

Is the Chair of Peter Vacant?

An Argument for Sedevacantism

by

Rev. Courtney Edward Krier



**This treatise was first published in installments during 2017 in
The Catholic Tradition Newsletter
a weekly emailed presentation of News, Information, Readings and Commentary for
traditional Roman Catholics and Catholic Families remaining faithful to the
teaching Magisterium as held by all faithful Catholics through the centuries.**

**St Joseph's Catholic Church
131 N. 9th Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
<http://stjosephlv.org>**

**All rights reserved. No part or parts may be reproduced in any manner except with
approval of the author except to quote parts with proper attribution.**

CONTENTS

I An Argument for Sedevacantism

1. What Is the Church?

2. The Church Is One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic

3. The Church Possesses the Attributes of Authority, Infallibility and Indefectibility

II First Contradiction: The Authority of the Pope: to obey or not to obey?

III Second Contradiction: The Infallibility of the Pope: to believe or not to believe?

IV Third Contradiction: One Church or Many?

V Fourth Contradiction: Unity or Disunity?

VI Fifth Contradiction: The Church: Indefectible or Defectible

VII Sixth Contradiction: Holy Mass: Sacrifice or Meal?

Introduction

In the *Catholic Family News* [December 2015, one of several media owned by followers of the Lefebvrists (CFN is the publication of John Vennari)], was published a recent article titled: *Major New Work on Sedevacantism*. Promoting the book, *True or False Pope? Refuting Sedevacantism and other Modern Errors*, by John Salza and Robert Siscoe with a forward by Bernard Fellay (Superior General of the SSPX), this article is in the form of an interview of the authors where they expose their intention to defend Jorge Bergoglio as their “Pope” when so many of the followers of the Lefebvrists begin to question the continuous insistence that a man who is not Catholic is head of their Church.

In other words, the conservatives were concerned almost exclusively with the last seven Commandments. Well, now that Pope Francis is undermining not only the faith, but also morality (the last seven Commandments), the conservatives are searching for answers. One “answer” they are no doubt considering is whether Francis is a true Pope. And because most of the conservative types have a false understanding of Papal Infallibility (as do their sedevacantist counterparts), it is expected that many of them will be tempted to embrace the Sedevacantist thesis (although they will likely do so in secret rather than in public). How should the faithful react if they are tempted to Sedevacantism? They should react by reading our book, which will provide the answer to every question they are wondering about, and many others that they have not yet considered. . . . (p. 3)

This is the first fallacy of members of the Conciliar Church and the Levfebrists: they don’t judge the situation as a matter between acceptance or rejection of faith and morals, but between Conservatives and Liberals, as though the Church is a political entity and it doesn’t matter what the person believes, a papal conclave is just an election that can put into office a liberal candidate just as it could have put into office a conservative candidate—not a Catholic given the charism to “confirm the brethren” in the faith (cf. Luke 22:32). This can be seen in the recent communique of Bernard Fellay:

*I think we do not have to wait for everything to be resolved in the [Conciliar] Church, for all the problems to be solved. But a certain number of conditions are necessary, **and for us the essential condition is our survival. So I have told Rome, very clearly, that, just as Archbishop [Marcel] Lefebvre used to say in his day, we have a sine qua non condition: if this condition is not met, then we will not move. And this condition is for us to be able to remain as we are, to keep all the principles that have kept us alive, that have kept us Catholic.*** [Retrieved January 30, 2017: <http://sspx.org/en/news-events/news/bp-fellay-gives-rome-clear-condition>]

The second fallacy is that they wait and see if they approve of the leadership of the man elected, just like any political candidate, and if they like what he does he is a “good” pope and if they don’t, then he is a “bad” Pope that one does not have to listen to. Because they make this judgment, they assume everyone else is making the same judgment like the Kennedys, Bidens and Pelosis. Therefore, they conclude also that because Jorge Bergoglio doesn’t meet the approval of the Sedevacantists, that is the only reason why the Sedevacantists claim Jorge Bergoglio isn’t the

Pope—but, if Jorge Bergoglio would have met the expectations of the Sedevacantists, they, the Sedevacantists would have acknowledged him as pope.

They next decide that by calling something erroneous it must be erroneous, that is, why not simply state that Sedevacantists claim the “popes” after Pius XII have not been true Popes?

There are actually two related errors: the first is the simple error that the Popes after Pius XII (died 1958) have not been true Popes. The second error, which quickly follows from the first (and sometimes precedes it), is that the entire Church over which the recent Popes have reigned is a false Church – a “New Church.” (p. 26)

The authors then introduce a term, “realm of being” that in context can only infer that of the candidates “being” heretics before they were elected in conjunction with the next term “realm of action” referring to their “teaching” heresy once elected.

The third fallacy of the authors is that they revert back to pre-Vatican II ecclesiology because:

Thanks in large part to the false ecumenism that has spread throughout the Church during the post-Vatican II era, there is today much confusion over ecclesiology. We treat this subject thoroughly, relying on the Popes, Doctors, saints and some of the most respected pre-Vatican II theologians. (ibid.)

Yet, this is what exactly distinguishes the Catholic Church from the Vatican II Conciliar Church: that the teachings are clear in the Roman Catholic Faith but not clear nor the same in the Vatican II Conciliar Church. One who is truly Catholic today cannot say: I believe everything Jorge Bergoglio believes about the Catholic Church; but one could say in 1958: I believe everything that Pope Pius XII believes about the Catholic Church, just as I believed Pius XI and Pius X and Pius IX, etc., to Peter and what they taught about the Catholic Faith.

A fourth fallacy is the insistence that there must be a pope—yet, *sede vacante* is not a term made up by Catholics rejecting the Conciliar popes, it is a fact that happens at the death of each and every pope and until another papabile is elected and enthroned as Pope.

Finally, the fallacy that to accept sedevacantism, that is, that there is no pope presently, is to say the Church ceased to exist or to say the Church is invisible. But this also does not follow—just a false dilemma or ignorance of what is meant by a visible Church.

These fallacies will be addressed in the present exposition, but it should be clear that even though these authors publish a book with the support of the Levfebrists and Conciliarists, and even though they may regard numbers as proof, and even though they may consider themselves academics and may point to Sedevacantists [I prefer Roman Catholics, but am using the term to distinguish those who stand fast and hold to tradition (cf. *Thess.* 2:14) from those who believe the Church evolves with the ages] as a minority, as not receiving the applause of the world, and as non-academics (which is not true—though doctorates are withheld from us as they hold the once Catholic universities—which really even now shouldn’t have the appellation “Catholic” since they have become the nurseries of infidelity and immorality), the reminder is that Christ chose non-

academics to be His Apostles (the only one possible academic, Judas Iscariot, betrayed the Christ) and is therefore a *non sequitur*. Yet, the resistance to the changes of Vatican II was led by Cardinals, archbishops, bishops, clergy and laity within academic circles. Fifty years later the same resistance continues among bishops, clergy and laity. Cardinals and archbishops are positions bestowed only by a pope—and which anyone claiming such a title today while claiming to be a clergyman within the traditional Roman Catholic Church would be a fraud. The vast amount of writings in the 1960's and 70's that came from the well-trained clergy and academics within the Universities and Seminaries of the Catholic Church prior to Vatican II attest that it wasn't ignorant housewives who rejected the changes, nor was it amateur lay theologians. That because a so-called serious Conciliar apologist engages a housewife to prove his intellectual prowess is only because he perhaps does not dare not meet an Edmund Campion. Nor may anyone take those who are on the fringes and feeding off the spoils (such as the Dimond Brothers, the Old Catholics and other un-Orthodox sects) as representative of the Roman Catholic Faith. To classify these with Sedevacantists is simply mudslinging, not debating the crisis within the Church.

Please keep in mind that in researching theological topics, whatever source is used, Pohle, Ott, Van Noort, Bartman, Tanqueray, Hunter, etc., each draws from the same sources. To repetitiously provide each presentation they provide will only make this work voluminous and even more unreadable when the task is to present the Catholic faith on those points where it forces one to the conclusion that the Conciliar hierarchy is not the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

The following will be a step by step look into the constitution of the Church and why Roman Catholics—not Gallicanists, Modernists, or Conciliarists—conclude that there is no Pope sitting on the Chair of Peter in Rome at the present time.

1. What is the Catholic Church?

The Catholic Church is:

Catechism of the Council of Trent:

. . . in ordinary Scripture-phrase, the word was afterwards used to designate the Christian commonwealth only, and the assemblies of the faithful; that is of those who were called by faith to the light of truth, and the knowledge of God; who, forsaking the darkness of ignorance and error, worship the living and true God in piety and holiness, and serve him from their whole hearts. In a word, “the Church,” says S. Augustine, “consists of the faithful dispersed throughout the world.” [S. Aug. in Ps. cxlix. 1.]

Catholic Encyclopedia:

*The Church is the society of those who accept redemption, of those whom Christ “has chosen out of the world” (John 15:19). Thus it is the Church alone which He “hath purchased with his own blood” (Acts 20:28). Of the members of the Church, the Apostle can say that “God hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love” (Colossians 1:13). St. Augustine terms the Church “mundus salvatus” — the redeemed world — and speaking of the enmity borne towards the Church by those who reject her, says: “The world of perdition hates the world of salvation” (Tractate 80 on the Gospel of John, no. 2). To the Church Christ has given the means of grace He merited by His life and death. She communicates them to her members; and those who are outside her fold she bids to enter that they too may participate in them. By these means of grace — the light of revealed truth, the sacraments, the perpetual renewal of the Sacrifice of Calvary — the Church carries on the work of sanctifying the elect. Through their instrumentality each individual soul is perfected, and conformed to the likeness of the Son of God. (Joyce, G. (1908). The Church. In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company.)*

Leo XIII (*Satis Cognitum*, June 29, 1896): . . . *it is the body of Christ endowed with supernatural life.*

And Pope Pius XII (*Mystici Corporis Christi*, June 29, 1943):

If we would define and describe this true Church of Jesus Christ - which is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church [cf. Vat. Council, Const. de Eccl., cap. 1] - we shall find nothing more noble, more sublime, or more divine than the expression “the Mystical Body of Christ” - an expression which springs from and is, as it were, the fair flowering of the repeated teaching of the Sacred Scriptures and the Holy Fathers. (Par. 13)

The Church was founded by Christ for the salvation of its members.

Gregory the Great (Bk 5, letter 18):

*Certainly Peter, the first of the apostles, himself a member of the holy and universal Church, Paul, Andrew, John,— what were they but heads of particular communities? And yet all were members under one Head. And (to bind all together in a short girth of speech) **the saints before the law, the saints under the law, the saints under grace**, all these making up the Lord's Body, were constituted as members of the Church, and not one of them has wished himself to be called universal.*

Again, Leo XIII:

And, since it was necessary that His divine mission should be perpetuated to the end of time, He took to Himself Disciples, trained by himself, and made them partakers of His own authority. And, when He had invoked upon them from Heaven the Spirit of Truth, He bade them go through the whole world and faithfully preach to all nations, what He had taught and what He had commanded, so that by the profession of His doctrine, and the observance of His laws, the human race might attain to holiness on earth and neverending happiness in Heaven. In this wise, and on this principle, the Church was begotten. If we consider the chief end of His Church and the proximate efficient causes of salvation, it is undoubtedly spiritual; but in regard to those who constitute it, and to the things which lead to these spiritual gifts, it is external and necessarily visible. The Apostles received a mission to teach by visible and audible signs, and they discharged their mission only by words and acts which certainly appealed to the senses. So that their voices falling upon the ears of those who heard them begot faith in souls - "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the words of Christ" (Rom. x., 17). And faith itself - that is assent given to the first and supreme truth - though residing essentially in the intellect, must be manifested by outward profession - "For with the heart we believe unto justice, but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. x., 10). In the same way in man, nothing is more internal than heavenly grace which begets sanctity, but the ordinary and chief means of obtaining grace are external: that is to say, the sacraments which are administered by men specially chosen for that purpose, by means of certain ordinances.

Jesus Christ commanded His Apostles and their successors to the end of time to teach and rule the nations. He ordered the nations to accept their teaching and obey their authority. But his correlation of rights and duties in the Christian commonwealth not only could not have been made permanent, but could not even have been initiated except through the senses, which are of all things the messengers and interpreters.

For this reason the Church is so often called in Holy Writ a body, and even the body of Christ - "Now you are the body of Christ" (I Cor. 12:, 27) - and precisely because it is a body is the Church visible: and because it is the body of Christ is it living and energizing, because by the infusion of His power Christ guards and sustains it, just as the vine gives nourishment and renders fruitful the branches united to it. And as in animals the vital principle is unseen and invisible, and is evidenced and manifested by the movements and action of the members, so the principle of supernatural life in the Church is clearly shown in that which is done by it. (Satis Cognitum)

The Church was instituted by Christ for the sole reason of the salvation of mankind. Salvation means the forgiveness of sin and the possession of eternal life. The Church was not given any other reason (mission):

All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. 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. (Matt. 28:18-20)

And he said to them: Go ye into the whole world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned. . . But they going forth preached everywhere: the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed. (Mark 16:15-16, 20)

Therefore Paul gives this admonition: *Wherefore, my dearly beloved, (as you have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but much more now in my absence,) with fear and trembling work out your salvation. (Philip. 2:12)* To the Ephesians: *That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy, and without blemish. Eph. 5:27*

And Leo XIII, in the Encyclical cited, teaches:

. . . This becomes even more evident when the purpose of the Divine Founder is considered. For what did Christ, the Lord, ask? What did He wish in regard to the Church founded, or about to be founded? This: to transmit to it the same mission and the same mandate which He had received from the Father, that they should be perpetuated. This He clearly resolved to do: this He actually did. "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you" (John 20:, 21). "As thou hast sent Me into the world I also have sent them into the world" (John 17:, 18).

But the mission of Christ is to save that which had perished: that is to say, not some nations or peoples, but the whole human race, without distinction of time or place. "The Son of Man came that the world might be saved by Him" (John iii., 17). "For there is no other name under Heaven given to men whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv., 12). The Church, therefore, is bound to communicate without stint to all men, and to transmit through all ages, the salvation effected by Jesus Christ, and the blessings flowing there from. . . . (Satis Cognitum, par. 4)

The members of the Church are:

*To the church of God that is at Corinth, **to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus**, called to be saints, with all that invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, in every place of theirs and ours. (1 Cor. 1:2)* And, again *For as the body is one, and hath many members; and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and in one Spirit we have all been made to drink. For the body also is not one member, but many. (1 Cor. 12:12-14)*

Gregory the Great (Bk 5, letter 18): *And (to bind all together in a short girth of speech) **the saints before the law, the saints under the law, the saints under grace**, all these making up the Lord's Body, were constituted as members of the Church*

Pope Pius XII (*Mystici Corporis Christi*, June 29, 1943):

Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith, and who have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body, or been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed. "For in one spirit" says the Apostle, "were we all baptized into one Body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free." [I Cor., XII, 13.] As therefore in the true Christian community there is only one Body, one Spirit, one Lord, and one Baptism, so there can be only one faith. [Cf. Eph., IV, 5.] And therefore, if a man refuse to hear the Church, let him be considered—so the Lord commands—as a heathen and a publican. [Cf. Matth., XVIII, 17] It follows that those who are divided in faith or government cannot be living in the unity of such a Body, nor can they be living the life of its one Divine Spirit. (Par. 22)

And, in *Humani Generis* (August 12, 1950), Pius XII again stated:

Some say they are not bound by the doctrine, explained in Our Encyclical Letter of a few years ago, and based on the sources of revelation, which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing. (Mystici Corporis) Some reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation. Others finally belittle the reasonable character of the credibility of Christian faith. (Par. 27)

St. Robert Bellarmine's well-known definition:

The Church is a union of men who are united by the profession of the same Christian faith, and by participation in the same Sacraments under the direction of their lawful pastors, especially of the one representative of Christ on earth, the Pope of Rome (De eccl. mil. 2; cf. Balt. Cat., q. 136).

Monsignor G. Van Noort, in his *Dogmatic Theology*, (Volume II, *Christ's Church*, 1957; cf. also Ludwig Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, part II, chapt. 5, §19)

We call members of the Church only those who unqualifiedly belong to the visible Church. Three facts are required for this: (a) that a person have received the sacrament of baptism; (b) that he be not separated from the profession of the faith of the Church; (c) that he be not separated from union with its hierarchy. These three factors, however, should not receive the same evaluation. Baptism alone is the cause which incorporates a man into the Church; the other two factors are conditions which must be fulfilled if baptism is not to be frustrated in its effect. Baptism, by Christ's own ordinance, always ingrafts a man into the body of the Church unless its efficacy be impeded; and union with the Church, once it has been caused by baptism, perseveres uninterruptedly so long as it be not severed by either of the separations mentioned above.

Presently the argument is not over the Church in the broad sense (all who have obtained salvation or possess sanctifying grace including and since Adam and Eve), but the Roman Catholic Church in her visible constitution here on earth, the Church Militant. Again, bear with this exposé as certain terms are defined. A statement ought not be made unless it is true; but it is also necessary to show at times, through proper argumentation, that the statement is true—yet if the terminology

used by one side is understood differently than on the other side, there then becomes merely an argument over words, not statements.

2. The Catholic Church is One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic

In continuing, **the Church must be one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic:** *I believe in one, holy, Catholic and apostolic Church.* (Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed)

a. The Church is One. The Catechism of the Council of Trent, from which source Catholics were taught throughout the world, summarizes this unity as follows:

“My dove is one, my beautiful one is one.” [Cant. vi.8] So vast a multitude, scattered far and wide, is called one, for the reasons mentioned by St. Paul in his epistle to the Ephesians: “One Lord, one faith, one baptism.” [Eph. iv.5.] This Church has, also, but one ruler and one governor, the invisible one, Christ, whom the Eternal Father “hath made head over all the Church, which is his body;” [Eph. i.22, 23] the visible one, him, who, as legitimate successor of Peter the prince of the Apostles, fills the apostolic chair.

Vatican Council Session IV (July 18, 1870):

*“The eternal Pastor and Bishop of our souls” [1 Pet. 2:25], in order to render the saving work of redemption perennial, willed to build a holy Church, in which, as in the house of the living God, all the faithful might be contained by the bond of one faith and charity. Therefore, before His glory was made manifest, “He asked the Father, not only for the Apostles but also for those who would believe through their word in Him, that all might be one, just as the Son Himself and the Father are one” [John 17:20 f.]. Thus, then, as He sent the apostles, whom He had selected from the world for Himself, as He himself had been sent by the Father [John 20:21], so in His Church He wished the pastors and the doctors to be “even to the consummation of the world” [Matt. 28:20]. But, that the episcopacy itself might be one and undivided, and that the entire multitude of the faithful through priests closely connected with one another **might be preserved in the unity of faith and communion**, placing the blessed Peter over the other apostles He established in him the perpetual principle and visible foundation of both unities, upon whose strength the eternal temple might be erected, and the sublimity of the Church to be raised to heaven might rise in the firmness of this faith. [Cf. St. Leo the Great, serm. 4 de natali ipsius c. 2] And, since the gates of hell, to overthrow the Church, if this were possible, arise from all sides with ever greater hatred against its divinely established foundation, We judge it to be necessary for the protection, safety, and increase of the Catholic flock, with the approbation of the Council, to set forth the doctrine on the institution, perpetuity, and nature of the Sacred Apostolic Primacy, in which the strength and solidarity of the whole Church consist, to be believed and held by all the faithful, according to the ancient and continual faith of the universal Church, and to proscribe and condemn the contrary errors, so pernicious to the Lord’s flock. (Dogmatic Constitution I on the Church of Christ, Preamble; cf. D 1821)*

To preserve that unity, a visible head is necessary:

That this visible head is necessary to establish and preserve unity in the Church is the unanimous accord of the Fathers; and on this, the sentiments of St. Jerome, in his work against Jovinian, are as clearly conceived as they are happily expressed: "One," says he, "is chosen, that, by the appointment of a head, all occasion of schism may be removed;" [S. Hyeron. Lib. I contr. Jovin. In med. Et epist. 57.] and to Damasus, "Let envy cease, let the pride of Roman ambition be humbled: I speak to the successor of the fisherman, and to the disciple of the cross. Following no chief but Christ, I am united in communion with your Holiness, that is, with the chair of Peter. I know that on that rock is built the Church. Whoever will eat the lamb outside this house is profane: who ever is not in the ark of Noah shall perish in the flood." The same doctrine was, long before, established by S. S. Irenaeus, [Iren. Lib. 3 contr. Haeres. Cap. 3.] and Cyprian: [B. Cyprian. de simp. Praeel. In principio fere.] the latter, speaking of the unity of the Church, observes: "The Lord said to Peter, I say to thee Peter! thou art Peter: and upon this rock I will build my Church: [Matt. 16:18.] he builds his Church on one; and although, after his resurrection, he gave equal power to all his Apostles, saying, As the Father hath sent me, I also send you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost; [John 20:21, 22.] yet, to display unity, he disposed, by his own authority, the origin of this unity, which had its beginning with one, &c." Again, Optatus of Milevis says: "It cannot be ascribed to ignorance on your part, knowing, as you do, that the episcopal chair, in which, as head of all the Apostles, Peter sat, was, first, fixed by him in the city of Rome, that in him alone may be preserved the unity of the Church; and that the other Apostles may not claim each a chair for himself; so that, now, he, who erects another, in opposition to this single chair, is a schismatic and a prevaricator." [Optat. Initio lib. 2. Ad Parmen.] In the next place, S. Basil has these words: "Peter is made the foundation, because he says: Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God: and hears in reply that he is a rock; but although a rock, he is not such a rock as Christ, for in himself Christ is, truly, an immovable rock, but Peter, only by virtue of that rock; for God bestows his dignities on others: He is a priest, and he makes priests; a rock, and he makes a rock: what belongs to himself, he bestows on his servants." [Basil. Hom. 29. Quae est de paenit.] Lastly, S. Ambrose says: "Should any one object, that the Church is content with one head and one spouse, Jesus Christ, and requires no other, the answer is obvious; for, as we deem Christ not only the author of all the Sacraments, but, also, their invisible minister; (he it is who baptises, he it is who absolves, although men are appointed by him the external ministers of the sacraments) so has he placed over his Church, which he governs by his invisible spirit, a man to be his vicar, and the minister of his power: a visible Church requires a visible head, and, therefore, does the Saviour appoint Peter head and pastor of all the faithful, when, in the most ample terms, he commits to his care the feeding of all his sheep; [45 John 21:15.] desiring that he, who was to succeed him, should be invested with the very same power of ruling and governing the entire Church." (Rom. Cat. I, ix)

The unity is in Faith (and Hope):

Leo XIII in *Satis Cognitum*:

Wherefore, in His divine wisdom, He ordained in His Church Unity of Faith; a virtue which is the first of those bonds which unite man to God, and whence we receive the name of the faithful - "one Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. iv., 5). That is, as there is one Lord and one baptism, so should all Christians, without exception, have but one faith. And so the Apostle St. Paul not merely begs, but entreats and implores Christians to be all of the same mind, and to avoid difference of opinions: "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing,

and that there be no schisms amongst you, and that you be perfect in the same mind and in the same judgment” (I Cor. i., 10). Such passages certainly need no interpreter; they speak clearly enough for themselves. Besides, all who profess Christianity allow that there can be but one faith. It is of the greatest importance and indeed of absolute necessity, as to which many are deceived, that the nature and character of this unity should be recognized. And, as We have already stated, this is not to be ascertained by conjecture, but by the certain knowledge of what was done; that is by seeking for and ascertaining what kind of unity in faith has been commanded by Jesus Christ.

The heavenly doctrine of Christ, although for the most part committed to writing by divine inspiration, could not unite the minds of men if left to the human intellect alone. It would, for this very reason, be subject to various and contradictory interpretations. This is so, not only because of the nature of the doctrine itself and of the mysteries it involves, but also because of the divergencies of the human mind and of the disturbing element of conflicting passions. From a variety of interpretations a variety of beliefs is necessarily begotten; hence come controversies, dissensions and wranglings such as have arisen in the past, even in the first ages of the Church. Irenaeus writes of heretics as follows: “Admitting the sacred Scriptures they distort the interpretations” (Lib. iii., cap. 12, n. 12). And Augustine: “Heresies have arisen, and certain perverse views ensnaring souls and precipitating them into the abyss only when the Scriptures, good in themselves, are not properly understood” (In Evang. Joan., tract 18; cap. 5, n. 1). Besides Holy Writ it was absolutely necessary to insure this union of men’s minds - to effect and preserve unity of ideas - that there should be another principle. This the wisdom of God requires: for He could not have willed that the faith should be one if He did not provide means sufficient for the preservation of this unity; and this Holy Writ clearly sets forth as We shall presently point out. Assuredly the infinite power of God is not bound by anything, all things obey it as so many passive instruments. In regard to this external principle, therefore, we must inquire which one of all the means in His power Christ did actually adopt. For this purpose it is necessary to recall in thought the institution of Christianity. (Par. 6-7)

Again, the Roman Catechism (*ibid.*):

The Apostle, moreover, writing to the Corinthians, tells them, that there is but one and the same Spirit who imparts grace to the faithful, as the soul communicates life to the members of the body. [I Cor 12:11, 12.] Exhorting the Ephesians to preserve this unity, he says, “Be careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” [Eph. iv.3.] As the human body consists of many members, animated by one soul, which gives sight to the eyes, hearing to the ears, and to the other senses, the power of discharging their respective functions; so, the mystical body of Christ, which is the Church, is composed of many faithful. The hope, to which we are called, is, also, one, as the Apostle tells us in the same place: [Eph. iv.4.] we all hope for the same consummation, eternal life. Finally, the faith, which all are bound to believe and to profess, is one: “Let there be no schisms amongst you;” [I Cor i.10.] and baptism, which is the seal of our solemn initiation into the Christian faith, is, also, one. [Eph. iv.5.]

Pius IX in his Allocution, *Ubi primum* to the Consistory, December 17, 1847:

. . . We have a special reverence for and We defend very strongly those [traditions] which are in harmony with the tradition of the other Churches, and above all with this Holy Roman Church,

with which, to use the words of Irenaeus, “by reason of her eminent primacy, every church must necessarily agree, that is to say, the faithful of the entire world, and in which is kept, by all the faithful, the tradition which comes from the Apostles” [Adv. Haereses, III, 3, 2.]

*Therefore, let those who wish to be saved come to this pillar, to this foundation of the truth which is the Church; let them come to the true Church of Christ which, in her Bishops and in the Roman Pontiff, the supreme head of all, possesses the uninterrupted succession of apostolic authority, which has never had anything more closely at heart than to preach, to preserve, and to defend with all her strength the doctrine announced by the Apostles on the order of Jesus Christ; who, since the days of the Apostles, has grown in the midst of difficulties of every kind, and who, splendid with the splendor of miracles in the entire world, made fruitful by the blood of Martyrs, ennobled by the virtues of Confessors and Virgins, strengthened by the testimony and the wise writings of the Fathers, has sent down roots and still nourishes in all the countries of the earth, **brilliant in the perfect unity of her faith, of the sacraments and of her spiritual sacred government.** For Us, who, in spite of Our unworthiness, sit on this supreme Chair of the Apostle Peter, on which Jesus Christ Our Lord laid the foundations of his Church, **We will never spare either Our efforts or Our labors, to bring back, by the grace of the same Jesus Christ, to this unique way of truth and salvation, those in ignorance and error. Let all those who oppose Us remember that heaven and earth will pass away, but that not One of Christ’s words can pass away, that nothing can be changed in the doctrine which the Catholic Church has received from Jesus Christ to preserve, to defend, and to preach.***

Van Noort provides this outline:

Christ willed that His Church enjoy unity of faith and of profession (credal unity) which consists in this, that all the members of the Church hold and make profession of the same doctrine as it is presented for belief by the Church’s teaching office.

Note the phrase “make profession of”; for a purely internal assent of the mind to truth does not satisfy the requirements of a visible society such as the Church is. This assent must be given clear outward expression as well: Because with the heart a man believes and attains holiness, and with the lips profession of faith is made and salvation secured (Rom. 10:10).

He then provides the Scriptural texts that prove our Lord and the Apostles *demand that everyone profess the faith preached by the apostles and their successors*: Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-17; Gal. 1:8; I Cor. 1:10; Eph. 4:5, 13-14; Tit. 3:10-11. Next, he draws from early Christianity:

According to St. Justin, real Christians are “disciples of the genuine and unsullied doctrine of Jesus Christ,” and are “one mind, one congregation, one Church.” On the contrary, “those who claim to be Christians but do not hold His doctrine” are heretics.’ Hegesippus stigmatizes as heretics those “who have, each of them, privately introduced their own pet opinions,” because “by introducing strange doctrine . . . they have rent asunder the unity of the Church.” [Cited in Eusebius’ History of the Church, 4. 21.] St. Irenaeus: “Just as the sun is one and the same all throughout the world, so too the preaching of the truth shines everywhere and enlightens all who desire to arrive at a knowledge of the truth. . . for the universal Church has the one and the same faith all throughout the world.” [Adversus haereses i. 10. 2-3].

St. Augustine lists eighty-eight heresies, and then concludes: "There may be or there may arise other heresies, but if anyone espouses one of them, he will not be a Catholic Christian." [Liber de haeresibus concl.]

Van Noort then defines unity of faith:

The unity of faith which Christ decreed without qualification consists in this, that everyone accepts the doctrines presented for belief by the Church's teaching office. In fact our Lord requires nothing other than the acceptance by all of "the preaching of the apostolic college, a body which is to continue forever; or, what amounts to the same thing, of the pronouncements of the Church's teaching office, which He Himself set up as the rule of faith. And so, (a) the essential unity of faith definitely requires that everyone hold each and every doctrine clearly and distinctly presented for belief by the Church's teaching office; and that everyone hold these truths explicitly or at least implicitly, i.e., by acknowledging the authority of the Church which teaches them. But, (b) it does not require the absence from the Church of all controversy about religious matters. For as long as there does not exist a clear and explicit statement of the Church about some point or other, even though it may perchance be contained objectively in the sources of revelation, it can be freely discussed without any detriment to the unity of the faith, provided that all the disputants are ready to bow to a decision of the Church's teaching office, should one be forthcoming. Obviously the unity of faith does not extend beyond the limits of the rule of faith. (op. cit., p. 126-28; cf. Ott, Part 2, chapt. 3, p. 15)

The Unity is also in Communion (Charity)

I therefore, a prisoner in the Lord, beseech you that you walk worthy of the vocation in which you are called, With all humility and mildness, with patience, supporting one another in charity. Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one Spirit; as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism. (Eph. 4:1-5)

That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given to them; that they may be one, as we also are one: I in them, and thou in me; that they may be made perfect in one: and the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast also loved me. (John 17:21-23)

Ludwig Ott in *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*:

This consists, on the one hand, in the subjection of the members of the Church to the authority of the bishops and of the Pope (unity of government or hierarchical unity); on the other hand, in the binding of the members among themselves to a social unity by participation in the same cult and in the same means of grace (unity of cult or liturgical unity). The unity both of faith and of communion is guaranteed by the Primacy of the Pope, the Supreme Teacher and Pastor of the Church (centrum unitatis: D 1960). One is cut off from the unity of Faith by heresy and from the unity of communion by schism. (Part 2, chapt. 3, p. 15; cf. Noort, op. cit., p. 128)

It can be summed up in the words of Saint Thomas Aquinas, in his work, *The Apostles' Creed*:

The unity of the Church arises from three sources:

(1) the unity of faith. All Christians who are of the body of the Church believe the same doctrine. "I beseech you... that you all speak the same thing and that there be no schisms among you" [1 Cor 1:10]. And: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism" [Eph 4:5];

(2) the unity of hope. All are strengthened in one hope of arriving at eternal life. Hence, the Apostle says: "One body and one Spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling" [Eph 4:4];

(3) the unity of charity. All are joined together in the love of God, and to each other in mutual love: "And the glory which You hast given Me, I have given them; that they may be one, as We also are one" [Jn 17:22]. It is clear that this is a true love when the members are solicitous for one another and sympathetic towards each other: "We should in every way grow up in Him who is the head, Christ. From whom the whole body, being joined and fit together, by every joint with which it is supplied, when each part is working properly, makes bodily growth and builds itself up in charity" [Eph 4:15-16]. This is because each one ought to make use of the grace God grants him, and be of service to his neighbor. No one ought to be indifferent to the Church, or allow himself to be cut off and expelled from it; for there is but one Church in which men are saved, just as outside of the ark of Noah no one could be saved. (Art. ix.)

In the previous section a review of the Church's teaching on possessing the mark of being one was provided. The other marks, holy, catholic and apostolic will now be examined to clarify that the understanding Sedevacantist bishops and priests have is not erroneous.

b. The Church must be holy. The holiness of the Church is not in that all her members are holy, for it is evident that there are saints and sinners within her bosom. Christ speaks of the wheat and the cockle to express the condition of the Church:

The kingdom of heaven is likened to a man that sowed good seeds in his field. But while men were asleep, his enemy came and oversowed cockle among the wheat and went his way. And when the blade was sprung up, and had brought forth fruit, then appeared also the cockle. And the servants of the goodman of the house coming said to him: Sir, didst thou not sow good seed in thy field? whence then hath it cockle? And he said to them: An enemy hath done this. And the servants said to him: Wilt thou that we go and gather it up? And he said: No, lest perhaps gathering up the cockle, you root up the wheat also together with it. Suffer both to grow until the harvest, and in the time of the harvest I will say to the reapers: Gather up first the cockle, and bind it into bundles to burn, but the wheat gather ye into my barn (Matt. 13, 24-30)

This teaching of His was repeated by Matthew in recording that of the gathering of the fishes (Matt. 13, 47-50), the invitation to the wedding feast (Matt. 22, 1-14), and the wise and foolish virgins (Matt. 25, 1-13). It is applied by Paul who admonishes the Corinthians with these words:

But let a man prove himself: and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body

of the Lord. Therefore are there many infirm and weak among you, and many sleep. (I Cor. 11:28-30)

Sanctity is union with God (cf Ott, II, 4, 16; Noort, p. 135). Therefore, as a visible Church, this sanctity, or union with God, must be visible to those observing the Church. Matthew quotes Christ as saying: *You are the salt of the earth. But if the salt lose its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is good for nothing any more but to be cast out, and to be trodden on by men. You are the light of the world. A city seated on a mountain cannot be hid. (5:13-14)*

Ott sets these signs of holiness:

The Church is holy in her origin, her purpose, her means and her fruits. She is holy in her Founder and Invisible Head of the Church, Christ the Lord; in her inner life-principle, the Holy Ghost; in her purpose which is the glory of God and the sanctification of men, in the means by which she attains her purpose, in the teaching of Christ with its propositions of faith, commandments and counsels concerning morals, in her liturgy especially the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, in her laws, in her institutions, such as the Orders and Congregations, the institutes of education and of charity, in the sacraments, the sacramentals and the liturgical prayers, the gifts of grace and charisma given by the Holy Ghost. Many members of the Church are holy in the ordinary sense of holiness (possession of the state of grace). The Church has never lacked examples of heroic holiness and marvellous manifestations of holiness. Of the kinds of holiness named, however, only the last two, holiness of the means and heroic holiness of the members, are perceptible to the senses, and only these may be regarded as notes of the Church of Christ. (Ott, II, 4, 16)

The Roman Catechism (I, ix) teaches that the holiness of the Church is in her members through baptism in which they are united with God, as in the words of St. Peter (ii.9): “You are a chosen generation, a holy nation.”

The Church is called holy, because she is consecrated and dedicated to God; [Lev. xxvii.28, 30] as other things, such as vessels, vestments, altars, when appropriated and dedicated to the worship of God, although material, are called holy; and, in the same sense, the first-born, who were dedicated to the Most High God, were, also, called holy. [cf. Exod. 13:12]

. . . She is, also, to be called holy, because, as the body, she is united to her head, Christ Jesus, [Eph. iv.15, 16.] the fountain of all holiness, from whom flow the graces of the Holy Spirit, and the riches of the divine bounty S. Augustine interpreting these words of the prophet : “Preserve my soul because I am holy,” [Ps. lxxxv.2.] thus admirably expresses himself: “Let the body of Christ boldly say, let also, that one man, exclaiming from the ends of the earth, boldly say, with Christ his head, and under Christ his head; I am holy: for he received the grace of holiness, the grace of baptism and of remission of sins.” [St. Aug. in Psalm lxxxv. 2.] . . . the Church alone has the legitimate worship of sacrifice, and the salutary use of the sacraments, by which, as the efficacious instruments of divine grace, God establishes us in true holiness; so that to possess true holiness we must belong to this Church. . .

Van Noort teaches:

Christ willed that His Church be holy as to its members (or its effects). That is, that in every age very many of the Church's members be brought to a state of ordinary holiness, and at least some be shining examples of outstanding or heroic holiness. This harvest of holiness may be quite abundant at one time, less satisfying at another. . . .

A harvest of even outstanding holiness can never be wanting in the Church.

From Christ's purpose in founding the Church and the aid He promised. He founded the Church that it might lead men to even perfect holiness; besides, He promised it effective and perpetual help (Matt. 28:20) for the attainment of this purpose. Therefore the Church can no more fail in producing holiness than it can in preaching truth

Christ willed that His Church be holy as to its charisms, that is, that the Church in every age be enriched with certain miraculous gifts through which God manifests its holiness.

Charisms have an essential relationship to holiness, both because they are signs that the Holy Spirit dwells in the Church, and because ordinarily they are enjoyed by those who are outstanding for perfect holiness.

That Christ willed His Church to be favored with charisms in all ages is proved by His unqualified promise:

"Go into the whole world and preach the gospel to all creation. . . . And in the way of proofs of their claims, the following will accompany those who believe: in my name they will drive out demons; they will speak in new tongues; they will take up serpents in their hands, and if they drink something deadly, it will not hurt them; they will lay their hands on the sick, and these will recover (Mark 16:15-18; see John 14:12; I Cor. 12:4-11).

This promise is general, restricted by no time limit, and therefore it cannot be confined to the apostolic age. And Christ added nothing about the measure in which the promise (which was made to the Church, not to individual Christians) should be fulfilled. Consequently there can be a profusion of miraculous gifts in one age and a relative scarcity of them in another, in accord with the needs of the Church or with the decrees of divine Providence, but they will never be totally lacking. . . .

Pius XII concludes also that there should be evident holiness visible in the lives of Catholics at all times:

Moreover He conferred a triple power on His Apostles and their successors, to teach, to govern, to lead men to holiness, making this power, defined by special ordinances, rights and obligations, the fundamental law of the whole Church.

But our Divine Savior governs and guides the Society which He founded directly and personally also. For it is He who reigns within the minds and hearts of men, and bends and subjects their wills to His good pleasure, even when rebellious. "The heart of the King is in the hand of the Lord;

whithersoever he will, he shall turn it.” [Prov. 21:1.] By this interior guidance He the “Shepherd and Bishop of our souls,” [cf. I Peter ii.25.] not only watches over individuals but exercises His providence over the universal Church, whether by enlightening and giving courage to the Church’s rulers for the loyal and effective performance of their respective duties, or by singling out from the body of the Church - especially when times are grave - men and women of conspicuous holiness, who may point the way for the rest of Christendom to the perfecting of His Mystical Body. (Mystici Corporis, par. 38, 39)

The holiness of the Church is seen, therefore, in those members who avail themselves of the means, of which it will be noticeable that these members are living a life of union with God and through those most conspicuous in holiness the Holy Ghost manifests His charisms or works miracles.

c. The Catholicity of the Church is seen in that of her presence always and everywhere throughout the world, being that the Church is for the salvation of all. She is not confined to a certain people, or place or time. Possessing the unity of faith and the means of sanctity as Christ founded the Church, all men who seek the Church can find her and be received within her bosom. Our Lord gave the command to His Apostles: *Going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. 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.* (Matt 28:19-20; cf. Mark 16:15-16) Moral catholicity suffices for the concept of Catholicity. Nevertheless it is Christ’s will that the Church constantly endeavor to extend—the ideal is physical Catholicity. The prophetic Scriptures of the Old Testament point to this catholicity as for example the following: *In thee shall all the kindred of the earth be blessed* (Gen. 12:3); and, *Ask of me, and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession* (Ps. 2: 8). Further, *And in the last days the mountains of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it* (Isai. 2:2). Finally, *For from the rising if the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation: for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts* (Mal. 1:11).

It is substantiated in the New Testament not only by the quote already provided from Matthew, but also from the following examples:

And they sang a new canticle, saying, ‘Worthy art Thou to take the scroll and to open its seals; For Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us for God with Thy Blood, out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation, and hast made them for our God a kingdom and priests, and they shall reign over the earth’ (Apoc. 5:9-10).

And this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world, for a witness to all nations; and then will come the end (Matt. 14:14).

And you shall be witnesses for Me in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and even to the very ends of the earth (Acts 1:8).

