁵ Baptism and Marriage, neither of which require a priest, may be valid. Baptism, however, is distorted by the theological training which sees this rite as "welcoming a person into the Christian community," and hence conditional re-baptism is usually advisable. Marriage, providing the parties understand, requires a priest, and hence are usually considered valid.

ADDENDUM: BENEDICT XVI

The death of John Paul II and the advent of “Pope” Benedict XVI provides traditional Catholics with no real hope for a change in Rome, quite apart from his public statements about continuing the policies of John Paul II and furthering the Church’s “irreversible” commitment to ecumenism. Let us listen to his statement reported by *Zenit* (April 25, 2005): “Following the footsteps of my predecessors, in particular Paul VI and John Paul II, I feel intensely the need to affirm again the irreversible commitment assumed by Vatican II” to journey on the “path toward the full communion desired by Jesus and his disciples.”

Ratzinger himself can hardly be considered a Catholic. Perhaps most significant are his published writings such as his *Principles of Catholic Theology* in which he says such things as: “The Resurrection cannot be an historical event in the same sense as was the Crucifixion,” despite the fact that Scripture tells us that if there is no Resurrection, our faith is false and the Resurrection of the body is part of the traditional Creed. Like his predecessor, he praises evolution and tells us: “The impetus given by Teilhard de Chardin exerted a wide influence. With daring vision it incorporated the historical movement of Christianity into the great cosmic process of evolution.”

He is clearly soft on Lutheranism, telling us that “Luther’s historical instinct is clearly proving itself right.” And again, he asserts that “both the Catholic and Protestant interpretation of Christianity have meaning each in its own way; they are true in their historical moment. . . . Truth becomes a function of time. . . . Fidelity to yesterday’s truth consists precisely in abandoning it in assuming it into today’s truth.”

In his *Begrundung Christlicher Existenz* (The Sacramental Reason for Christian Existence), he says: “Eucharistic devotion such as is noted in the silent visit by the devout in church must not be thought of as a conversation with God. This would assume that God was present there locally and in a confined way. To justify such an assertion shows a lack of understanding of the Christological mysteries of the very concept of God. This is repugnant to the serious thinking of the man who knows about the omnipresence of God. To go to church on the ground that one can visit God Who is present there is a senseless act which the modern man rightfully rejects.” Such statements clearly deny the “Real Presence” of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist.

Addendum: Benedict XVI

Further, Cardinal Ratzinger also claims that Catholics are now free to reject the great 1864 *Syllabus of Errors* of Venerable Pope Pius IX, because, says the Cardinal without apology, Vatican II is a “counter syllabus” (Fr. Joseph Sainte-Marie, *Catholic Family News*, July 2000 Ratzinger). This is in essence a rejection of the teachings of Vatican I which in essence held that this syllabus was *de fide*. Again, Ratzinger “uncondemned” some false propositions of Antonio Rosmini, which had been condemned by Leo XIII. The principle that he used was that of historical criticism. In short, it means that the condemnation was true when it happened, but now it is no longer true. We understand better now. Leo XIII understood as best he could, but given his time and circumstances. Now we understand better (Letter of Fr. Sanborn, March 7, 2002).

Ratzinger’s seeming conservative stance is self explained. He tells us that he was a radical leftist theologian during the Second Vatican Council (a close associate with Hans Küng), but is now considered the most conservative of the cardinals. His eminence has admitted that he has not moved to the right in four decades, but that the world has moved so far to the left that even a progressive of his conviction looks traditional (Editorial, *Washington Times*, September 30, 2003).

Finally, it must be clearly understood that the only corrective action that can satisfy truly traditional Catholics is a return to the traditional sacraments of the Church and a valid Catholic priesthood. Such is virtually impossible in the present situation. Let me explain: In order to achieve unity with the various Protestant sects that John Paul II and Benedict XVI so ardently desire, it was and is necessary to destroy all the sacraments that depend on a valid Catholic priesthood for the simple reason that the Protestant sects deny any need for a genuine priesthood. (For them, every man is his own priest.) This is precisely what the post-Conciliar Church has done and which is reflected not only in the new “mass,” but above all in the destruction of the Apostolic Succession which is so clearly reflected in the new “rite” for consecrating “bishops.” (Ratzinger himself was “consecrated” a “bishop” using the new and false rite in 1977.) And so it is that however conservative Benedict XVI may appear, he remains in radical opposition to the true Apostolic Catholic Faith.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

RAMA P. COOMARASWAMY was born in New York in 1929, the son of Ananda and Doña Louisa Coomaraswamy. He received his early education in Canada, India, and England, before undertaking undergraduate studies at Harvard University, and medical studies at New York University, where he graduated in 1959. Subsequent post-graduate studies at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York City saw him specialize in both general and thoracic and cardiovascular surgery. Subsequently, after developing some cardiac problems, he retrained in psychiatry and was Assistant Professor of Psychiatry at the same medical school in New York City. Parallel with his distinguished medical career, Dr. Coomaraswamy has retained a deep interest in theological matters and was professor of Ecclesiastical History at St. Thomas Aquinas Seminary in Ridgefield, Connecticut for a period of five years. He is one of the most forceful exponents of traditional Christian teachings—he converted to Catholicism at age 22—and is the author of over fifty articles (many of which are available on his website at: Coomaraswamy-catholic-writings.com), as well as *The Problems with the New Mass* (1990), and *The Invocation of the Name of Jesus: As Practiced in the Western Church* (1999).

BISHOP ROBERT F. MCKENNA, O.P., was initially a Dominican monk who objected to the changes in the beliefs and practices of the Church introduced during the time of Vatican II and its aftermath. He was associated with the Orthodox Roman Catholic Movement—a group of 14 priests who shared similar attitudes, from its inception. He was forced to leave the Dominican monastery because of his refusal to say the *Novus Ordo Missae*, or New Mass, and eventually established himself in Monroe, Connecticut, at Our Lady of the Rosary Chapel. He was consecrated a bishop by Gerard de Laurier who in turn was consecrated by Archbishop Thuc. He has for a long time made himself available as an exorcist, a practice that many traditional priests shy away from. He has conditionally ordained several priests who have left the *Novus Ordo* Church and in turn has consecrated several individuals to the Episcopacy with the intention of preserving Holy Orders within the true Roman Catholic Church. He has associated with him a large group of Dominican teaching nuns, and functions on a daily basis as a parish priest for a large group of laymen.

BISHOP THOMAS C. FOUHY was born in New Zealand in 1908 where he grew up on a sheep farm. He was ordained in 1943 and has worked in

The Destruction of the Christian Tradition

Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, and the United States. He briefly left the priesthood after the changes introduced by Vatican II and its aftermath. He was married for a brief period of time, and after his wife divorced him, decided to return to the active practice of the priesthood as a traditional priest. He performed a public penance because of this lapse—carrying a large cross throughout the length of New Zealand—and then returned to the full practice of the traditional priesthood. He is the author of several articles and a book entitled *The Challenge of Truth*. He was responsible for teaching many in the United States the proper manner of saying the Tridentine Mass, and traveled throughout the world in defense of the Traditional Catholic Faith. He was consecrated in the Thuc line in France in 1993 and subsequently functioned as a traditional Catholic bishop. Currently, at the age of 96, he lives in retirement in a nursing home in New Zealand.