Saint Augustine instructs Vincentius, a member of a Donatist sect, as to the concept of Catholic in these words (Letter 93, 7, 23):

You think that you make a very acute remark when you affirm the name Catholic to mean universal, not in respect to the communion as embracing the whole world, but in respect to the observance of all Divine precepts and of all the sacraments, as if we (even accepting the position that the Church is called Catholic because it honestly holds the whole truth, of which fragments here and there are found in some heresies) rested upon the testimony of this word's signification, and not upon the promises of God, and so many indisputable testimonies of the truth itself, our demonstration of the existence of the Church of God in all nations. In fact, however, this is the whole which you attempt to make us believe, that the Rogatists alone remain worthy of the name Catholics, on the ground of their observing all the Divine precepts and all the sacraments; and that you are the only persons in whom the Son of man when He comes shall find faith. [Luke 17:8] You must excuse me for saying we do not believe a word of this. For although, in order to make it possible for that faith to be found in you which the Lord said that He would not find on the earth, you may perhaps presume even to say that you are to be regarded as in heaven, not on earth, we at least have profited by the apostle's warning, wherein he has taught us that even an angel from heaven must be regarded as accursed if he were to preach to us any other gospel than that which we have received. [Galatians 1:8] But how can we be sure that we have indisputable testimony to Christ in the Divine Word, if we do not accept as indisputable the testimony of the same Word to the Church? For as, however ingenious the complex subtleties which one may contrive against the simple truth, and however great the mist of artful fallacies with which he may obscure it, any one who shall proclaim that Christ has not suffered, and has not risen from the dead on the third day, must be accursed—because we have learned in the truth of the gospel, that it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead on the third day; [Luke 24:46] —on the very same grounds must that man be accursed who shall proclaim that the Church is outside of the communion which embraces all nations: for in the next words of the same passage we learn also that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem; [Luke 24:47] and we are bound to hold firmly this rule, If any preach any other gospel unto you than that you have received, let him be accursed. [Galatians 1:9]

And he continues elsewhere (Letter 185, 1, 5) : . . . [T]he evidence of all the several scriptures with one accord proclaims the Church spread abroad throughout the world, with which the faction of Donatus does not hold communion. The law of God declared, “In your seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. [Gen. 26:4] After which, in Sermon 46 (23) he references still other passages (Gen 22, 18.; Ps 2, 8.; Ps 21, 28-29.; Ps 95, 1.; Ps 71, 11.) and concludes:

Nearly every page is nothing than Christ's voice, that the Church is to be diffused in all the world. It strikes me as a voice for the Donatists: What is this wonderful thing I seek? That the Church is to be diffused in all the world was not said to be lost. Is there so many testimonies remaining that predict its loss? Not one voice is there throughout the Law, the Prophets, the Songs, of the pastor—not that they were able to speak the truth without the Word of God, which is Christ—listen to the voice of the Word, and from the mouth of the Word.

Saint Thomas fully agrees with Saint Augustine in these words:

The Church is Catholic, that is, universal. Firstly, it is universal in place, because it is worldwide. This is contrary to the error of the Donatists. For the Church is a congregation of the faithful; and since the faithful are in every part of the world, so also is the Church: "Your faith is spoken of in the whole world" [Rom 1:8]. . . Secondly, the Church is universal in regard to all the conditions of mankind; for no exceptions are made, neither master nor servant, neither man nor woman: "Neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female" [Gal 3:28]. Thirdly, it is universal in time. Some have said that the Church will exist only up to a certain time. But this is false, for the Church began to exist in the time of Abel and will endure up to the end of the world. . . even after the end of the world, it will continue to exist in heaven. (Apostle's Creed, art. ix.)

The Roman Catechism imparts this instruction:

The third mark of the Church is, that she is Catholic, that is, universal; and justly is she called Catholic, because, as S. Augustine says: "She is diffused by the splendour of one faith from the rising to the setting sun." [S. Aug. serm. 131 & 181. de temp.] Unlike republics of human institution, or the conventicles of heretics, she is not circumscribed within the limits of any one kingdom, nor confined to the members of any one society of men; but embraces, within the amplitude of her love, all mankind, whether barbarians or Scythians, slaves or freemen, male or female. Therefore it is written, "Thou hast redeemed us to God in thy blood, out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made us to our God, a kingdom." [Apoc. v. 9, 10.] Speaking of the Church, David says: "Ask of me, and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession:" [Ps. ii. 8.] and also, "I will be mindful of Rahab and of Babylon knowing me:" [Ps. lxxxvi. 4.] and "This man and that man is born in her:" [Ps. lxxxvi. 5.] To this Church, "built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets," [Eph. ii. 20.] belong all the faithful who have existed from Adam to the present day, or who shall exist, in the profession of the true faith, to the end of time; all of whom are founded and raised upon the one corner stone, Christ, who made both one, and announced peace to them that are near, and to them that are afar. She is, also, called universal, because all who desire eternal salvation must cling to and embrace her, like those who entered the ark, to escape perishing in the flood. [Gen. vii.7.]

This, therefore, is to be taught as a most just criterion, to distinguish the true from a false Church.

In *Satis Cognitum*, Leo XIII provides this quality of Catholicism

[T]he mission of Christ is to save that which had perished: that is to say, not some nations or peoples, but the whole human race, without distinction of time or place. "The Son of Man came that the world might be saved by Him" (John iii., 17). "For there is no other name under Heaven given to men whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv., 12). The Church, therefore, is bound to communicate without stint to all men, and to transmit through all ages, the salvation effected by Jesus Christ, and the blessings flowing there from. Wherefore, by the will of its Founder, it is necessary that this Church should be one in all lands and at all times. To justify the existence of more than one Church it would be necessary to go outside this world, and to create a new and unheard-of race of men. That the one Church should embrace all men everywhere and at all times was seen and foretold by Isaias, when looking into the future he saw the appearance of a mountain conspicuous by its all surpassing altitude, which set forth the image of "The House of the Lord"

—that is, of the Church, “And in the last days the mountain of the House of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of the mountains” (Isa. ii., 2).

Drawing from these sources, all theologians present the same understanding of the meaning Catholic.

d. The Last mark of the Church is that of Apostolicity. Van Noort explains it as follows: *According to Catholic teaching, Christ’s Church essentially and necessarily enjoys a triple sort of apostolicity: **apostolicity of doctrine, government, and membership**.* (Noort, 151) He then goes on to explain each:

Apostolicity of doctrine means the Church always retains and teaches the very same doctrine which it received from the apostles. Doctrine, as the term is used at this point, includes also the sacraments. . .

Apostolicity of government—or mission, or authority—means the Church is always ruled by pastors who form one same juridical person with the apostles. In other words it is always ruled by pastors who are the apostles’ legitimate successors.

It has already been proved that Christ Himself founded a living organization, a visible Church. Granted that fact, it should be obvious that an essential part of that Church’s structure is apostolicity of government. For on no one but the apostolic college, under the headship of Peter, did Christ confer the power of teaching, sanctifying, and ruling the faithful until the end of the world.” This triple power, therefore, necessarily belongs, and can only belong, to those who form one moral person with the apostles: their legitimate successors.

Apostolicity of membership means that the Church in any given age is and remains numerically the same society as that planted by the apostles.

. . . Here it is asserted that the entire membership of the Church is likewise apostolic. Apostolicity of membership follows as an inescapable consequence of apostolicity of government. A moral body, despite the fact that it constantly undergoes change and renovation in its personnel, remains numerically the same moral body so long as it retains the same social structure and the same authority. . . (ibid. 150-51, 154)

Further, Tanqueray points out:

By divine right the Apostles’ successors are the Bishops collectively taken, as far as the powers to teach, to rule, and to sanctify the faithful are concerned.

This thesis is historically certain; it is theologically de fide since it has been proposed to faith through the ordinary magisterium of the Church.

The words by divine right are used because Jesus wished the office of the Apostles to be a perpetual one in the Church. Therefore, we should not use the term by ecclesiastical right only as the Protestants and Modernists do.

We say Bishops collectively taken, because only the college of Bishops was made the heir of the Apostolic College. (Vol. II., 111)

That the Church is built upon the foundation of the Apostles is clear in Scripture. In speaking to the Apostles, Christ expresses it in the following quotes:

He said therefore to them again: Peace be to you. As the Father hath sent me, I also send you. (John 20, 21)

Going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. 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. (Matt 28:19-20; cf. Mark 16:15-16)

He that receiveth you, receiveth me: and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me. (Matt. 10:40)

He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me. (Luke 10:16)

Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven. (Mt. 18:18)

The Catechism of the Council of Trent expresses the apostolicity of the Church in this way:

The true Church is, also, to be known from her origin, which she derives under the law of grace, from the Apostles; for her doctrines are neither novel nor of recent origin, but were delivered, of old, by the Apostles, and disseminated throughout the world. Hence, no one can, for a moment, doubt that the impious opinions which heresy invents, opposed, as they are, to the doctrines taught by the Church from the days of the Apostles to the present time, are very different from the faith of the true Church. That all, therefore, may know the true Catholic Church, the Fathers, guided by the Spirit of God, added to the Creed the word "APOSTOLIC;" for the Holy Ghost, who presides over the Church, governs her by no other than Apostolic men; and this Spirit, first imparted to the Apostles, has, by the infinite goodness of God, always continued in the Church. But as this one Church, because governed by the Holy Ghost, can not err in faith or morals, it necessarily follows, that all other societies arrogating to themselves the name of Church, because guided by the spirit of darkness, are sunk in the most pernicious errors both doctrinal and moral. (I, ix)

And Saint Charles Borromeo refers us to Tertullian's *Prescription against Heretics*, where, in chapter 27 he states:

Since, therefore, it is incredible that the apostles were either ignorant of the whole scope of the message which they had to declare, or failed to make known to all men the entire rule of faith, let us see whether, while the apostles proclaimed it, perhaps, simply and fully, the churches, through their own fault, set it forth otherwise than the apostles had done. All these suggestions of distrust

you may find put forward by the heretics. They bear in mind how the churches were rebuked by the apostle: O foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you? Galatians 3:1 and, You did run so well; who has hindered you? Galatians 5:7 and how the epistle actually begins: I marvel that you are so soon removed from Him, who has called you as His own in grace, to another gospel. Galatians 1:6 That they likewise (remember), what was written to the Corinthians, that they were yet carnal, who required to be fed with milk, being as yet unable to bear strong meat; who also thought that they knew somewhat, whereas they knew not yet anything, as they ought to know. 1 Corinthians 8:2 When they raise the objection that the churches were rebuked, let them suppose that they were also corrected; let them also remember those (churches), concerning whose faith and knowledge and conversation the apostle rejoices and gives thanks to God, which nevertheless even at this day, unite with those which were rebuked in the privileges of one and the same institution.

Finally, Pope Leo XIII gives a wonderful outlay of apostolicity and indefectibility in his encyclical, *Satis Cognitum*:

. . . The Apostolic mission was not destined to die with the Apostles themselves, or to come to an end in the course of time, since it was intended for the people at large and instituted for the salvation of the human race. For Christ commanded His Apostles to preach the "Gospel to every creature, to carry His name to nations and kings, and to be witnesses to him to the ends of the earth." He further promised to assist them in the fulfilment of their high mission, and that, not for a few years or centuries only, but for all time - "even to the consummation of the world." Upon which St. Jerome says: "He who promises to remain with His Disciples to the end of the world declares that they will be for ever victorious, and that He will never depart from those who believe in Him" (In Matt., lib. iv., cap. 28, v. 20). But how could all this be realized in the Apostles alone, placed as they were under the universal law of dissolution by death? It was consequently provided by God that the Magisterium instituted by Jesus Christ should not end with the life of the Apostles, but that it should be perpetuated. We see it in truth propagated, and, 'as it were, delivered from hand to hand. For the Apostles consecrated bishops, and each one appointed those who were to succeed them immediately "in the ministry of the word."

Nay more: they likewise required their successors to choose fitting men, to endow them with like authority, and to confide to them the office and mission of teaching. "Thou, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace which is in Christ Jesus: and the things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same command to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii., 1-2). Wherefore, as Christ was sent by God and the Apostles by Christ, so the Bishops and those who succeeded them were sent by the Apostles. "The Apostles were appointed by Christ to preach the Gospel to us. Jesus Christ was sent by God. Christ is therefore from God, and the Apostles from Christ, and both according to the will of God. . . . Preaching therefore the word through the countries and cities, when they had proved in the Spirit the first - fruits of their teaching they appointed bishops and deacons for the faithful. . . . They appointed them and then ordained them, so that when they themselves had passed away other tried men should carry on their ministry" (S. Clemens Rom. Epist. I ad Corinth. capp. 42, 44). On the one hand, therefore, it is necessary that the mission of teaching whatever Christ had taught should remain perpetual and immutable, and on the other that the duty of accepting and professing all their doctrine should likewise be perpetual and immutable. "Our Lord Jesus Christ, when in His Gospel He testifies that those who are not with Him are His enemies, does not designate any special form of heresy, but declares that all heretics who are not with Him and do not gather with Him, scatter His flock and are His

adversaries: He that is not with Me is against Me, and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth”
(S. Cyprianus, *Ep. lxix., ad Magnum, n. 1*). (p. 8)

One can see, then, that apostolicity subsists in apostolic succession, apostolic teaching and a membership that has continued since the Apostles began their apostolic mission.

These marks were reviewed because the Catholic Church must possess these four marks or, as the above quotes prove, the Church is not the Church Christ founded and therefore not the Catholic Church. As was said, the Church must possess these four marks. To possess these marks, the Church must also have the attributes that sustain their presence within her constitution. These attributes are infallibility, indefectibility and authority. They will be covered in the next section.

3. The Church Possesses the Attributes of Authority, Infallibility and Indefectibility

To preserve the unity, sanctity, catholicity and apostolicity of the Church, the Church has been endowed with three attributes: Indefectibility, infallibility and authority. Since the Church has only one purpose for its existence, the salvation of souls, there must be the absolute assurance that the Church is capable of obtaining that end, being that it is a divine institution. It must have the authority to teach; but to teach someone to believe error which would cause that person to lose salvation would defeat her purpose—as would her inexistence at any moment within history.

a. What is the indefectibility of the Church? Our Lord, in founding the Church, announced to Peter: *And I say to thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it* (Matt. 16:18). He then, later, instructed His Apostles: *Teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world* (Matt. 28: 20). The Church was to be the means of salvation, the new covenant (Matt. xxvi.26ff; Mark 14:22ff; Luke 22:19ff; 1 Cor. 11:25) *until he comes* (1 Cor. 11:26) *in virtue of an everlasting covenant* (Hebr. 13:20). This attribute of the Church which Christ founded is called indefectibility or perpetuity. The Indefectibility of the Church, therefore, is the doctrine that the Church, as Christ founded it, will last until His Second Coming. This is to be understood that the Universal Church, as a divine institution, cannot change its essential internal and external character and still remain the Church Christ founded. But these marks are addressed to the “mission of the Church”, or its *raison d’être*. The Church was instituted by Christ to teach, to sanctify, and to govern. This is the “mission” of the Church, in order to bring all men to salvation: *Now this is everlasting life, that they may know thee, the only true God, and him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ* (John 17:3). Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *Satis Cognitum* of June 29, 1896, explains this point accordingly:

Therefore the Church is a society divine in its origin, supernatural in its end and in the means proximately adapted to the attainment of that end; but it is a human community inasmuch as it is composed of men. For this reason we find it called in Holy Scriptures by names indicating a perfect society. It is spoken of as the house of God, the city placed upon the mountain to which all nations must come. But it is also the fold presided over by one Shepherd, and into which all Christ’s sheep must commit themselves. Truly it is called the kingdom which God has raised up and which will stand forever. Finally it is the body of Christ—that is, of course, His mystical Body, but a body living and duly organized and composed of many members; members indeed which have not all the same functions, but which, united one to the other, are kept bound together by the guidance and authority of the head. (10)

Now these threefold commands, or “mission of the Church,” we find enjoined by Christ upon the Apostles in Sacred Scripture, where he says:

All power in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world (Matt. 28:18- 20).

To which the Vatican Council (1870) holds for our belief:

The eternal Shepherd and Guardian of our souls (cf. 1 Pet. ii. 25), in order to render the saving work of redemption lasting, decided to establish His holy Church that in it, as in the house of the living God, all the faithful might be held together by the bond of one faith and one love. For this reason, before he was glorified, he prayed to the Father, not for the apostles only, but for those also who would believe in him on their testimony, that all might be one as he, the Son, and the Father are one (cf. John 17: 20f). Therefore, just as he sent the apostles, whom he had chosen for himself out of the world, as he himself was sent by the Father (cf. John 20: 21), so also he wished shepherds and teachers to be in his Church until the consummation of the world (Matt. 28: 20). (cf. D 1825)

In considering the attribute of the Indefectibility of the Church, it is necessary that the Church, as the only means of salvation instituted by Christ, not only be present at all times and in all places, but also that she teach the immutable “truth” at all times and in all places, that she minister the same Sacraments at all times and in all places, and that her visibility expressed in her hierarchical structure be present at all times and in all places: “One Lord, one faith, one Baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and throughout all, and in us all” (Eph. iv.5-6). Pope Leo XIII expressed this adequately in his above mentioned Encyclical on the *Unity of the Church*:

But Christ’s mission is to save that which had perished; namely, not some nations or peoples, but the whole human race, without distinction of time or place. The Son of man came that the world might be saved through Him (John 3: 17). For there is no other name under Heaven given to men by which we must be saved (Acts iv. 12). The Church, therefore, is bound to communicate without limit to all men, and to transmit through all ages, the salvation effected by Jesus Christ, and the blessing flowing there from. Therefore, by the will of its Founder, it is necessary that this Church should be one in all lands and at all times. To justify the existence of more than one Church it would be necessary to go outside in this world, and to create a new—and unheard of—race of men. (4)

It must constantly be stressed that it is the same teachings, the same sacraments, and the same composition of government, be it in the early Church, in the Middle Ages, or in Modern times, the same doctrine was and is to be held which Christ, the Eternal Word, taught (or it ceases to be the one, holy catholic, and apostolic Church as expressed when writing of the Marks of the Church).

Ludwig Ott, in his *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, can sum up, therefore, the idea of indefectibility as follows:

In saying that the Church is indefectible we assert both her imperishableness, that is, her constant duration to the end of the world, and the essential immutability of her teaching, her constitution and her liturgy. This does not exclude the decay of individual churches and accidental changes (Bk. 4, Pt. 2, par. 12, p. 296).

Again, as the Church is a divine institution, she is assured that this divine assistance will be given her to fulfill her mission by her Head: *I will ask the Father and He will give you another Advocate to dwell with you forever* (John 14:16). It is the fulfillment of the Old Testament Messianic

prophecies which envisage an eternal bond between God and His People, referring to Christ and to His kingdom, the Church. Isaias foretells: *His empire shall be multiplied, and there shall be no end of peace: he shall sit upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom; to establish it and strengthen it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth and forever: the zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this* (9:7; cf. 55:3 and Jer. 32:40). Daniel foresees the Church amidst the worldly kingdoms, which will pass away, but itself remaining: *But in the days of those kingdoms the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed, and his kingdom shall not be delivered up to another people, and it shall break in pieces, and shall consume all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand forever* (2:44). Which prophecies saw their fulfillment in the words the Angel Gabriel exchanged with the Virgin Mary, at the Annunciation: And the Lord God will give him the throne of David his father, and he shall be king over the house of Jacob forever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end (*Luke 1:32-33*).

That the early Church accepted the indefectibility of the Church as such may be read in the extant writings of those Fathers of the Church who lived in this era. St. Ignatius of Antioch, who died a martyr in the beginning of the second century, wrote: *The Lord permitted myrrh to be poured on his head that He might breathe incorruption upon the Church* (*Ep. 17, 1*). St. Irenaeus, an early apologist for the Church, affirms that the preaching of the Church, thanks to the efficacy of the Holy Ghost, *is immutable and always remaining the same* (*Adv. haer. iii, 24, 1*). St. Augustine draws the indefectibility of the Church from its foundation upon Christ: *The Church will totter when her foundation totters. But how shall Christ totter? . . . as long as Christ does not totter, neither shall the Church totter in eternity* (*Enarr. in Ps. ciii, 2, 5; cf. Enarr. in Ps. 47, 7 et lx. 6*).

And this same faith was taught at the Vatican Council (I) in its dogmatic constitution on Faith:

For all the many marvelous proofs that God has provided to make the credibility of the Christian faith evident point to the Catholic Church alone. Indeed, the Church itself, because of its marvelous propagation, its exalted sanctity, and its inexhaustible fruitfulness in all that is good, because of its Catholic unity and its unshaken stability, is a great and perpetual motive of credibility and an irrefutable proof of its own divine mission.

Consequently, the Church, like a standard lifted up for the nations (cf. Isa. 11:12), not only calls to herself those who have not yet believed, but also she proves to her own children that the faith they profess rests on a most solid foundation. To this testimony is added the efficacious help of the supernatural power. For the most merciful Lord stirs up and helps with His grace those who are wandering astray, so that they can “come to the knowledge of the truth” (1 Tim. 2:4); and, never abandoning anyone, unless He is abandoned, He strengthens with His grace those whom He has brought out of darkness into His marvelous light (1 Peter 2:9), so that they may remain in this light. Therefore, the position of those who have embraced the Catholic truth by the heavenly gift of faith and of those who have been misled by human opinions and follow a false religion is by no means the same, for the former, who have accepted the faith under the teaching authority of the Church, can never have any just reason for changing that faith or calling it into question. In view of all this, let us give thanks to God the Father, “who has made us worthy to share in the lot of the saints in light” (Col. 1:12), and let us not neglect so great a salvation, but “looking towards the author and finisher of faith, Jesus” (Hebr. 12: 2), “let us hold fast the confession of our hope without wavering” [(Hebr. 10:23); D 1794].

To those who would claim the Church has and can change, there has only been rejection on the side of the Magisterium of the Church. This is because she can only accept and transmit the truth. Pope Clement XI condemned this error of Paschal Quesnel in 1713:

Truths have descended to this, that they are, as it were, a foreign tongue to most Christians, and the manner of preaching them is, as it were, an unknown idiom, so remote is the manner of preaching from the simplicity of the apostles, and so much above the common grasp of the faithful; nor is there sufficient advertence to the fact that this defect is one of the greatest visible signs of the weakening of the Church and of the wrath of God on his sons —1 Cor. 14:21 (prop. 95; cf. D 1445).

And Pope Pius VI condemned this error of the Council of Pistoia in his Constitution *Auctorem fidei* of August 28, 1794: *The proposition, which asserts “that in these later times there has been spread a general obscuring of the more important truths pertaining to religion, which are the basis of faith and of the moral teachings of Jesus Christ—heretical* (cf. D 1501). This was against those who would say that the Church could obscure *the more important truths pertaining to religion, which are the basis of faith and of the moral teachings of Jesus Christ*, not those outside the Church.

The errors of the Modernists were already condemned by Pope St. Pius X on July 3, 1907, in the Decree *Lamentabili* where these concepts of the Modernists are exposed: *The organic constitutions of the Church is not unchangeable; rather, the Christian society is just as subject to perpetual evolution as human society is* (cf. D 2053). And, another concept prevalent among Modernists: *Dogmas, sacraments, hierarchy—both their notion and their reality—are nothing but evolutions and interpretations of Christian thought which caused the tiny seed, hidden in the Gospel, to grow through external accretions and brought it to fruition* (cf. D 2054).

With the above understanding of what the Church teaches regarding her indefectibility, can one say that the Church may change? Absolutely not! In her teachings of Faith and Morals, in her Liturgy and Sacraments, and in her Hierarchical structure she must be found the same. Is it possible for a Pope to change any of these? No. The Pope, as head of the Catholic Church, expresses what the universal Church believes, the Pope confirms the faith: *But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren* (Luke 22:32) are the words Christ addressed to Peter. Thus the famous proverb: *Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia* (St. Ambrose, Enarr. in Ps. xl. 30). This is particularly expressed in the decisions of a Pope being determined infallible (Papal Infallibility) as also lawful Ecumenical Councils when the Pope determines them infallible. (Many decrees of Councils were wholly or partly rejected on this basis: e.g., Ephesus (II) in 449 and Constance in 1414.)

Referring again to Pope Leo XIII’s Encyclical on Christian Unity, he instructs the Bishops and the Universal Church that:

Hence, from the very earliest times the Fathers and Doctors of the Church have been accustomed to follow and with one accord to defend this rule. Origen writes: “As often as the heretics allege the possession of the canonical Scriptures, to which all Christians give unanimous consent, they

seem to say: 'Behold the word of truth is in the houses.' But we should not believe them and not abandon the primary and ecclesiastical tradition. We should not believe other than as has been handed down by the tradition of the Church of God" (Vetus Interpretatio Commentariorum in Matt., n. 46). Irenaeus also says: "The doctrine of the apostles is the true faith . . . which is known to us through the episcopal succession . . . which has reached even to our age by the very fact that the Scriptures have been zealously guarded and fully interpreted" (Contra Haereses, l. 4, c. 33, n. 8). And Tertullian: "It is therefore clear that all doctrine which agrees with that of the apostolic churches—the matrices and original centers of the faith—must be looked upon as the truth, maintaining without hesitation that the Church received it from the apostles, the apostles from Christ, and Christ from God. . . We are in communion with the apostolic churches, and by the very fact that they agree among themselves we have a testimony of truth" (De Praescript., c. 31). And thus Hilary: "Christ teaching from the ship signifies that those who are outside the Church can never grasp the divine teaching; for the ship embodies the Church where the Word of life is deposited and preached. Those who are outside are like sterile and worthless sand: they cannot understand" (Comment. in Matt. 13, n. 1). Rufinus praises Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil because "they studied the text of Holy Scriptures alone, and took the interpretation of its meaning not from their own inner consciousness, but from the writings and on the authority of the ancients, who in their turn, as is clear, took their norm for understanding the meaning from the apostolic secession" (Hist. Eccl., l. 2, c. p. 9). (9)

What preserves this unity of faith, of liturgy, of the constitution of the Church? Her divine guidance of the Holy Ghost which allows the Church to be infallible in faith and morals.

b. What is the infallibility of the Church? It is the impossibility of the Church to fall into error regarding her Faith and morals.

A full explanation of the infallibility of the Church would include papal infallibility, which must and will be covered in its own right. Yet, let me insert that the admittance the Church is a divine institution, guided by the Holy Ghost, is the key to understand its inerrancy. The intrinsic basis of the infallibility of the Church lies in the assistance of the Holy Ghost, which was promised to her especially for the exercise of the teaching office: *And I will ask the Father and He will give you another Advocate to dwell with you forever, the Spirit of truth whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees Him nor knows Him. But you shall know Him, because He will dwell with you, and be in you* (John 14: 16-17).

This inerrancy St. Irenaeus stresses against the Gnostic error that the promulgation of the Church is always the same, because she possesses the Spirit of the Holy Ghost: *Where thy Church is, there is also the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace; but the Spirit is truth* (Adv. haer., iii. 24,1), and where he states the Church as *the house of the truth*, from which false teaching is excluded (iii. 24,2). Again he informs us that the unfalsified tradition of the apostolic teaching is guaranteed by the uninterrupted succession of the Bishops from the Apostles downwards. *They have received the certain charisma of the truth according to the pleasure of the Father, with the succession in the office of Bishop* (iv. 26, 2). And the Roman Catechism teaches:

[T]his one Church, because governed by the Holy Ghost, cannot err in delivering the discipline of faith and morals; so all other societies, which arrogate to themselves the name of Church, because guided by the spirit of the devil, are necessarily sunk in the most pernicious errors both of doctrine and morals (Part I, ch. X).

Again, the Vatican Council (Sess. IV, cap. 3) instructs and lays before us the correct belief:

To satisfy this pastoral duty, Our predecessors have always expended untiring effort to propagate Christ's doctrine of salvation among all people of the world. And with similar care they have watched that the doctrine might be preserved genuine and pure wherever it was received. Therefore, the bishops of the whole world, sometimes singly, sometimes assembled in councils, following the long-standing custom of the churches and the form of the ancient rule, reported to this Apostolic See those dangers especially which came up in matters of faith, so that here where the faith can suffer no diminution, the harm suffered by the faith might be repaired. However, the Roman Pontiffs on their part, according as the condition of the times and the circumstances dictated, sometimes calling together ecumenical councils or sounding out the mind of the Church throughout the whole world, sometimes through regional councils, or sometimes by using other helps which divine Providence supplied, have, with the help of God, defined as to be held such matters as they had found consonant with Holy Scripture and with apostolic tradition. The reason for this is that the Holy Spirit was promised to the successors of St. Peter not that they might make known new doctrine by His revelation, but rather, that with His assistance they might religiously guard and faithfully explain the revelation or deposit of faith that was handed down through the apostles. Indeed, it was this apostolic doctrine that all the Fathers held and the holy orthodox Doctors revered and followed. For they fully realized that this See of St. Peter always remains untainted by any error, according to the divine promise of our Lord and Savior made to the prince of His disciples, 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail; and thou, when once thou hast turned again, strengthen thy brethren'" (Luke 22: 32; cf. D 1836).

Now, if the Church could err in her opinion, consequences would arise which would be incompatible with the sanctity of the Church. There would be no guarantee that we are taught the same doctrines, receiving the Sacraments, obeying the Church. Rather, as Pope Leo XIII writes in his Encyclical on the *Unity of the Church*:

*Therefore, 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 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 in virtue of an everlasting covenant (Hebr. 13:20) 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. "Lord, if we be in error, we are being deceived by Thee" (Richard of St. Victor, *De Trin.*, l. 1, c. 2). In this manner, all cause for doubting being removed, can it be lawful for anyone to reject any one of those truths without by the very fact falling into heresy? —without separating himself from the Church? —without repudiating in one sweeping act the whole of Christian teaching? For such is the nature of faith that nothing can be more absurd than to accept some things and reject others. . . (9)*

Ott speaks of an active and a passive infallibility, a teaching office and a believing church: *The former belongs to the pastors of the Church in the exercise of their teaching office (infallibilitas in docendo), the latter to the faithful as a whole in its assent to the message of faith (infallibilitas in credendo). Active and passive are related as cause and effect.* (Bk 4, pt 2, par 13)

When the Church teaches the faith, the faithful believe. If the Church teaches error, the faithful believe error. As man was made to believe truth he would have to reject the teachings of the Church unless there was an assurance that those teachings the Church teaches are not erroneous. What guarantee is there? The Spirit of Truth (cf. *John* 14:16-17) that bestows on the Church the Charism of infallibility. The Holy Ghost dwells in the members of the Church, the Head of which is Christ who places Peter as His visible representative (cf. *Matt.* 16:18f) and entrusts the flock to Peter's care (cf. *John* 21:15ff) after telling Peter, *I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.* (*Luke* 22:32)

The Vatican Council, convoked to define the teaching of Papal Infallibility, gave this definition in Session IV Dogmatic Constitution I on the Church of Christ (*Pastor Aeternus*, July 18, 1870):

And so, faithfully keeping to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, for the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and for the salvation of Christian peoples, we, with the approval of the sacred Council, teach and define that it is a divinely revealed dogma: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra, that is, when, acting in the office of shepherd and teacher of all Christians, he defines, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, possesses through the divine assistance promised him in the person of St. Peter, the infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed in defining doctrine concerning faith or morals; and that such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are therefore irreformable because of their nature, but not because of the agreement of the Church (cf. D 1839).

Therefore, in the final decision on doctrines concerning Faith and Morals the Church is Infallible, is *de fide*. This is not to say the Pope is the Church, but to say the Pope speaks for the Church which is infallible, and why the Pope must therefore have the Faith of the Catholic Church.

Again, Scripture points to the Church holding this attribute: *Teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world* (*Matt.* 28: 20). *And I will ask the Father and He will give you another Advocate to dwell with you forever, the Spirit of truth whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees Him nor knows Him. But you shall know Him, because He will dwell with you, and be in you* (*John* 14:16-17). *He who hears you, hears Me; and he who rejects you, rejects Me; and he who rejects Me rejects Him who sent Me* (*Luke* 10:16). *I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.* (*Luke* 22:32)

Saint Paul emphasizes not just faith but the Faith, for in writing to the Romans he holds the agreement of faith: *By whom we have received grace and apostleship for **obedience to the faith**, in all nations, for his name; Among whom are you also the called of Jesus Christ.* (*Rom.* 1:5-6) and to Timothy: *that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God,*

which is the church of the living God, **the pillar and ground of the truth**. (1Tim 3:15) To the Galatians, Paul reprimands them for error of faith and insisting that they even reject him if he departs from the faith:

I wonder that you are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel. Which is not another, only there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema. As we said before, so now I say again: If any one preach to you a gospel, besides that which you have received, let him be anathema. For do I now persuade men, or God? Or do I seek to please men? If I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ. (Gal. 1:6-10)

The Apostolic Fathers have already been referenced, but here would be well to include others to point out the unity of Faith in its Catholicity and Apostolicity for the sanctity of the members of the Church. Saint Ignatius writes to the Ephesians:

Do not err, my brethren. (James 1:16) Those that corrupt families shall not inherit the kingdom of God. (1 Cor. 6:9-10) If, then, those who do this as respects the flesh have suffered death, how much more shall this be the case with any one who corrupts by wicked doctrine the faith of God, for which Jesus Christ was crucified! Such an one becoming defiled [in this way], shall go away into everlasting fire, and so shall every one that hearkens unto him.

For this end did the Lord allow the ointment to be poured upon His head, John 12:7 that He might breathe immortality into His Church. Be not anointed with the bad odour of the doctrine of the prince of this world; let him not lead you away captive from the life which is set before you. And why are we not all prudent, since we have received the knowledge of God, which is Jesus Christ? Why do we foolishly perish, not recognising the gift which the Lord has of a truth sent to us? (Epistle to the Ephesians, 16-17)

Again, St. Irenaeus writes: *One should obey the presbyters [bishops] of the Church, for they are the successors of the apostles and along with episcopal succession have received the sure charism of truth according to the good pleasure of the Father. (Adv. haer., iv. 26, 2.)* Tertullian asks how it is possible that all Catholics had the same faith unless the prayer of Christ was granted:

Grant, then, that all have erred; that the apostle was mistaken in giving his testimony; that the Holy Ghost had no such respect to any one (church) as to lead it into truth, although sent with this view by Christ, John 14:26 and for this asked of the Father that He might be the teacher of truth; John 15:26 grant, also, that He, the Steward of God, the Vicar of Christ, neglected His office, permitting the churches for a time to understand differently, (and) to believe differently, what He Himself was preaching by the apostles—is it likely that so many churches, and they so great, should have gone astray into one and the same faith? No casualty distributed among many men issues in one and the same result. Error of doctrine in the churches must necessarily have produced various issues. When, however, that which is deposited among many is found to be one and the same, it is not the result of error, but of tradition. Can any one, then, be reckless enough to say that they were in error who handed on the tradition? (De praescriptione 28.)

Saint Cyprian of Carthage writes to Pope Cornelius against the heretics:

Nor ought it, my dearest brother, to disturb any one who is faithful and mindful of the Gospel, and retains the commands of the apostle who forewarns us; if in the last days certain persons, proud, contumacious, and enemies of God's priests, either depart from the Church or act against the Church, since both the Lord and His apostles have previously foretold that there should be such. Nor let any one wonder that the servant placed over them should be forsaken by some, when His own disciples forsook the Lord Himself, who performed such great and wonderful works, and illustrated the attributes of God the Father by the testimony of His doings. And yet He did not rebuke them when they went away, nor even severely threaten them; but rather, turning to His apostles, He said, Will you also go away? John 6:67 manifestly observing the law whereby a man left to his own liberty, and established in his own choice, himself desires for himself either death or salvation. Nevertheless, Peter, upon whom by the same Lord the Church had been built, speaking one for all, and answering with the voice of the Church, says, Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life; and we believe, and are sure that You are the Christ, the Son of the living God: Matthew 15:13 signifying, doubtless, and showing that those who departed from Christ perished by their own fault, yet that the Church which believes on Christ, and holds that which it has once learned, never departs from Him at all, and that those are the Church who remain in the house of God; but that, on the other hand, they are not the plantation planted by God the Father, whom we see not to be established with the stability of wheat, but blown about like chaff by the breath of the enemy scattering them, of whom John also in his epistle says, They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, no doubt they would have continued with us. 1 John 2:19 Paul also warns us, when evil men perish out of the Church, not to be disturbed, nor to let our faith be lessened by the departure of the faithless. For what, he says, if some of them have departed from the faith? Hath their unbelief made the faith of God of none effect? God forbid! For God is true, but every man a liar. Romans 3:3-4 (Letter 59 (54), 7)

St. Athanasius addresses Bishop Epictetus concerning the Arians who rejected the Council of Nicea (325):

Such were the contents of the memoranda; diverse statements, but one in their sense and in their meaning; tending to impiety. It was for these things that men who make their boast in the confession of the fathers drawn up at Nicæa were disputing and quarrelling with one another. But I marvel that your piety suffered it, and that you did not stop those who said such things, and propound to them the right faith, so that upon hearing it they might hold their peace, or if they opposed it might be counted as heretics. For the statements are not fit for Christians to make or to hear, on the contrary they are in every way alien from the Apostolic teaching. For this reason, as I said above, I have caused what they say to be baldly inserted in my letter, so that one who merely hears may perceive the shame and impiety therein contained. And although it would be right to denounce and expose in full the folly of those who have had such ideas, yet it would be a good thing to close my letter here and write no more. For what is so manifestly shown to be evil, it is not necessary to waste time in exposing further, lest contentious persons think the matter doubtful. It is enough merely to answer such things as follows: we are content with the fact that this is not the teaching of the Catholic Church, nor did the fathers hold this. But lest the 'inventors of evil things Romans 1:30' make entire silence on our part a pretext for shamelessness, it will be

well to mention a few points from Holy Scripture, in case they may even thus be put to shame, and cease from these foul devices. (Epistula ad Epictetum 3; Letter 59).

St. Augustine, the great expounder of the Faith and opponent of heresies, pens these lines: *Many tongues and various heresies speak in opposition . . . hasten to the tabernacle of God, hold fast to the Catholic Church, depart not from the rule of truth, and you will find in this tabernacle asylum from the tongues which wag in opposition. (Enarr. in Psalmos 30. 3. 8.)* Further, he instructs:

The Catholic Church wages war against all heresies. It can give battle, but it can never be vanquished. All heresies have gone forth from it [the Church] like useless branches pruned from a vine; but it remains itself firmly fixed in its roots, in its vine, in its love. The gates of hell will not prevail against it. (De Symbolo ad Catechumenos, 1, 6.—as quoted in Van Noort)

Having quoted Augustine, one must also then turn to the other great Doctor of the Church, Thomas Aquinas, who in speaking of the faith expressed in the Creed, wrote:

The universal Church cannot err, since she is governed by the Holy Ghost, Who is the Spirit of truth: for such was Our Lord's promise to His disciples (John 16:13): "When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will teach you all truth." Now the symbol is published by the authority of the universal Church. Therefore it contains nothing defective.

[Because] As the Apostle says (Hebrews 11:6), "he that cometh to God, must believe that He is." Now a man cannot believe, unless the truth be proposed to him that he may believe it. Hence the need for the truth of faith to be collected together, so that it might the more easily be proposed to all, lest anyone might stray from the truth through ignorance of the faith. It is from its being a collection of maxims of faith that the symbol [Greek] takes its name. (S. Th. IIa IIae, 1, 9)

The Church is the *guardian and teacher of the revealed word of God* as the Vatican Council teaches:

Moreover, in order that we may satisfactorily perform the duty of embracing the true faith and of continuously persevering in it, God, through His only-begotten Son, has instituted the Church, and provided it with clear signs of His institution, so that it can be recognized by all as the guardian and teacher of the revealed word. (Sess. III, Dogmatic Constitution concerning the Catholic Faith, cap. 3; cf. D 1793).

Van Noort, therefore, says that the primary object of infallibility belong specifically:

- 1. Decisions on the **canon**, or the material extent, of Sacred Scripture, or on its true meaning in passages dealing with faith or morals.*
- 2. Decisions acknowledging and explaining the **records of divine tradition**.*
- 3. Decisions on the **selection of terms** in which revealed truth is to be presented for belief (dogmatic terminology, creeds, dogmatic decrees).*

4. Decisions on doctrines **directly opposed** to revealed truth (condemnation of heresies). For he who knows with infallible certainty the truth of a proposition knows with the same infallibility the falseness of a contradictory or contrary proposition. (p. 109f)

It extends, as Ott states, to the *truths of the Church teaching on faith and morals, which are not formally revealed, but which are closely connected with the teaching of Revelation.* (op. cit.) Here one can reference what the Vatican Council (Sess. III, cap. 3) stated as quoted above:

. . . Our predecessors have always expended untiring effort to propagate Christ's doctrine of salvation among all people of the world. And with similar care they have watched that the doctrine might be preserved genuine and pure wherever it was received. Therefore, the bishops of the whole world, sometimes singly, sometimes assembled in councils, following the long-standing custom of the churches and the form of the ancient rule, reported to this Apostolic See those dangers especially which came up in matters of faith, so that here where the faith can suffer no diminution, the harm suffered by the faith might be repaired . . . (cf. D 1836)

Pope Pius XII reiterated that infallibility in the ordinary teaching in faith and morals when he wrote in *Humani generis* (1950):

Some say they are not bound by the doctrine, explained in Our Encyclical Letter of a few years ago, and based on the Sources of Revelation, which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing. [Cfr. Litt. Enc. Mystici Corporis Christi, A.A.S., vol. XXXV, p. 193 sq.] Some reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation. Others finally belittle the reasonable character of the credibility of Christian faith. (par. 27)

Ott (op. cit.) mentions these as pertaining to faith and morals and therefore infallibility:

- 1) Theological conclusions;
- 2) Historical facts;
- 3) Natural truths of reason; and
- 4) Canonization of saints.

Therefore, if a Council, such as the robber Council of Ephesus or the Council of Basle, the Synod of Pistoia, and Vatican II, does not teach the universal Truths of the Catholic Church, it is not a true Council, be it "Pastoral", "Synodal" or "Ecumenical". Nor can a true Pope approve of such a Council or Synod. If a Pope were to approve doctrines contrary to the universal teaching of the Church, he would no longer be representing Christ, and would not be His Vicar here on earth.

In conclusion we may take the words of Saint Paul to heart: "*Remember your superiors, who spoke to you the word of God. Consider how they ended their lives, and imitate their faith. Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday and today, yes, and forever*" (Hebr. 13:7-8).

For this reason the Fathers of the Vatican Council laid down nothing new, but followed divine revelation and the acknowledged immutable 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 its ordinary and universal Magisterium (Sess. 3, c. 3).

Here one may ask: How can the Church, as a whole, be infallible? It is not that each individual is infallible. It is not that a cleric is infallible, or even a theologian. Rather, one looks at the Constitution of the Church, which is founded on Peter and the Apostles, whose successors are the Pope and the Bishops. They (Pope and Bishops), when they speak in one voice, or when the Pope, as the visible representative of Christ and head of the college of bishops, speaks for the whole episcopacy, possess the divine guidance of the Holy Ghost to teach infallibly concerning matters of faith and morals, that is, to teach that a doctrine or moral must be absolutely believed or observed without exception.

The Church expresses the infallibility of the Pope in these words: **The Pope is Infallible when He speaks ex cathedra** (*de fide*). Since there is no dispute that the Church is infallible, the infallibility of the Church in its entirety will not be further discussed. It is true that there is no dispute that the Pope is infallible, but it must be discussed since it is disputed as to what is meant by the infallibility of the Pope—for Sedevacantists claim the fallible universal teachings on faith and morals of those usurping the Chair of Peter prove they are not popes, while those who might admit the fallible teachings, claim it is because Popes are not infallible unless the Church accepts them as infallible. After the Vatican Council of 1870, which defined the Infallibility of the Popes, Bishop Joseph Fessler, the Secretary General of the Council, wrote a defense of the teaching of papal infallibility. In this work, approved by Pius IX—the Pope who convoked the Council and approved the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church which contains the teaching on Papal Infallibility as well as the teaching on the Papal Office—one reads the following:

. . . [T]he final cause of the foundation of the Church was not that the Hierarchy might govern, and that the laity might obey, but that every one might find salvation in her. . . [I]t is the will of God that the Pope and the Bishops should instruct and govern the Church, of course . . . in that ordinary sense in which the words have ever been understood, and the thing practised in the Church. To the Pope and to the Bishops, in the person of Peter and of the rest of the Apostles, was the whole truth of Revelation committed by Jesus Christ, the Founder of the holy Church. This truth is preserved by them, with a true and earnest watchfulness, as a precious treasure entrusted to them by God, and laid up in their keeping, to be imparted, either by themselves or by their assistants, the priests, to all who, by a true acceptance of this truth and by Baptism, have either already found admission into her, or who shall hereafter find admission. This is what the Pope and the Bishops, according to the will of God, teach. But it is also the will of God that they should govern the Church. This means that they should lead on their way to heaven the faithful committed to their pastoral care by means of the truth which they have received, as also by the means of grace which they have received to administer, and by virtue of that spiritual power with which, in the third place, they are endowed. This they know right well, and bear it always in mind: that in their ministrations they should always, and before all things, as their first duty, follow the example of their Divine Redeemer, the first and highest Pastor of souls, who hath said to them, 'I have given you an example, that you also should do as I have done unto you'. 'Learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly of heart.' 'He who will be great among you, let him be your servant; and he who will be first, let him be your minister, like as the Son of Man is not come to be ministered unto, but

to minister and to give his life a ransom for many.’ This ministration for the good of souls is exercised in very different ways: sometimes with loving and sometimes with zealous words; sometimes with instruction by word of mouth, and sometimes with words of written admonition, after the fashion of the Apostles, in the doctrine and love of Christ. (True and False Infallibility, pp. 41-43)

This corresponds to what was written above. That is, everything the Pope binds on the Universal Church must lead, of itself, to the salvation of the members of the Church. In his next chapter Joseph Fessler takes up Papal Infallibility in this explanation:

1) By this expression, then, ex cathedra, the gift of God’s divine grace conveying Infallibility in faith and morals to the Roman Pontiff, the visible head of the Catholic Church, and who in the person of St. Peter has received from our Lord Jesus Christ the full power to feed the universal Church, to direct and to guide it, is closely restricted to the exercise of his office as Pastor and Doctor of all Christians.

The Pope, as visible head of the whole Church, is:

- I. The Supreme Teacher of truth revealed by God.*
- II. The Supreme Priest.*
- III. The Supreme Legislator in ecclesiastical matters.*
- IV. The Supreme Judge in ecclesiastical causes.*

*He has, however, the gift of Infallibility, according to the manifest sense of the words of the definition, only as **supreme teacher of truths necessary for salvation revealed by God**, not as supreme priest, not as supreme legislator in matters of discipline, not as supreme judge in ecclesiastical questions, not in respect of any other questions over which his highest governing power in the Church may otherwise extend. And when I here decline to place in the range of subjects for the exercise of Infallibility ecclesiastical matters, I mean to exclude all those matters which commonly form the subject of ecclesiastical processes, as, for instance, marriage questions, benefice questions, patronage questions, church-building questions, &c.; **questions of faith of course the Pope decides as Supreme Teacher.***

(2) As doctrinal definitions comprehend doctrines respecting the faith as well as doctrines respecting morals, it will often happen in the nature of things that definitions on the latter of these two subjects, viz. morals, will be issued to the universal Church in the form of a command or prohibition from the Pope (Precepta morum).

(3) Here, in order that we may better understand the subject, it will be well to compare what we are now saying with what is said in the third chapter of the Vatican definition de fide, where it is expressly taught that the Pope possesses the highest power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, ‘not only in matters of faith and morals, but also in matters of the discipline and government of the Church extended over the whole orbis terrarum.’ Thus there are here distinguished four classes of matters as belonging to the province of things ecclesiastical, which fall under the supreme power of the Pope:

- I. Matters of faith.
- II. Matters of morals.
- III. Matters of discipline.
- IV. Matters of government.

In all these matters the faithful owe a true obedience to the Pope.

(4) Then in the fourth chapter, entitled *On the Infallible Teaching Office of the Roman Pope*, the Council treats exclusively of the teaching power of the Pope matters, that is, of the first and second class, faith and morals, not matters of the third and fourth class, i.e. discipline and government. Accordingly, it is only as regards definitions of the Pope upon faith and morals, that the Council defines, as a proposition revealed by God, that they possess infallible certainty by virtue of the unerring divine assistance promised to the Pope in St. Peter, i.e. as the successor of St. Peter. Cardinal Bellarmine had already made this distinction, speaking of the doctrine on morals as follows (*De Rom. Pontif. lib. iv. cap. v.*): *Non potest errare summus Pontifex in praeceptis morum, quae toti ecclesiae praescribuntur, et quae in rebus necessariis ad salutem, vel in iis quae per se bona et mala sunt, versantur.* [The Supreme Pontiff cannot err in the precepts of morals that are prescribed to the whole of the church and regards what is necessary for salvation, or pertains to good in itself, and not only in those things that are evil. —Author's Translation.] What he then says further in this place refers to discipline: *'Non est erroneum dicere Pontificem in aliis legibus posse errare, nimirum superfluum legem condendo vel minus discretam, &c. Ut autem jubeat (sc. Pontifex) aliquid quod non est bonum neque malum ex se, neque contra salutem, sed tamen est inutile, vel sub poena nimis gravi illud praecipiat, non est absurdum dicere posse fieri, &c.* [It is not erroneous to say that the Pope is able to err in the other laws, namely a law that is not necessary or is made more or less unconnected, etc. And if he (that is the Pope) orders something that is neither good nor evil of itself, nor is contrary to salvation, but may seem useless, or prescribes it under severe punishment, it is not absurd to say he can do so, etc.—Author's Translation] And other theologians follow Bellarmine on this point.

(5) This Infallibility of the Pope in the exercise of his office as Pastor and Doctor of all Christians is, however, still more closely defined as 'that Infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be provided in the definition of a doctrine relating to faith or morals. Before, then, we proceed to answer the question, how far the Papal Infallibility extends over matters which concern faith or morals, the question arises how far the Infallibility of the Church extends over such matters? Without entering into the investigation of this very wide question, on which much precise information is afforded in all our great theological works, I content myself with selecting the following proposition, universally acknowledged in theology—viz. That even in dogmatic Decrees, Bulls, &c. &c., not all which therein occurs in any one place, not that which occurs or is mentioned incidentally, not a preface, nor what is laid down as the basis of the decree, is to be looked upon as itself a dogmatic definition, and so as matter of Infallibility.

(6) Lastly, the Council adds that the definitions of the Pope, in which, by virtue of his office as Pastor and Doctor, he lays down a certain doctrine on faith or morals as firmly to be held *de fide* by all Christians, are *per se* irreversible, i.e. of their own nature, and not only irreversible when they receive the subsequent assent of the Church. It is not meant by this that the Pope ever decides anything contrary to the tradition of the Church, or that he would stand alone in opposition to all

the other Bishops, but only that the Infallibility of his definition is not dependent on the acceptance of the Church, and rests on the special divine assistance promised and vouchsafed to him in the person of St. Peter for the exercise of his supreme teaching office. Since, then, it is here expressly said that those definitions on which the Infallibility of the Pope exercises itself are per se unalterable, it follows, as a matter of course, that all those laws which are issued from time to time by the Pope in matters of discipline, and which are alterable, are, by the very reason that they are alterable, not included in the de fide definition of the Vatican Council. (pp. 56-60)

One can not, from what is said above, nullify that a Pope is infallible when teaching the Universal Church regarding faith and morals—otherwise one would never know if what the Pope taught regarding what is the faith or divine law must be believed.

c. The Authority of the Church consists in her Authority to teach, to sanctify and to govern in a unity. Her authority to teach is bound in her mission. Her authority to sanctify is bound in her orders. Her authority to govern is bound in her hierarchy. It is acknowledged in the Visibility of the Church, in which the Hierarchy, Priesthood and Teachings are one and known by all. The authority, as presented here, is reflective of the threefold office of Christ which He confers on His Apostles and which they confer on their successors: teacher (*Magisterium*), priest (*Ministerium*) and king (*Imperium*).

Devivier defines this authority as the *spiritual rights and powers over the souls of men as well as over the means of salvation* (Christian Apologetics, p. 391) and states the Church has *all the power necessary to continue the work of redemption till the end of the world.* (*Ibid.*, p. 393)

The Authority to Teach is found in that of the words of Christ: *Going therefore, teach ye all nations; . . . Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you* (Matt. 28:19, 20; cf. Mark 16:15.) The unity of faith to be taught has been discussed under the Church's Unity, Infallibility and Indefectibility. The Teaching is Authoritative because it is the Truth. Leo XIII, in his Encyclical, *Satis cognitum* (June 29, 1896), states it in these words:

And, since it was necessary that His divine mission should be perpetuated to the end of time, He took to Himself Disciples, trained by himself, and made them partakers of His own authority. And, when He had invoked upon them from Heaven the Spirit of Truth, He bade them go through the whole world and faithfully preach to all nations, what He had taught and what He had commanded, so that by the profession of His doctrine, and the observance of His laws, the human race might attain to holiness on earth and never-ending happiness in Heaven. In this wise, and on this principle, the Church was begotten. If we consider the chief end of His Church and the proximate efficient causes of salvation, it is undoubtedly spiritual; but in regard to those who constitute it, and to the things which lead to these spiritual gifts, it is external and necessarily visible. The Apostles received a mission to teach by visible and audible signs, and they discharged their mission only by words and acts which certainly appealed to the senses. So that their voices falling upon the ears of those who heard them begot faith in souls—"Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the words of Christ" (Rom. x., 17). And faith itself—that is assent given to the first and supreme truth - though residing essentially in the intellect, must be manifested by outward profession—"For with the heart we believe unto justice, but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. x., 10). In the same way in man, nothing is more internal than heavenly grace which begets

sanctity, but the ordinary and chief means of obtaining grace are external: that is to say, the sacraments which are administered by men specially chosen for that purpose, by means of certain ordinances.

Jesus Christ commanded His Apostles and their successors to the end of time to teach and rule the nations. He ordered the nations to accept their teaching and obey their authority. But his correlation of rights and duties in the Christian commonwealth not only could not have been made permanent, but could not even have been initiated except through the senses, which are of all things the messengers and interpreters. (par. 3.)

Hunter writes in this way of the Teaching Authority:

The Prophetical or teaching office committed by Christ to His Church finds its proper place in the present Treatise, and we proceed to show that there is in the Church authority to teach. We have seen in the last section, that there is in the Church, by Divine institution, a distinction of governors and governed, and there being authority to teach, it is consistent that the governors are they who teach the governed, and thus we have the distinction of the Church as Teacher and the Church as Learner. We shall see in its proper place (n. 208) that the Church as Teacher is constituted by the Bishops united with the Roman Pontiff. At present, it will suffice if we speak of teachers, without defining more particularly who they are.

That the Church has authority to teach follows from what we have said upon her nature and office. For the Church is the company of believers in Christ (n. 166), and faith comes by hearing (Romans x. 14, 17); and there is to be one faith even as there is one Lord and one Baptism (Ephes. iv. 5), which oneness of belief cannot be secured unless there is a judge of controversies who speaks intelligibly and whom all may obey: but this judge cannot be the reason of each man which is weak and variable and has no binding force on the multitude: nor is it the Christian people at large, for we nowhere find that such power has been given to them as the Apostles claimed for themselves (see especially I Cor. ix. 1, Ephes. ii. 20): nor the head of the civil state, who has his own functions, but is within the Church as a Learner; nor, lastly, does it please God to settle controversies by revelations (n. 112), except perhaps by private revelations that avail no one but the receiver. (n. 22.) The Scripture is dead and cannot make its voice heard, and those who profess to be its expounders are at variance: there is no living voice but that of the Church that can be the judge of whose existence we are assured. (Outlines of Dogmatic Theology, pp. 288-290.)

Again, Devivier explains it as follows: *The Church has received from her divine Founder the power to teach, or doctrinal authority, that is, the right and duty to preach the moral and dogmatic doctrine of Jesus Christ, and to impose this, doctrine upon all men. (Ibid.)*

Saint Paul expresses it in these words:

How then shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed? Or how shall they believe him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear, without a preacher? And how shall they preach unless they be sent, as it is written: How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, of them that bring glad tidings of good things! But all do not obey the gospel. For Isaias saith: Lord, who hath believed our report? Faith then cometh by hearing; and hearing by the word of Christ. (Rom. 10:14-17)

Paul had already opened this epistle in that of establishing his authority to teach: *By whom we have received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith, in all nations* (Rom. 1:5.) And, if one were to return to the words of Our Lord, besides that of the command to teach found in the close of Matthew's and Mark's Gospels which He gave at the time of His Ascension, Luke quotes Him addressing the Apostles earlier saying: *He that heareth you, heareth Me: and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me. And he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me.* (Luke 10:16.) And the Acts of the Apostles, following the words of Mark's Gospel, *they going forth preached everywhere: the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed* (Mark 16:20.), has them replying to those who would silence them: *Peter and John answering, said to them: If it be just in the sight of God, to hear you rather than God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard* (Acts 4:19-20); and, later, the Jewish leaders reproached them, saying: *Commanding we commanded you, that you should not teach in this name; and behold, you have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and you have a mind to bring the blood of this man upon us;* the answer by Peter and the apostles: *We ought to obey God, rather than men.* (Ibid. 5:28, 29.)

Devivier continues in setting forth the understanding of the teaching authority:

The Church's manner of teaching is always twofold. The ordinary teaching is that which is administered daily through the bishops or their delegates and under their surveillance, by the aid of preaching, or catechising, or theological lectures, etc. The extraordinary teaching is that which is given by the Pope, or the Councils when they proclaim a dogma or condemn an error. It is evident that the extraordinary form of teaching is in no way required to make a doctrine an article of faith to Christians, otherwise the dogma of the Eucharist, for example, would not have been of faith before the tenth century, and in our own day the visibility of the Church, her indefectibility, etc., would not be articles of faith, since they have never been solemnly defined. The Church cannot err in her constant and universal teaching any more than in her definitions of dogma. The promises made by Christ admit of no exception. Heresy may consist, therefore, in denying wittingly a dogma proclaimed by the ordinary and uniform teaching of the entire Church.

In consequence of this mission and this power the Church is obliged to maintain the purity of faith, to guard the faithful against erroneous, impious, and immoral doctrines, to forbid the reading of books and papers that might corrupt faith and morals, to supervise all dogmatic and moral teaching given in society by any teachers whether private or official, that is, appointed by the state (op. cit., p. 395-96.)

The Authority of the Church to teach is intertwined, then, with Infallibility and Indefectibility, because this Authority from Christ pertains to bringing *to the knowledge of the truth* (cf. 1 Tim. 2:4) and salvation (cf. *ibid.*) to man which would not be possible if the Authority to Teach and demand *obedience of faith* (cf. Rom. 16:26.) was authorizing error and perdition. John quotes our Lord promising: *I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever. The spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, nor knoweth him: but you shall know him; because he shall abide with you, and shall be in you.* (John 14:16-17.) The same Truth must be taught throughout the ages for our Lord, again, promised: *Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.* (Matt. 28:20.) He said this

after giving the command: *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you (ibid.)*

The Authority, as has been noted, is not just in teaching, but also in ministering, that is, the power to confer the Sacraments. Turning again to Devivier, one reads: *The Church has received the power of regulating all that concerns the administration of the sacraments, the celebration of the holy sacrifice, of deciding, in a word, all that belongs to public worship.*

The Catechism of the Council of Trent, in explaining the Sacrament of Orders, connects the Authority of the Church in the Hierarchy of the Church which is also found in that of the priesthood:

This power is two-fold, of jurisdiction, and of orders: the power of orders has reference to the body of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist, that of jurisdiction to his mystical body, the Church; for to this latter belong the government of his spiritual kingdom on earth, and the direction of the faithful in the way of salvation. In the power of Orders is included not only that of consecrating the Holy Eucharist, but also of preparing the soul for its worthy reception, and whatever else has reference to the sacred mysteries. Of this the Scriptures afford numerous attestations, amongst which the most striking and weighty are contained in the words recorded by St. John and St. Matthew on this subject: "As the Father hath sent me," says the Redeemer, "I send you: Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained;" [1 John xx. 21, 22, 23.] and again, "Amen, I say unto you, whatever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed also in heaven." [Matt. xviii.18.] (Catech. Conc. Trid., pt. II, c. vii, n. 6.)

At the twenty-third session, (July 15, 1563), the Council of Trent decreed the following canons:

Canon 6. If anyone says that in the Catholic Church a hierarchy has not been instituted by divine ordinance, which consists of the bishops, priests, and ministers: let him be anathema [cf. DB 966].

Canon 7. If anyone says that the bishops are not superior to priests; or that they do not have the power to confirm and to ordain, or, that the power which they have is common to them and to the priests; or that orders conferred by them without the consent or call of the people or of the secular power are invalid, or, that those who have been neither rightly ordained nor sent by ecclesiastical and canonical authority, but come from a different source, are lawful ministers of the word and of the sacraments: let him be anathema [cf. DB 967].

Canon 8. If anyone says that the bishops who are chosen by the authority of the Roman Pontiff are not true and legitimate bishops, but a human invention: let him be anathema [cf. DB. 968].

The Church has never defined exactly the fullness of the Authority of the Church as she has that of explicitly defining the Infallibility of the Pope in teaching and the primacy of the Pope in governing. Infallibility is not confined to the Pope, but is part of the constitution of the Church. So, also, governance is not confined to the Pope, but is part of the constitution of the Church. This does not deny his supremacy—it is only to state the obvious. The Pope is the visible head and sign

of unity since in Peter is to be found the unity of Faith and Authority. The Vatican Council (1870) teaches:

*. . . But, that the episcopacy itself might be one and undivided, and that the entire multitude of the faithful through priests closely connected with one another might be preserved in the unity of faith and communion, placing the blessed Peter over the other apostles He established in him the perpetual principle and visible foundation of both unities, upon whose strength the eternal temple might be erected, and the sublimity of the Church to be raised to heaven might rise in the firmness of this faith. And, since the gates of hell, to overthrow the Church, if this were possible, arise from all sides with ever greater hatred against its divinely established foundation, We judge it to be necessary for the protection, safety, and increase of the Catholic flock, with the approbation of the Council, to set forth the doctrine on the institution, perpetuity, and nature of the Sacred Apostolic Primacy, in which the strength and solidarity of the whole Church consist, to be believed and held by all the faithful, according to the ancient and continual faith of the universal Church, and to proscribe and condemn the contrary errors, so pernicious to the Lord's flock. (Sess. IV, July 18, 1870—*Pastor aeternus*; cf. DB 1821.)*

Devivier argues for the Ministerial or Priestly Authority as follows:

How could the Church fulfil her mission of saving souls if, while enlightening minds with the light of revelation, she did not at the same time impart the strength absolutely indispensable for the observance of the precepts imposed by revelation? Now it is through the sacraments, through the sacrifice of the Mass particularly, and through the exercises of her worship, that the faithful obtain the graces necessary for the maintenance of the spiritual life.

Our Saviour's will in this respect is very clear. Thus we see that when He gave His apostles the command and the power to teach. He also imposed upon them the obligation to baptize all men; at the Last Supper, after distributing His body and blood to them, He bade them do the same in remembrance of Him; on another occasion He gave them the power to forgive sins, so that they alone had the power to loose and to bind.

The apostles themselves affirm this power implicitly by exercising it, and explicitly by their words. In fact we see them baptizing, confirming, ordaining, celebrating Mass, ministering to the sick, etc., and St. Paul writes: "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. iv. 1). (op. cit. p. 397.)

The Power to Govern, or the kingly office, is what is generally considered the Authority of the Church. This is also called her Jurisdiction as was quoted above from the Roman Catechism. Devivier provides this exposition on the power to govern:

The right of self-government given to the Church comprises three distinct powers similar to those possessed by civil society: legislative power, or the right to make laws and rules binding upon all the subjects of the Church; judiciary power, to define the sense and reach of her laws, to decide disputed cases, to pronounce judgment upon guilt, etc.; and, finally, executive or coercive power, that is, the right to procure, by the necessary means, particularly by the use of penalties either

spiritual or temporal, the observance of the laws which she imposes on her members. . . (ibid., pp. 397-99)

. . . A society cannot really exist and attain its end without the power to govern. A multitude of wills seeking to attain the same end necessarily requires common and efficacious guidance. Hence, when it pleased Our Saviour to unite in a perfect society all who believed in Him, He could not but endow this society with the authority necessary to accomplish its mission. In other words, He had to establish heads and rulers invested with a triple power, legislative, judiciary, and coercive; a law supposes the right to judge the guilty and to inflict punishment.

. . . The apostles from the beginning exercised all these powers, making laws, pronouncing judgment, hurling anathemas at the guilty and the rebellious without consulting the civil power or even despite its opposition (Acts xv. 28; 1 Tim. i. 20; 1 Cor. xi.33, 34; vii. 12, 13; v. 3, 4, 5; iv. 21; xi. 2; 1 Thess. iv. 2.) The Church in the centuries which followed continued to exercise the same powers in virtue of the authority properly belonging to her; nor has belief in the legislative authority of lawful heads ever varied in the Church. (ibid., pp. 397-99)

It is the universal teaching of the Church that Peter has the first place in the hierarchy, which teaching is presented by the Vatican Council:

So we teach and declare that according to the testimonies of the Gospel the primacy of jurisdiction over the entire Church of God was promised and was conferred immediately and directly upon the blessed Apostle Peter by Christ the Lord. For the one Simon, to whom He had before said: "Thou shalt be called Cephas" [John 1:42], after he had given forth his confession with those words: "Thou art Christ, Son of the living God" [Matt. 16:16], the Lord spoke with these solemn words: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar Jona; because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee: That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: and I shall give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven" [Matt. 16:17 ff.]. [against Richerius etc. (see n. 1503)]. And upon Simon Peter alone Jesus after His resurrection conferred the jurisdiction of the highest pastor and rector over his entire fold, saying: "Feed my lambs," "Feed my sheep" [John 21:15 ff.]. To this teaching of Sacred Scriptures, so manifest as it has been always understood by the Catholic Church, are opposed openly the vicious opinions of those who perversely deny that the form of government in His Church was established by Christ the Lord; that to Peter alone, before the other apostles, whether individually or all together, was confided the true and proper primacy of jurisdiction by Christ; or, of those who affirm that the same primacy was not immediately and directly bestowed upon the blessed Peter himself, but upon the Church, and through this Church upon him as the minister of the Church herself.

And solemnly declares in its canon:

If anyone then says that the blessed Apostle Peter was not established by the Lord Christ as the chief of all the apostles, and the visible head of the whole militant Church, or, that the same received great honor but did not receive from the same our Lord Jesus Christ directly and

immediately the primacy in true and proper jurisdiction: let him be anathema. (Sess. IV; cf. DB 1822, 1823)

And Tanqueray argues:

Peter cannot be the foundation on which the Church is to be made firm and solid unless he is to be powerful with the supreme authority of teaching and of ruling in spiritual affairs. The same authority he is promised in the following words: "I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven" and: "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth . . ." (op. cit., p. 119.)

Van Hove, writing on the subject *Hierarchy* (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 7.—1910 ed.),

In the hierarchy of jurisdiction the episcopate and the papacy are of Divine origin; all the other grades are of ecclesiastical institution. According to the Vatican Council the Bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter, has been established by Christ as the visible head of the whole Church militant, and possesses a real primacy of jurisdiction, in virtue of which he has supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church in matters of faith, morals, discipline, and the government of the Church. This power is ordinary and immediate over all the Churches, and over each one in particular, over all the pastors and faithful, collectively and individually (Const. de Eccl. Christi, cap. i-3). The government of the Church is strictly monarchical. The bishops are the successors of the Apostles, but do not inherit their personal prerogatives, such as universal jurisdiction and infallibility (Conc. Trid., Sess. XXIII, De sacramento ordinis, cap. iv). The pope is bound to establish bishops who enjoy genuine ordinary power in the Church (potestas ordinaria), and who are not merely his delegates or vicars, as some medieval theologians held. On the other hand, the theory proposed in the fifteenth century at the Councils of Constance and Basle, which made the pope subject to an œcumenical council; the Gallican theory, that would impose limits on his power by the ancient canons received in the Church, and requiring the acceptance or consent of the Church before his decisions could become irreformable; and the theory of Febronius, who maintained that the Holy See had usurped many rights which properly belonged to the bishops and that ought to be restored to them, are all equally false and opposed to the monarchical constitution of the Church). An œcumenical council does, indeed, possess sovereign authority in the Church, but it cannot be œcumenical without the pope.

Pope Leo XIII continues, in *Satis Cognitum*, to address the Authority in the Church and sums in up in this way:

Apostolic mission was not destined to die with the Apostles themselves, or to come to an end in the course of time, since it was intended for the people at large and instituted for the salvation of the human race. For Christ commanded His Apostles to preach the "Gospel to every creature, to carry His name to nations and kings, and to be witnesses to him to the ends of the earth." He further promised to assist them in the fulfilment of their high mission, and that, not for a few years or centuries only, but for all time - "even to the consummation of the world." Upon which St. Jerome says: "He who promises to remain with His Disciples to the end of the world declares that they will be for ever victorious, and that He will never depart from those who believe in Him" (In Matt., lib. iv., cap. 28, v. 20). But how could all this be realized in the Apostles alone, placed as they were under the universal law of dissolution by death? It was consequently provided by God that the

Magisterium instituted by Jesus Christ should not end with the life of the Apostles, but that it should be perpetuated. We see it in truth propagated, and, 'as it were, delivered from hand to hand. For the Apostles consecrated bishops, and each one appointed those who were to succeed them immediately "in the ministry of the word."

Nay more: they likewise required their successors to choose fitting men, to endow them with like authority, and to confide to them the office and mission of teaching. "Thou, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace which is in Christ Jesus: and the things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same command to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii., 1-2). Wherefore, as Christ was sent by God and the Apostles by Christ, so the Bishops and those who succeeded them were sent by the Apostles. "The Apostles were appointed by Christ to preach the Gospel to us. Jesus Christ was sent by God. Christ is therefore from God, and the Apostles from Christ, and both according to the will of God Preaching therefore the word through the countries and cities, when they had proved in the Spirit the first-fruits of their teaching they appointed bishops and deacons for the faithful They appointed them and then ordained them, so that when they themselves had passed away other tried men should carry on their ministry" (S. Clemens Rom. Epist. I ad Corinth. capp. 42, 44). On the one hand, therefore, it is necessary that the mission of teaching whatever Christ had taught should remain perpetual and immutable, and on the other that the duty of accepting and professing all their doctrine should likewise be perpetual and immutable. "Our Lord Jesus Christ, when in His Gospel He testifies that those who not are with Him are His enemies, does not designate any special form of heresy, but declares that all heretics who are not with Him and do not gather with Him, scatter His flock and are His adversaries: He that is not with Me is against Me, and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth" (S. Cyprianus, Ep. lxi., ad Magnum, n. I).

The Church, founded on these principles and mindful of her office, has done nothing with greater zeal and endeavour than she has displayed in guarding the integrity of the faith. Hence she regarded as rebels and expelled from the ranks of her children all who held beliefs on any point of doctrine different from her own. The Arians, the Montanists, the Novatians, the Quartodecimans, the Eutychians, did not certainly reject all Catholic doctrine: they abandoned only a certain portion of it. Still who does not know that they were declared heretics and banished from the bosom of the Church? In like manner were condemned all authors of heretical tenets who followed them in subsequent ages. "There can be nothing more dangerous than those heretics who admit nearly the whole cycle of doctrine, and yet by one word, as with a drop of poison, infect the real and simple faith taught by our Lord and handed down by Apostolic tradition" (Auctor Tract. de Fide Orthodoxa contra Arianos).

The practice of the Church has always been the same, as is shown by the unanimous teaching of the Fathers, who were wont to hold as outside Catholic communion, and alien to the Church, whoever would recede in the least degree from any point of doctrine proposed by her authoritative Magisterium. Epiphanius, Augustine, Theodore drew up a long list of the heresies of their times. St. Augustine notes that other heresies may spring up, to a single one of which, should any one give his assent, he is by the very fact cut off from Catholic unity. "No one who merely disbelieves in all (these heresies) can for that reason regard himself as a Catholic or call himself one. For there may be or may arise some other heresies, which are not set out in this work of ours, and, if

any one holds to one single one of these he is not a Catholic" (S. Augustinus, *De Haeresibus*, n. 88).

The need of this divinely instituted means for the preservation of unity, about which we speak is urged by St. Paul in his epistle to the Ephesians. In this he first admonishes them to preserve with every care concord of minds: "Solicitous to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. iv., 3, et seq.). And as souls cannot be perfectly united in charity unless minds agree in faith, he wishes all to hold the same faith: "One Lord, one faith," and this so perfectly one as to prevent all danger of error: "that henceforth we be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness, by which they lie in wait to deceive" (Eph. iv., 14); and this he teaches is to be observed, not for a time only - "but until we all meet in the unity of faith...unto the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ" (13). But, in what has Christ placed the primary principle, and the means of preserving this unity? In that - "He gave some Apostles - and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ" (11-12).

Wherefore, from the very earliest times the fathers and doctors of the Church have been accustomed to follow and, with one accord to defend this rule. Origen writes: "As often as the heretics allege the possession of the canonical scriptures, to which all Christians give unanimous assent, they seem to say: 'Behold the word of truth is in the houses.' But we should believe them not and abandon not the primary and ecclesiastical tradition. We should believe not otherwise than has been handed down by the tradition of the Church of God" (Vetus Interpretatio Commentariorum in Matt. n. 46). Irenaeus too says: "The doctrine of the Apostles is the true faith...which is known to us through the Episcopal succession...which has reached even unto our age by the very fact that the Scriptures have been zealously guarded and fully interpreted" (Contra Haereses, lib. iv., cap. 33, n. 8). And Tertullian: "It is therefore clear that all doctrine which agrees with that of the Apostolic churches - the matrices and original centres of the faith, must be looked upon as the truth, holding without hesitation that the Church received it from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ and Christ from God....We are in communion with the Apostolic churches, and by the very fact that they agree amongst themselves we have a testimony of the truth" (De Praescrip., cap. xxxi). And so Hilary: "Christ teaching from the ship signifies that those who are outside the Church can never grasp the divine teaching; for the ship typifies the Church where the word of life is deposited and preached. Those who are outside are like sterile and worthless sand: they cannot comprehend" (Comment. in Matt. xiii., n. 1). Rufinus praises Gregory of Nazianzum and Basil because "they studied the text of Holy Scripture alone, and took the interpretation of its meaning not from their own inner consciousness, but from the writings and on the authority of the ancients, who in their turn, as it is clear, took their rule for understanding the meaning from the Apostolic succession" (Hist. Eccl., lib. ii., cap. 9).

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 every one 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. "Lord, if we be in error, we

are being deceived by Thee" (Richardus de S. Victore, *De Trin.*, lib. i., cap. 2). In this wise, all cause for doubting being removed, can it be lawful for anyone to reject any one of those truths without by the very fact falling into heresy? without separating himself from the Church? - without repudiating in one sweeping act the whole of Christian teaching? For such is the nature of faith that nothing can be more absurd than to accept some things and reject others. Faith, as the Church teaches, is "that supernatural virtue by which, through the help of God and through the assistance of His grace, we believe what he has revealed to be true, not on account of the intrinsic truth perceived by the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God Himself, the Revealer, who can neither deceive nor be deceived" (Conc. Vat., Sess. iii., cap. 3). If then it be certain that anything is revealed by God, and this is not believed, then nothing whatever is believed by divine Faith: for what the Apostle St. James judges to be the effect of a moral delinquency, the same is to be said of an erroneous opinion in the matter of faith. "Whosoever shall offend in one point, is become guilty of all" (Ep. James ii., 10). Nay, it applies with greater force to an erroneous opinion. For it can be said with less truth that every law is violated by one who commits a single sin, since it may be that he only virtually despises the majesty of God the Legislator. But he who dissents even in one point from divinely revealed truth absolutely rejects all faith, since he thereby refuses to honour God as the supreme truth and the formal motive of faith. "In many things they are with me, in a few things not with me; but in those few things in which they are not with me the many things in which they are will not profit them" (S. Augustinus in Psal. liv., n. 19). And this indeed most deservedly; for they, who take from Christian doctrine what they please, lean on their own judgments, not on faith; and not "bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ" (2 Cor. x., 5), they more truly obey themselves than God. "You, who believe what you like, believe yourselves rather than the gospel" (S. Augustinus, lib. xvii., *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, cap. 3).

For this reason the Fathers of the Vatican Council 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 its ordinary and universal Magisterium" (Sess. iii., cap. 3). Hence, as it is clear that God absolutely willed that there should be unity in His Church, and as it is evident what kind of unity He willed, and by means of what principle He ordained that this unity should be maintained, we may address the following words of St. Augustine to all who have not deliberately closed their minds to the truth: "When we see the great help of God, such manifest progress and such abundant fruit, shall we hesitate to take refuge in the bosom of that Church, which, as is evident to all, possesses the supreme authority of the Apostolic See through the Episcopal succession? In vain do heretics rage round it; they are condemned partly by the judgment of the people themselves, partly by the weight of councils, partly by the splendid evidence of miracles. To refuse to the Church the primacy is most impious and above measure arrogant. And if all learning, no matter how easy and common it may be, in order to be fully understood requires a teacher and master, what can be greater evidence of pride and rashness than to be unwilling to learn about the books of the divine mysteries from the proper interpreter, and to wish to condemn them unknown?" (*De Unitate Credendi*, cap. xvii., n. 35).

It is then undoubtedly the office of the church to guard Christian doctrine and to propagate it in its integrity and purity. But this is not all: the object for which the Church has been instituted is

not wholly attained by the performance of this duty. For, since Jesus Christ delivered Himself up for the salvation of the human race, and to this end directed all His teaching and commands, so He ordered the Church to strive, by the truth of its doctrine, to sanctify and to save mankind. But faith alone cannot compass so great, excellent, and important an end. There must needs be also the fitting and devout worship of God, which is to be found chiefly in the divine Sacrifice and in the dispensation of the Sacraments, as well as salutary laws and discipline. All these must be found in the Church, since it continues the mission of the Saviour for ever. The Church alone offers to the human race that religion—that state of absolute perfection—which He wished, as it were, to be incorporated in it. And it alone supplies those means of salvation which accord with the ordinary counsels of Providence.

Having covered extensively the teaching of the Church regarding her Constitution and holding to that teaching, it is now necessary to address the present crisis found in the Catholic Church where the claimant to the chair of Peter is found wanting in possessing the Catholic Faith. The following may be stated:

1. The Church was founded by Christ to bring men to salvation.
2. As a divine institution, it is endowed with infallibility, indefectibility and authority to achieve its purpose.
3. As visible head of the Church, the Pope is infallible when teaching the Universal Church what it must believe regarding Faith and Morals to obtain salvation; the Pope holds primacy of authority in governance of the Church, whom all members of the Church must obey or be considered schismatic, that is, excluded from salvation.

The above was necessary to present, because it must be clear that Sedevacantist clergy do know what the Church teaches and that those who hold the position of Sedevacantism are not “hiding” Church teaching.

Now it must be shown, in light of the teachings above, why one can say that those who claim to be holding the chair of Peter are not, in fact, possessors of the keys of the kingdom of God.

Is the Chair of Peter Vacant?

First Contradiction: The Authority of the Pope, to obey or not to obey?

If one delves into the history of most heretical and schismatic sects, speaking of only those that directly departed from the Catholic Church, they did so not in a sudden split, but rather gradually. The Church did not want to separate the wheat from the cockle (cf. Matt. 13:24 ff.) and did everything to bring the erring back to the Truth. This can be witnessed in the Epistles, where Saint Paul, speaking of the controversy in Corinth, reproves the Church there:

For first of all I hear that when you come together in the church, there are schisms among you; and in part I believe it. For there must be also heresies: that they also, who are approved, may be made manifest among you. When you come therefore together into one place, it is not now to eat the Lord's supper. . . . Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself: and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord. Therefore are there many infirm and weak among you, and many sleep. (1 Cor. 11:18-22, 27-30.)

Again, he admonishes the Galatians:

I wonder that you are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel. Which is not another, only there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema. As we said before, so now I say again: If any one preach to you a gospel, besides that which you have received, let him be anathema. (Gal. 1:6-9.)

Yet, he tells Titus: *A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid: Knowing that he, that is such an one, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned by his own judgment. (Titus 3:10-11)*

Saint John, in his First Epistle, indicates that these who oppose truth eventually leave of their own accord:

[A]s you have heard that Antichrist cometh, even now there are become many Antichrists: whereby we know that it is the last hour. They went out from us, but they were not of us. For if they had been of us, they would no doubt have remained with us; but that they may be manifest, that they are not all of us. (1 John 2:18-19)

This is particularly evident when the innovators came along in the Sixteenth Century. They called the Roman Church "the Babylon of the Apocalypse, the synagogue of Satan, the society of Antichrist" (cf. Martin Luther, *On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, October of 1520). The Church, though pronouncing excommunication on Luther in July of 1520 had spent years trying to keep him in the faith, but were forced to publicly condemn him. Yet, it was Martin Luther who actually rejected reconciliation:

*As far back as 10 July, when the Bull was only under discussion, he scornfully defied it. "As for me, the die is cast: I despise alike the favour and fury of Rome; I do not wish to be reconciled with her, or ever to hold any communion with her. Let her condemn and burn my books; I, in turn, unless I can find no fire, will condemn and publicly burn the whole pontifical law, that swamp of heresies" [(De Wette, op. cit., 466.) H. Ganss: Martin Luther, *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. IX.]*

The foregoing was introduced to show why, at first, amongst traditional Catholics, there was not an immediate condemnation of the Modernists and their actions due to their (traditional Catholics) spirit to be faithful. However, there was an immediate condemnation by the Modernists of traditional Catholics who rejected their errors, and the Modernists were quick to expel priests and laity from their parishes. In fact, though Angelo Roncalli was introducing teachings that were erroneous, no thought was given to the possibility that he was not a valid Pope. They therefore gave the benefit of the doubt that his teachings were authoritative and to be followed.

Councils have been called frequently in the history of the Church. The first being the Council of Jerusalem (cir. 54 A.D.). Though many may count the first Ecumenical to be the Council of Nicea (325 A.D.), there have been twenty or twenty-one accepted Ecumenical Councils. So the fact that an Ecumenical Council had been called by Angelo Roncalli raised no concern. However, the goal for this council was presented as *Aggiornamento* which, of itself, roused the Catholic *sensus* that something was wrong. It was a word one would never forget even if mispronounced, because it encapsulated everything Angelo Roncalli would initiate. It also implied that the “old” spirit that every Catholic embraced was to be swept away and replaced by the “new”. Angelo Roncalli described it thus: “*Throw open the windows of the church and let the fresh air of the spirit blow through*”, and “*Renew your wonders in our time, as though in a new Pentecost*” (*Humanae Salutis*, October 4, 1962). The Holy Ghost was out, the spirit of the world was in—and everything was changed to SPIRIT. As one Catholic of the time stated: They (the Conciliar Church) gave up the Ghost (Holy Ghost).

One of the proposals of the Council was to address the problem of Clericalism, defined as the clergy abusing the laity by demanding the laity serve them as lords, the laity accepting their position as subjects, as opposed to the clergy serving the laity by administering the Sacraments and Spiritual treasures of the Church to them. Clericalism had been a perennial problem in the Church due to the weakness of human nature. This may be why Our Lord specifically used the washing of the feet as a rite of humility even before He instituted the Holy Eucharist before his Passion and Death. In doing so, he warned the Apostles: “*Know you what I have done to you? You call me Master, and Lord; and you say well for so I am. If then I being your Lord and Master have washed your feet; you also ought to wash one another’s feet. For I have given you an example, that, as I have done to you, so do you also.*” (John 13:12ff).

Catholics had the patience to understand that Christ uses human instruments, and the Church, through her Popes, Councils and saints, constantly reminded the clergy of their obligations toward the laity. However, the modernization or updating resulting from this council did nothing to rein in Clericalism, but instead became even more bureaucratic and oppressive toward the laity. Now, it was no longer the parish priest who had care of the souls entrusted to him, but the gauntlet of a parish office of busy-body women that the lay person had to also come up against and pass through.

The Modernization was Modernism, it was updating the faith to coincide with the Modern Secular World: *"The substance of the ancient doctrine of the deposit of faith is one thing, and the way in which it is presented is another. And it is the latter that must be taken into great consideration with patience if necessary, everything being measured in the forms and proportions of a magisterium which is predominantly pastoral in character"*. (In Sollemni SS. Concilii Inauguratione, October 11, 1962.)

This phrase, *"the way in which it is presented is another"*, was used as a semantical tool not to change words, but to change meanings. Church equated to Mystery and Mystery equated to Sacrament and the Church became a Sacrament, a holy Communion, or a Sacramental Communion. That is, there is a Eucharistic Celebration whenever the People of God gathered together, with no reference at all to Transubstantiation and the Presence of Christ's Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity under the appearance of bread and wine which is offered in a perpetual sacrifice—no, only the presence of Christ in the Eucharist when the people of God assembled and celebrated. It was not based on an understanding of the Mystical Body of Christ, so well treated by Pope Pius XII in his Encyclical, *Mystici Corporis Christi* (June 29, 1943), which Pope Leo XIII also described in *Satis cognitum* (June 29, 1896), drawing from Scripture and the Fathers of the Church. It was negating the Sacraments as the source of sanctification and presenting the Church as a human entity centered on humanistic evolution. Of course, this was not completely evident before Vatican II, but it was undeniable afterwards. Definitely, *aggiornamento*, and its unholy spirit was disturbing the peace of the Church as it was prior to Vatican II. And the *new Pentecost* it brought with it was clarified by Leon Suenens: *The Second Vatican Council emphasized the Church as the People of God on pilgrimage, at the service of the world.* (*A New Pentecost*, p. 2)

In the Preface to his Book, *A New Pentecost*, Suenens states in 1974:

To those who at this moment are distressed because they cannot recognize—in the confusion and the changes of today—the Church of their childhood or even that of yesterday, this book offers a message: be of courage, the power of the Holy Spirit is at work deep within the heart of his Church, breathing into it a fresh youthfulness. It is the Spirit who is our living hope for the future.

When Vatican II was announced, hopes were high. Just before the Council opened, Pope John XXIII suggested that we should read the Acts of the Apostles and relive the time when the disciples were together in the upper room preparing to receive the Spirit. "joined in continuous prayer, along with several women, including Mary the mother of Jesus ... " (Acts I, 14). Pope John prayed and asked the Lord: "Renew your wonders in this our day give us a new Pentecost."

The Council came, and it was an inestimable grace. It opened new vistas and charted fresh ways for renewing the Church, but it entrusted to the future the task of bringing to full fruition the consequences of the logic implied in the Council's fundamental decrees. The Fathers at the Council were not unaware that the work which remained exceeded men's capacities to realize it. and they said so clearly: "The Spirit endows and directs the Church with various gifts, both hierarchical and charismatic, and adorns her with the fruits of his grace (cf. Eph. 4, 11-12; 1 Cor. 12, 4; Gal. 5, 22). By the power of the Gospel he makes the Church grow, perpetually renews her, and leads her to perfect union with her Spouse.")

We should reflect on these words. We must look to the Spirit beyond men and their limitations. Future historians will say that the Council opened a few windows in the upper room and let in the first breeze of springtime. But they will add, no doubt, that the "mighty wind" of Pentecost had yet to fill "the whole house" in which the disciples were sitting.

We should not be surprised, then, that Pope Paul VI in his turn took up the prayer of John XXIII and asked the Lord to grant us a "new Pentecost." He has expressed this wish insistently and frequently, saying that the Church today needs first and foremost the miracle of Pentecost: the wind and fire and spiritual power which is the Holy Spirit.

These words are not idle, for as the site for Leon Suenens on the John Carroll University web pages states:

When Pope John XXIII called the world's bishops to Rome for a council that lasted four years (1962–1965), he found in Suenens a man who shared his views on the need for renewal in the Church. When the first session fell into organizational chaos under its weight of documents, it was Suenens who, at the invitation of the pope, rescued it from deadlock and essentially set the agenda for the Council. If Pope John opened the window, it was Suenens who pulled back the curtains so that fresh air could circulate. Dialogue with other Christian denominations as well as other religions, the expanded role of the laity, modernization of canonical religious life for women, religious liberty, collaboration and co-responsibility in the Church were among the causes he advocated.

Pope Paul VI, who succeeded Pope John in June, 1963, made Cardinal Suenens one of the four moderators of the Council and in the opinion of many Church historians he was the animateur and the star among them.

(Retrieved on April 26, 2016 from <http://sites.jcu.edu/suenens/pages/cardinal-suenens/>)

One need not go into his role of introducing the Charismatic Movement into the Modernist Church, disenfranchising many who had left the Protestant sects because of the bizarre antics of these emotional high pursuers and who cared nothing of faith or family.

While hearing about *aggiornamento* (modernization), there was also the constant talk of returning to the early Church, the *ressourcement*, spear headed by Hans Urs Von Balthasar and Karl Rahner (with collaboration of the liberal Protestant Karl Barth), and having adherents like Joseph Ratzinger, Hans Kung, Yves Congar, Edward Schillebeeckx, Marie-Dominique Chenu, Louis Bouyer (Lutheran convert), and Jean Daniélou among other leading neo-Modernists, or "*Nouvelle Théologie*". Rejecting the Neo-scholasticism and the Council of Trent, these theologians wrote of wanting to return to the faith found in the early Fathers of the Church, its liturgy, and sacraments, while at the same time claiming the ever upward evolving of the Church. Louis Bouyer presents this in his work, *The Church of God* (1982—English translation of the French edition of 1970), where, in his preface he writes:

*Even before the beginning of the twentieth century, people spoke of the "Century of the Church." **The early unfolding of modern "ecumenism" (of Protestant origin)**, as well as the currents of thought that developed in Eastern Orthodoxy and Catholicism, seem to have verified this*

prediction throughout the first half of this century, particularly since the First World War. Then John XXIII convoked a council. By the very fact that it became a reality, and through its reverberations, seemed to have accomplished something beyond all expectation—and results that to some extent were a complete surprise.

. . . By the same token, with all that it produced or gave rise to, the council can be understood and fairly evaluated only if it is put into the context of an entire movement: the Church's rediscovery of herself. . .

*Needless to say, it was long before the council—even before anyone spoke of it—that this problem had been at the center of our research and meditation. Readers who are familiar with our work on the Virgin Mary, *Le Trone de la Sagesse*, may remember that it was to have been followed by another volume, dealing precisely with the Church, before still another work on the created universe. Consequently, for many years our thoughts have been oriented toward what the fathers of the Church called the Christian *oikonomia*. **The works were to have proceeded from anthropology, concentrated on the person of Mary as the type of Christian perfection, to sociology, in order to end with the cosmology of Christianity. It is the central volume of this trilogy that we present today.***

It is central because of its place in the development of our reflections, but it is clear that in this we are merely part of our own time. For the subject is also central in the preoccupations of Christians of our age. We will not hesitate, then, to say that here will be found the heart, as it were, of our Christian experience and of all the thoughts it gives rise to in us.

*Yet this centrality of view supposes a prior vision of the Christian personality in its eternal vocation, as we tried to sketch in *Le Trone de la Sagesse* and which, perhaps, we shall one day take up again in a broader perspective. But it is also situated within the heart of an interpretation of the meaning of the world, of divine creation, of its fallen and redeemed history in accord with the fullness of the plan of creation and salvation. This is the object of the third volume of our attempt at a synthesis of the Christian *oikonomia*, which will be devoted to the Cosmos: within the perspectives of this divine glory, in the biblical sense, of which the world is to be the effulgence *ad extra*, just as the Divine Word is its glow *ad infra*.*

*As a matter of fact, this last work has been long in progress in an effort to come to grips with the unfolding of Christian revelation and its interpretation, along with a philosophical reflection upon the totality of the experience of man when left to his own devices and his own lights, at least as they appear to be. The central intent of this study has to be a Christian interpretation of what is called the "modern scientific vision of the world." Even if we are a long way from following Fr. Teilhard de Chardin in all his conclusions, we shall join him in the *Problematik*, which he managed to make famous. . . . [M]odern science has become a typical product of that encounter of human research with Christian revelation to explain the rational order of the world that is supposed by our science and that it can be conceived only in a climate of thought which, if not Christian, is at least dependent upon Christianity or results from it. Yet the development in science and technology which is its inevitable result, albeit a product that reacts against its own source, has yet to be fully achieved (and undoubtedly never can be). A Christian interpretation of it ought to come down to a criticism of the present moment through a philosophy enlightened by the total experience of*

Christian man. In this way it might sketch the needed complement to what we have discovered, as well as the rectification of our undertaking as proposed by revelation-which is itself at the very source of Christianity.

. . . [O]nly an essay of Christology (inseparably a theology of the Word, of revelation of the word of God in Jesus Christ, and a hermeneutics of history in general and biblical and Christian history in particular) can give the preceding studies their central perspective. That means raising our vision through our own experience and transcending to its supreme object. This object then reveals itself as the subject which is, at once, quite different from and quite close to what we might call another experience in which our experience is contained: the experience of the Source Being and the supreme end upon which our own being depends.

But in Jesus Christ this divine subject and the human subject become one, and their union in Christ is but the principle of a union which is to become universal. This oneness is revealed to us by the Divine Spirit, who is both its motor and its term. Thus our Christology ought to reach its end and completion in pneumatology. Indeed, both of them will have to be transcended (together with our entire vision of the creative and saving economy) in the unfathomable vastness of the deity, in the luminous darkness of the source of all things: the invisible Father, "from whom all fatherhood, in heaven as on earth, derives its name."

And Joseph Ratzinger not only considers the Council of Trent as fossilizing the Catholic Faith, but always formulates the doctrines of faith in a Teihardian pantheism, such as Tracey Rowland's presentation of his concept of Revelation:

In his Conciliar commentaries Ratzinger is clearly in favour of the approach taken to Revelation in Dei Verbum and in various places contrasts it with the approaches taken at Trent and Vatican I. He notes that whereas Vatican I starts from the natural knowledge of God and considers 'supernatural' Revelation only in close connection with this idea, in order to proceed immediately to the question of its transmission in scripture and tradition, in Dei Verbum the question of the natural knowledge of God is put at the end and God's revealing activity described within a comprehensive survey of salvation history. The starting point is now the notion of God as a person whose Revelation is personal. Further, whereas Vatican I used the expression 'the eternal decree of his will', which carries strong juridical overtones, Vatican II spoke of 'the sacrament of his will': '[I]nstead of the legalistic view that sees Revelation largely as the issuing of divine decrees, we have a sacramental view, which see law and grace, word and deed, message and sign, the person and his utterance within the one comprehensive unity of the mystery.

Such an understanding of Revelation gives priority to the dialogue which takes place between God and the human person and in turn feeds into the Trinitarian anthropology of Gaudium et spes, of which Ratzinger strongly approved. It is no mere 'theistically coloured' account of Revelation, but one which pays due regard to the significance of each of the processions within the Trinity. The movement of Revelation proceeds from God (the Father) to humanity through Christ, and admits the faithful into fellowship of God in the Holy Spirit. The purpose of this dialogue between God and the human person is not so much the transmission of information but rather the transformation of the person in the life of the Trinity. For Ratzinger this is not a matter of removing the intellectual component of faith but understanding it as a component in a wider whole. He believes that 'the

act of faith is an event that expands the limits of individual reason' and 'brings the isolated and fragmented individual intellect into the realm of Him who is the logos, the reason, and reasonable ground of all things, and all mankind'. (Ratzinger's Theology: The Faith of Benedict XVI, preface.)

Basically, and as Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P. points out in his "*La nouvelle théologie où va-t-elle?*" (1946), modernists would say: The words of the Bible don't change, but the meaning changes according to the times, circumstances and comprehension of the reader and, as such becomes the living Word. There is, then, no absolute Truth.

Pope Pius XII, in his encyclical, *Humani generis* (August 12, 1950), agreed with Garrigou-Lagrange, writing:

5. If anyone examines the state of affairs outside the Christian fold, he will easily discover the principle trends that not a few learned men are following. Some imprudently and indiscreetly hold that evolution, which has not been fully proved even in the domain of natural sciences, explains the origin of all things, and audaciously support the monistic and pantheistic opinion that the world is in continual evolution. Communists gladly subscribe to this opinion so that, when the souls of men have been deprived of every idea of a personal God, they may the more efficaciously defend and propagate their dialectical materialism.

6. Such fictitious tenets of evolution which repudiate all that is absolute, firm and immutable, have paved the way for the new erroneous philosophy which, rivaling idealism, immanentism and pragmatism, has assumed the name of existentialism, since it concerns itself only with existence of individual things and neglects all consideration of their immutable essences.

7. There is also a certain historicism, which attributing value only to the events of man's life, overthrows the foundation of all truth and absolute law, both on the level of philosophical speculations and especially to Christian dogmas.

8. In all this confusion of opinion it is some consolation to Us to see former adherents of rationalism today frequently desiring to return to the fountain of divinely communicated truth, and to acknowledge and profess the word of God as contained in Sacred Scripture as the foundation of religious teaching. But at the same time it is a matter of regret that not a few of these, the more firmly they accept the word of God, so much the more do they diminish the value of human reason, and the more they exalt the authority of God the Revealer, the more severely do they spurn the teaching office of the Church, which has been instituted by Christ, Our Lord, to preserve and interpret divine revelation. This attitude is not only plainly at variance with Holy Scripture, but is shown to be false by experience also. For often those who disagree with the true Church complain openly of their disagreement in matters of dogma and thus unwillingly bear witness to the necessity of a living Teaching Authority.

9. Now Catholic theologians and philosophers, whose grave duty it is to defend natural and supernatural truth and instill it in the hearts of men, cannot afford to ignore or neglect these more or less erroneous opinions. Rather they must come to understand these same theories well, both because diseases are not properly treated unless they are rightly diagnosed, and because sometimes even in these false theories a certain amount of truth is contained, and, finally, because

these theories provoke more subtle discussion and evaluation of philosophical and theological truths.

10. If philosophers and theologians strive only to derive such profit from the careful examination of these doctrines, there would be no reason for any intervention by the Teaching Authority of the Church. However, although we know that Catholic teachers generally avoid these errors, it is apparent, however, that some today, as in apostolic times, desirous of novelty, and fearing to be considered ignorant of recent scientific findings, try to withdraw themselves from the sacred Teaching Authority and are accordingly in danger of gradually departing from revealed truth and of drawing others along with them into error.

11. Another danger is perceived which is all the more serious because it is more concealed beneath the mask of virtue. There are many who, deploring disagreement among men and intellectual confusion, through an imprudent zeal for souls, are urged by a great and ardent desire to do away with the barrier that divides good and honest men; these advocate an "eirenism" according to which, by setting aside the questions which divide men, they aim not only at joining forces to repel the attacks of atheism, but also at reconciling things opposed to one another in the field of dogma. And as in former times some questioned whether the traditional apologetics of the Church did not constitute an obstacle rather than a help to the winning of souls for Christ, so today some are presumptive enough to question seriously whether theology and theological methods, such as with the approval of ecclesiastical authority are found in our schools, should not only be perfected, but also completely reformed, in order to promote the more efficacious propagation of the kingdom of Christ everywhere throughout the world among men of every culture and religious opinion.

12. Now if these only aimed at adapting ecclesiastical teaching and methods to modern conditions and requirements, through the introduction of some new explanations, there would be scarcely any reason for alarm. But some through enthusiasm for an imprudent "eirenism" [Ecumenism] seem to consider as an obstacle to the restoration of fraternal union, things founded on the laws and principles given by Christ and likewise on institutions founded by Him, or which are the defense and support of the integrity of the faith, and the removal of which would bring about the union of all, but only to their destruction.

Pius XII went on to reject freeing dogma of definition, limiting Scripture of truth and inspiration, that God can be known by reason and His Creation, that the word Transubstantiation should not be used as understood, that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same, and that there is no need to be a member of the Catholic Church. In *Mediator Dei* (November 20, 1947), Pius XII had already condemned:

This way of acting . . . to revive the exaggerated and senseless antiquarianism to which the illegal Council of Pistoia gave rise. It likewise attempts to reinstate a series of errors which were responsible for the calling of that meeting as well as for those resulting from it, with grievous harm to souls, and which the Church, the ever watchful guardian of the "deposit of faith" committed to her charge by her divine Founder, had every right and reason to condemn. [Cf. Pius VI, Constitution Auctorem fidei, August 28, 1794, nn. 31-34, 39, 62, 66, 69-74.] For perverse designs and ventures of this sort tend to paralyze and weaken that process of sanctification by which the

sacred liturgy directs the sons of adoption to their Heavenly Father of their souls' salvation. (Par. 64)

*. . . But in all these matters, it is essential that you [Bishops and Religious Superiors] watch vigilantly lest the enemy come into the field of the Lord and sow cockle among the wheat;[Cf. Matt. 13:24-25.] in other words, do not let your flocks be deceived by the subtle and dangerous errors of false mysticism or quietism - as you know We have already condemned these errors; [Encyclical letter *Mystici Corporis*] also do not let a certain dangerous "humanism" lead them astray, nor let there be introduced a false doctrine destroying the notion of Catholic faith, nor finally an exaggerated zeal for antiquity in matters liturgical. Watch with like diligence lest the false teaching of those be propagated who wrongly think and teach that the glorified human nature of Christ really and continually dwells in the "just" by His presence and that one and numerically the same grace, as they say, unites Christ with the members of His Mystical Body. (Par. 203)*

A third ruffling of feathers, one might say, was the complete about face towards Communism and Socialism.

Angelo Roncalli, in his first acts, made Giovanni Montini a Cardinal along with 22 others, raising the number from 70 to 74. With Giovanni Montini, he also made Julius Döpfner and Franz König his Cardinals who would be pillars of innovation. The number meant that, with the ageing Cardinals, he would be deciding his successor, but it was also an indication that Catholic tradition was no longer any concern to him, for since at least the 9th century, that is, over a thousand years, 70 was the number set based on the number Moses was told to choose to assist in the governance of the Israelites (cf. Num. 11:16ff.) and the number Pope John VIII (872-82) had set (cf. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova, et amplissima collectio*, XVII, 247-248.). This is mentioned because, though not of faith and morals, it did not go unnoticed. Angelo Roncalli was redefining the Church as a divine foundation, i.e., one founded on faith, to one founded on a secular foundation, i.e., modern societal considerations. It may be noted that Domenico Tardini, an obedient servant of the Church, at the same time was forced to become Cardinal and Secretary of State and promoter of Angelo Roncalli's Council, but after everything was set in motion Domenico Tardini conveniently had a massive heart attack.

Regarding the scourge of Communism, Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical, *Divini Redemptoris* (March 19, 1937), wrote:

*This Apostolic See, above all, has not refrained from raising its voice, for it knows that its proper and social mission is to defend truth, justice and all those eternal values which Communism ignores or attacks. Ever since the days when groups of "intellectuals" were formed in an arrogant attempt to free civilization from the bonds of morality and religion, Our Predecessors overtly and explicitly drew the attention of the world to the consequences of the de-christianization of human society. With reference to Communism, Our Venerable Predecessor, Pius IX, of holy memory, as early as 1846 pronounced a solemn condemnation, which he confirmed in the words of the Syllabus directed against "that infamous doctrine of so-called Communism which is absolutely contrary to the natural law itself, and if once adopted would utterly destroy the rights, property and possessions of all men, and even society itself." [Encycl. *Qui Pluribus*, Nov. 9, 1864 (Acta Pii IX, Vol I, p. 13). Cf. Syllabus, IV, (A.S.S., vol. III, p. 170).] Later on, another of Our predecessors,*

the immortal Leo XIII, in his Encyclical Quod Apostolici Muneris, defined Communism as "the fatal plague which insinuates itself into the very marrow of human society only to bring about its ruin." [Encycl. Quod Apostolici Muneris, Dec. 28, 1928 (Acta Leonis XII, Vol. 1, p. 46).] With clear intuition he pointed out that the atheistic movements existing among the masses of the Machine Age had their origin in that school of philosophy which for centuries had sought to divorce science from the life of the Faith and of the Church.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt seemed to convince the Americans that the Soviet Union had changed and Uncle Joe (Stalin) was on the side of freedom, while Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan were the enemies of mankind. But, with the collapse of Nazi Germany, the Communists, backed by the Soviet Union, were taking all of Eastern Europe, threatening to take Austria, infiltrating Italy, defeating the Chinese National Army, entering into Indo-china, and were now just a few miles off the coast of Florida. Many former African Colonies, having newly gained independence were drenched in blood as Communist-supported revolutionary coups were setting up dictatorships—but not one word of denouncement by the leadership in the Vatican. Instead, Roncalli wrote *Pacem in terris*.

Pius XII wrote to the Ruthenians (Ukraine, Poland and Czechoslovakia) on the 23 December, 1945, the encyclical, *Orientales omnes Ecclesias*, stating:

For we have learnt with great grief that, in those territories which have recently been made over to the sway of Russia, our dear brethren and sons of the Ruthenian people are in dire straits in consequence of their fidelity to the Apostolic See; every means are being employed to take them away from the bosom of their mother, the Church, and to induce them, against their will and against their known religious duty, to enter the communion of the dissidents. Thus it is reported that the clergy of the Ruthenian rite have complained in a letter to the civil government that in the Western Ukraine, as it is called today, their Church has been placed in an extremely difficult position; all its bishops and many of its priests have been arrested; and at the same time it has been prohibited that anyone should take up the government of the same Ruthenian Church. (Par. 56)

We are well aware that this harsh and severe treatment is speciously attributed to political reasons. But this is no new procedure used today for the first time; very often in the course of the centuries the enemies of the Church have hesitated to make public profession of their opposition to the Catholic faith and to attack it openly; they brought cunning and subtle allegations that Catholics were plotting against the State. In the very same way the Jews accused the Divine Redeemer himself before the Roman governor, saying "We have discovered that this man is subverting the loyalty of our people, forbids the payment of tribute to Caesar." [18] But faces and events themselves plainly manifest, and show in its true light, what was and is the real cause of this savagery. For, as is well known, the patriarch Alexis, recently elected by the dissident bishops of Russia, openly exalts and preaches defection from the Catholic Church in a letter lately addressed to the Ruthenian Church, a letter which contributed not a little to the initiation of this persecution. (Par. 57.)

These griefs cut us the more deeply because while the cruel war was yet raging almost all the nations of the world, through a gathering of their representatives, solemnly proclaimed among

other things that no persecution of religion must ever be undertaken. This had given us hope that peace and true liberty would be granted everywhere to the Catholic Church, the more so since the Church has always taught, and teaches, that obedience to the ordinances of the lawfully established civil power, within the sphere and bounds of its authority, is a duty of conscience. But, unfortunately, the events we have mentioned have grievously and bitterly weakened, have almost destroyed, our hope and confidence so far as the lands of the Ruthenians are concerned. (Par. 58.)

And, regarding the Communist takeovers, Pius XII condemned on June 20, 1949, those progressive Catholics who formed *Actio Catholica* with the support of Gottwald's Communist government in Czechoslovakia. Then on July 1 of the same year, with the intent of warning all Catholics—even though in Italy—he had the following decree (A.A.S., Vol. XLI (1949), p. 334):

Decree of the Holy Office July 1, 1949

Q.1 Utrum licitum sit, partibus communistarum nomen dare vel eisdem favorem praestare.

[Whether it is licit to give one's name to or to take favors from the communist parties?]

R. Negative: Communismum enim est materialisticus et antichristianus; communistarum autem duces, etsi verbis quandoque profitentur se religionem non oppugnare, se tamen, sive doctrina sive actione, Deo veraeque religioni et Ecclesia Christi sere infensos esse ostendunt.

[Negative: Communism is materialistic and Antichristian; even though the leaders of the Communists profess they do not attack religion with words, yet their teachings and actions show them to be at enmity toward God, the true religion, and the Church of Christ.]

Q.2 Utrum licitum sit edere, propagare vel legere libros, periodica, diaria vel folia, qual doctrine vel actioni communistarum patrocinantur, vel in eis scribere.

[By chance is it licit to publish, promulgate or read books, journals or leaflets which defend the action or the communist doctrine, or to write for them?]

R. Negative: Prohibentur enim ipso iure.

[Negative: By their very nature they are forbidden by law.]

Q.3 Utrum Christifideles, qui actus, de quibus in n.1 et 2, scienter et libere posuerint, ad sacramenta admitti possint.

[Can Christians who knowingly and freely perform the acts mentioned on n.1 and 2 be admitted to the sacraments?]

R. Negative, secundum ordinaria principia de sacramentis denegandis iis, Qui non sunt dispositi.

[Negative, according to the ordinary principles these are to be denied the sacraments, because they are not disposed (to receive them).]

Q.4 Utrum Christifideles, Qui communistarum doctrinam materialisticam et anti Christianam profitentur, et in primis, Qui eam defendunt vel propagant, ipso facto, tamquam apostatae a fide catholica, incurrant in excommunicationem speciali modo Sedi Apostolicae reservatam.

[Whether Christians who openly profess the materialistic and antichristian doctrine of the communists, and, primarily, if they defend it or promulgate it, by that very fact do they incur an excommunication specially reserved to the Apostolic See?]

R. Affirmative.

[Affirmative.]

The book, *The Silent Church*, by Fathers Lino Gussoni and Aristede Brunello, New York, Veritas Publishers 1954, had exposed to the Catholics in America what was happening to Catholics under Communist rule. But any mention of Communism being condemned by the Church or any warnings against Communism ceased under Angelo Roncalli. In *Mater et Magistra* (May 15, 1961), he did write: *Unrestricted competition in the liberal sense, and the Marxist creed of class warfare, are clearly contrary to Christian teaching and the nature of man.* (Par. 23) But the phraseology contrasts extremes, not principles. And his social encyclical was followed two years later with another, *Pacem in terris* (April 11, 1963) which was basically a revision of the first, but that left out a rejection of Marxism and gave the green light to support Socialists:

The principles We have set out in this document take their rise from the very nature of things. They derive, for the most part, from the consideration of man's natural rights. Thus the putting of these principles into effect frequently involves extensive co-operation between Catholics and those Christians who are separated from this Apostolic See. It even involves the cooperation of Catholics with men who may not be Christians but who nevertheless are reasonable men, and men of natural moral integrity. "In such circumstances they must, of course, bear themselves as Catholics, and do nothing to compromise religion and morality. Yet at the same time they should show themselves animated by a spirit of understanding and unselfishness, ready to co-operate loyally in achieving objects which are good in themselves, or conducive to good." (*Mater et Magistra*, par. 239)

It is always perfectly justifiable to distinguish between error as such and the person who falls into error—even in the case of men who err regarding the truth or are led astray as a result of their inadequate knowledge, in matters either of religion or of the highest ethical standards. A man who has fallen into error does not cease to be a man. He never forfeits his personal dignity; and that is something that must always be taken into account. Besides, there exists in man's very nature an undying capacity to break through the barriers of error and seek the road to truth. God, in His great providence, is ever present with His aid. Today, maybe, a man lacks faith and turns aside into error; tomorrow, perhaps, illumined by God's light, he may indeed embrace the truth.

Catholics who, in order to achieve some external good, collaborate with unbelievers or with those who through error lack the fullness of faith in Christ, may possibly provide the occasion or even the incentive for their conversion to the truth.

Again it is perfectly legitimate to make a clear distinction between a false philosophy of the nature, origin and purpose of men and the world, and economic, social, cultural, and political undertakings, even when such undertakings draw their origin and inspiration from that philosophy. True, the philosophic formula does not change once it has been set down in precise terms, but the undertakings clearly cannot avoid being influenced to a certain extent by the changing conditions in which they have to operate. Besides, who can deny the possible existence of good and commendable elements in these undertakings, elements which do indeed conform to the dictates of right reason, and are an expression of man's lawful aspirations?

It may sometimes happen, therefore, that meetings arranged for some practical end—though hitherto they were thought to be altogether useless—may in fact be fruitful at the present time, or at least offer prospects of success. But whether or not the moment for such cooperation has arrived,

and the manner and degree of such co-operation in the attainment of economic, social, cultural and political advantages—these are matters for prudence to decide; prudence, the queen of all the virtues which rule the lives of men both as individuals and in society.

As far as Catholics are concerned, the decision rests primarily with those who take a leading part in the life of the community, and in these specific fields. They must, however, act in accordance with the principles of the natural law, and observe the Church's social teaching and the directives of ecclesiastical authority. For it must not be forgotten that the Church has the right and duty not only to safeguard her teaching on faith and morals, but also to exercise her authority over her sons by intervening in their external affairs whenever a judgment has to be made concerning the practical application of this teaching. (Pacem in Terris, Par. 157-160)

The final paragraph seems to direct one toward Church decisions, but Angelo Roncalli never issued any condemnation against the Communists and the understanding was immediately recognizable when the Communists gained a million votes in the 1963 election, while the Catholic supported political party lost 750,000 votes. It was also now visible that there was a struggle in the Church. On April 4, 1959, Alfredo Ottaviani—with the approval of Angelo Roncalli, renewed the condemnation of those supporting the Communists and Socialists. Yet only a month later, *Civiltà Cattolica*, the Jesuit Magazine which received direct review and approval from the Pope, published that it was possible to support the Communists and Socialists (*Civiltà Cattolica*, Anno 110, Vol. II, p.449, May 30, 1959). The Communists recognized the writing of both *Mater and Magistra* and *Pacem in terris* as opening the doors to their idealism and were quick to point it out to those who would still claim the Church opposed them.

Even deeper, what was a Catholic, who had recognized the struggle the Church waged against Freemasonry and the perpetual condemnations by the Popes against such an anti-Catholic Organization that had worked to destroy the Church, what was a Catholic, who had studied the philosophy of the Freemasons, to understand when Angelo Roncalli writes in *Pacem in terris*:

6. . . . *The Father [i.e., the Grand Architect] of the universe has inscribed them in man's nature, and that is where we must look for them; there and nowhere else.*

[Fraternity]

7. *These laws clearly indicate how a man must behave toward his fellows in society, and how the mutual relationships between the members of a State and its officials are to be conducted. They show too what principles must govern the relations between States; and finally, what should be the relations between individuals or States on the one hand, and the world-wide community of nations on the other. Men's common interests make it imperative that at long last a world-wide community of nations be established. . . .*

[Rights of Man]

11. *But first We must speak of man's rights. Man has the right to live. He has the right to bodily integrity and to the means necessary for the proper development of life, particularly food, clothing, shelter, medical care, rest, and, finally, the necessary social services. In consequence, he has the right to be looked after in the event of ill-health; disability stemming from his work; widowhood;*

old age; enforced unemployment; or whenever through no fault of his own he is deprived of the means of livelihood.

[Liberty]

12. Moreover, man has a natural right to be respected. He has a right to his good name. He has a right to freedom in investigating the truth, and—within the limits of the moral order and the common good—to freedom of speech and publication, and to freedom to pursue whatever profession he may choose. He has the right, also, to be accurately informed about public events.

[Equality]

13. He has the natural right to share in the benefits of culture, and hence to receive a good general education, and a technical or professional training consistent with the degree of educational development in his own country. Furthermore, a system must be devised for affording gifted members of society the opportunity of engaging in more advanced studies, with a view to their occupying, as far as possible, positions of responsibility in society in keeping with their natural talent and acquired skill. . . .

[Favoring Communism and Naturalism as opposed to Catholic State with man's salvation as cornerstone]

53. Men, both as individuals and as intermediate groups, are required to make their own specific contributions to the general welfare. The main consequence of this is that they must harmonize their own interests with the needs of others, and offer their goods and services as their rulers shall direct—assuming, of course, that justice is maintained and the authorities are acting within the limits of their competence. Those who have authority in the State must exercise that authority in a way which is not only morally irreproachable, but also best calculated to ensure or promote the State's welfare.

54. The attainment of the common good is the sole reason for the existence of civil authorities. In working for the common good, therefore, the authorities must obviously respect its nature, and at the same time adjust their legislation to meet the requirements of the given situation.

[Green light to support Communists]

67. For the rest, it is not possible to give a general ruling on the most suitable form of government, or the ways in which civil authorities can most effectively fulfill their legislative, administrative, and judicial functions.

68. In determining what form a particular government shall take, and the way in which it shall function, a major consideration will be the prevailing circumstances and the condition of the people; and these are things which vary in different places and at different times.

We think, however, that it is in keeping with human nature for the State to be given a form which embodies a threefold division of public office properly corresponding to the three main functions of public authority. In such a State a precise legal framework is provided, not only for the official functions of government, but also for the mutual relations between citizens and public officials. This will obviously afford sure protection to citizens, both in the safeguarding of their rights and in the fulfilment of their duties.

69. If, however, this juridical and political structure is to realize its potential benefits, it is absolutely essential that public officials do their utmost to solve the problems that arise; and they must do so by using policies and techniques which it is within their competence to implement, and which suit the actual condition of the State. It is also essential that, despite constantly changing conditions, legislators never disregard the moral law or constitutional provision, nor act at variance with the exigencies of the common good. And as justice must be the guiding principle in the administration of the State, and executives must thoroughly understand the law and carefully weigh all attendant circumstances, so too in the courts: justice must be administered impartially, and judges must be wholly incorrupt and uninfluenced by the solicitations of interested parties. The good order of society also requires that individuals and subsidiary groups within the State be effectively protected by law in the affirmation of their rights and the performance of their duties, both in their relations with each other and with government officials.

Elisa Carrillo, studying the change of the Vatican from anti-Communism to pro-Communism, writes:

On April 10, 1963, Pope John issued the second of his controversial encyclicals, Pacem in Terris, addressed to all men of good will. Pacem in Terris drew a distinction between historical movements that had economic, social, or political ends and "the false philosophical teachings" which had originally animated those movements. The pope declared that 'those movements, insofar as they conform to the dictates of right reason, contain elements that are positive and deserving of approval.' The world press interpreted "historical movements" as Marxist movements, and thus Pope John could be said to endorse collaboration with both the Socialist and Communist parties. For an Italian Catholic electorate brought up on anti-communism, this was a startling reversal of the Church's position. And insofar as the encyclical called for an end to the arms race, the pope seemed to be blessing the Soviet Union's efforts to bring about disarmament. (Elisa Carrillo, The Italian Catholic Church and Communism, 1943-1963 in The Catholic Historical Review, Vol. 77, No. 4 (Oct., 1991), pp. 644-657.)

Angelo Roncalli would die less than two months later on June 3, 1963, with Italy now under the influence of the Communists. His policy to join anti-Catholics instead of opposing them saw the assassination, under the direction of John F. Kennedy, of the Catholic anti-Communist Ngo Dinh Diem on November 2 of the same year. Yet, John F. Kennedy would, himself, die the same way less than three weeks later on November 22. For many Catholics it was clear that the bulwark against anti-Catholic forces, the Catholic Hierarchy, had joined the anti-Catholic forces. This was particularly relevant to Catholics who had served in the military or suffered because of the Communists.

On the local level, in the local parish church, there was no apparent change until 1962. Then a new *Missale Romanum* was published with the first change to the Canon of the Mass since at the latest Gregory I (590-604). Instead of changes to the Canon throughout the centuries, for this Canon was made obligatory of all clergy celebrating Mass in Latin, even for all variations of rites, there were only changes in the other parts of the Missal. And even Gregory I added only the words *diesque nostros in tua pace dispones* (and dispose our days in thy peace) The Council of Trent taught at the Twenty-second Session (September 17, 1562):

And since it is fitting that holy things be administered in a holy manner, and this sacrifice is of all things the most holy, the Catholic Church, that it might be worthily and reverently offered and received, instituted the sacred canon many centuries ago, so free from all error [can. 6], that it contains nothing in it which does not especially diffuse a certain sanctity and piety and raise up to God the minds of those who offer it. For this consists both of the words of God, and of the traditions of the apostles, and also of pious instructions of the holy Pontiffs. (cap. iv.; cf. DB 942.)

And declared de fide: Canon 6: If anyone says that the canon of the Mass contains errors, and should therefore be abrogated: let him be anathema (cf. n. 942; DB 953).

Regarding the title, *Canon of the Mass*, Adrian Fortescue writes:

*One can only conjecture the original reason for its use. Walafrid Strabo says: "This action is called the Canon because it is the lawful and regular confection of the Sacrament" (De reb. eccl., xxii); Benedict XIV says: "Canon is the same word as rule, the Church uses this name to mean that the Canon of the Mass is the firm rule according to which the Sacrifice of the New Testament is to be celebrated" (De SS. Missæ Sacr., Lib. II, xii). It has been suggested that our present Canon was a compromise between the older Greek Anaphoras and variable Latin Eucharistic prayers formerly used in Rome, and that it was ordered in the fourth century, possibly by Pope Damasus (366-84). The name Canon would then mean a fixed standard to which all must henceforth conform, as opposed to the different and changeable prayers used before (E. Burbridge in Atchley, "Ordo Rom. Primus", 96). In any case it is noticeable that whereas the lessons, collects and Preface of the Mass constantly vary, the Canon is almost unchangeable in every Mass. Another name for the Canon is Actio. Agere, like the Greek dran, is often used as meaning to sacrifice. Leo I, in writing to Dioscurus of Alexandria, uses the expression "in qua [sc. basilica] agitur", meaning "in which Mass is said". Other names are Legitimum, Prex, Agenda, Regula, Secretum Missæ. (Fortescue, A. (1908). Canon of the Mass. In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company.)*

Exactly 400 years later after this decree of the Council of Trent, Angelo Roncalli, rejecting the Council Decree and the decision of previous popes to never even consider changing the *unchangeable canon*, inserted the name: Saint Joseph. There are various stories—it may be difficult to prove any, but all attempts to justify this act are merely to detract from the reality: A teaching of the Church which was considered unchangeable was changed. It reversed what the Council of Trent had decreed and essentially what Pope Pius V decreed to prevent such a change:

From the very first, upon Our elevation to the chief Apostleship, We gladly turned our mind and energies and directed all our thoughts to those matters which concerned the preservation of a pure liturgy, and We strove with God's help, by every means in our power, to accomplish this purpose....

... and thus they have restored the Missal itself to the original form and rite of the holy Fathers. When this work has been gone over numerous times and further emended, after serious study and reflection, We commanded that the finished product be printed and published as soon as possible, so that all might enjoy the fruits of this labor; and thus, priests would know which prayers to use and which rites and ceremonies they were required to observe from now on in the celebration of Masses.

. . . . 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 the 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. (*Quo primum tempore*, July 14, 1570.)

All priests who read this document knew that the *Missale Romanum* of Pius V, under the decree of *Quo primum*, was not setting the *Tridentine Mass* on the same par as the Scriptures. What they understood was that the Roman Rite was now required as published by the Holy See and that the Holy See was safeguarding the Eucharistic Sacrifice. What they also grasped was that the same Canon of the Mass that had always been said, and was hated by the Protestants, was still to be said without any change.

Finally, the teaching of the Church in relation to the Jews became skewed. Sacred Scripture, in the New Testament, has it written: Jesus said to them [the Jews]: *If you were blind, you should not have sin: but now you say: We see. Your sin remaineth.* (John 9:41.) The Church reminds the Jews and Christians that as long as one refuses to accept Christ as the Incarnate word of God, one is as Saint John writes thrice: *Who is a liar, but he who denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is Antichrist, who denieth the Father, and the Son* (1 John 2:22.); and: *Every spirit that dissolveth Jesus, is not of God: and this is Antichrist, of whom you have heard that he cometh, and he is now already in the world* (1 John 4:3); and: *For many seducers are gone out into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh: this is a seducer and an antichrist.* (2 John 1:7.) It applies to all, Jew and Gentile.

In the Liturgy of Good Friday the Church prays for the unfaithful Jews, that is, those Jews who refuse to acknowledge the works God performed for them to believe in Him and in His Christ, and therefore unbelieving:

Let us pray also for the unbelieving Jews, that our God and Lord will lift the veil from their hearts so that they may also acknowledge our Lord Jesus Christ.

Almighty and eternal God, you do not refuse mercy even to the Jews. Hear our prayers in behalf of their blindness, so that they may acknowledge the light of your truth, Christ, and be led out of their darkness. Through the same Jesus Christ our Lord.

Then the Church prays for the Gentiles:

Let us pray also for the pagans, that almighty God will dispel the blindness of their hearts, so that they may renounce their false gods and be converted to the living and true God, and his only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ, our God and Lord.

Almighty and eternal God, you desire not the death of sinners but that they should live. Mercifully hear our prayers and lead those who are in darkness from the worship of false gods to union with your holy Church for the glory of your holy name. Through our Lord.

Catholics believe there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church and, as such, join with Christ Who, on the Cross, died for all. Such an act of charity, to pray for the conversion of non-Catholics, cannot be blameworthy—at least it is not for Catholics. In 1960, Angelo Roncalli removed the word *perfidis* or *unbelieving*. One could not say that it now meant the Jews were believing, but it brought confusion to Catholics as to the relationship the Jews had in the redemptive act.

Pius XII had, more than any other world leader, intervened to stop the persecution of Jews during World War II—yet, he, more than any other world leader, was blamed for the death of Jews. As the Pope, as the visible Head of the Catholic Church, alone he should be accountable for assisting the Catholic Faithful in a secular world that rejected all his attempts at obtaining peace. When, in 1945, he speaks to Catholic Cardinals of the sufferings the Catholic clergy and faithful suffered in concentration camps, he is condemned by the same Jews—who had the power but who would not pay the price to obtain the freedom of their own people—for not mentioning the sufferings of the Jews under Nazism. This act of blaming the Catholic Church for the death of Jews under Hitler shows an ulterior motive as did also the setting the number of dead to six million: The Jews were using it to force societal opinion on their side to obtain something, and Catholics began to see it was an attempt to force the Church to reject her own teachings regarding salvation. It wasn't the first time. The case of Edgardo Mortara in the middle of the 1800's brought down the papal states as the Jews turned societal opinion against Pope Pius IX.

One cannot say that Catholics, prior to 1960, were anti-Semitic. It is simple logic: Catholics are not Jews, nor do Catholics practice Jewish customs of which the Apostle Paul was adamant to eliminate from Christianity. Jews are not Catholics, nor are they forced to practice Catholic customs. Yet, Catholics were told they were anti-Semitic in 1960 by Angelo Roncalli, and not only had he taken out the word “unbelieving” in the Good Friday Solemn Liturgy, but invited a group of Jews to meet him, greeting them with the words, *I am Joseph, your brother*. (Cf. L'Osservatore Romano, 19 October, 1960, in which he also says: *To be honest, there is a large gap between those who accept only the Old Testament and those who add the New Testament to it as well, as [their] supreme law and guidance. This distinction does not, however, impede the brotherhood that derives from our common origin, since we are all children of the same heavenly Father, and so this should always shine forth before all people, and should be put into practice through charity.*)

It is not that the Popes have always been protectors of the Jews when they were being persecuted. It was that these Jews were invited to work with Augustine Bea in drawing up a document for the Council on Catholic-Jewish relationships (which became *Aetate Nostra*) and not acknowledging that there were theological and political differences that could not be reconciled. They had to be converted to be saved. They had been joined to the leaders in almost every attack on Catholicism. And now they were demanding that Catholics apologize and pay for centuries of anti-Semitism.

By 1962, the book *Plot against the Church* [A badly translated English edition was printed in 1967] under the pseudonym of Maurice Pinay (a collaboration of bishops and priests under the direction of Joaquín Sáenz Arriaga) was circulating, exposing the Jewish-Marxist connection and its direct attacks on the Catholic Church. The Blue Army, founded by Fr. Harold V. Colgan in 1946, was so named in opposition to the Red Army of Communists, and Catholics were being informed in meetings of the evils of it. It was dedicated to spreading the message of Fatima, in which Our Lady predicted Russia would spread her errors and as a means to convert Russia,

devotion to her Immaculate Heart was to be propagated among Catholics. Now Catholics were being told the enemy was not Russia and Communism; Catholics were being told it was Catholics persecuting Jews, not Jews rejecting Christ, that was erroneous (even though Scripture and history showed the opposite, i.e., that the Jews persecuted the Christians, the Jews supported Mohammed and the Moors against the Christians, the Jews were the leaders of the Marxist dictatorships that persecuted the Christians).

In fact, the Church has historically opposed persecution of the Jews and demanded toleration:

Gregory I (590-604) *Sicut Judaeis*: *Just as the Jews ought not to be permitted to presume to do in their synagogues more than the law allows them, so they ought not to suffer restriction of those privileges accorded them.*

Decretals of Gregory IX (1227-1241): *Be advised that you ought not to allow the Jews to construct anew synagogues where they have not had them. Indeed, if old ones fall, or threaten to fall, the Jews may be permitted to rebuild them. They may not, however, enhance them or make them larger or more attractive than they were known to be previously. In any case, they should clearly have the right to be tolerated in their old synagogues and observances.*

Angelo Roncalli conscientiously took this path away from the Church. Catholics, not completely then, but afterwards, understood that to reject what Angelo Roncalli taught, without being a Gallican or Febronist, would be to admit that he was not a valid pope. To admit he is a pope would mean that Scripture was erroneous, that the Church was erroneous, and that as a Catholic, one would have to accept the present Jews as are our brothers in the faith (of which the Catholic Faith would no longer be the true Faith since Truth is one and this would mean there are two Truths as there would be two faiths). To admit Angelo Roncalli is pope would mean that Pope Saint Pius X was wrong in his condemnation of Modernism—of which Angelo Roncalli knew the *Ressourcement* and *la nouvelle théologie* and *aggiornamento* were just a re-wording of the term *Modernism*. Later it would be named *Hermeneutics of Tradition* (cf. *Communio* n. 18, Winter 1991) and now *Hermeneutics of Continuity* (cf. *Address of His Holiness Benedict XVI to the Roman Curia* on December 22, 2005.) It must be noted that Joseph Ratzinger participated in the *Ressourcement* and gave the names to the last two “movements”. To admit Angelo Roncalli is pope would mean that the Canon of the Mass, contrary to the Council of Trent, was not *free from all error* and was finally able to be corrected and eventually abrogated. The Tridentine Profession of Faith and the Oath against Modernism, which was required before priestly ordination would be abolished by July of 1967 and replaced simply with the Nicene-Constantinople Creed (cf. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* Vol 059, 1967, p. 1587.). It was to be expected by Faithful Catholics who questioned how those who claimed to be Catholic could change the faith, contrary to the oaths they took to nullify the oath. But these neo-Modernists did take the following oath, in which here are excerpts from the Profession of Faith of the Council of Trent, from the Bull of Pius IV, *Iniunctum nobis*, Nov. 13, 1565:

The apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions and all other observances and constitutions of that same Church I most firmly admit and embrace. I likewise accept Holy Scripture according to that sense which our holy Mother Church has held and does hold, whose [office] it is to judge of the true

meaning and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures; I shall never accept nor interpret it otherwise than in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Fathers. (Cf. DB 995.)

. . . I also profess that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper sacrifice of propitiation for the living and the dead, and that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially present the body and blood together with the soul and the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there takes place a conversion of the whole substance of bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; and this conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also acknowledge that under one species alone the whole and entire Christ and the true sacrament are taken. (Cf. DB 997.)

I steadfastly hold that a purgatory exists, and that the souls there detained are aided by the prayers of the faithful; likewise that the saints reigning together with Christ should be venerated and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics should be venerated. I firmly assert that the images of Christ and of the Mother of God ever Virgin, and also of the other saints should be kept and retained, and that due honor and veneration should be paid to them; I also affirm that the power of indulgences has been left in the Church by Christ, and that the use of them is especially salutary for the Christian people. (Cf. DB 998.)

And they pronounced these words which are excerpts from the Oath against Modernism from the Moto proprio, *Sacrorum antistitum*, September 1, 1910:

Therefore, I entirely reject the heretical misrepresentation that dogmas evolve and change from one meaning to another different from the one which the Church held previously. I also condemn every error according to which, in place of the divine deposit which has been given to the spouse of Christ to be carefully guarded by her, there is put a philosophical figment or product of a human conscience that has gradually been developed by human effort and will continue to develop indefinitely. Fifthly, I hold with certainty and sincerely confess that faith is not a blind sentiment of religion welling up from the depths of the subconscious under the impulse of the heart and the motion of a will trained to morality; but faith is a genuine assent of the intellect to truth received by hearing from an external source. By this assent, because of the authority of the supremely truthful God, we believe to be true that which has been revealed and attested to by a personal God, our creator and Lord. . . . (Cf. DB 2145.)

. . . I also reject the error of those who say that the faith held by the Church can contradict history, and that Catholic dogmas, in the sense in which they are now understood, are irreconcilable with a more realistic view of the origins of the Christian religion. I also condemn and reject the opinion of those who say that a well-educated Christian assumes a dual personality—that of a believer and at the same time of a historian, as if it were permissible for a historian to hold things that contradict the faith of the believer, or to establish premises which, provided there be no direct denial of dogmas, would lead to the conclusion that dogmas are either false or doubtful. Likewise, I reject that method of judging and interpreting Sacred Scripture which, departing from the tradition of the Church, the analogy of faith, and the norms of the Apostolic See, embraces the misrepresentations of the rationalists and with no prudence or restraint adopts textual criticism as the one and supreme norm. . . . (Cf. DB 2146.)

Saint Augustine writes in his chapter on *Proofs of the Catholic Faith*:

For in the Catholic Church, not to speak of the purest wisdom, to the knowledge of which a few spiritual men attain in this life, so as to know it, in the scantiest measure, indeed, because they are but men, still without any uncertainty (since the rest of the multitude derive their entire security not from acuteness of intellect, but from simplicity of faith,)— not to speak of this wisdom, which you do not believe to be in the Catholic Church, there are many other things which most justly keep me in her bosom. The consent of peoples and nations keeps me in the Church; so does her authority, inaugurated by miracles, nourished by hope, enlarged by love, established by age. The succession of priests keeps me, beginning from the very seat of the Apostle Peter, to whom the Lord, after His resurrection, gave it in charge to feed His sheep, down to the present episcopate. And so, lastly, does the name itself of Catholic, which, not without reason, amid so many heresies, the Church has thus retained; so that, though all heretics wish to be called Catholics, yet when a stranger asks where the Catholic Church meets, no heretic will venture to point to his own chapel or house. Such then in number and importance are the precious ties belonging to the Christian name which keep a believer in the Catholic Church, as it is right they should, though from the slowness of our understanding, or the small attainment of our life, the truth may not yet fully disclose itself. But with you, where there is none of these things to attract or keep me, the promise of truth is the only thing that comes into play. Now if the truth is so clearly proved as to leave no possibility of doubt, it must be set before all the things that keep me in the Catholic Church; but if there is only a promise without any fulfillment, no one shall move me from the faith which binds my mind with ties so many and so strong to the Christian religion. (St. Augustine, Against the Letter of Mani Called 'The Foundation', 4, 5.)

Is the Chair of Peter Vacant?

Second Contradiction: The Infallibility of the Pope, to believe or not to believe?

The opening of the Second Vatican Council was done with the normal fanfare and television coverage that now became part of many lives. The first Session was from October 11 to December 8, 1962. According to Ralph Wiltgen (cf. *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber*, 1967, New York: Hawthorne), this session dwelt mainly with changing the Liturgy and rejecting the Schemas. He clearly points out that there were two distinct and opposite parties. One was what he called the conservatives, that is, reiterating the Catholic Faith in a clear and precise form. The other was what he called the liberals, that is, Modernists who wanted to change the faith completely. He names as “conservative” leaders Cardinals Ottaviani, Bacci, and Ruffini. He names as “liberal” leaders Cardinals Alfrink, Frings, Bea, Koenig, Lienart, Suenens, Montini. All the “liberals” were made Cardinals by Angelo Roncalli with the exception of Lienart and Frings. Their periti were all participants of the *La nouvelle théologie*, such as Joseph Ratzinger who was theologian for Frings and Edward Schillebeeckx who was theologian for Alfrink along with those theologians chosen by Angelo Roncalli to the Council: Hans Kung, Yves Marie-Joseph Congar (forbidden by Pius XII to teach and publish), Jean-Guenolé-Marie Daniélou, Henri-Marie Joseph Sonier de Lubac (forbidden to teach and whose books condemned by Pius XII), and Marie-Dominique Chenu (forbidden to teach and writings placed on index under Pius XI and Pius XII). The Council was obviously stacked and Ralph Wiltgen admits that these “liberals” were provided all the support they needed to change the direction of the Church.

Not only does Ralph Wiltgen see the applause of the progressives or Modernists humiliating Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani whenever possible, but as Ottaviani was placed to head the Theological Preparatory Commission by Angelo Roncalli, he also notes that Roncalli does not support Ottaviani. As the first session ends and Ottaviani attempts to have the Schema on the Church passed, he finds opposition by the “liberals.” Wiltgen continues:

The Cardinal proceeded to stress the caliber of the membership of the Theological Preparatory Commission; which had prepared the schema on the Church. It had consisted of thirty-one members, with thirty-six consultants from fifteen countries. Most of these men were university professors or professors in major ecclesiastical institutions of learning in different parts of the world. Each had several publications of outstanding importance to his credit, and some of these were used as textbooks in seminaries and universities. As a result, the Theological Preparatory Commission had considered itself intellectually equipped to carry out the weighty task of drawing up a schema on the Church. It had, moreover, borne in mind the pastoral aspect of the Council. (op. cit. p. 56.)

The objections to Ottaviani were such that, as Wiltgen writes:

The last speaker that day was Bishop Luigi Carli of Segni, Italy. He maintained that certain Council Fathers had carried their ecumenical preoccupations to excess. It was no longer possible, he charged, to speak about Our Lady; no one might be called heretical; no one might use the

expression "Church militant"; and it was no longer proper to call attention to the inherent powers of the Catholic Church. . . .

Cardinal Bacci of the Roman Curia expressed belief that the Council Fathers were in accord on the doctrinal substance of the document, and that the schema would prove satisfactory after some corrections had been made in the style. Bishop Giulio Barbetta of the Roman Curia took issue with Bishop De Smedt, insisting that the text was neither triumphal nor clerical in tone, nor legalistic. (ibid. 57)

But these "conservative" Cardinals faced an invisible wall created by Angelo Roncalli and the Modernists.

On the first day of the debate on the schema, Cardinal Alfrink had called for a careful coordination of texts in order to avoid useless repetition in the Council agenda. This proposal, whose adoption was to alter profoundly the organizational structure of the Council, as well as the future form and content of the schemas, was supported in the following three meetings by Cardinals Leger, Suenens, and Montini.

. . . . December 5, carrying out the suggestions of the four cardinals, Pope John founded a new Coordinating Commission "to coordinate and direct the work of the Council." It was to be composed exclusively of cardinals, with Cardinal Cicognani as President, and Cardinals Lienart, Dopfner, Suenens, Confalonieri, Spellman, and Urbani as members. (ibid. 58)

. . . . Pope John under the same date approved the norms which were to govern the Council in the interval between the first and second sessions. The first of these norms stipulated that, during that period, all the schemas should "be subjected once more to examination and improvement" by the Council commissions. This implied, of course, that not only the schema on the Church would have to be revised, but the dogmatic constitutions as well which had been attacked by Father Schillebeeckx and the Dutch bishops.

All the norms were read to the Council Fathers at the morning meeting of December 6, and they were recognized by the liberals as yet another victory over the Curia. (ibid. 58)

. . . The German theologian Father Joseph Ratzinger called the absence of any approved Council text at the end of the first session "the great, astonishing, and genuinely positive result of the first session." The fact that no text had gained approval was evidence, he said, of "the strong reaction against the spirit behind the preparatory work." This he called "the truly epoch-making character of the Council's first session." (ibid. 59)

Father Kung called the rejection of the schema on the sources of revelation "a great step in the right direction. It was something all of us in Germany had hoped for. But being a very small minority, we did not dream it possible." In conclusion, he said that "perhaps the most decisive outcome of the first session is the realization on the part of the bishops that they, and not merely the Roman Curia, make up the Church."

Bishop Sergio Mendez Arceo of Cuernavaca, Mexico, said at the end of the session, "It has been a most successful Council." He noted that some Council Fathers had complained that there was too much talking and even too much repetition on the Council floor. "But I feel," he explained, "that this was necessary, if we were all to find out what the others' thoughts were. St. Peter's basilica, where our meetings were held, was like a giant pressure cooker which rapidly and profoundly transformed the outlook of the bishops of the entire world."

Rejection of schemas and rapid transformations of outlook were the earmarks of the first session of Vatican II. (ibid. 59-60)

In other words, the Council was taken out of the hands of Catholic Cardinals and theologians faithful to the Universal Magisterium of the Church and placed in the hands of the Modernists who rejected past teachings in the guise of evolving understandings of Church teaching.

Pope St. Pius X condemned Modernism in the Encyclical, *Pascendi dominici gregis*, of September 8, 1907. The philosophical core of Modernism is Phenomenology, or experience as the basis of knowledge. This excludes objective reality separate from experience and it also rejects Divine Revelation separate from human experience. Therefore, the Modernist claims that the experiences at the time of the Apostles was different than the experiences at the time of the Middle ages which in turn is different than the experiences of the Modern World which means the faith of the Apostles will be different than the faith of those living in the Middle Ages which in turn will be different than the faith of those living in the Modern World. As such, looking at the Historical approach of the Modernists, they will attempt to explain why people believed as they did according to the age they lived in and why one in the Modern World will not have the same faith though one might use the same expressions. This is what Pius X confirms when he discusses each application of the Modernists in the following capacities:

- (I) the philosopher
- (II) the believer,
- (III) the theologian,
- (IV) the historian,
- (V) the critic,
- (VI) the apologist,
- (VII) the reformer.

Here it would be appropriate to review *Pascendi dominici gregis* and what Pius X wrote concerning each:

I. The philosopher

Now, to begin with the philosopher, the modernists place the foundation of their religious philosophy in that doctrine which is commonly called agnosticism. Perforce, then, human reason is entirely restricted to phenomena, namely, things that appear, and that appearance by which they appear; it has neither the right nor the power to transgress the limits of the same. Therefore, it cannot raise itself to God nor recognize His existence, even through things that are seen. Hence, it is inferred that God can by no means be directly an object of science; yet, as far as pertains to history, that He is not to be considered an historical subject. —Moreover, granting all this,

everyone will easily see what becomes of Natural Theology, of the motives of credibility, of external revelation. These, of course, the modernists completely spurn, and relegate to intellectualism, an absurd system, they say, and long since dead. Nor does the fact that the Church has very openly condemned such portentous errors restrain them, for the Vatican Synod so decreed: "If anyone, etc.," [see n. 1806 f., 1812].

. . . Religion, whether this be natural or supernatural, must, just as any fact, admit of some explanation. But the explanation, with natural theology destroyed and the approach to revelation barred by the rejection of the arguments of credibility, with even any external revelation utterly removed, is sought in vain outside man. It is, then, to be sought within man himself; and, since religion is a form of life, it is to be found entirely within the life of man. From this is asserted the principle of religious Immanence. Moreover, of every vital phenomenon, to which it has just been said religion belongs, the first actuation, as it were, is to be sought in a certain need or impulsion; but, if we speak more specifically of life, the beginnings are to be posited in a kind of motion of the heart, which is called a sense. Therefore, since God is the object of religion, it must be concluded absolutely that faith, which is the beginning and the foundation of any religion, must be located in some innermost sense, which has its beginning in a need for the divine. Moreover, this need for the divine, since it is felt only in certain special surroundings, cannot of itself pertain to the realm of consciousness, but it remains hidden at first beneath consciousness, or, as they say with a word borrowed from modern philosophy, in the subconsciousness, where, too, its root remains hidden and undetected . . . "Science and history are included within a twofold boundary: one external, that is the visible world; the other internal, which is consciousness. When they have reached one or the other, they are unable to proceed further, for beyond these boundaries is the unknowable. In the presence of this unknowable, whether this be outside man and beyond the perceptible world of nature, or lies concealed within the subconsciousness, the need of the divine in a soul prone to religion, according to the tenets of fideism, with no judgment of the mind anticipating, excites a certain peculiar sense; but this sense has the divine reality itself, not only as its object but also as its intrinsic cause implicated within itself, and somehow unites man with God." This sense, moreover, is what the modernists call by the name of faith, and is for them the beginning of religion.

. . . From this, moreover, Venerable Brothers, comes that absurd affirmation of the modernists, according to which any religion according to its various aspects is to be called natural and also supernatural. From this, consciousness and revelation have interchangeable meanings. From this is the law according to which religious consciousness is handed down as a universal rule, to be equated completely with revelation, to which all must submit, even the supreme power in the Church, whether this teaches or legislates on sacred matters or discipline.

Yet in all this process, from which according to the modernists, faith and revelation come forth, one thing is especially to be noted, indeed of no small moment because of the historico-critical sequences which they pry from it. For the unknowable, of which they speak, does not present itself to faith as something simple or alone, but on the contrary adhering closely to some phenomenon, which, although it pertains to the fields of science and history, yet in some way passes beyond them, whether this phenomenon be a fact of nature containing some secret within itself, or be any man whose character, actions, and words do not seem possible of being reconciled with the ordinary laws of history. Then faith, attracted by the unknowable which is united with the

phenomenon, embraces the whole phenomenon itself and in a manner permeates it with its own life. Now from this two things follow: first, a kind of transfiguration of the phenomenon by elation, that is, above its true conditions, by which its matter becomes more suitable to clothe itself with the form of the divine, which faith is to introduce; second, some sort of disfiguration, (we may call it such) of the same phenomenon, arising from the fact that faith attributes to it, when divested of all adjuncts of place and time, what in fact it does not possess; and this takes place especially when phenomena of times past are concerned, and the more fully as they are the older. From this twofold source the modernists again derive two canons, which, when added to another already borrowed from agnosticism, constitute the foundations of historical criticism. The subject will be illustrated by an example, and let us take that example from the person of Christ. In the person of Christ, they say, science and history encounter nothing except the human. Therefore, by virtue of the first canon deduced from agnosticism whatever is redolent of the divine must be deleted from His history. Furthermore, by virtue of the second canon the historical person of Christ was transfigured by faith; therefore, whatever raises it above historical conditions must be removed from it. Finally, by virtue of the third canon the same person of Christ is disfigured by faith; therefore, words and deeds must be removed from it, whatever, in a word, does not in the least correspond with His character, state, and education, and with the place and time in which He lived. A wonderful method of reasoning indeed! But this is the criticism of the modernists.

II. The Believer

. . . . [F]or the modernist believer it is established and certain that the reality of the divine definitely exists in itself, and certainly does not depend on the believer. But if you ask on what then the assertion of the believer rests, they will reply: In the personal experience of every man.—In this affirmation, while they break with the rationalists, to be sure, yet they fall in with the opinion of Protestants and pseudomystics [cf. n. 1273]. For they explain the subject as follows: that in the religious sense a kind of intuition of the heart is to be recognized, by which man directly attains the reality of God, and draws from it such conviction of the existence of God and of the action of God both within and without man, that it surpasses by far all conviction that can be sought from science. They establish, then, a true experience and one superior to any rational experience. If anyone, such as the rationalists, deny this, they say that this arises from the fact that he is unwilling to establish himself in the moral state which is required to produce the experience.

2082 When these errors have once been admitted, together with others already mentioned, we shall express below how open the way is to atheism. It will be well to note at once that from this doctrine of experience joined with another of symbolism, any religion, not even excepting paganism, must be held as true. For why should not experiences of this kind not occur in any religion? In fact, more than one asserts that they have occurred. By what right will modernists deny the truth of an experience which an Islamite affirms, and claim true experiences for Catholics alone? In fact, modernists do not deny this; on the contrary some rather obscurely, others very openly contend that all religions are true. But it is manifest that they cannot think otherwise. For on what basis, then, should falsity have been attributed to any religion according to their precepts? Surely it would be either because of the falsity of the religious sense or because a false formula was set forth by the intellect. Now the religious sense is always one and the same, although sometimes it is more imperfect; but that the intellectual formula be true, it is enough that it respond to the religious sense and to the human believer, whatever may be the character of the perspicacity of the latter. In the conflict of different religions the modernists might be able to contend for one

thing at most, that the Catholic religion, inasmuch as it is the more vivid, has more truth; and likewise that it is more worthy of the name of Christian, inasmuch as it corresponds more fully with the origins of Christianity.

. . . . [M]odernists understand tradition thus: that it is a kind of communication with others of an original experience, through preaching by means of the intellectual formula. To this formula, therefore, besides, as they say, representative force, they ascribe a kind of suggestive power, not only to excite in him who believes the religious sense, which perchance is becoming sluggish, and to restore the experience once acquired, but also to give birth in them who do not yet believe, to a religious sense for the first time, and to produce the experience. Thus, moreover, religious experience is spread widely among the people; and not only among those who are now in existence, but also among posterity, both by books and by oral transmission from one to another.--But this communication of experience sometimes takes root and flourishes; sometimes it grows old suddenly, and dies. Moreover, to flourish is to the modernists an argument for truth; for they hold truth and life to be the same. Therefore, we may infer again: that all religions, as many as exist, are true; for otherwise they would not be alive.

III. The Theologian

[T]he study of the modernists in the theological arena . . . is a question, indeed, of conciliating faith with science, and this in no other way than by subjecting one to the other. In this field the modernist theologian makes use of the same principles that we saw employed by the philosopher, and he adapts them to the believer; we mean the principles of immanence and symbolism. Thus, moreover, he accomplishes the task most easily. It is held as certain by the philosopher that the principle of faith is immanent; it is added by the believer that this principle is God; and he himself (the theologian) concludes: God, then, is immanent in man. From this comes theological immanence. Again, to the philosopher it is certain that the representations of the object of faith are only symbolical; to the believer, likewise, it is certain that the object of faith is God in Himself; so the theologian gathers that the representations of the divine reality are symbolical. From this comes theological symbolism. . . [T]o speak at once about symbolism, since such symbols are symbols with regard to their object, but with regard to the believer are instruments, the believer must first of all be on his guard, they say, lest he cling too much to the formula, as formula, but he must make use of it only that he may fasten upon the absolute truth, which the formula at the same time uncovers and covers, and struggles to express without ever attaining it. Besides, they add, such formulae are to be applied by the believer insofar as they help him; for they are given as a help, not as a hindrance, with full esteem indeed, which out of social respect is due the formulae which the public magisterium has judged suitable for expressing the common consciousness, as long, of course, as the same magisterium shall not declare otherwise. But regarding immanence what the modernists mean really, is difficult to show, for they do not all have the same opinion. There are some who hold on this subject, that God working in man is more intimately present in him than man is even in himself; which, if rightly understood, bears no reproach. Others on this matter lay down that the action of God is one with the action of nature, as the action of the first cause is one with that of the second cause, which really destroys the supernatural order. Finally, others so explain it in a way that causes a suspicion of a pantheistic meaning; yet this fittingly coincides with the rest of their doctrines.

Now to this axiom of immanence is added another which we can call divine permanence; these two differ from each other in about the same way as private experience does from experience

transmitted by tradition. An example will illustrate the point, and let us take it from the Church and the sacraments. The Church, they say, and the sacraments are by no means to be believed as having been instituted by Christ Himself. Agnosticism stipulates this, which recognizes nothing but the human in Christ, whose religious conscience, like that of the rest of men, was formed gradually; the law of immanence stipulates this, which rejects external applications, to use their terms; likewise the law of evolution stipulates this, which demands time and a certain series of circumstances joined with it, that the germs may be evolved; finally, history stipulates this, which shows that such in fact has been the course of the thing. Yet it is to be held that the Church and the sacraments have been mediately established by the Christ. But how? All Christian consciences, they affirm, were in a way virtually included in the conscience of Christ, as the plant in the seed. Moreover, since the germs live the life of the seed, all Christians are to be said to live the life of Christ. But the life of Christ according to faith is divine; thus, also, is the life of Christians. If, then, this life in the course of the ages gave origin to the Church and the sacraments, quite rightly will such an origin be said to be from Christ, and be divine. Thus they effect completely that the Sacred Scriptures also are divine, and that dogmas are divine.—With this, then, the theology of the modernists is essentially completed. . . .

IV. The historian

Certain of the modernists who have given themselves over to composing history, seem especially solicitous lest they be believed to be philosophers; why, they even profess to be entirely without experience of philosophy. This they do with consummate astuteness, lest, for example, anyone think that they are imbued with the prejudiced opinions of philosophy, and for this reason, as they say, are not at all objective. Yet the truth is that their history or criticism bespeaks pure philosophy; and whatever conclusions are arrived at by them, are derived by right reasoning from their philosophic principles. This is indeed easily apparent to one who reflects.—The first three canons of such historians and critics, as we have said, are those same principles which we adduced from the philosophers above: namely, agnosticism, the theorem of the transfiguration of things by faith, and likewise another which it seemed could be called disfiguration. Let us now note the consequences that come from them individually.—According to agnosticism, history, just as science, is concerned only with phenomena. Therefore, just as God, so any divine intervention in human affairs must be relegated to faith, as belonging to it alone. Thus, if anything occurs consisting of a double element, divine and human, such as are Christ, the Church, the sacraments, and many others of this kind, there will have to be a division and separation, so that what was human may be assigned to history, and what divine to faith. Thus, the distinction common among the modernists between the Christ of history and the Christ of faith, the Church of history and the Church of faith, the sacraments of history and the sacraments of faith, and other similar distinctions in general.—Then this human element itself, which we see the historian assume for himself, must be mentioned, such as appears in documents, raised above historical conditions by faith through transfiguration. so, the additions made by faith must in turn be dissociated, and relegated to faith itself, and to the history of faith; so when Christ is being discussed, whatever surpasses the natural condition of man, as is shown by psychology, or has been raised out of the place and the time in which He lived, must be dissociated.—Besides, in accord with the third principle of philosophy those things also which do not pass beyond the field of history, they view through a sieve, as it were, and eliminate all and relegate likewise to faith, which in their judgment, as they say, are not in the logic of facts or suited to the characters. Thus they do not will that Christ said those things which appear to exceed the capacity of the listening multitude. Hence from His

real history they delete and transfer to faith all his allegories that occur in His discourses. Perhaps we shall ask by what law these matters are dissociated? From the character of the man, from the condition which He enjoyed in the state; from His education, from the complexus of the incidents of any fact, in a word, if we understand well, from a norm which finally at some time recedes into the merely subjective. They aim, of course, themselves to take on the character of Christ and, as it were, to make it their own; whatever, in like circumstances they would have done, all this they transfer to Christ.—Thus then to conclude, a priori and according to certain principles of philosophy which they in truth hold but profess to ignore, they affirm that Christ, in what they call real history, is not God and never did anything divine; indeed, that He did and said as a man what they themselves attribute to Him the right of doing and saying, taking themselves back to His times.

V. The Critic

Moreover, as history receives its conclusions from philosophy, so criticism takes its conclusions from history. For the critic, following the indications furnished by the historian, divides documents in two ways. Whatever is left after the threefold elimination just mentioned he assigns to real history; the rest he delegates to the history of faith or internal history. For they distinguish sharply between these two histories; the history of faith (and this we wish to be well noted) they oppose to the real history, as it is real. Thus, as we have already said, the two Christs: one real, the other, who never was in fact, but pertains to faith; one who lived in a certain place and in a certain age; another, who is found only in the pious commentaries of faith; such, for example, is the Christ whom the Gospel of John presents, which, according to them is nothing more or less than a meditation.

. . . After the documents have been distributed in a twofold manner, the philosopher is again on hand with his dogma of vital immanence; and he declares that all things in the history of the Church are to be explained by vital emanation. But either the cause or the condition of vital emanation is to be placed in some need or want; therefore, too, the fact must be conceived after the need, and the one is historically posterior to the other.

Then again there is place for the philosopher, who enjoins upon the historian so to exercise his zeal as the precepts and laws of evolution prescribe. Thereupon the historian examines the documents again; examines carefully the circumstances and conditions which the Church has experienced for period after period: her conserving power, the needs both internal and external which have stimulated her to progress, the obstacles which have been in her way, in a word, everything whatsoever which helps to determine how the laws of evolution have been kept. Finally, after this he describes the history of the development in broad outlines, as it were. The critic comes in and adapts the rest of the documents. He applies his hand to writing. The history is finished. . . The whole business is carried on through apriorism; and indeed by an apriorism reeking with heresy. Surely such men are to be pitied, of whom the Apostle would have said: "They become vain in their thoughts . . . professing themselves to be wise they became fools" [Rom. 1:21-22]; but yet they move us to anger, when they accuse the Church of so confusing and changing documents that they may testify to her advantage. Surely they charge the Church with that for which they feel that they themselves are openly condemned by their own conscience. . . .

VI. The Apologist

But let us pass on to the apologist. He, too, among the modernists depends in a twofold manner upon the philosopher. First, indirectly, taking history as his subject matter, written at the dictation of the philosopher, as we have seen; then directly, having obtained his doctrines and judgments from him. Hence that precept widespread in the school of the modernists that the new apologetics should resolve controversies over religion by historical and psychological investigations. . . . The end which he places before himself for accomplishment, is this: to win a person thus far inexperienced in the faith over to it, that he may attain this experience of the Catholic religion, which according to the modernists is the only basis of faith. A twofold way is open to this: one objective, the other subjective. The first proceeds from agnosticism, and it strives to show that that vital virtue is in religion, especially the Catholic religion, which persuades every psychologist and likewise historian of good mind that in its history something of the unknown must be concealed. To this end it is necessary to show that the Catholic religion, as it exists today, is exactly that which Christ founded, or that it is nothing other than the progressive development of that germ which Christ introduced. First, then, it must be determined of what nature the germ is. This, furthermore, they wish to prove by the following formula: The Christ announced the coming of the kingdom of God, which was to be established shortly; and that He Himself would be its Messiah, that is, the divinely given founder and ordainer. Then it must be shown in what way this germ, always immanent and permanent in the Catholic religion, has evolved gradually, and according to history, and has adapted itself to succeeding circumstances, taking to itself from these vitally whatever of the doctrinal, cultural, and ecclesiastical forms was useful to it, but meanwhile overcoming such obstacles as met it, scattering its enemies, and surviving all attacks and combats. Yet after it has been shown that all these, namely, obstacles, enemies, attacks, combats, and likewise the vitality and fecundity of Church have been of such nature that, although the laws of evolution appear unimpaired in the history of the Church, yet they are not alike to be fully developed by the same history

Yet while by reciting arguments the new apologists struggle to proclaim and bring conviction to the Catholic religion, of their own accord they grant and concede that there is much in it which offends. With a kind of ill-concealed pleasure they even declare repeatedly and openly that they find errors and contradictions also in the field of dogma; yet they add that these not only admit of an excuse, but, which should be an object of wonder, that these have been produced rightly and lawfully. Thus, even according to themselves much in the Sacred Books within the field of science and history is affected by error. But they say that here it is not a question of science or history, but only of religion and morals. There science and history are a kind of covering with which the religious and moral experiences are bound, so that they may be more easily spread among the masses; since, indeed, the masses would not understand this otherwise, a more perfect kind of science and history would not have been a help but a harm to them. But, they add, the Sacred Books, because they are religious by nature, necessarily possess life; now, life also has its own truth and logic, quite different from rational truth and rational logic, rather of an entirely different order, namely, the truth of comparison and proportion not only with reference to the medium (so they themselves call it) in which it is lived, but also with reference to the end for which it is lived. Finally, they proceed to such a point that, abandoning all restraint, they assert that whatever is evolved through life, is entirely true and legitimate.--Now We, Venerable Brethren, for whom there is one, unique truth, and who regard the Sacred Books thus, "that written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit they have God as their author" [see n. 1787], declare that this is the same as giving the lie of utility, or the officious lie to God Himself, and We assert in the words of St. Augustine:

"Once some officious lie is admitted against so high an authority, there will remain not a clause in those books which, according as it will appear to anyone difficult to practice or incredible of belief, is not referred according to this same pernicious rule to the plan and purpose of a lying author." [Letter 28, c. 3 (ML 33 [Aug. II], 112, 3)] Therefore it will happen, as the same Holy Doctor adds: "In these, namely the Scriptures, everyone will believe what he wishes; what he does not wish, he will not believe."—But the modernist apologists move forward rapidly. They also concede that in the Sacred Books such reasonings are frequently discovered which attempt to prove a certain doctrine without rational foundation; such kind are those which rest upon the prophecies. And they defend these as a kind of artifice for preaching, which are made legitimate by life. What more? They admit, rather, they assert that Christ Himself manifestly erred in indicating the time of the coming of the kingdom of God; and this should not seem strange, they say, for He, too, was bound by the laws of life! Again, what about the dogmas of the Church? These also abound in open contradictions; but in addition to the fact that they are admitted by vital logic, they are not opposed to symbolic truth; for in these it is a question of the infinite, to which belong infinite considerations. Finally, they so prove and defend all this that they do not hesitate to profess that no more noble honor is shown the Infinite than the affirming of contradictions about Him.—But when a contradiction is approved, what will not be approved?

VII. The Reformer

Finally, a few words must be said about the modernist as a reformer. What we have said thus far shows abundantly with how great and keen a zeal for innovating these men are carried away. Moreover, this zeal extends to absolutely everything which exists among Catholics. They wish philosophy to be reformed, especially in ecclesiastical seminaries, so that, after relegating scholastic philosophy to the history of philosophy along with the other obsolete systems, youth may be taught modern philosophy which alone is true and in accord with our age.—To reform theology, they wish that that which we call rational have modern philosophy as a basis, but they demand that positive theology be based especially upon the history of dogma.—They also demand that history be written and be taught according to their method and modern prescriptions. Dogmas and the evolution of the same, they declare, must be brought into harmony with science and history.—As regards catechesis, they demand that only those dogmas be noted in catechism, which have been reformed, and are within the capacity of the masses. As for worship they say that external devotions are to be reduced in number, and that steps be taken to prevent their increase, although some who are more favorable toward symbolism show themselves more indulgent on this score.—They cry out that the government of the Church must be reformed in every respect, but especially on the disciplinary and dogmatic side. Thus, both within and without it is to be brought in harmony with the modern conscience, as they say, which tends entirely towards democracy; so to the lower clergy and to laity itself appropriate parts in the government should be assigned, and when authority has been unified too much and too centralized, it is to be dispersed.—The Roman congregations they likewise wish to be modified in the performance of their holy duties, but especially that which is known as the Holy Office and is also called the Index. Likewise, they contend that the action of ecclesiastical authority must be changed in the political and social fields, so that it may at the same time live apart from civil affairs, yet adapt itself to them in order to imbue them with its spirit.—In the field of morals they adopt the principle of the Americanists, that the active virtues are to be placed before the passive, and should be put ahead of them in practice.—They desire that the clergy be prepared to practice the ancient humility and poverty; moreover, that in thought and deed they conform with the precepts of modernism.—Finally, there

are some who, giving heed to the words of their Protestant masters, desire the removal of holy celibacy itself from the priesthood—What, then, do they leave untouched in the Church, that is not to be reformed by them or according to their pronouncements? (Cf. DB 2072-2104)

Those clergymen who had studied under theologians who were clear in teaching the faith, such as Réginald Marie Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., or Joseph Fenton, were shocked to hear exactly what Pius X had condemned as quoted above, especially as they had exposed the *Nouvelle Theologie*. But not only Pius X, also what Pius XI and even more recently Pius XII had absolutely forbade and condemned, as faithful Theologians requested. They were hearing the same arguments that were presented at the Synod of Pistoia but condemned by Pius VI in *Auctorem Fidei* on August 28, 1794, who condemned:

1. *The proposition, which asserts "that in these later times there has been spread a general obscuring of the more important truths pertaining to religion, which are the basis of faith and of the moral teachings of Jesus Christ,"—heretical. (Cf. DB 1501)*

29. *The doctrine of the synod, in that part in which, undertaking to explain the doctrine of faith in the rite of consecration, and disregarding the scholastic questions about the manner in which Christ is in the Eucharist, from which questions it exhorts priests performing the duty of teaching to refrain, it states the doctrine in these two propositions only: 1) after the consecration Christ is truly, really, substantially under the species; 2) then the whole substance of the bread and wine ceases, appearances only remaining; it (the doctrine) absolutely omits to make any mention of transubstantiation, or conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which the Council of Trent defined as an article of faith [see n. 877, 884], and which is contained in the solemn profession of faith [see n. 997]; since by an indiscreet and suspicious omission of this sort knowledge is taken away both of an article pertaining to faith, and also of the word consecrated by the Church to protect the profession of it, as if it were a discussion of a merely scholastic question,—dangerous, derogatory to the exposition of Catholic truth about the dogma of transubstantiation, favorable to heretics. (Cf. DB 1529)*

31. *The proposition of the synod enunciating that it is fitting, in accordance with the order of divine services and ancient custom that there be only one altar in each temple, and therefore, that it is pleased to restore that custom,—rash, injurious to the very ancient pious custom flourishing and approved for these many centuries in the Church, especially in the Latin Church. (Cf. DB 1531)*

32. *Likewise, the prescription forbidding cases of sacred relics or flowers being placed on the altar,—rash, injurious to the pious and approved custom of the Church. (Cf. DB 1532)*

33. *The proposition of the synod by which it shows itself eager to remove the cause through which, in part, there has been induced a forgetfulness of the principles relating to the order of the liturgy, "by recalling it (the liturgy) to a greater simplicity of rites, by expressing it in the vernacular language, by uttering it in a loud voice"; as if the present order of the liturgy, received and approved by the Church, had emanated in some part from the forgetfulness of the principles by which it should be regulated, —rash, offensive to pious ears, insulting to the Church, favorable to the charges of heretics against it. (Cf. DB 1533)*

And what Pius XI condemned in *Mortalium animos*, January 26, 1928:

And here it seems opportune to expound and to refute a certain false opinion, on which this whole question, as well as that complex movement by which non-Catholics seek to bring about the union of the Christian churches depends. For authors who favor this view are accustomed, times almost without number, to bring forward these words of Christ: "That they all may be one.... And there shall be one fold and one shepherd," [John xvii, 21; x, 6.] with this signification however: that Christ Jesus merely expressed a desire and prayer, which still lacks its fulfillment. For they are of the opinion that the unity of faith and government, which is a note of the one true Church of Christ, has hardly up to the present time existed, and does not to-day exist. They consider that this unity may indeed be desired and that it may even be one day attained through the instrumentality of wills directed to a common end, but that meanwhile it can only be regarded as mere ideal. They add that the Church in itself, or of its nature, is divided into sections; that is to say, that it is made up of several churches or distinct communities, which still remain separate, and although having certain articles of doctrine in common, nevertheless disagree concerning the remainder; that these all enjoy the same rights; and that the Church was one and unique from, at the most, the apostolic age until the first Ecumenical Councils. Controversies therefore, they say, and longstanding differences of opinion which keep asunder till the present day the members of the Christian family, must be entirely put aside, and from the remaining doctrines a common form of faith drawn up and proposed for belief, and in the profession of which all may not only know but feel that they are brothers. The manifold churches or communities, if united in some kind of universal federation, would then be in a position to oppose strongly and with success the progress of irreligion. This, Venerable Brethren, is what is commonly said. There are some, indeed, who recognize and affirm that Protestantism, as they call it, has rejected, with a great lack of consideration, certain articles of faith and some external ceremonies, which are, in fact, pleasing and useful, and which the Roman Church still retains. They soon, however, go on to say that that Church also has erred, and corrupted the original religion by adding and proposing for belief certain doctrines which are not only alien to the Gospel, but even repugnant to it. Among the chief of these they number that which concerns the primacy of jurisdiction, which was granted to Peter and to his successors in the See of Rome. Among them there indeed are some, though few, who grant to the Roman Pontiff a primacy of honor or even a certain jurisdiction or power, but this, however, they consider not to arise from the divine law but from the consent of the faithful. Others again, even go so far as to wish the Pontiff Himself to preside over their motley, so to say, assemblies. But, all the same, although many non-Catholics may be found who loudly preach fraternal communion in Christ Jesus, yet you will find none at all to whom it ever occurs to submit to and obey the Vicar of Jesus Christ either in His capacity as a teacher or as a governor. Meanwhile they affirm that they would willingly treat with the Church of Rome, but on equal terms, that is as equals with an equal: but even if they could so act, it does not seem open to doubt that any pact into which they might enter would not compel them to turn from those opinions which are still the reason why they err and stray from the one fold of Christ.

This being so, it is clear that the Apostolic See cannot on any terms take part in their assemblies, nor is it anyway lawful for Catholics either to support or to work for such enterprises; for if they do so they will be giving countenance to a false Christianity, quite alien to the one Church of Christ. Shall We suffer, what would indeed be iniquitous, the truth, and a truth divinely revealed, to be made a subject for compromise? For here there is question of defending revealed truth. Jesus

Christ sent His Apostles into the whole world in order that they might permeate all nations with the Gospel faith, and, lest they should err, He willed beforehand that they should be taught by the Holy Ghost: [John xvi, 13.] has then this doctrine of the Apostles completely vanished away, or sometimes been obscured, in the Church, whose ruler and defense is God Himself? If our Redeemer plainly said that His Gospel was to continue not only during the times of the Apostles, but also till future ages, is it possible that the object of faith should in the process of time become so obscure and uncertain, that it would be necessary to-day to tolerate opinions which are even incompatible one with another? If this were true, we should have to confess that the coming of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles, and the perpetual indwelling of the same Spirit in the Church, and the very preaching of Jesus Christ, have several centuries ago, lost all their efficacy and use, to affirm which would be blasphemy. But the Only-begotten Son of God, when He commanded His representatives to teach all nations, obliged all men to give credence to whatever was made known to them by "witnesses preordained by God," [Acts x, 41] and also confirmed His command with this sanction: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." [Mark xvi, 16] These two commands of Christ, which must be fulfilled, the one, namely, to teach, and the other to believe, cannot even be understood, unless the Church proposes a complete and easily understood teaching, and is immune when it thus teaches from all danger of erring. In this matter, those also turn aside from the right path, who think that the deposit of truth such laborious trouble, and with such lengthy study and discussion, that a man's life would hardly suffice to find and take possession of it; as if the most merciful God had spoken through the prophets and His Only-begotten Son merely in order that a few, and those stricken in years, should learn what He had revealed through them, and not that He might inculcate a doctrine of faith and morals, by which man should be guided through the whole course of his moral life.

These pan-Christians who turn their minds to uniting the churches seem, indeed, to pursue the noblest of ideas in promoting charity among all Christians: nevertheless how does it happen that this charity tends to injure faith? Everyone knows that John himself, the Apostle of love, who seems to reveal in his Gospel the secrets of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and who never ceased to impress on the memories of his followers the new commandment "Love one another," altogether forbade any intercourse with those who professed a mutilated and corrupt version of Christ's teaching: "If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house nor say to him: God speed you." [II John 10] For which reason, since charity is based on a complete and sincere faith, the disciples of Christ must be united principally by the bond of one faith. Who then can conceive a Christian Federation, the members of which retain each his own opinions and private judgment, even in matters which concern the object of faith, even though they be repugnant to the opinions of the rest? And in what manner, We ask, can men who follow contrary opinions, belong to one and the same Federation of the faithful? For example, those who affirm, and those who deny that sacred Tradition is a true fount of divine Revelation; those who hold that an ecclesiastical hierarchy, made up of bishops, priests and ministers, has been divinely constituted, and those who assert that it has been brought in little by little in accordance with the conditions of the time; those who adore Christ really present in the Most Holy Eucharist through that marvelous conversion of the bread and wine, which is called transubstantiation, and those who affirm that Christ is present only by faith or by the signification and virtue of the Sacrament; those who in the Eucharist recognize the nature both of a sacrament and of a sacrifice, and those who say that it is nothing more than the memorial or commemoration of the Lord's Supper; those who believe it to be good and useful to invoke by prayer the Saints reigning with Christ, especially

Mary the Mother of God, and to venerate their images, and those who urge that such a veneration is not to be made use of, for it is contrary to the honor due to Jesus Christ, "the one mediator of God and men." [Cf. I Tim ii, 5.] How so great a variety of opinions can make the way clear to effect the unity of the Church We know not; that unity can only arise from one teaching authority, one law of belief and one faith of Christians. But We do know that from this it is an easy step to the neglect of religion or indifferentism and to modernism, as they call it. Those, who are unhappily infected with these errors, hold that dogmatic truth is not absolute but relative, that is, it agrees with the varying necessities of time and place and with the varying tendencies of the mind, since it is not contained in immutable revelation, but is capable of being accommodated to human life. Besides this, in connection with things which must be believed, it is nowise licit to use that distinction which some have seen fit to introduce between those articles of faith which are fundamental and those which are not fundamental, as they say, as if the former are to be accepted by all, while the latter may be left to the free assent of the faithful: for the supernatural virtue of faith has a formal cause, namely the authority of God revealing, and this is patient of no such distinction. For this reason it is that all who are truly Christ's believe, for example, the Conception of the Mother of God without stain of original sin with the same faith as they believe the mystery of the August Trinity, and the Incarnation of our Lord just as they do the infallible teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, according to the sense in which it was defined by the Ecumenical Council of the Vatican. Are these truths not equally certain, or not equally to be believed, because the Church has solemnly sanctioned and defined them, some in one age and some in another, even in those times immediately before our own? Has not God revealed them all? For the teaching authority of the Church, which in the divine wisdom was constituted on earth in order that revealed doctrines might remain intact for ever, and that they might be brought with ease and security to the knowledge of men, and which is daily exercised through the Roman Pontiff and the Bishops who are in communion with him, has also the office of defining, when it sees fit, any truth with solemn rites and decrees, whenever this is necessary either to oppose the errors or the attacks of heretics, or more clearly and in greater detail to stamp the minds of the faithful with the articles of sacred doctrine which have been explained. But in the use of this extraordinary teaching authority no newly invented matter is brought in, nor is anything new added to the number of those truths which are at least implicitly contained in the deposit of Revelation, divinely handed down to the Church: only those which are made clear which perhaps may still seem obscure to some, or that which some have previously called into question is declared to be of faith.

So, Venerable Brethren, it is clear why this Apostolic See has never allowed its subjects to take part in the assemblies of non-Catholics: for the union of Christians can only be promoted by promoting the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it, for in the past they have unhappily left it. To the one true Church of Christ, we say, which is visible to all, and which is to remain, according to the will of its Author, exactly the same as He instituted it. During the lapse of centuries, the mystical Spouse of Christ has never been contaminated, nor can she ever in the future be contaminated, as Cyprian bears witness: "The Bride of Christ cannot be made false to her Spouse: she is incorrupt and modest. She knows but one dwelling, she guards the sanctity of the nuptial chamber chastely and modestly." [De Cath. Ecclesiae unitate, 6.] The same holy Martyr with good reason marveled exceedingly that anyone could believe that "this unity in the Church which arises from a divine foundation, and which is knit together by heavenly sacraments, could be rent and torn asunder by the force of contrary wills." [Ibid.] For since the mystical body of Christ, in the same manner as His physical body, is one, [I Cor. xii, 12.]

compacted and fitly joined together,[Eph. iv, 16] it were foolish and out of place to say that the mystical body is made up of members which are disunited and scattered abroad: whosoever therefore is not united with the body is no member of it, neither is he in communion with Christ its head.[Cf. Eph. v, 30; I, 22.] (Pars. 7-10)

Further, what Pius XII had recently declared, in *Mediator Dei*, November 20, 1947:

The Church is without question a living organism, and as an organism, in respect of the sacred liturgy also, she grows, matures, develops, adapts and accommodates herself to temporal needs and circumstances, provided only that the integrity of her doctrine be safeguarded. This notwithstanding, the temerity and daring of those who introduce novel liturgical practices, or call for the revival of obsolete rites out of harmony with prevailing laws and rubrics, deserve severe reproof. It has pained Us grievously to note, Venerable Brethren, that such innovations are actually being introduced, not merely in minor details but in matters of major importance as well. We instance, in point of fact, those who make use of the vernacular in the celebration of the august eucharistic sacrifice; those who transfer certain feast-days—which have been appointed and established after mature deliberation—to other dates; those, finally, who delete from the prayerbooks approved for public use the sacred texts of the Old Testament, deeming them little suited and inopportune for modern times.

The use of the Latin language, customary in a considerable portion of the Church, is a manifest and beautiful sign of unity, as well as an effective antidote for any corruption of doctrinal truth. In spite of this, the use of the mother tongue in connection with several of the rites may be of much advantage to the people. But the Apostolic See alone is empowered to grant this permission. It is forbidden, therefore, to take any action whatever of this nature without having requested and obtained such consent, since the sacred liturgy, as We have said, is entirely subject to the discretion and approval of the Holy See.

61. The same reasoning holds in the case of some persons who are bent on the restoration of all the ancient rites and ceremonies indiscriminately. The liturgy of the early ages is most certainly worthy of all veneration. But ancient usage must not be esteemed more suitable and proper, either in its own right or in its significance for later times and new situations, on the simple ground that it carries the savor and aroma of antiquity. The more recent liturgical rites likewise deserve reverence and respect. They, too, owe their inspiration to the Holy Spirit, who assists the Church in every age even to the consummation of the world. [Cf. Matt. 28:20.] They are equally the resources used by the majestic Spouse of Jesus Christ to promote and procure the sanctity of man.

Assuredly it is a wise and most laudable thing to return in spirit and affection to the sources of the sacred liturgy. For research in this field of study, by tracing it back to its origins, contributes valuable assistance towards a more thorough and careful investigation of the significance of feast-days, and of the meaning of the texts and sacred ceremonies employed on their occasion. But it is neither wise nor laudable to reduce everything to antiquity by every possible device. Thus, to cite some instances, one would be straying from the straight path were he to wish the altar restored to its primitive tableform; were he to want black excluded as a color for the liturgical vestments; were he to forbid the use of sacred images and statues in Churches; were he to order the crucifix so designed that the divine Redeemer's body shows no trace of His cruel sufferings; and lastly

were he to disdain and reject polyphonic music or singing in parts, even where it conforms to regulations issued by the Holy See.

Clearly no sincere Catholic can refuse to accept the formulation of Christian doctrine more recently elaborated and proclaimed as dogmas by the Church, under the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit with abundant fruit for souls, because it pleases him to hark back to the old formulas. No more can any Catholic in his right senses repudiate existing legislation of the Church to revert to prescriptions based on the earliest sources of canon law. Just as obviously unwise and mistaken is the zeal of one who in matters liturgical would go back to the rites and usage of antiquity, discarding the new patterns introduced by disposition of divine Providence to meet the changes of circumstances and situation.

This way of acting bids fair to revive the exaggerated and senseless antiquarianism to which the illegal Council of Pistoia gave rise. It likewise attempts to reinstate a series of errors which were responsible for the calling of that meeting as well as for those resulting from it, with grievous harm to souls, and which the Church, the ever watchful guardian of the "deposit of faith" committed to her charge by her divine Founder, had every right and reason to condemn. [Cf. Pius VI, Constitution Auctorem fidei, August 28, 1794, nn. 31-34, 39, 62, 66, 69-74.] For perverse designs and ventures of this sort tend to paralyze and weaken that process of sanctification by which the sacred liturgy directs the sons of adoption to their Heavenly Father of their souls' salvation. (Pars. 59-64)

It was fresh in the memory what Pius XII, in *Humani Generis*, August 12, 1950, again repeats of Pius X's and Pius XI's condemnations of Modernism and false ecumenism:

Another danger is perceived which is all the more serious because it is more concealed beneath the mask of virtue. There are many who, deploring disagreement among men and intellectual confusion, through an imprudent zeal for souls, are urged by a great and ardent desire to do away with the barrier that divides good and honest men; these advocate an "eirenism" according to which, by setting aside the questions which divide men, they aim not only at joining forces to repel the attacks of atheism, but also at reconciling things opposed to one another in the field of dogma. And as in former times some questioned whether the traditional apologetics of the Church did not constitute an obstacle rather than a help to the winning of souls for Christ, so today some are presumptive enough to question seriously whether theology and theological methods, such as with the approval of ecclesiastical authority are found in our schools, should not only be perfected, but also completely reformed, in order to promote the more efficacious propagation of the kingdom of Christ everywhere throughout the world among men of every culture and religious opinion.

Now if these only aimed at adapting ecclesiastical teaching and methods to modern conditions and requirements, through the introduction of some new explanations, there would be scarcely any reason for alarm. But some through enthusiasm for an imprudent "eirenism" seem to consider as an obstacle to the restoration of fraternal union, things founded on the laws and principles given by Christ and likewise on institutions founded by Him, or which are the defense and support of the integrity of the faith, and the removal of which would bring about the union of all, but only to their destruction. (Pars. 11-12)

The Magisterium is guided by the Holy Ghost, the charism that preserves the Church from teaching error and guarantees the Pope to speak infallibly when teaching the Catholic Church in matters of faith and morals. When the Faith was loyally defended by Catholic Cardinals and bishops they were ignored completely or even rebuffed by Angelo Roncalli, such as the incident related when, in opposition to Bishop William Duschak asking for something completely unacceptable to a Catholic, that is, a “Mass”, a *Missa Orbis*, agreeable to non-Catholics that was “Christ’s own words” and “closely with the Last Supper” –which he never historically witnessed!—in which even Protestants could be invited and understand and where the priest faced the people saying everything in the vernacular and in response, on November 7, 1962, Bishop Antonio de Castro Mayer of Campos, Brazil, spoke, pointing to the sacred, the unequivocal, and perpetuity of the Mass. Wiltgen writes of Roncalli’s rebuttal:

Bishop Mayer's remarks contrasted greatly with remarks made on the same day by Pope John at a public audience granted after he had watched the morning meeting of the Council on closed-circuit television. Explaining the activities of the Council Fathers, the Pope said: "The business at hand is not to make a careful study of some old museum or of some school of thought from the past. No doubt this can be helpful—just as a visit to ancient monuments can be helpful—but it is not enough. We live to advance, appreciating at the same time whatever the past has to offer us in the line of experience. But we must move ever further onward along the road which Our Lord has opened up before us." And, to make sure that there should be no misunderstanding as to his meaning, he added, "The Christian life is not a collection of ancient customs." (op. cit. p. 40.)

Of course, Angelo Roncalli initiated the call for change as Wiltgen continues:

On the previous Sunday, both by action and by word, he had expressed himself in favor of the vernacular. It was the fourth anniversary of his coronation, and the faithful of Rome as well as the Council Fathers were present at a celebration in St. Peter's. Speaking in Latin to the Council Fathers, the Pope said: "This should be the common language used by prelates of the Universal Church when communicating with the Apostolic See, and it should be regularly used at Council meetings." After greeting them in Latin, he said, he would switch to Italian, "especially since it can be more easily understood by very many of those present that is, by the people, who have come together here in great numbers to honor the anniversary in the pontificate of their Pastor and Father." This was the very same argument that the missionary bishops had been using for the introduction of the vernacular in the Mass. (Ibid., p 40-41)

And though it was proposed as for “pastoral” benefits, it was a suggestion that did not even have any significance for Duschak, because when *Asked whether his proposal originated with the people whom he served, he answered, "No, I think they would oppose it, just as many bishops oppose it. But if it could be put into practice, I think they would accept it."* (Ibid. p. 39) Where, then, did it originate? And why force it on his flock?

The Pope was to confirm the brethren in the Faith. Angelo Roncalli questioned the Faith. But Catholics were not to question the Pope in matters of Faith and morals, they were to follow him. Despite the fact that Roncalli did not release the third Secret of Fatima in 1960 after reading it in August of 1959 as stated in the diary of John XXIII, 17 August 1959 [“*Audiences: Father Philippe, Commissary of the Holy Office, who brought me the letter containing the third part of the secrets*

of Fatima. I intend to read it with my Confessor". (cf. *The Message of Fatima*, Retrieved May 20, 2016.

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000626_message-fatima_en.html] Faithful Catholics were beginning to gather to pray the family Rosary or as groups as a spiritual warfare against the complete spiritual vacuum being created as the true Faith left Rome. Many began to start studying their faith to understand how what they believed yesterday was no longer to be believed today as the Newspapers began carrying stories of what the Bishops and priests were saying at the Council. Can a pope contradict a pope in matters of faith and morals if both are infallible? Does one follow what Pius XII and all the prior Popes taught or the novelties of Angelo Roncalli?

1963

The year 1963 was a year of change. There were the young people who had not experienced World War II but could reap the material benefits of the war effort and personal freedoms they saw denied to others. There was change in the women who were offered jobs previously reserved for men but opened because of the war effort—making them no longer dependent on a husband. There was The Pill, approved in 1960 in the United States, it was now being promoted throughout the world and, by 1963, allowing women to become promiscuous without bearing the results and to add to this was the publication on February 19 of Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* giving rise to women rebelling against womanhood as Friedan invents the unhappy housewife mystique. In April, as the young people enjoyed freedom and women began to complain about being in the home they dreamed of, the Blacks began to rebel also as to the condition they found themselves in, as the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in Birmingham, Alabama, began to protest against racial segregation with Martin Luther King designated as leader. This general dissatisfaction was fed by the media, which now had a national audience with the introduction of television in nearly every American home and elsewhere and the media with its journalists and newscasters could cull the stories to fit the picture they wanted to present on the three national broadcasting stations. Radio had brought America together for the War Effort and it was expected if television could be used for the dissemination of ideas it could also be used to direct the public for or against ideas.

In other parts of the world, various nations were turning toward Marxism and Socialism. Despite receiving American aid, Yugoslavia closed its borders and declared itself a Socialist Republic on April 7. Italy holds elections on April 28 and Palmiro Togliatti of the Communist Party along with the Socialist Party nearly win the majority of seats in the Italian Parliament and the Catholic Aldo Moro finds himself unable to lead the Parliament. By May, Vietnam, under the Catholic President Ngo Dinh Diem, finds his country disintegrating as the United States incites the majority Buddhists against him for opposing American hegemony in his country. On July 7 Ngo Dinh Nhu, confronts American journalists inciting protests against the Diem regime. In August John F. Kennedy approves the assassination of the Ngo Dinh Family (but Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc is allowed to leave at the request of the Vatican in September—not knowing what was planned for his family—due to the Vatican Council). A *coup d'état* was staged with the support of the United States government, and on November 2 Ngo Dinh Diem was assassinated, after leaving holy Mass, and later that day his brother Ngo Dinh Nhu. Three weeks afterwards, on November 22, John F. Kennedy met the same fate. Lyndon B. Johnson assumes the presidency and begins a war in

Vietnam that will send tens of thousands of Americans to their death. Martin Luther King had delivered his “I have a dream” speech on August 28, but America would only live through a nightmare and wake up with innocence of her children lost by the 70’s.

While these world events are happening, there was also change for the Church. The New Modernists were busy formulating a *Novus Ordo*. Amendments to the Schema on the Church was ordered to be submitted by February 28. The Americans had a large delegation to the Council and had a greater majority of representatives, but failed to take any lead. But this was not the case of the New Modernists of the *Nouvelle Theologie*. The German, French, Belgium and Dutch Bishops who adopted the theologians from this circle as their *periti* held meetings under the direction of Julius August Döpfner, the Archbishop of Munich-Freising. As a member of the Coordinating Commission of the Council, Döpfner had access to knowing what was being done in other quarters—nothing! Therefore in the meeting of February 5-6 this circle drew up a completely new schema—written already by Karl Rahner, referenced it and emphasized to be considered as *pastoral*, circulated it among the Austrian and German Hierarchy with these words: *In no way does it intend to keep silent about or to conceal Catholic truths, not even those which Protestants either doubt or deny. However, it always tries to give consideration to Protestant objections, but without, of course, treating those objections explicitly.* (As quoted by Wiltgen, 64)

The German-speaking Council Fathers were now well prepared for the opening debate of the second session, the schema on the Church. Still further preparations were to be made at a second conference held in August of the same year, at Fulda.

It is worth noting that the opening words of the substitute schema, "Lumen gentium" ("Light of nations"), taken from Pope John's address of September 11, 1962, were subsequently adopted as the official title of the Council's dogmatic constitution on the Church. (Wiltgen, 64-65)

Regarding the Commission on the Sacred Liturgy—something was amiss. Annabale Bugnini was removed under Angelo Roncalli and replaced with Ferdinando Antonelli on October 21, 1962. One cannot forget that the works of Teilhard de Chardin were forbidden to be read or published by an admonition of June 30th, 1962:

. . . [I]t is obvious that in philosophical and theological matters, the said works are replete with ambiguities or rather with serious errors which offend Catholic doctrine. That is why . . . the Rev. Fathers of the Holy Office urge all Ordinaries, Superiors, and Rectors . . . to effectively protect, especially the minds of the young, against the dangers of the works of Fr. Teilhard de Chardin and his followers. (AAS, 30 June 1962, 526)

It was a repetition of the Holy Office’s decree on November 15, 1957. Yet, Joseph Ratzinger, Yves Congar, Dominic Chenu and the other New Modernists were all followers of his ideas and today Joseph Ratzinger always refers back to Teilhard de Chardin as a source of his Theological conclusions.

This duplicity under John XXIII, as in the case of dealing with Catholics supporting Communists, seems to be evident once again here—removing Bugnini to appear opposing his revolutionary liturgical innovations while giving the approval that Bugnini could continue his experimentations until a better time to bring them to light. The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy *Sacrosanctum*

Concilium was not outright rejected as amended during Council sessions and the Liturgical Commission met in Rome on April 23, 1963, to ready a final document. Frederick McManus was the *periti* of Archbishop Paul Hallinan of Atlanta, Georgia. The Archbishop commented at the end of the two week meeting:

"[There is] very good reason for the optimism and the confidence that has accompanied this three-week period on the part of all the members of the Commission. . . . In the first place, we have been assured by Cardinal Larraona that the Holy Father himself is very pleased with the work of the Liturgical Commission. In an audience about three weeks ago, he expressed his confidence that the work done by the Liturgical Commission and the Council Fathers was a real step toward the aggiornamento. This naturally is a cause of confidence and satisfaction to us all."

He then referred to the "very democratic style" in which Arcadio Cardinal Larraona, President of the Liturgical Commission, conducted its meetings. (Wiltgen, 67)

Frederick McManus, who was the Thomas Jefferson of the final draft, would soon be recognized—as a member of the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL)—for his absolutely incorrect and novel translations of even the parodic *Novus Ordo Missae*.

The *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* was already known to be a façade for the more radical innovations to come. Bugnini was already formulating the contemporary Bernsteinite *Novus Ordo Missae*.

On April 9 Angelo Roncalli released his encyclical *Pacem in terris* that would turn the view of Catholics from opposing Communism and Socialism to supporting these anti-Catholic movements as an evolution of societal change. The elections in Italy on April 28 proved the validity and Angelo Roncalli was able to witness his success or failure according to his intention.

On June 3, 1963, Angelo Roncalli died from the stomach cancer he had been suffering. All attention in the world was now centered on his internment but more so his successor. Giovanni Montini, whom all regarded as the true leader of the Second Vatican Council with his support for the *Ressourcement* and *Nouvelle Theologie*—summarized constantly in the slogan of *Aggiornamento*—, was quickly elected on June 21 and took complete direction of the Vatican Council which he announced would still reconvene on September 8, 1963. Expressing displeasure at Angelo Roncalli calling a Council (*cf.* Hebblewaite, p. 284.) and his seeming disinterest during the first session may be due to his fear that the original schemas of Father Sebastiaan Tromp and Cardinal Ottaviani might be approved. Roncalli indicated that he expected the Council to only last one session as the preparatory commissions had already drawn up the schemas and just needed to be approved. As was seen, this did not happen. The New Modernists were able to reject all of the schemas and rewrite them. Giovanni Montini called for the Council to reconvene on September 29, 1963.

Those known under Pope Pius XII for defending the Catholic Faith against the New Modernists, such as Domenico Tardini (1888-1961) and Réginald Marie Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P. (1877–1964), as also more than half of the Cardinals created under Pius XI and Pius XII had died before the end of the Council with Angelo Roncalli and Giovanni Montini naming 79 Cardinals from 1958-1965—leaving no formidable defenders of the faith. Whenever Ottaviani, Bacci or Ruffini stood

up to oppose or present the Catholic Faith, they were ridiculed by the New Modernists. The Second Session that opened on September 29 would be completely different than the first Session.

Is the Chair of Peter Vacant?

Third Contradiction: One Church or Many?

The world still seemed a safe place the first six months of 1963. The death of Angelo Roncalli signaled a change of guard, a spirit of revolution, the end of order. The European colonies in Africa were fighting for liberation; the former colonies in Asia were fighting for self-determination; the adolescents were fighting for freedom from parental control; and the *Nouvelle Theologie* periti were ready to fight for a totally new Church. This was the prevailing spirit at the end of the summer as the Fathers of the Council were returning for the Second Session of the Vatican Council. Immediately after his election, on June 22, 1963, Giovanni Montini announced he would re-open the Council again on September 29. The media, too, was ready to convince the world it needed to accept these changes in the spirit of progress and modernity.

As Wiltgen saw the power of the media to sway opinion and already seal changes before they were even brought up at the Council, he continued to play the role of directing what the media should focus on. He also was present with those making the changes, such as the European alliance at Fulda:

The work carried out by the European alliance at Fulda was very impressive, and it is to be regretted that all national and regional episcopal conferences did not work with the same intensity and purpose. Had they done so, they would not have found it necessary to accept the positions of the European alliance with so little questioning. The Council would then have been less one-sided, and its achievements would truly have been the result of a world-wide theological effort. (Op. cit., 79-80)

And the coverage that was produced:

A meeting of Council Fathers from so many nations was bound to interest the press, and a succession of newspaper stories appeared with references to a "conspiracy" and an "attack" upon the Roman Curia and some of its representatives. Some of the Council Fathers were styled "progressives," others "traditionalists," still others "anti-progressives." It was insinuated that the Fulda conference was intended to counteract the possible "personal inclinations" of the new Pontiff in regard to the direction to be taken by the Council, which might make it deviate from the path which Pope John had indicated. (Ibid., 81)

In other words, before the Fathers had even come together, the world saw the Church divided into *progressives* and *anti-progressives* and a direction, though never formulated, toward which the Council was to reach, which the media (directed by Wiltgen and the New Modernists) invented to obtain the goals of the *progressives*.—That is, Wiltgen wrote what Catholics tried to reveal without success: The Council was a robber council, stolen by the New Modernists, the media and persons elected as popes that had no intention of being Catholic in Faith. The Fathers of the Council would leave at the end of the Council, many celebrating the foundation of a New Church, the Conciliar Church, most not recognizing they had founded a new Church. Therefore, what happened in 1963 during the Second Session?

The Council came back with major changes in organization. Catholic Cardinals and Bishops who were opposed to the New Modernists found themselves stripped of any power to resist a railroading of decisions that were contrary to Church teaching. As Wiltgen informs his readers:

. . . [M]ajor changes were being prepared in the organization and procedure governing the Council. These were announced by Pope Paul VI on September 13. "On the advice of certain venerable Council Fathers," he said, he was revising the Rules of Procedure which had been approved thirteen months earlier by Pope John. Under the revised rules, the Presidency received an increase in membership but suffered a loss of power. The number of Cardinal Presidents was raised from ten to twelve, and their function reduced to that of policing the Council, enforcing the rules, and "solving doubts and difficulties." They were no longer to have any authority in the matter of the direction of Council discussions.

The new rules placed the responsibility for "directing the activities of the Council and determining the sequence in which topics would be discussed at the business meetings" in the hands of four Cardinal Moderators chosen from the membership of the Coordinating Commission, which had been expanded from six to nine by Pope Paul. The four Moderators chosen by the Pope were Cardinals Döpfner, Suenens, Lercaro, and Agagianian. . . .

By these papal appointments the European alliance grew in power and influence, advancing from control of 30 per cent of the Council Presidency and control of 50 per cent of the Coordinating Commission to control of 75 per cent of the board of Cardinal Moderators. And since Cardinal Agagianian [regarded the most acceptable Curial Cardinal to their cause] was not a forceful person, the three liberal Cardinal Moderators often had 100-per-cent control. (op. cit., 82, 83)

Opening on September 29, 1963, Giovanni Montini addressed the Fathers of the Council, asking for a fuller definition of the Church, for a renewal of the Church, for Christian Unity, and the Church's place within Modern Society. At a brief glance, all worthy of consideration. But the interpretation became disturbing as the Council produced its documents that no longer were sustainable with past Church teaching. The Church became a *mystery*, not the absolute means of salvation; Renewal meant sensing an experience of the faith by activity; Christian Unity was not conversion of non-Catholics to the Faith, but acknowledging different paths to Christ and acceptance of basic principles (The non-Catholics were welcoming in receiving recognition of their sects; but none wanted to give up their autonomy even if they didn't need to reject their errors); and understanding the Church's place within Modern Society meant converting the Church into a social organization that worked for peace and providing for societal needs. The New Modernists grasped this call as their call.

The very next day, September 30, 1963, the Schema on the Church devised by Karl Rahner and the New Modernists was brought forward for consideration. As a whole it was presenting the Church in a manner that was new. Under the mantra of balancing the supreme authority and infallibility of the pope, the concept of episcopal collegiality was introduced with the understanding that bishops were a collective and could decide issues alone collectively or that bishops were a collective with the Pope as leader. Both concepts were rejected by those Cardinals and Bishops retaining Catholic doctrine. As Wiltgen summarizes:

Cardinal Siri of Genoa, for instance, maintained that the bishops, "under certain conditions," certainly constituted a college together with the Roman Pontiff; that was evident from Sacred Scripture and tradition. However, the concept of a college was "strictly juridical" and therefore much more complex than that of a simple association. It implied, in fact, "a juridical solidarity both in being and in action." Cardinal Siri felt that the wording of the schema should be clearer and better organized, and should be harmonized with what the First Vatican Council had already defined on the papal primacy. (op. cit., 86-87)

. . . Archbishop Sigaud, of Diamantina, Brazil, called for special caution in the phrasing of episcopal collegiality. The Archbishop, who called himself a traditionalist, said that a comparison of Articles 12, 13, and 16 of the schema made it appear that "some new doctrine" was being taught—namely, that the twelve Apostles, with Peter as head, constituted together a true and permanent college strictly so called, and "even by divine institution."

. . . "If by divine institution the bishops and the Pope constitute a true and permanent college, strictly so called, then the Church must habitually and ordinarily (not extraordinarily) be ruled by the Pope with the college of bishops. In other words, the government of the Church, by divine institution, is not monarchical or personal, but collegial." But the exercise of collegial authority by bishops, as in ecumenical councils, was a rare event in the history of the Church, and must therefore be regarded as an extraordinary—not an ordinary—manner of governing the Universal Church.

The traditional Catholic teaching in the matter, he said, was that every bishop, on his appointment to office by the Pope, "receives the duty and, consequently, the authority of exercising the episcopal office among the faithful committed to him, within the territorial limits indicated to him by the competent authority." There was a distinction, he pointed out, between acts performed by bishops collectively, and those performed collegially. An example of collective action was the gathering of many bishops of one ecclesiastical province or nation, the efficacy of which was not derived from divine institution and could not be said to have been collegially produced. The decisions of such gatherings had only "a juridical efficacy, that is, they oblige within a diocese only if the Roman Pontiff approves of such decisions as binding by virtue of his own full and universal power; or if the bishop of the diocese concerned, by virtue of his own jurisdiction, approves such decisions as binding for his own diocese."

Two "very dangerous precipices" must be avoided, said Archbishop Sigaud. In the first place, "we must avoid the establishment of some world institution which would be like a permanent ecumenical council, to which some bishops would be elected or delegated by others, and who would carry out the duties of the entire episcopal college. In this way, together with the Roman Pontiff, they would perform acts which were truly collegial, in a habitual and ordinary manner, and their efficacy would be extended by divine institution to the Universal Church." Such an organism, said the Archbishop, would be a kind of "world parliament" within the Church. But, he pointed out, Christ had most certainly not established such an organism, because for twenty centuries the Roman Pontiffs and bishops had been wholly unaware of it. "On the contrary, it is clear to all that Christ the Lord conferred the supreme government of his Church upon the person

of Peter, to be personally exercised, first, indeed, by Peter himself, and then by Peter's successors." (Ibid., 88-89)

Later in conversation with Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, Wiltgen condenses further objections:

It was easy to conceive, said the Archbishop, that "three, four, or five bishops in a national episcopal conference will have more influence than the rest and will take over leadership." This he called "a danger to the teaching and pastoral authority of the individual bishop, who is the divinely constituted teacher and pastor of his flock." Referring specifically to the conference of archbishops of France, he said that at times this conference would issue a joint statement on social or pastoral questions. "It is then very difficult for an individual bishop to disagree with the public stand that has been taken, and he is simply reduced to silence." Archbishop Lefebvre called this "a new and undesirable power over the diocesan bishop."

He went further, saying that it was "a new kind of collectivism invading the Church." The present tendency in the Council hall, he said, was to make national episcopal conferences so strong that "individual bishops would be so restricted in the government of their dioceses as to lose their initiative." An individual bishop might contradict a national episcopal conference, "but then his clergy and laity would be in a quandary, not knowing whether to follow their own bishop or the conference." (ibid., 89-90)

When the topic of collegiality was again broached by the Council in November, Bishop Wright of Pittsburgh, a New Modernist, claimed overwhelming support of the Council, even though 408 voted against the idea of collegiality as the Moderators attempted to bypass discussion and accept the schema on the Church. When Cardinal Browne announced that it would be necessary for the Theological Commission to clarify what was meant by collegiality:

Two days later, Cardinal Frings referred to Cardinal Browne's remarks as "indeed amazing." Those remarks, he said, would seem to imply that the Theological Commission had access to sources of truth unknown to the rest of the Council Fathers. Such observations, he went on, lost sight of the fact that the Council commissions were intended to function only as instruments of the General Congregations, and to execute the will of the Council Fathers. While the October 30 vote had been merely indicative, "an almost unanimous assent should not be considered as of no value at all." (Ibid., 116)

Cardinal Ottaviani responded to Frings in this paraphrase of Wiltgen:

As for the votes which had been taken in the Council hall on October 30, they had been "only an indication of the thinking of the Council Fathers." It was unfortunate, he said, that the points voted on had been proposed by the four Moderators without first being submitted to the Theological Commission, which was competent in the matter, since it touched on dogma. Those points had contained equivocal terms which should have been clarified. In particular, the point on collegiality had presumed the existence of the Apostolic College, of which the present College of Bishops was said to be the successor. "But this is a case of confusion on the nature of episcopal succession," he said. "It is true that the bishops succeed the Apostles, but they do not succeed the College of Apostles as a college, because the College of Apostles as such did not exist, at least not in a

juridical sense." There had been only one example of collegiality among the Apostles, and that had been at the Council of Jerusalem. No one doubted that at Jerusalem the Apostles had acted as a college, he said, "just as no one doubts that the bishops today, in Council, are acting as a college with and under the Pope." Christ's words "Feed my sheep" had been addressed only to his vicar, "and therefore whoever wants to be counted among the sheep of Christ must be under the universal pastor appointed by Christ." There were no exceptions to this rule, "not even bishops." (Ibid., 117)

But the New Modernists would not back down, knowing they had Paul VI and the Moderators on their side. Wiltgen, in interviewing Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani that evening, writes: *When he [Ottaviani] came into the room and sat down, he seemed disturbed and said distractedly: "I have just come from a meeting of the Theological Commission and things look very bad; the French and the Germans have united everyone against us. . . ." (Ibid., 118)*

Xavier Rynnes, in his book, *The Second Session*, reminds his readers who actually was in control:

Shortly before this, on Thursday Nov. 7th, the Vatican newspaper announced that the Pope had received in special audience the Archbishop of Freiburg in Germany, the editor of the German Catholic publishing house of Herder Verlag, and one of the latter's principal authors, the famous German theologian Father Karl Rahner, S.J., who had been accused by Cardinal Ottaviani some weeks before in a speech on the floor of having solicited bishops on behalf of a married diaconate. In the course of the audience Pope Paul expressed his deep "appreciation" to Father Rahner for his profound theological knowledge and works, which, along with those of the French Dominican Father Yves Congar, had had such an influence on shaping the course of the Council. Congar was later to be awarded a "Masterate of Theology" with the full approval of the Pope. The "rehabilitation" of both men-who had suffered for years at the hands of the Holy Office because of their supposedly "dangerous" ideas was Paul's way of replying to the campaign of fear and suspicion which the Holy Office was still waging on all fronts. (An eloquent article by Abbe Rene Laurentin in Le Figaro on December 9, 1963, entitled simply "The Price of Vatican Council II," listed the vexations, bannings and even banishments of which Pere Congar had been the victim over the years, from 1935 until the present time. He is now fortunately back teaching and carrying on his studies at Le Saulchoir.) (Rynne, 190-191)

The Schema on the Church would not be voted on in 1963 due to opposition. The final section on collegiality reads as follows:

Just as in the Gospel, the Lord so disposing, St. Peter and the other apostles constitute one apostolic college, so in a similar way the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter, and the bishops, the successors of the apostles, are joined together. Indeed, the very ancient practice whereby bishops duly established in all parts of the world were in communion with one another and with the Bishop of Rome in a bond of unity, charity and peace, and also the councils assembled together, in which more profound issues were settled in common, the opinion of the many having been prudently considered, both of these factors are already an indication of the collegiate character and aspect of the Episcopal order; and the ecumenical councils held in the course of centuries are also manifest proof of that same character. And it is intimated also in the practice, introduced in ancient times, of summoning several bishops to take part in the elevation of the newly elected to the ministry of the high priesthood. Hence, one is constituted a member of the Episcopal body in

virtue of sacramental consecration and hierarchical communion with the head and members of the body.

But the college or body of bishops has no authority unless it is understood together with the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter as its head. The pope's power of primacy over all, both pastors and faithful, remains whole and intact. In virtue of his office, that is as Vicar of Christ and pastor of the whole Church, the Roman Pontiff has full, supreme and universal power over the Church. And he is always free to exercise this power. The order of bishops, which succeeds to the college of apostles and gives this apostolic body continued existence, is also the subject of supreme and full power over the universal Church, provided we understand this body together with its head the Roman Pontiff and never without this head. This power can be exercised only with the consent of the Roman Pontiff. For our Lord placed Simon alone as the rock and the bearer of the keys of the Church, and made him shepherd of the whole flock; it is evident, however, that the power of binding and loosing, which was given to Peter, was granted also to the college of apostles, joined with their head. This college, insofar as it is composed of many, expresses the variety and universality of the People of God, but insofar as it is assembled under one head, it expresses the unity of the flock of Christ. In it, the bishops, faithfully recognizing the primacy and pre-eminence of their head, exercise their own authority for the good of their own faithful, and indeed of the whole Church, the Holy Spirit supporting its organic structure and harmony with moderation. The supreme power in the universal Church, which this college enjoys, is exercised in a solemn way in an ecumenical council. A council is never ecumenical unless it is confirmed or at least accepted as such by the successor of Peter; and it is the prerogative of the Roman Pontiff to convoke these councils, to preside over them and to confirm them. This same collegiate power can be exercised together with the pope by the bishops living in all parts of the world, provided that the head of the college calls them to collegiate action, or at least approves of or freely accepts the united action of the scattered bishops, so that it is thereby made a collegiate act.

This collegial union is apparent also in the mutual relations of the individual bishops with particular churches and with the universal Church. The Roman Pontiff, as the successor of Peter, is the perpetual and visible principle and foundation of unity of both the bishops and of the faithful. The individual bishops, however, are the visible principle and foundation of unity in their particular churches, fashioned after the model of the universal Church, in and from which churches comes into being the one and only Catholic Church. For this reason the individual bishops represent each his own church, but all of them together and with the Pope represent the entire Church in the bond of peace, love and unity.

. . . . And this also is important, that by governing well their own church as a portion of the universal Church, they themselves are effectively contributing to the welfare of the whole Mystical Body, which is also the body of the churches. (Lumen Gentium, par. 22-23)

What is so apparent in this is that the Pope suddenly becomes the Church, bishops have no power by divine right but are there only for the Pope, and Christ ceases to be Head of the Church. The Mystical Body is not the Union of the Faithful with Christ, but a body of churches. Faith ceases because membership in the Church is no longer through Faith in Christ, but in relationship to the Pope (even without faith). The Pope is absolute, without Faith in Christ. This is in conjunction with all the other objections presented by the Fathers.

Compare this with *Mystici Corporis* (1943) which places the Pope as visible head and vicar of Christ with supreme authority for unity but realizes the bishop's role of governing his own flock in order to obtain the end for which the Church was established, union with Christ, by which one is a member of the Mystical Body:

They, therefore, walk in the path of dangerous error who believe that they can accept Christ as the Head of the Church, while not adhering loyally to His Vicar on earth. They have taken away the visible head, broken the visible bonds of unity and left the Mystical Body of the Redeemer so obscured and so maimed, that those who are seeking the haven of eternal salvation can neither see it nor find it.

*What we have thus far said of the Universal Church must be understood also of the individual Christian communities, whether Oriental or Latin, which go to makeup the one Catholic Church. For they, too, are ruled by Jesus Christ through the voice of their respective Bishops. Consequently, Bishops must be considered as the more illustrious members of the Universal Church, for they are united by a very special bond to the divine Head of the whole Body and so are rightly called "principal parts of the members of the Lord;" [Gregory the Great, *Moral.*, XIV, 35, 43; Migne, P.L., LXXV, 1062.] moreover, as far as his own diocese is concerned, each one as a true Shepherd feeds the flock entrusted to him and rules it in the name of Christ. [Cf. *Vat. Council, Const. de Eccl., Cap. 3.*] Yet in exercising this office they are not altogether independent, but are subordinate to the lawful authority of the Roman Pontiff, although enjoying the ordinary power of jurisdiction which they receive directly from the same Supreme Pontiff. Therefore, Bishops should be revered by the faithful as divinely appointed successors of the Apostles, [Cf. *Cod. Iur. Can., can. 329, 1.*] and to them, even more than to the highest civil authorities should be applied the words: "Touch not my anointed one!" [I Paral., XVI, 22; Ps., CIV, 15.] For Bishops have been anointed with the chrism of the Holy Spirit.*

*That is why We are deeply pained when We hear that not a few of Our Brother Bishops are being attacked and persecuted not only in their own persons, but - what is more cruel and heartrending for them - in the faithful committed to their care, in those who share their apostolic labors, even in the virgins consecrated to God; and all this, merely because they are a pattern of the flock from the heart [Cf. I Peter, V, 3.] and guard with energy and loyalty, as they should the sacred "deposit of faith" [Cf. I Tim., VI, 20.] confided to them; merely because they insist on the sacred laws that have been engraved by God on the souls of men, and after the example of the Supreme Shepherd defend their flock against ravenous wolves. Such an offence We consider as committed against Our own person and We repeat the noble words of Our Predecessor of immortal memory Gregory the Great: "Our honor is the honor of the Universal Church; Our honor is the united strength of Our Brethren; and We are truly honored when honor is given to each and every one." [Cf. *Ep. ad Eulog.*, 30; Migne, P.L., LXXVII, 933.]*

Because Christ the Head holds such an eminent position, one must not think that he does not require the help of the Body. What Paul said of the human organism is to be applied likewise to the Mystical Body: "The head cannot say to the feet: I have no need of you." [I Cor., XII, 21.] It is manifestly clear that the faithful need the help of the Divine Redeemer, for He has said: "Without me you can do nothing," [John, XV, 5.] and according to the teaching of the Apostle every advance of this Mystical Body towards its perfection derives from Christ the Head. [Cf. Eph., IV, 16; Col.,

II, 19.] Yet this, also, must be held, marvelous though it may seem: Christ has need of His members. First, because the person of Jesus Christ is represented by the Supreme Pontiff, who in turn must call on others to share much of his solicitude lest he be overwhelmed by the burden of his pastoral office, and must be helped daily by the prayers of the Church. Moreover as our Savior does not rule the Church directly in a visible manner, He wills to be helped by the members of His Body in carrying out the work of redemption. That is not because He is indigent and weak, but rather because He has so willed it for the greater glory of His spotless Spouse. Dying on the Cross He left to His Church the immense treasury of the Redemption, towards which she contributed nothing. But when those graces come to be distributed, not only does He share this work of sanctification with His Church, but He wills that in some way it be due to her action. This is a deep mystery, and an inexhaustible subject of meditation, that the salvation of many depends on the prayers and voluntary penances which the members of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ offer for this intention and on the cooperation of pastors of souls and of the faithful, especially of fathers and mothers of families, a cooperation which they must offer to our Divine Savior as though they were His associates. (Par. 41-44)

The Schema did not end with this distorted view of the Church where it no longer mattered what you believe, as long as you accepted the Pope as head of the Church (a true popolatry), but one that prepared everyone to accept the most outrageous acts—one has only to think of Rio de Janeiro and the World Youth Day 2013 on Copacabana Beach.

The Council continued by setting Mary not in the singular role of her participation in that of the redemptive act with her Divine Son as of necessity, but stressing her role as Mother of the Church in that of nurturing faith as a mother in apropos to that of Abraham as the father of faith, that is a model of faith. As Karl Rahner insisted, it was added to the Schema on the Church. Likewise, as he insisted anything objectionable to non-Catholics be removed or *unimaginable harm would result from an ecumenical point of view, in relation to both Orientals and Protestants*. Having certain titles, such as *Mediatrice of all graces*, in the document would result in *all the success achieved in the field of ecumenism through the Council and in connection with the Council will be rendered worthless*. . . (As quoted by Wiltgen, 91) As Hans Urs von Balthasar and Karl Rahner conceived it, Mary:

. . . [I]s "the mother of the members of Christ . . . having cooperated by charity that faithful might be born in the Church, who are members of that Head." Wherefore she is hailed as a pre-eminent and singular member of the Church, and as its type and excellent exemplar in faith and charity.

. . . She stands out among the poor and humble of the Lord, who confidently hope for and receive salvation from Him. With her the exalted Daughter of Sion, and after a long expectation of the promise, the times are fulfilled and the new Economy established, when the Son of God took a human nature from her, that He might in the mysteries of His flesh free man from sin. (Lumen Gentium, cap. VIII)

Not that this is untrue, but that here New Modernists and non-Catholics formulated how Catholics were to understand the role of Mary: Model of faithful submission to Christ, not as actively participating in the Redemptive act. For example, John 2:4: *And Jesus saith to her: Woman, what*

is that to me and to thee? my hour is not yet come. And her reponse: Whatsoever he shall say to you, do ye. (Ibid. 2:5)

It was the same with presenting the Church as a “Mystery”, i.e., Sacrament. Cardinal Ruffini, in the very beginning of the Second Session:

. . . Criticiz[ed] especially the inappropriateness of certain biblical quotations and remarking apropos of the statement that "the Church is a sacrament": "For a long time the term sacrament has been reserved to the seven sacraments; because its use with reference to the Church is obscure today and needs long explanations, it is contrary to the pastoral orientation of the Council. This term was often used heretically by George Tyrrell, apostate priest and leader of the Modernists." (Rynne, 50)

The New Modernists again interposed Rahnerian novelties as *balzo in avanti* by taking the request of not forgetting the diaconate as part of the Holy Orders and making mention in the Schema to making the diaconate a permanent rite—and not just a permanent rite, but open to married men—that is a participation in the priesthood by married men within the Latin rite. Surprisingly, but financially conscious, Francis Spellman was first to object. Beyond the practical, he also mentioned:

The proposal to revive permanent deacons stems mostly from liturgists who wish to restore ancient ways without taking into account present conditions. Le Monde quotes the cardinal as having said here: "Let us not indulge in archeology." [Oct. 6-7, 1963] Pius XII in "Mediator Dei" warned against considering something as good simply because it was old. . . Seminarians obviously want to become priests. This is a sign of their divine vocation and nothing should be done to interfere with this. "God exercises his Providence over the Church according to present conditions" the cardinal concluded. "It must be decided whether it is better to by-pass the divine will and have fewer priests along with permanent deacons, or more priests without them." (Rynne, 100)

And Rynne continues: *It was obvious that practical considerations dominated the cardinal's thought throughout and that he, or his advisers, had little sympathy for the pastoral-theological side of the question developed by modern theologians such as Karl Rahner. (Ibid.)*

Of course the New Modernists Moderators had a response. Both Cardinal Döpfner and Cardinal Suenens defended Rahner on exactly the same lines of “sacrament”. For Cardinal Döpfner:

. . . [I]t was a question of "sacramentalizing functions that already exist," not introducing new ones. Those who were already trained for these functions, or were exercising them, he said, like married catechists in mission lands, should receive the corresponding sacramental grace to help them carry them out more perfectly. In conclusion, he pointed out that the purpose of the text was "simply to give a dogmatic basis for a permanent diaconate and to open the door to a further examination of the question." (Wiltgen, 97)

And Cardinal Suenens:

... Because the diaconate was sacramental, it pertained to the very constitution of the Church and must be treated on a supernatural level, he said. Certain functions in the Church should be entrusted only to those with the necessary supernatural grace. God had established certain ministries and graces, and these ought not to be neglected in building up a Christian community; the community had a right to them. The Cardinal rejected the contention that a married diaconate would undermine priestly celibacy or result in a decline in vocations. The diaconate itself was a gift of divine grace and would strengthen Christian communities, thereby aiding the growth of the Church. . . (Ibid.)

Cardinal Bacci, as defending the position Pius XII maintained against the innovators, countered that it was dangerous to propose a married deaconate, harming the priesthood both through vocations as also the "*finestrella*" would become a "*finestra*", that is a small window would soon become a normal window: priests would want to be married. (Cf. Rynne, 101; Wiltgen, 98)

The Rahnerian Schema on the Church, therefore, includes this:

At a lower level of the hierarchy are deacons, upon whom hands are imposed "not unto the priesthood, but unto a ministry of service." (Constitutiones Ecclesiac aegyptiacae, III, 2: ed. Funk, Didascalia, II, p. 103. Statuta Eccl. Ant. 371: Mansi 3, 954.) For strengthened by sacramental grace, in communion with the bishop and his group of priests they serve in the diaconate of the liturgy, of the word, and of charity to the people of God. It is the duty of the deacon, according as it shall have been assigned to him by competent authority, to administer baptism solemnly, to be custodian and dispenser of the Eucharist, to assist at and bless marriages in the name of the Church, to bring Viaticum to the dying, to read the Sacred Scripture to the faithful, to instruct and exhort the people, to preside over the worship and prayer of the faithful, to administer sacramentals, to officiate at funeral and burial services. Dedicated to duties of charity and of administration, let deacons be mindful of the admonition of Blessed Polycarp: "Be merciful, diligent, walking according to the truth of the Lord, who became the servant of all." (S. Polycarpus, Ad Phil. 5, 2)

Since these duties, so very necessary to the life of the Church, can be fulfilled only with difficulty in many regions in accordance with the discipline of the Latin Church as it exists today, the diaconate can in the future be restored as a proper and permanent rank of the hierarchy. It pertains to the competent territorial bodies of bishops, of one kind or another, with the approval of the Supreme Pontiff, to decide whether and where it is opportune for such deacons to be established for the care of souls. With the consent of the Roman Pontiff, this diaconate can, in the future, be conferred upon men of more mature age, even upon those living in the married state. It may also be conferred upon suitable young men, for whom the law of celibacy must remain intact.

Of course it goes from bad to worse, from tolerable to intolerable, from rejection of tradition to rejection of dogma. The final discussion on the Church was that of ecumenism, that of the place of non-Catholics in relationship to the Church. It has to be repeated that those who are baptized are baptized because of Christ, not by any Church. Those who are validly baptized, that is, with proper matter and form, become members of the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Catholic Church. They remain members of the Church so long as they do not leave, as Pius XII formulates it:

Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith, and who have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body, or been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed. "For in one spirit" says the Apostle, "were we all baptized into one Body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free." [I Cor., XII, 13.] As therefore in the true Christian community there is only one Body, one Spirit, one Lord, and one Baptism, so there can be only one faith. [Cf. Eph., IV, 5.] And therefore, if a man refuse to hear the Church, let him be considered—so the Lord commands—as a heathen and a publican. [Cf. Matth., XVIII, 17.] It follows that those who are divided in faith or government cannot be living in the unity of such a Body, nor can they be living the life of its one Divine Spirit.

Nor must one imagine that the Body of the Church, just because it bears the name of Christ, is made up during the days of its earthly pilgrimage only of members conspicuous for their holiness, or that it consists only of those whom God has predestined to eternal happiness. It is owing to the Savior's infinite mercy that place is allowed in His Mystical Body here below for those whom, of old, He did not exclude from the banquet. [Cf. Matth., IX, 11; Mark, II, 16; Luke, XV, 2.] For not every sin, however grave it may be, is such as of its own nature to sever a man from the Body of the Church, as does schism or heresy or apostasy. Men may lose charity and divine grace through sin, thus becoming incapable of supernatural merit, and yet not be deprived of all life if they hold fast to faith and Christian hope, and if, illumined from above, they are spurred on by the interior promptings of the Holy Spirit to salutary fear and are moved to prayer and penance for their sins. (Mystici Corporis, par. 22-23; cf. DB 2286.)

Therefore, if one professes to be of another faith than the one true Catholic Faith, they cease to be members of the Mystical Body, members of the Church. But the teaching of the Church was to be sidestepped.

Cardinal Suenens succeeded in having the Coordinating Commission partially alter its orders of January, and call for an additional chapter on "The People of God." This chapter, which carefully avoided the word "member," was to be so phrased as to include not only Catholics, but everyone who in any way might be called a Christian. (Wiltgen, 101)

The following is therefore contained in the Schema on the Church:

The Church recognizes that in many ways she is linked with those who, being baptized, are honored with the name of Christian, though they do not profess the faith in its entirety or do not preserve unity of communion with the successor of Peter. (Cfr. Leo XIII, Epist. Apost. Praeclara gratulationis, 20 iun. 1894; AAS 26 (1893-94) p. 707.) For there are many who honor Sacred Scripture, taking it as a norm of belief and a pattern of life, and who show a sincere zeal. They lovingly believe in God the Father Almighty and in Christ, the Son of God and Saviour. (Cfr. Leo XIII, Epist. Encycl. Satis cognitum, 29 iun. 1896: ASS 28 (1895-96) p. 738. Epist. Encycl. Caritatis studium, 25 iul. 1898: ASS 31 (1898-99) p. 11. Pius XII, Nuntius radioph. Nell'alba, 24 dec. 1941: AAS 34 (1942) p. 21.) They are consecrated by baptism, in which they are united with Christ. They also recognize and accept other sacraments within their own Churches or ecclesiastical communities. Many of them rejoice in the episcopate, celebrate the Holy Eucharist and cultivate devotion toward the Virgin Mother of God. (Cfr. Pius XI, Litt. Encycl. Rerum Orientalium, 8 sept.

1928: AAS 20 (1928) p. 287. Pius XII, *Litt. Encycl Orientalis Ecclesiae*, 9 apr. 1944: AAS 36 (1944) p. 137) *They also share with us in prayer and other spiritual benefits. Likewise we can say that in some real way they are joined with us in the Holy Spirit, for to them too He gives His gifts and graces whereby He is operative among them with His sanctifying power. Some indeed He has strengthened to the extent of the shedding of their blood. In all of Christ's disciples the Spirit arouses the desire to be peacefully united, in the manner determined by Christ, as one flock under one shepherd, and He prompts them to pursue this end. (Cfr. Inst. S.S.C.S. Officii 20 dec. 1949: AAS 42 (1950) p.142.) Mother Church never ceases to pray, hope and work that this may come about. She exhorts her children to purification and renewal so that the sign of Christ may shine more brightly over the face of the earth.*

16. Finally, those who have not yet received the Gospel are related in various ways to the people of God. (Cfr. S. Thomas, *Summa Theol.* III, q. 8, a. 3, ad 1.) In the first place we must recall the people to whom the testament and the promises were given and from whom Christ was born according to the flesh. (Cf. Rom. 9:4-5) On account of their fathers this people remains most dear to God, for God does not repent of the gifts He makes nor of the calls He issues. (Cf. Rom. 11:28-29) But the plan of salvation also includes those who acknowledge the Creator. In the first place amongst these there are the Muslims, who, professing to hold the faith of Abraham, along with us adore the one and merciful God, who on the last day will judge mankind. Nor is God far distant from those who in shadows and images seek the unknown God, for it is He who gives to all men life and breath and all things, (Cf. Acts 17:25-28.) and as Saviour wills that all men be saved. (Cf. 1 Tim. 2:4.) Those also can attain to salvation who through no fault of their own do not know the Gospel of Christ or His Church, yet sincerely seek God and moved by grace strive by their deeds to do His will as it is known to them through the dictates of conscience. (Cfr. Epist. S.S.C.S. Officii ad Archiep. Boston.: Denz. 3869-72.) Nor does Divine Providence deny the helps necessary for salvation to those who, without blame on their part, have not yet arrived at an explicit knowledge of God and with His grace strive to live a good life. Whatever good or truth is found amongst them is looked upon by the Church as a preparation for the Gospel. (Cfr. Eusebius Caes., *Praeparatio Evangelica*, 1, 1: PG 2128 AB.) She knows that it is given by Him who enlightens all men so that they may finally have life. But often men, deceived by the Evil One, have become vain in their reasonings and have exchanged the truth of God for a lie, serving the creature rather than the Creator. (Cf Rom. 1:21, 25.) Or some there are who, living and dying in this world without God, are exposed to final despair. Wherefore to promote the glory of God and procure the salvation of all of these, and mindful of the command of the Lord, "Preach the Gospel to every creature," (Mk. 16:16.) the Church fosters the missions with care and attention.

For those Catholics who reject salvation outside the Church—and the statement, *no salvation outside the Catholic Church*, cannot be interpreted as simply applying to Catholics outside the Catholic Church—it has come to mean by the Conciliar Church that all are saved except those Catholics refusing to accept the *Nouvelle Theologie* of Vatican II. That is, the neo-Modernists were teaching that there is sanctification, or the working of God, in the errors of non-Catholic religions as opposed to the Catholic teaching that an individual soul may cooperate with actual grace despite the errors of the non-Catholic religion they adhere to—but, in corresponding to that actual grace, they reject the false religion and seek the true Church. This cooperation with actual grace—denied by Pelagians and modern Rationalists—is missing in this document. Ludwig Ott (Fundamentals

of Catholic Dogma, Bk. 4, Part II, The Church, 270ff.) clearly develops this concept as taught by Pius XII in his encyclical, *Mystici Corporis* (1943).

This false ecumenism that was developed by the *Nouvelle Theologie* was condemned by Pope Pius XI in his encyclical, *Mortalium animos* (January 6, 1928):

Is it not right, it is often repeated, indeed, even consonant with duty, that all who invoke the name of Christ should abstain from mutual reproaches and at long last be united in mutual charity? Who would dare to say that he loved Christ, unless he worked with all his might to carry out the desires of Him, Who asked His Father that His disciples might be "one." [John xvii, 21.] And did not the same Christ will that His disciples should be marked out and distinguished from others by this characteristic, namely that they loved one another: "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another"? [John xiii, 35] All Christians, they add, should be as "one": for then they would be much more powerful in driving out the pest of irreligion, which like a serpent daily creeps further and becomes more widely spread, and prepares to rob the Gospel of its strength. These things and others that class of men who are known as pan-Christians continually repeat and amplify; and these men, so far from being quite few and scattered, have increased to the dimensions of an entire class, and have grouped themselves into widely spread societies, most of which are directed by non-Catholics, although they are imbued with varying doctrines concerning the things of faith. This undertaking is so actively promoted as in many places to win for itself the adhesion of a number of citizens, and it even takes possession of the minds of very many Catholics and allures them with the hope of bringing about such a union as would be agreeable to the desires of Holy Mother Church, who has indeed nothing more at heart than to recall her erring sons and to lead them back to her bosom. But in reality beneath these enticing words and blandishments lies hid a most grave error, by which the foundations of the Catholic faith are completely destroyed.

Pius XII, whom the New Modernists attempt to fall back on for authority, repeated what his predecessor said:

Another danger is perceived which is all the more serious because it is more concealed beneath the mask of virtue. There are many who, deploring disagreement among men and intellectual confusion, through an imprudent zeal for souls, are urged by a great and ardent desire to do away with the barrier that divides good and honest men; these advocate an "eirenism" according to which, by setting aside the questions which divide men, they aim not only at joining forces to repel the attacks of atheism, but also at reconciling things opposed to one another in the field of dogma. And as in former times some questioned whether the traditional apologetics of the Church did not constitute an obstacle rather than a help to the winning of souls for Christ, so today some are presumptive enough to question seriously whether theology and theological methods, such as with the approval of ecclesiastical authority are found in our schools, should not only be perfected, but also completely reformed, in order to promote the more efficacious propagation of the kingdom of Christ everywhere throughout the world among men of every culture and religious opinion.

Now if these only aimed at adapting ecclesiastical teaching and methods to modern conditions and requirements, through the introduction of some new explanations, there would be scarcely any reason for alarm. But some through enthusiasm for an imprudent "eirenism" seem to consider as

an obstacle to the restoration of fraternal union, things founded on the laws and principles given by Christ and likewise on institutions founded by Him, or which are the defense and support of the integrity of the faith, and the removal of which would bring about the union of all, but only to their destruction. (Humani Generis, 1950, pars 11-12)

Even the Religious Life, the consecrated virgins and the monks, was to be snubbed in the acceptance of *Americanism* (cf. Leo XIII, *Testem Benevolentiae*, 22 January, 1899), for ecumenical reasons:

The position of the European alliance was based on the arguments advanced by Father Rahner and Monsignor Philips, and submitted to the German-speaking Fathers meeting in Munich in February, 1963. Those arguments were that the inclusion of the chapter on the religious life would "confirm Protestants in their objections, namely, that in the Church, through the religious state, there exist two essentially diverse paths to salvation; that the laity are not called to evangelical perfection and automatically are always on a lower level of sanctity; and that those who are members of religious orders are automatically considered better than those who are joined in marriage." (Wiltgen, 103-104)

But for even the 108 Religious Superiors at the Council this was too much to be considered no different than a lay person unless they were a priest by the New Modernists. The practical stance of the Conciliar Church can be seen when one considers that immediately after Vatican II, not only did vocations to the Religious State practically cease, but the existing Orders found themselves losing members. *By their fruits you shall know them.* (Matt. 7:16)

By the time the Second Session was coming to a close, it was clear the Council was no longer—even if it had meant to be—an Oecumenical Council, but a robber Council under control of formerly discredited New Modernists who had been rehabilitated to change the Church with the express support of Angelo Roncalli and, usurping the helm, Giovanni Montini. Wiltgen speaks of this group as follows:

The world alliance during the first session was an undercover group of five or six bishops and archbishops, representing national, regional, or continental episcopal conferences, who met periodically. From the beginning of the second session, when they considered themselves strong enough to act more openly, they held meetings at Domus Mariae each Friday evening and saw their membership grow to twenty-four bishops and archbishops, who represented approximately sixty-five episcopal conferences. The one who presided over the meetings was Coadjutor Archbishop Pierre Veuillot of Paris, whenever he was in Rome.

Although not juridically organized, the world alliance was able to determine the policy of the controlling liberal majority, and prepared sample letters which individual episcopal conferences then submitted to the Pope, requesting him to take specific action on specific issues. The secretaries of these twenty-four members held a meeting of their own every Tuesday night, thus making possible top level intercommunication twice every week. (op. cit., 129-130)

Two Documents were promulgated at the close of the Second Session on December 4, 1963. The first, *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, or *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, was a deceptive ploy to

destroy the heart and soul of the Catholic Faith. In paragraph 4—which was pointed to the moment a priest or lay person questioned whether it would change the Mass—reads as follows:

4. Lastly, in faithful obedience to tradition, the sacred Council declares that holy Mother Church holds all lawfully acknowledged rites to be of equal right and dignity; that she wishes to preserve them in the future and to foster them in every way. The Council also desires that, where necessary, the rites be revised carefully in the light of sound tradition, and that they be given new vigor to meet the circumstances and needs of modern times.

The priest or lay person would then be told that the Mass would never change. But the following section from Wiltgen foreshadowed what this Constitution would do:

On March 5, L'Osservatore Romano announced the establishment of a Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, as promised by Pope Paul in his Motu proprio. The new commission had a membership of forty-two persons, representing twenty-six countries, with Cardinal Lercaro as President. On this commission were most of the Council Fathers who had been members of the Liturgical Commission, as well as many others; its Secretary was Father Annibale Bugnini, C.M., who had acted in the same capacity on the preparatory commission on the liturgy.

The most surprising name of all on this commission was that of Archbishop Felici, who had so thoroughly blue-penciled the Motu proprio and caused such commotion among the bishops and such embarrassment for the Holy Father. What had he done to merit a seat on this commission? He was a canon lawyer, but not a liturgist. The appointment had been promoted by Father Bugnini, who felt that the Archbishop deserved to be rewarded for what he had done in behalf of the schema in its early stages, when eighty-year-old Gaetano Cardinal Cicognani, older brother of the Secretary of State and President of the Liturgical Preparatory Commission, had hesitated in giving the necessary approval. Strong conservative elements in the Sacred Congregation of Rites were urging him to withhold his signature. Archbishop Felici, who reported regularly on the progress of the schemas and their distribution to Pope John, explained the difficulty that he was having with Cardinal Cicognani, since without his signature the schema was blocked, even though the required majority of the commission had already approved it. Before the audience was over, a plan was devised to obtain the desired signature.

Pope John called for his Secretary of State and told him to visit his brother and not to return until the schema was duly signed. On February 1, 1962, he went to his brother's office, found Archbishop Felici and Father Bugnini in the corridor nearby, and informed his brother of Pope John's wish. Later a peritus of the Liturgical Preparatory Commission stated that the old Cardinal was almost in tears as he waved the document in the air and said, "They want me to sign this, but I don't know if I want to." Then he laid the document on his desk, picked up a pen, and signed it. Four days later he died. (Op. cit., 140-141)

By force and threat Paul VI would do the same to every Latin Rite Catholic Bishop and priest: have them reject the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass that had been the life of the Church for 1900 years. Four years after the Council, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass would also have its universal requiem except among those Bishops and priests who resisted first the pressure to change, and then, after

recognizing the Conciliar Church as not possessing legitimacy as it directly contradicted and opposed past Catholic Councils and Papal teachings, continued to function as Bishops and priests in the Roman Catholic Church.

The implications of this document, as all duplicitous acts [One has only to think of the *Affordable Care Act* commonly referred to as Obamacare to realize what happens when the authors of a duplicitous bill is enacted that is not clear—there are always amendments and interpretations that extend well beyond what was originally presented and promised], would not be clear until 1969, when Giovanni Montini presented his *Missale Romanum* (April 3, 1969) and *Novus Ordo Missae*, introduced between the First Sunday of Advent 1969 and Palm Sunday 1970. But on December 4, 1964, Giovanni Montini outright lied to the Bishops and all Catholics. As Wiltgen reports:

The new Constitution on the Liturgy, he [Montini] said, would simplify liturgical rites, make them more understandable to people, and accommodate the language used to that spoken by the people concerned. There was no question of impoverishing the liturgy, the Pope said; "on the contrary, we wish to render the liturgy more pure, more genuine, more in agreement with the Source of truth and grace, more suited to be transformed into a spiritual patrimony of the people." (Op. cit., 139.)

As always when half-truths are published they are changed until a final, accepted version becomes official, various Motu proprios were released until, by March 2, a final one was given after “fifteen revisions had been made.” And Wiltgen adds, *To many [Neo Modernists] Council Fathers, those few sheets of paper were a symbol of their victory over the Roman Curia [i.e., Catholic Church].* (Ibid., 140.)

A second document was also promulgated, *Inter Mirifica* (The Means of Social Communication), which received little notice and acceptance as wary journalists asked panel members for a full explanation of Article 12, which provided that the civil authority had the duty “to defend and protect a true and just availability of information; the progress of modern society utterly depends on this, especially as regards freedom of the press.” They were particularly disturbed at the statement that the civil authority had “the duty of seeing to it in a just and vigilant manner that serious danger to public morals and social progress do not result from a perverted use” of communications media. This appeared to open the door to state censorship of the press.

Three Catholic newsmen, Mr. Robert Kaiser of Time, Mr. John Cogley of Commonweal, and Mr. Michael Novak of the Catholic Reporter, decided to alert the Council Fathers. They set out their views in a short statement and had four periti attest that their statement was “worthy of consideration”; the periti were Father John Courtney Murray, S.J., Father Jean Danielou, S.J., Father Jorge Mejia, and Father Bernard Haring, C.S.S.R. The statement termed the proposed decree on communications media “not an aggiornamento, but a step backward,” which might “one day be cited as a classic example of how the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council failed to come to grips with the world around it.” In two important passages, said the authors, the schema seemed to give the state “an authority over mass media which is dangerous to political liberty everywhere and which in some countries like the United States is proscribed by constitutional law.” . . . (Ibid., 132-133.)

The document would be ignored as Paul VI would remove the Index of Condemned Books on June 14, 1966, and eliminate the requirement of an imprimatur, except for specifically Church use (liturgical, scriptural, catechetical) or as a textbook in a “Catholic” school.

With the close of 1963 the world would see the last of public devotion, filial piety and the Church as the center of life for the family. 1964 would open up to the Beatles, a changing Church that would no longer be Catholic, and “God is dead” with the anti-Christ crow’s foot replacing the dove as a symbol of peace.

Is the Chair of Peter Vacant?

Fourth Contradiction: Unity or Disunity?

The year 1964, for those who can remember, was the beginning of the *Novus Ordo Seclorum*. Everything was Novus Ordo, New Age—and the New Church was going to ride with it. But the New Age was not one of peace but war; it was not one of love but hate; it was not one of unity but disunity: That is, it was not of Christ, it was of anti-Christ. 1964 is remembered for the Beatles, the Vietnam War escalation, the War on Poverty, Draft dodgers, Hippies and loss of Sacredness. In the United States it was the year that *we split apart*. (Cf. PBS: 1964.) The young adults—through the educational system and the burgeoning media, that was now not just written, not just heard, but also seen with a hypnotic effect that had the viewer's eyes glued to the mesmerizing screen—like the children of the Pied Piper danced to the tune of revolution against virtue and began the plunge into vice. The Church began to split apart along the seam of those joining the forces of the *zeitgeist* and those doing everything to hang onto the *Rock which is Christ*. (Cf. 1 Cor. 10:4.)

World events were consuming the attention of the Western World. Britain's empire was coming to an end, Africa was torn by civil war, Latin America was plagued by coups as was Southeast Asia. Russia was to eventually oust the Ukrainian Nikita Khrushchev in October and the United Kingdom would turn to the Socialist Party at the same time (October 15). Catholics were being told change was coming, but they had been told this since 1958 with the election of Angelo Roncalli,—the only noticeable change was the Last Gospel and Confiteor before Communion being removed (St. Joseph was also inserted into the Canon, but since the Canon was said quietly it was not noticed) and Church architecture was becoming less aesthetic and more theatrical.

With the Conciliar Church taking the initiative to revamp its liturgy and sacramental system, it was in control through the one who was expected to be against them, but was one with them: Giovanni Montini. With the Constitution on the Liturgy approved, Montini set to work when already on 3 January, 1964, he appointed Annibale Bugnini as Secretary of the Council and charged with implementing the Constitution. Giovanni Montini was already making plans for a *Novus Ordo Missae* for the New Ordo Church. He was also preparing for the next Session of Vatican Council II which was to begin on September 14; it was to include women and it was to accept that Protestants were part of the Church.

On January 5, without a public announcement, Paul VI went to the Holy Land (still its official Catholic appellation). There Paul VI met with Athenagoras, leader of the Greek Orthodox Church, expressing a new concept of collegiality—the meeting of patriarchs, with the patriarch of Rome being the moderator. Excommunication would be lifted on December 7, 1965, which meant the Orthodox, without rejecting any error and without accepting the primacy of Peter, would now be considered members of the Church [Of course, the Conciliar Church, not the Roman Catholic Church.].

With Giovanni Montini, the neo-Modernists and Liberals had plotted to take complete control of the next session. The First session only saw a change of guards, from the Curia to neo-Modernists. The Second Session saw two documents slip through after a bitter battle: one on the liturgy that

was used to do what its authors said it would not do; the other on communication which was completely ignored. There were more than a dozen more documents the neo-Modernists wanted to be approved to assure the New Montinian Church (cf. Joaquin Saenez y Arriaga, *The New Post-Conciliar or Montinian Church*, 1971) would be born, and the strategy of the Neo-Modernists was to assure those Catholic Cardinals and Bishops who would surely undermine their attempts could be silenced. Certainly the media would be on their side in the public square, but on the Council floor, each bishop could still speak—that is, until this third session.

The Coordinating Commission took still further steps to speed up the Council's work at its next meeting, on June 26. These steps involved amendments to the Rules of Procedure and were approved by Pope Paul VI on July 2. From now on, all cardinals and Council Fathers who wished to speak had to submit written summaries of their proposed addresses to the Secretary General "at least five days before discussion of the topic begins." As a result, rebuttal was virtually impossible. According to the original Rules of Procedure approved by Pope John XXIII, any Council Father who wished to refute a statement could inform the Secretary General of his wish to speak, and was then to be given the floor as soon as the list of speakers was exhausted. During the second session, this request had to be supported by five signatures. Now, however, according to a new clause added to the rules, such a request had to be made in the name of at least seventy other Council Fathers. As might have been expected, the figure was such as to discourage anyone who did not belong to a highly organized group from asking for the floor; and the measure proved very effective in silencing minority views. (Wiltgen, 147)

The Fathers of the Council in general seemed to believe that Montini could not and would not be deliberately leading them into error just as they could not believe that Angelo Roncalli deliberately led them into error; the few Fathers who knew Giovanni Montini was betraying the Church wanted the erroneous changes. Toleration and allowing discussion to have clarity of theological issues is not new within Councils, but the doctrine on grace was not defined at the Council of Trent since there was no clarity, that is, not all the bishops, during the discussions, could agree. Whereas what was clear after the Council of Trent and after the Vatican Council (1870) became unclear or assumed a completely different connotation in the Vatican II Council. As mentioned above, ideas condemned by the Church as heretical and erroneous, as also priests who were forbidden to teach or write, became the *avant garde* in the Vatican II Council. Concepts that could be accepted in the secular sphere, but proved to be unacceptable in the religious, were now touted as if they originated in the religious sphere and were to be promoted in the religious sphere. But, beyond, that which was argued was simultaneously and universally being propagated throughout the world as if, by the pushing of a switch, what was once believed was no longer to be believed and what was never believed before was now to be believed as if it had always been believed.

The Civil Rights Movement became the code word in the secular sphere not for ensuring everyone respect from their fellow man and the government, but for governments to be able to take away individual rights and remove all Christian values from society. The War on Poverty, too, was not to end poverty by providing jobs but to make the vast majority of citizens (and today non-citizens) dependent on government by keeping them in poverty. It was not that there was no opposition. Barry Goldwater was bringing a certain national awareness in the United States in his bid for the presidential nomination—but the media painted him as extreme and reactionary, ready to hurl nuclear warheads at anyone who might oppose him and supporting the Ku Klux Klan (But the

media and Democrats won't tell you the Ku Klux Klan were members and always voted Democrat prior to the '64 election).

The same struggle over principles and rhetoric was happening in the Vatican II Council. Progress did not entail better presentation of the faith and conversion of non-Catholics, but rather changing the faith and acknowledging non-Catholics were just as enlightened and on the path to God and even that these non-Catholics should understand that Catholics believe just as they do. There was also opposition growing among Catholics and, knowing that the Neo-Modernists were united, these "traditional" Catholic bishops began attempts to unite, for if there was not a large enough contingent to reach the 70 signatures immediately after each neo-Modernist spoke, the "traditional" Catholic Bishops would never be heard. Archbishop Geraldo Sigaud of Brazil organized the largest opposition, calling the group the International Group of Fathers. He held weekly meetings during the sessions *"to study the schemas of the Council—with the aid of theologians—in the light of the traditional doctrine of the Church and according to the teaching of the Sovereign Pontiffs."* (Cf. *op. cit.*, 149) Some of the participants were Cardinals Santos, Ruffini, Siri, Larraona, and Browne, Bishops Carli, Lefebvre, and Meyer.

Soon the International Group of Fathers became so active and influential that it aroused the indignation of the European alliance, and one of the alliance cardinals stated that Archbishop Sigaud ought to be "shot to the moon." Katholische Nachrichten Agentur, the Catholic news agency subsidized by the German bishops, called him an archconservative and depicted him and his group as working covertly against the aims of the Council. (Ibid.)

On November 9, 1963, during the second session, Bishop Carli, one of the group's most active members, drafted a letter to Pope Paul VI in which he appealed to him "to ask the Cardinal Moderators to abstain completely from making public interventions in their own name, both inside and outside the Council hall." In the eyes of all, he said, they appeared to be "interpreters of the mind of the Supreme Pontiff," and there was suspicion that they had leanings "in a certain definite direction." But Cardinal Ruffini advised against making this appeal, and it was dropped.

Father Ratzinger, the personal theologian of Cardinal Frings, while dining one day with a group, mentioned that the liberals had thought they would have a free hand at the Council after obtaining the majority in the Council commissions. But in the speeches and voting in the Council hall, he said, they began to notice some resistance to their proposals, and consequently commissions had to take this into consideration when revising the schemas. Unknown to Father Ratzinger, one of those seated nearby and within hearing distance was Archbishop Sigaud, who chuckled at this public admission by a representative of the European alliance. (Ibid. 149-150)

An example of how one-sided the Council was, that is, to initiate a new Church, one can take Cardinal Bea's comment when rejecting the title, "Mediatrice." This title is, of course, repudiated by the Protestants and, as Bea was President of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, one might understand that he would object to its use. This is not what is considered here, but the principle he invokes while denying it to those who also invoke it:

A Council text, he said, was not intended as a manual for personal devotion. What the Council Fathers had to decide was whether each and every affirmation made in the text was sufficiently thought out and theologically proven to be presented by the Council, as the highest Church

authority. Since the role of Mary as Mediatrix was still disputed by some theologians, it should not be included in the text. (Ibid., 155)

The documents he would promote along with the other neo-Modernists were not *sufficiently thought out and theologically proven* and were *still disputed* by most *theologians*. As the Catholic Cardinals and Bishops asserted over and over—even after having to gain the seventy-plus signatures and which substantiated that this one Cardinal or one bishop was not an outlier—, what the Neo-Modernists were proposing was not theologically proven, but actually rejected as contrary to Catholic theology. Their pleas went nowhere, while Giovanni Montini himself intervened when the errors of the neo-Modernists seemed to be untenable even to many of the liberal bishops.

Regarding Mary, the attempts at compromise destroyed any true doctrine about Mary as well as displeased the Protestants anyway, for Wiltgen places this episode in his book:

Professor Oscar Cullmann, a guest of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, gave a lengthy press conference at the end of the Council in the course of which he said: "We cannot pass over in silence the disappointment that we experienced at seeing the title of 'Mediatrix' given to Mary. . . . The fact that the text on Mary, after so much discussion as to where it should be placed, should have finally become the concluding chapter of the schema on the Church—a decision which was in fact intended to weaken Mariology—has in reality made it even stronger, because everything stated about the Church culminates, so to speak, in this chapter."

He went on to observe that, in the light of the many ceremonies honoring Mary during the Council, and also of the statements made about her by both Pope John and Pope Paul, it must be concluded "that Mariology at this Council has in general been intensified to a degree which is not in keeping with the ecumenical tendencies of Protestantism. . . and with a return to the Bible. Our expectations in this connection have not been fulfilled." It was clear, he said, "that we could not require the surrender of a teaching and tradition which belongs to the very kernel of Catholic piety." What he had expected, however, was "a weakening of emphasis, not some sort of revision of the fundamental relationship to the Virgin Mary." (Ibid., 158-159)

And to see where these neo-Modernists derived their source of belief you have only to look at that of Giovanni Montini's reference for collegiality. The Vatican Council (1870) stated in the dogmatic Constitution *Pastor Aeternus* (cf. DB 1828) concerning the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff in relationship to the jurisdiction of the bishops:

This power [Primacy] of the Supreme Pontiff is so far from interfering with that power of ordinary and immediate episcopal jurisdiction by which the bishops, who, "placed by the Holy Spirit" [cf. Acts 20:28], have succeeded to the places of the apostles, as true shepherds individually feed and rule the individual flocks assigned to them, that the same (power) is asserted, confirmed, and vindicated by the supreme and universal shepherd, according to the statement of Gregory the Great: "My honor is the universal honor of the Church. My honor is the solid vigor of my brothers. Then am I truly honored, when the honor due to each and everyone is not denied." (St. Gregory's letter to Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, I, 8, c. 30 (PL 77:933C)

Pope Gregory had written Eulogius the following:

Your Blessedness has also been careful to declare that you do not now make use of proud titles, which have sprung from a root of vanity, in writing to certain persons, and you address me saying, As you have commanded. This word, command, I beg you to remove from my hearing, since I know who I am, and who you are. For in position you are my brethren, in character my fathers. I did not, then, command, but was desirous of indicating what seemed to be profitable. Yet I do not find that your Blessedness has been willing to remember perfectly this very thing that I brought to your recollection. For I said that neither to me nor to any one else ought you to write anything of the kind; and lo, in the preface of the epistle which you have addressed to myself who forbade it, you have thought fit to make use of a proud appellation, calling me Universal Pope. But I beg your most sweet Holiness to do this no more, since what is given to another beyond what reason demands is subtracted from yourself. For as for me, I do not seek to be prospered by words but by my conduct. Nor do I regard that as an honour whereby I know that my brethren lose their honour. For my honour is the honour of the universal Church: my honour is the solid vigour of my brethren. Then am I truly honoured when the honour due to all and each is not denied them. For if your Holiness calls me Universal Pope, you deny that you are yourself what you call me universally. But far be this from us. Away with words that inflate vanity and wound charity.

And, indeed, in the synod of Chalcedon and afterwards by subsequent Fathers, your Holiness knows that this was offered to my predecessors. And yet not one of them would ever use this title, that, while regarding the honour of all priests in this world, they might keep their own before Almighty God. Lastly, while addressing to you the greeting which is due, I beg you to deign to remember me in your holy prayers, to the end that the Lord for your intercessions may absolve me from the bands of my sins, since my own merits may not avail me. (Registrum epistolarum, viii, 30; PL 77:933 C.)

Pius IX took the quote to express papal primacy does not take away a bishop's right to govern his diocese, and Gregory I implies the same, and such an understanding was not in dispute until realigning collegiality to no longer refer to when the bishops gather for an oecumenical council, but that no bishop, of himself could govern his faithful (flock), but bishops together governed the faithful (flock). The apostles, while with Christ, were a college with Judas holding the purse and Christ as Head; but when Christ Ascended into heaven, the Apostles established their Churches and ritual. The College of Cardinals was a term well known and expressed the Cardinals assisting the Pope. It may be well to refer to the article on *Cardinals* by Sägmüller in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913), under the section of *College of Cardinals* to have an understanding of the term College and why it does not apply to bishops:

The cardinals, as already said, are a corporation, a college after the manner of the cathedral chapters. When the latter ceased to lead any longer the vita canonica or common life, they became corporations recognized by the canon law, with free administration of their property, chapter-meetings, autonomy, disciplinary authority, and the right to have and use a seal. That the members of the chapter (capitulars, canons) were the only counsellors and auxiliaries of the bishop helped to round out the position of the former, and to unite them as against the other clergy of the cathedral, all the more so as this right of the capitulars to co-government of the diocese (partly by counsel, concilium, and partly by consent, consensus) was constitutional and recognized by the canon law. The cathedral chapters reached their fullest development as corporations early in the

thirteenth century, when they obtained the exclusive rights of episcopal elections. In a similar way the cardinal-bishops, cardinal-priests, and cardinal-deacons came to form a corporation, by the fact that since Alexander III (1159-1181) they alone had the right to elect the pope, they alone were his immediate assistants at Mass, and were his only counsellors in all important matters. Since 1150 the corporation of the cardinals becomes more and more known as a collegium, though such synonymous terms as universitas, conventus, cætus, capitulum are occasionally used. The dean or head of the College of Cardinals is the Bishop of Ostia; the sub-dean is the Bishop of Porto. The dean is the successor of the former archpriest, the first of the cardinal-priests, known since the twelfth century as prior cardinalium presbyterarum; he is also to some extent the successor of the archdeacon, known since the thirteenth century as prior diaconarum cardinalium. The archpriest was the immediate assistant of the pope at ecclesiastical functions. The archdeacon, as supervisor of the discipline of the Roman clergy and administrator of the possessions of the Roman Church, was, after the pope, the most important person in the papal court. During a vacancy, as above stated, both archpriest and archdeacon, together with the chief notary (primicerius notariorum), governed the Apostolic See. When later on the cardinals became a corporation that included bishops among its members, one of these bishops must naturally assume the headship; it could be no other than the Bishop of Ostia, whose immemorial right it was to bear the pallium at the consecration of the newly-elected pope, in case the latter were not yet a bishop, and to whom fell later the privilege of anointing the Roman Emperor, and of taking in general councils the first place after the pope. As president of the college it is the duty of the dean to convoke the same, to conduct its deliberations, and to represent it abroad.

As a legal corporation the cardinals have their own revenues, which are administered by a camerlengo (camerarius) chosen from their own body (not to be confounded with the cardinal camerlengo, administrator of the papal estate), and to some extent the successor of the former archdeacon or prior diaconorum cardinalium. In the Middle Ages the revenues of the College of cardinals were considerable. They were jointly entitled, among other dues, to a share of the moneys paid into the papal treasury on such occasions as the conferring of the pallium, confirmation of bishops, also by nations and fiefs that acknowledged the sovereignty or protection of the Holy See. Therefore, since the thirteenth century, the cardinals have had their own treasury (F. Schneider, "Zur älteren päpstlichen Finanzgeschichte" in "Quellen und Forschungen aus italien. Archiv und Bibl.", IX, 1 sqq.). Nicholas IV allotted to the College of Cardinals (18 July, 1289) one half the revenues of the Apostolic See, i.e. of the pallium taxes, the dues for confirmation of bishops (servilit communio), the "census" or tribute from the countries subject to the pope, the Peter's-pence, the visitation dues (paid in on the occasion of their visits to Rome, visitatio liminum apostolorum, by all archbishops, by bishops immediately subject to the Holy See or confirmed and consecrated by the pope, and by abbots freed from episcopal jurisdiction and immediately subject to the Holy See), besides other sources of revenues. The common revenue of the College of Cardinals is now inconsiderable; hence the rotulus cardinalicius, or dividend paid yearly to the cardinals resident in Rome, is comparatively small.

Precedence or rank among the cardinals is regulated according to the three orders above described, and in each order according to seniority. In the order of bishops, however, seniority is not according to date of reception in the cardinalitial body, but according to the date of episcopal consecration. This means that when a cardinalitial office is vacant, the cardinal next in rank of seniority can choose (optare) the vacant office. Thus the oldest of the cardinal-bishops can choose the office of Dean of the College; he becomes at the same time Bishop of Ostia, since according to

ancient custom the Dean of the Sacred College is always the Bishop of Ostia. However, in the interest of their dioceses, and apart from the bishoprics of Ostia and Porto, the cardinal-bishops are allowed to make such option but once. The jus optionis is also customary for the other two orders, both within each order, and from one to the other, given the necessary qualifications for such elevation. A cardinal-deacon, already ten years in the Sacred College, holds the jus optionis ahead of a cardinal-priest of later creation, provided, however, that there remain in the college ten cardinal-deacons (Paul IV, "Cum venerabiles", 22 Aug., 1555, in "Bullar. Rom.", VI, 502 sqq.; Sixtus V, "Postquam verus", § 7, 8, 3 Dec., 1587, ibid., VIII, 810 sqq.; Benedict XIII, "Romani Pontifices", § 5, 7, 7 Sept., 1724, ibid., XXII, 94 sq.; Clement XII, "Pastorale Officium", § 8, 10 Jan., 1731, ibid., XII, 226; L. Brancatius, "Dissertatio de optione sex episcopatum", Rome, 1692).

As one can see, Bishops do not come together to elect their head, they are not ranked, and they do not incorporate as one body (except at a Council).

Giovanni Montini took the quote of St Gregory I to seemingly minimize the primacy to accommodate the Orthodox and Protestants while, in reality, denying local bishops the authority to rule their faithful because bishops would now be obliged, as part of a college, to conform to the rest of the college.

Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre saw this and opposed introducing a new concept as Ralph Wiltgen notes in his book:

It was easy to conceive, said the Archbishop, that "three, four, or five bishops in a national episcopal conference will have more influence than the rest and will take over leadership." This he called "a danger to the teaching and pastoral authority of the individual bishop, who is the divinely constituted teacher and pastor of his flock." Referring specifically to the conference of archbishops of France, he said that at times this conference would issue a joint statement on social or pastoral questions. "It is then very difficult for an individual bishop to disagree with the public stand that has been taken, and he is simply reduced to silence." Archbishop Lefebvre called this "a new and undesirable power over the diocesan bishop."

He went further, saying that it was "a new kind of collectivism invading the Church." The present tendency in the Council hall, he said, was to make national episcopal conferences so strong that "individual bishops would be so restricted in the government of their dioceses as to lose their initiative." An individual bishop might contradict a national episcopal conference, "but then his clergy and laity would be in a quandary, not knowing whether to follow their own bishop or the conference."

A restrictive influence was already at work in the Council, the Archbishop maintained, "because minority groups in various nations are not speaking out as they should, but are silently going along with their national episcopal conferences." What was needed, he said, "at this Catholic Council," was not a grouping of Council Fathers on national or linguistic lines, as hitherto, "but a grouping . . . on international lines, by schools of thought and special tendencies." In that way, it would be possible to see what the bishops thought, rather than what the nations thought. "For it is the bishops, not the nations, that make up the Council." (op. cit., 89-90)

Ralph Wilgen previously had given the arguments of Archbishop Geraldo de Proença Sigaud against the teaching of collegiality that basically coincided exactly with Archbishop Lefebvre. Yet, as to the source of such concepts put forward by Giovanni Montini and the neo-Moderists? Hebblethwaite, in his book, *Paul VI*, gives this glaring glimpse:

The quotation from St Gregory the Great was significant. Gregory, pope in the last years of the sixth century—he confidently expected the end of the world in 600—had heard that the Bishop of Constantinople, Rome's rival at the Eastern end of the Mediterranean, was now styling himself "universal patriarch". Gregory wrote rebuking him. Then, when the Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt flatteringly applied this title to Gregory himself, this ex-Roman senator got angry: "You have addressed me by the proud title of Universal Pope. I beg you not to do this again. . . I do not consider anything an honour to me by which my brother bishops lose the honour due to them. . . My honour is the united strength of my brothers."

*Paul quoted this in his address to the third session of the Council. But he omitted the first two sentences. Why? Because he knew that what St Gregory the Great disclaimed towards the end of the sixth century had been energetically claimed by St Gregory VII in his *Dictatus Papae* in 1071: "The Roman Pontiff is alone rightly to be called Universal Pontiff. . . He can be judged by no one. . . He alone can depose and reinstate bishops." (Cf. Brian Tierney, "Pope and Bishops: An Historical Survey", p. 232.)*

Paul's problem was summed up in the question: which Gregory should he follow? Pius XII, whom he venerated, laid the emphasis on Gregory VII's centralizing policies that formed the basis of the "Gregorian" reforms in the eleventh century; yet the example of John XXIII's spirituality and self-denying ordinance suggested that Gregory the Great was right to see the papal ministry strengthened rather than weakened by being set in the context of the universal episcopate.

*The solution lay in looking at office in terms of ministry as gift-for-others rather than power over others. **Following the Swiss Protestant theologian Oscar Cullmann**, Paul gathered the scriptural evidence for an equality of dignity but difference of role among all the successors of the Apostles. St Peter addresses his brothers as "elders", claiming only to be a "fellow elder" (I Peter, 5:1). From St Paul he borrows the term "my fellow partners in tribulations and consolations" (II Corinthians, 4:7). Paul summed up:*

We are in duty bound to recognize the apostles as teachers, rulers and sanctifiers of the Christian people, "stewards of the mysteries of God" (I Cor. 3, 1), witnesses to the Gospel, ministers of the New Testament and, in some sense, the very reflection of the glory of the Lord (II Cor. 3, 6-18).¹

This was very edifying, no doubt, but it cut little ice with the minority for whom tradition, not scripture, was "the norm of truth". They heard rumours of his dinner with Professor Oscar Cullmann and Henri de Lubac SJ, and drew sinister conclusions. (388-389)

When one hears that a supposed Pope goes to the Protestants for dogmatic teaching concerning the Catholic Faith, and that this Protestant decides what Catholics are to believe, even though it is contrary to Church teaching, definitely one cannot but begin to question both the Council and the person claiming to be pope. But this is where the third session of the Vatican II Council begins:

Non-Catholics deciding what Catholics are to believe and how Catholics are to worship. This was what caused the arguments within the Council.

Father Ratzinger, the personal theologian of Cardinal Frings, while dining one day with a group, mentioned that the liberals had thought they would have a free hand at the Council after obtaining the majority in the Council commissions. But in the speeches and voting in the Council hall, he said, they began to notice some resistance to their proposals, and consequently commissions had to take this into consideration when revising the schemas. Unknown to Father Ratzinger, one of those seated nearby and within hearing distance was Archbishop Sigaud, who chuckled at this public admission by a representative of the European alliance. (Wiltgen, 150)

A new Church has to be different than the old and the schema on the Constitution of the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, was to assure this was true. The clarity of *Satis Cognitum* of Pope Leo XIII, of *Mystici Corporis* of Pope Pius XII, of *Pastor Aeternus* of Vatican Council (I) regarding the Church is disregarded and a hodge-podge of heterodox statements that become open to any interpretation is the sand upon which the Conciliar Church will be built. According to *The HarperCollins Encyclopedia of Catholicism* (McBrien, 1306), these are the obvious changes to distinguish the Conciliar Church from the Catholic Church:

- 1. The Church is, first and foremost, a mystery, or sacrament, and not primarily an organization or institution.*
- 2. The Church is the whole People of God, not just the hierarchy, clergy, and religious.*
- 3. The Church's mission includes action on behalf of justice and peace and is not limited to the preaching of the word and the celebration of the sacraments.*
- 4. The Church includes all Christians and is not limited exclusively to the Catholic Church.*
- 5. The Church is a communion, or college, of local churches, which are not simply administrative subdivisions of the Church universal.*
- 6. The Church is an eschatological community; it is not yet the kingdom of God.*
- 7. The lay apostolate is a direct participation in the mission of the Church and not simply a sharing in the mission of the hierarchy.*
- 8. There is a hierarchy of truths; not all official teachings of the Church are equally binding or essential to the integrity of Catholic faith.*
- 9. God uses other Christian churches and non-Christian religions in offering salvation to all humankind; the Catholic Church is not the only means of salvation.*
- 10. The dignity of the human person and the freedom of the act of faith are the foundation of religious liberty for all, over against the view that "error has no rights."*

Therefore one reads of the Conciliar Church:

Paragraph 1:

Since the Church is in Christ like a sacrament or as a sign and instrument both of a very closely knit union with God and of the unity of the whole human race, it desires now to unfold more fully to the faithful of the Church and to the whole world its own inner nature and universal mission.

Paragraph 5

The mystery of the holy Church is manifest in its very foundation.

Paragraph 8

This Church constituted and organized in the world as a society, subsists in the Catholic Church, which is governed by the successor of Peter and by the Bishops in communion with him, although many elements of sanctification and of truth are found outside of its visible structure. These elements, as gifts belonging to the Church of Christ, are forces impelling toward catholic unity.

Paragraph 13

All men are called to be part of this catholic unity of the people of God which in promoting universal peace presages it. And there belong to or are related to it in various ways, the Catholic faithful, all who believe in Christ, and indeed the whole of mankind, for all men are called by the grace of God to salvation.

The document is so uninspired and ambiguous that a *nota praevia* or preliminary explanations had to be attached to correct this so-called Dogmatic Constitution. None of this seemed to ruffle the neo-Modernists as they added new Documents (e.g., *Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops*; *Decree on the Apostolate of the Lay People*, *Declaration on Religious Liberty*, *Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity*, *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests*, and *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*) to address the failure as well as introduce further novelties of the *Novelle Theologie* of Chenu, Congar and Rahner with help from Cullman, Barth and von Balthasar. The multiplicity of Biblical quotes in *Lumen Gentium* was to please the educated Protestants and instruct the “ignorant” Catholics. It needs not to be mentioned why there was no connection to the traditional Catholic concept of the Church.

The *nota praevia* itself developed in the following fashion, as Wiltgen providentially informs:

By July 28, Archbishop Staffa, of the Curia, had ready a lengthy study on the two newly revised schemas on the Church and on bishops, which he circulated to the Council Fathers. Referring to the sections on collegiality in both schemas, he expressed the deep conviction "that these propositions are opposed to the more common teaching of the saintly Fathers, of the Roman Pontiffs, of provincial synods, of the holy Doctors of the Universal Church, of theologians and of canonists. They are also contrary to century-old norms of ecclesiastical discipline." The Archbishop quoted from the theological works of an Italian Jesuit, Father Giovanni Bolgeni (1733-1811) and commented that "the fundamental positions of Bolgeni and those of the schema on the Church are substantially identical." He considered it extraordinary that, after 140 years, Bolgeni's principles, which theologians and canonists had long been "unanimous in rejecting as unacceptable and foreign to the sound tradition of the Church," should now suddenly be accepted as the foundations of a Council schema. He maintained that the schema deprived the Pope of his personal supreme power, and limited his primacy to serving as moderator for the bishops, in whom, according to the schema, the supreme power was vested. (Op. cit. 230)

Giovanni Montini ignored this Archbishop's letter and requests.

Meanwhile, thirty-five cardinals and the superiors general of five very large religious orders had written to the Pope stating that, while the text on collegiality in the schema had the appearance of

presenting the moderate liberal view, it was in fact ambiguous, and might, after the close of the Council, be interpreted according to the extreme liberal view.

The Pope . . . sent a reply to the cardinal whose name headed the list, attacking the arguments given in the letter. Whereupon the Cardinal went to see the Pope, on behalf of the others in his group, and explained the grounds for their suspicions. But the Pope took no action.

The Cardinal then suggested that the theologians of his group be allowed to debate the issue in the Holy Father's presence with his theologians, but the Holy Father did not agree to this plan. He asked the Cardinal, however, to name the theologians of his group, and when he named three, the Pope at once became visibly disturbed, since they were well known and he esteemed them highly. Again he took no action, recalling that the text on collegiality had been accepted by far more than the required majority. Before casting their votes, he said, the Council Fathers had certainly given the matter deep study and devoted much prayer to it. The Cardinal excused himself for remarking that he could not wholeheartedly share these sentiments. But the Pope still took no action because of his great faith in the Theological Commission.

Then one of the extreme liberals made the mistake of referring, in writing, to some of these ambiguous passages, and indicating how they would be interpreted after the Council. This paper fell into the hands of the aforesaid group of cardinals and superiors general, whose representative took it to the Pope. Pope Paul, realizing finally that he had been deceived [Actually, that the document would be rejected], broke down and wept.

What was the remedy? Since the text of the schema did not positively make any false assertion, but merely used ambiguous terms, the ambiguity could be clarified by joining to the text a carefully phrased explanation. This was the origin of the Preliminary Explanatory Note appended to the schema. (Op. cit. 230-32)

Lumen gentium, the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, is supposed to be defining what the Church is, which means that it is an infallible document (such as the documents of Trent and Vatican I). As such it has to be very clear. Obviously this admission shows the heterodoxy and the attempted cover-up. But a note to the note tells that it is not infallible though it is to be accepted as though infallible and begs the question whether the New Church is based on truth or authority? And what does dogmatic mean if it doesn't mean dogmatic? Wiltgen writes:

The second announcement concerned the assent which all members of the Church were expected to give to the teaching contained in this chapter. The teaching, according to this announcement, was not to be considered an infallible definition or dogma, but to be accepted on the supreme teaching authority of the Church. (Ibid., 233-234)

After the discussion on the Schema on the Church, the Council introduced, once again, a schema on Religious Liberty, which was under Augustine Bea who was President of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. Ecumenism and Religious Liberty are considered different (here only considering the neo-Modernists' definition) by the relationships given them: Ecumenism is acceptance of all religions by the Church; while Freedom of Religion is acceptance of all religions by the State. This detail demanded, in the minds of the neo-Modernists, two different schemas.

Augustine Bea developed an acceptance of all religions by the Church just as John Courtney Murray developed an acceptance of all religions by the State. As Ecumenism and Religious Freedom were originally part of the same schema and as the Americans were supposedly for Religious Freedom—of whom John Courtney Murray was developing—, Augustine Bea spent the spring of 1963 (Angelo Roncalli was still living) in the United States, speaking at Universities and Catholic and non-Catholic events to promote Christian Unity.

The June 13, 1963 edition of The Georgia Bulletin carried a front-page question and answer interview with Cardinal Augustine Bea, head of the Vatican Secretariat for Christian Unity. The cardinal had visited the United States in April 1963 and had a fresh look at the ecumenical movement in the U.S. The interview was copyrighted because of its exceptional exchange between questions asked by Atlanta Archbishop Paul J. Hallinan and answers written by Cardinal Bea. The cardinal wrote that the ecumenical climate in the United States “has improved in an absolutely surprising manner.” “In the United States . . . one feels that there has been something of an explosion” of interest in ecumenism, he said. Because there is such a large number of Christian denominations in the United States “the extreme intensity of the division makes more clearly apparent all the absurdity of the division itself and spurs on the search for a remedy,” Cardinal Bea said.

(Retrieved June 30, 2016 from <http://georgiabulletin.org/news/2013/06/looking-back-june-1963/>)

Already Augustine Bea, in his book, *The Unity of Christians*, which was the collection of his writings, speeches and interviews between 1961 and 1962, and preparing to be ready for his American visit, outlays exactly the change in mentality to be expressed by no longer *separated brethren*, which indicates their separation from the Church, but *brothers of the same home*, indicating they are members of the Church but not cognizant because of variable factors causing invincible ignorance. The following is his groundwork:

So much for hatred of error [previously held by the Church prior to John XXIII]. It remains to speak of love of those who err. But I repeat, it is charity that inspired the New Testament severity in face of heresy and schism. There is no contradiction in hating the error and loving those who are in error; these attitudes are different expressions of a single charity, which mingles severity and gentleness, both rooted in charity and growing out of charity.

Of this charity the Pope has spoken often. Immediately after his election, in a broadcast message of 29 October 1958, John XXIII spoke of his sincere desire for the union of all Christians: 'As we greet the Western Church so we greet the Eastern Church and open our arms and our heart to all those who are separated from this Apostolic See, where St Peter himself lives in his successors "until the consummation of the world" (Mt 28 :20) and fulfils Christ's command to bind and loose on earth (Mt 16: 19) and to feed the Lord's flock (John 21 :15-17) . . . May all return; with full and tender longing we beseech them to return . . . They will not enter a strange or unfriendly home but their own home.'

Again, in his first encyclical, Ad Petri Cathedram, he addressed separated Christians in the following words: 'Allow us to express our affection for you and to call you sons and brothers . . . We address you, then, as brothers even though you are separated from us. For as St Augustine

said: "Whether they like it or not, they are our brothers. They will only cease to be our brothers when they cease to say: *Our Father*".

Let us notice here that, according to the words of the Holy Father, the Catholic Church is, for baptized non-Catholics, not 'a strange or unfriendly home but their own home', and that he calls them brothers and sons. Leaving aside, for later discussion, the precise doctrinal import of these words, let us underline the fact: the charity he has in mind is the charity that exists among brothers, the charity that a father, the Pope, has for all the faithful, the mother's love that the Church has for Christians who are not Catholics.

Now let us examine in greater detail the reasons for this attitude of charity.

*In the first place, we must say that the severity shown in the New Testament texts we have cited above is directed to those who, individually and consciously, withdraw themselves from the true faith and obedience to the Church of Christ. This is certainly not the case of all those now separated from us. The great majority of them inherit their position from their forebears who, in many cases, were torn from the Church by force or deception. We have only to recall the celebrated adage: *Cujus regio, ejus religio*. As it is no merit of ours to have been born and brought up in a family belonging to the Catholic Church, so it is no fault of theirs that they are sons of parents separated from our Church. Accepting in good faith the inheritance handed on by their parents, these non-Catholics can sincerely believe that they are on the right path.*

Nor should we forget that, in spite of all the differences in doctrine and worship, our separated brethren still have much in common with us. The Oriental Church still preserves unbroken the succession of their bishops from the apostles and, along with that, valid sacraments, above all the Holy Eucharist. The liturgy of the Mass is the centre of their religious life, is considered 'the true sacrifice atoning for the living and the dead', and is celebrated with great solemnity. In doctrine the Orientals retain the ancient apostolic and patristic tradition, and differ from the faith of the Latin Church only in a few points, particularly in their denial of the dogmas defined by Councils since their separation, such as the primacy and infallibility of the Pope. Although they have not accepted the definitions of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption, devotion to our Lady remains strong among them, and these dogmas are found in their liturgical books and generally admitted by their members.

The Protestant inheritance from the Mother Church is not as rich as the Oriental, unfortunately, but they too have preserved precious elements of Catholic doctrine and worship, although the amount varies with the different forms of Protestantism. Above all, one notices in many Protestants, particularly in the ordinary faithful, a sincere piety, a great veneration for the Word of God contained in holy scripture, and a real effort to observe the commandments of God in their daily life. We can certainly presume that the Lord grants to these men, who publicly bear witness to the name of Christ, the graces necessary to lead a Christian life. (25-27)

The Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis redintegratio*, (21 Nov. 1964) written by Augustine Bea, retained this argument:

Even in the beginnings of this one and only Church of God there arose certain rifts, (Cf. 1 Cor. 11, 18-19; Gal. 1, 6-9; 1 Jn. 2, 18-19.) which the Apostle strongly condemned.(Cf. 1 Cor. 1, 11 sqq; 11, 22.) But in subsequent centuries much more serious dissensions made their appearance and quite large communities came to be separated from full communion with the Catholic Church - for which, often enough, men of both sides were to blame. The children who are born into these Communities and who grow up believing in Christ cannot be accused of the sin involved in the separation, and the Catholic Church embraces upon them as brothers, with respect and affection. For men who believe in Christ and have been truly baptized are in communion with the Catholic Church even though this communion is imperfect. The differences that exist in varying degrees between them and the Catholic Church - whether in doctrine and sometimes in discipline, or concerning the structure of the Church - do indeed create many obstacles, sometimes serious ones, to full ecclesiastical communion. The ecumenical movement is striving to overcome these obstacles. But even in spite of them it remains true that all who have been justified by faith in Baptism are members of Christ's body, (Cf. CONC. FLORENTINUM, Sess. VIII (1439), Decretum Exultate Deo: Mansi 31, 1055 A.) and have a right to be called Christian, and so are correctly accepted as brothers by the children of the Catholic Church. (Cf. S. AUGUSTINUS, In Ps. 32, Enarr. 11, 29: PL 36, 299)

Moreover, some and even very many of the significant elements and endowments which together go to build up and give life to the Church itself, can exist outside the visible boundaries of the Catholic Church: the written word of God; the life of grace; faith, hope and charity, with the other interior gifts of the Holy Spirit, and visible elements too. All of these, which come from Christ and lead back to Christ, belong by right to the one Church of Christ.

The brethren divided from us also use many liturgical actions of the Christian religion. These most certainly can truly engender a life of grace in ways that vary according to the condition of each Church or Community. These liturgical actions must be regarded as capable of giving access to the community of salvation.

It follows that the separated Churches (Cf. CONC. LATERANENSE IV (1215) Constitutio IV: Mansi 22, 990; CONC. LUGDUNENSE II (1274), Professio fidei Michaelis Palaeologi: Mansi 24, 71 E; CONC. FLORENTINUM, Sess. VI (1439), Definitio Laetentur caeli: Mansi 31, 1026 E.) and Communities as such, though we believe them to be deficient in some respects, have been by no means deprived of significance and importance in the mystery of salvation. For the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as means of salvation which derive their efficacy from the very fullness of grace and truth entrusted to the Church.

That is, these non-Catholics have the means of salvation in their own creeds, though it would be better as an example to the world if the Catholic Church and they were united in a visible unity. These non-Catholics do not need to change their creeds, they need only accept that they and Catholics believe the same thing, for example, the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* is agreed to by the Catholic Church's Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity and the Lutheran World Federation in 1999 that states the churches share "a common understanding of our justification by God's grace through faith in Christ." For 450 years the Church condemned (by an infallible canon) the Fiduciary Faith of the Protestants which they claim gave them justification. According to this document, after 450 years the Conciliar Church concedes the

Catholic Church erred and the Protestants had it right all along; but Catholics were blinded by bigotry (of which the Conciliar Hierarchy profusely apologizes at every opportunity).

The cleansing of the Catholic Faith of everything offensive to non-Catholics can be seen in the communications of Augustine Bea and Abraham Heschel as outlined by Donald Moore in his book extolling Heschel, *The Human and the Holy: The Spirituality of Abraham Joshua Heschel*. Moore relates on pages 9-10:

In the early spring of that year Cardinal Bea visited the United States, a visit which included an interfaith dinner held in New York City on April 1, 1963, at which Heschel delivered the keynote address. The day before this dinner Cardinal Bea, along with two of his staff members including then Msgr. Jan Willebrands, met with a select group of Jewish leaders at the offices of the American Jewish Committee in New York City. Rabbi Heschel was chosen to chair this gathering. In his opening remarks Heschel spoke of the ecumenical spirit which was permeating the Catholic world, due in no small part to Pope John XXIII and to Cardinal Bea; for Heschel this was "an event of historic significance, representing a "breakthrough toward the Divine message in accordance with Holy Writ." [English translation of the minutes of the meeting with Cardinal Bea on March 31, 1963, in the archives of the American Jewish Committee, New York City, p. 6.] Cardinal Bea then responded to a series of questions which had been submitted to him three weeks earlier for his consideration at this meeting and which to a large extent paralleled the four proposals of Heschel's memorandum of May 1962. ["Questions to Be Submitted to Cardinal Bea at the Meeting with Jewish Scholars," dated March 7, 1963, in the archives of the American Jewish Committee, New York City.]

The Cardinal's response to these questions began with a general refutation of the charge of deicide, using the framework of established Catholic dogma, and he concluded: "[F]rom what we have said, it is sufficiently clear how unjust it is to accuse the Jewish people as such of having rendered themselves guilty of deicide and that their dispersion among all peoples is in close connection with this curse." He pointed out that it would be "neither necessary nor wise" to refute this accusation by attacking either the claim of Jesus' divinity or the credibility of the Gospels, for here one would come into direct conflict with fundamental Christian beliefs. All such fundamental religious beliefs, whatever they might be, must be treated "with respect and veneration." Then addressing the questions submitted to him, Bea assured the assembled scholars that rejection of the charge of deicide and of the Jews as an accursed people was a primary target of the statement being drafted by his Secretariat. He expected that the statement would affirm the integrity and preciousness of Judaism as a living religion in its own right. On other points Bea hoped that the Council would stress the fundamental obligations of justice, truth, and love especially toward Jews, but specific regulations or practical applications would have to come from the Church's ordinary teaching, preaching, and practice rather than from specific actions by the more than two thousand bishops gathered at the Council. [27 "Conversation of Cardinal Bea with Jewish Scholars and Theologians," dated March 31, 1963, in the archives of the American Jewish Committee, New York City. Cf. also Tannenbaum, "Heschel and Vatican II," p. 11.]

He continues:

On the following evening in his address at the dinner honoring Cardinal Bea, Heschel spoke of the proclamation of the prophets that although humankind professes so many varied conceptions

of God, men and women are really worshipping one and the same God, despite their ignorance of this fact. Yet intolerance so often plays a disruptive role.

And he quotes Heschel:

"This is the agony of history: bigotry, the failure to respect each other's commitment, each other's faith. We must insist on loyalty to the unique and holy treasures of our own tradition and at the same time acknowledge that in this aeon religious diversity may be the providence of God." ["The Ecumenical Movement," Insecurity of Freedom, p. 181.]

Heschel had already submitted his works, *The Image of the Jew in Catholic Teaching* (July 1961) and *Anti-Jewish Elements in Catholic Liturgy* (November 1961) through Bea to Angelo Roncalli, after which Roncalli then revised the prayer for the conversion of the Jews on Good Friday. He then sent another work, *On Improving Catholic-Jewish Relations* (May 1962) with a letter dated May 22 to Bea demanding further concession, such as the second proposal that the Catholic Church *acknowledge the holiness of the Jews as Jews in their loyalty to the Torah* (Moore, 6.) and *that the Ecumenical Council would acknowledge the integrity and permanent preciousness of Jews and Judaism.* (*ibid.*, 7.) That is, Jews are already saved and the Church should not seek their conversion, but rather assist them in preserving their creed.

It will be seen that in the Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions (*Nostra aetate*) of 28 Oct 1965, the Jewish wishes became true as the Catholic faith was white-washed of its "anti-semitism."

Father Joaquin Saenz y Arriaga (under the pseudonym Maurice Pinay) had already learned of these meetings and wrote, with the assistance of other Catholics, the book *Plot Against the Church* to warn the Fathers of the Council what was pending, distributing Spanish and Italian versions to all who would take it. It was received as too fantastical to be true. As Fr. Joaquin Saenez writes:

Canon 66 [cf. 4th Council of Toledo, Canons 65 and 66. Compiled by Juan Tojado y Ramiro. Same edition. Volume II. Page 308.] expressly calls the Jews "Servants of the anti-Christ," like another already quoted Canon said of the bishops and presbyteries who help the Jews that they form part of the body of the Anti-Christ. It is worthy of note, that Canon 65 adds an innovation to the laws of the Catholic Church in that admittance is not only blocked to declared Jews to government offices, but to all those who belong to their race.

This must not be interpreted as racial discrimination; for Holy Church regards all men as equal before God, without discrimination of race. But since the conviction, repeatedly substantiated through facts, predominated that Christians of Jewish race with few exceptions secretly practised the Jewish cult, it was logical that one attempted to prevent the infiltration of crypto-Jews into the government offices. This was a vitally important defensive measure by the Christian state since, if the latter had once been ruled by its deadly enemies, who are simultaneously the principal foes of Holy Church, both institutions would have come into gravest danger. To block the door to government of the state to aggressive or converted Jews, was not only clever, but unavoidable, in order to protect it from the powerful "Fifth Column" which at a given moment could unleash its collapse. Thus it came about in catastrophic degree when a weak-minded leader of the state, who

violated these laws of the Church and those announced by his predecessors, cleared anew the possibility for the Israelites to gain control of the leading posts in the Gothic kingdom. This law of public security is without doubt the predecessor of further most energetic and far-reaching laws, which Holy Catholic Church passed many hundreds of centuries later.

It is interesting to establish that Saint Isidorus of Seville in his struggle against Judaism wrote two books against the Hebrews, which according to Graetz were compiled "with that lack of taste and feeling, which distinguished the Fathers of the Church from the beginning in their warring polemics against Jewry" [Graetz, same work, Volume III. Page 50] It is completely natural that the anti-Jewish books of the Church Fathers do not please the Jews, however, one must understand that the Israelites obscure the historical truth. Also they attempt to destroy the honour of all those who have fought against them, even if it is a question of such holy learned excellent men, as the Church Fathers are.

It is completely beyond doubt, that if Saint Isidorus of Seville as well as the Metropolitans and Bishops of the Fourth Toledo Council, had lived in our days, that they would immediately have been accused of Racism, anti-Semitism or of being Nazi criminals; and in fact not only by the Jews, but also by the clergy, who give themselves out as Christians, but in reality stand in the service of Jewry. (Plot Against the Church, p. 343-344)

Every knowledgeable Catholic knows how the Jews hate and revile Pius XII who did so much during World War II to save Jews from deportation and concentration camps. He did so much that the Chief Rabbi of Rome, Israel Anton Zoller, converted to Catholicism with his family (cf. <http://www.tabletmag.com/jewish-life-and-religion/196727/the-apostasy-of-rabbi-zolli>.) The Jews could never forgive this (remembering the Edgardo Mortaro episode) and it is reflected in the recent decisions of the Conciliar Church to forbid converting Jews.

Wiltgen provides this episode:

Two weeks before the opening of the third session, on August 31, 1964, I received a visit from Dr. Joseph Lichten, director of the Intercultural Affairs Department of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. He was deeply concerned over the fact that the phrase exculpating the Jews for the crucifixion of Christ had now been deleted from the Council document, and maintained that the phrase in question was the most important part of the document as far as the Jews were concerned. He had visited various cardinals in Europe on the matter, he told me, and was busy making contacts in Rome. He said further that Cardinal Bea was preparing a special amendment to be presented in the Council hall "on this unfortunate deletion."

At the eighty-eighth General Congregation, on September 25, 1964, Cardinal Bea gave a report on the revised declaration. The problem, he said, was "whether and in what manner the Jewish people, as a people, are to be considered guilty of the condemnation and death of Christ the Lord." He disagreed strongly with those who maintained that the chief cause of anti-Semitism was the aforesaid guilt of the Jewish people. He explained that there were many reasons for anti-Semitism which were not of a religious, but of a national, political, psychological, social, or economic nature.

In his theological exposition, Cardinal Bea said that "the leaders of the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem" had been guilty of the death of Christ, as the efficient cause in the historical order; denied that "the entire Jewish people of that time, as a people," could be declared guilty for what the leaders in Jerusalem had done; and stated that this guiltlessness of the Jews as a people at the time of Christ was all the more true with regard to the Jews of today. The Jewish leaders who condemned Christ to death, he said, were clearly not formally guilty of deicide, since Christ himself (Luke 23:34), St. Peter (Acts 3:17), and St. Paul (Acts 13:27) had all said that those leaders had acted without full knowledge of Christ's divinity. (Op. cit., 172)

Augustine Bea, then, acted on behalf of Jewish Americans and the B'nai Brith to obtain a change in the doctrine of the Church.

Regarding ecumenism, Augustine Bea repeatedly quotes from the *Instructio de motione oecumenica* (Instructions on the Ecumenical Movement) of December 20, 1949. This followed a Monitum, or Warning, named *Cum compertum*, of June 5, 1948, which is here presented:

Warning:

Mixed gatherings of non-Catholics with Catholics have been reportedly held in various places, where things pertaining to the Faith have been discussed against the prescriptions of the Sacred Canons and without previous permission of the Holy See. Therefore all are reminded that according to the norm of Canon 1325 § 3 laypeople as well as clerics both secular and regular are forbidden to attend these gatherings without the aforesaid permission. It is however much less licit for Catholics to summon and institute such kind of gatherings. Let therefore Ordinaries urge all to serve these prescriptions accurately.

These are to be observed with even stronger force of law when it comes to gatherings called "ecumenical", which laypeople and clerics may not attend at all without previous consent of the Holy See.

Moreover, since acts of mixed worship have also been posed not rarely both within and without the aforesaid gatherings, all are once more warned that any communication in sacred affairs is totally forbidden according to the norm of Canons 1258 and 731, § 2.

Given at Rome, at the premises of the Holy Office, on June 5th 1948.

Petrus Vigorita, Notary

(cf. Acta Apostolicae Sedis XL (1948), p. 257.; Periodica)

Canon 1325, § 3. Reads: *Let Catholics beware lest they have debates or conferences, especially public ones, with non-Catholics without having come to the Holy See or, if the case is urgent, to the local Ordinary.*

In the *Canon Law Digest* there is documented the decrees of the Popes and Holy Office pertaining to this Canon and Church teaching forbidding Catholics joining with non-Catholics as though they were Christian Churches, reserving any contact to bringing non-Catholics back to the Church (Catholic) and forbidding absolutely any participation in their services or allowing them to receive the Sacraments.

In a decree of July 4, 1919, regarding the Society for Union of Christendom

The Holy Office was asked:

Whether the instructions of this Supreme Sacred Congregation, of 16 Sept., 1864, regarding the participation of Catholics in a certain society founded in London "to procure the union of Christendom," are to be applied and obeyed by the faithful also in regard to their participation in meetings or conferences of whatever kind, public or private, called by non-Catholics for the purpose of promoting the union of all churches claiming to be Christian.

Reply. *In the affirmative, and ordering the publication in the AAS of the letter referred to and also of the letter "to certain English Puseyites," of 8 Nov., 1865. (I, 619; cf. AAS 11-309)*

The same response was given for the Lausanne Conference for Christian Unity by the Holy Office on July 8, 1927:

On the occasion of the conference which was to be held at Lausanne, in Switzerland, Aug. 3-21, 1927, the Holy Office was asked:

Whether Catholics are allowed to belong to or to favor conventions, meetings, conferences, or associations of non-Catholics which have for their purpose to unite all those who call themselves Christians in one religious federation.

Reply. *In the negative; and the Decree of the Holy Office of 4 July, 1919, regarding the participation of Catholics in the society "for the union of Christendom" is absolutely to be observed.*

This reply approved and ordered published, by His Holiness, Pius XI. (Ibid., 620; cf. AAS 19-278.)

Pope Pius XI then wrote the Encyclical, *Mortalium animos* (January 6, 1928; cf. AAS 20-5) that definitively condemns pan-Christianity and forbids Catholics to participate. It was necessary, for Bouscaren, in Canon Law Digest adds the following:

The annotations in Periodica recall in connection with the Encyclical, the following facts:

1. The World's Parliament of Religions, to which delegates from all religions of the world were invited, and which was held in Chicago in 1893, was opened by Cardinal Gibbons, who recited the Lord's Prayer.

2. Pope Leo XIII, on 18 Sept., 1895, in a letter to the then Apostolic Delegate to the United States, later Cardinal Satolli, temperately discountenanced participation by Catholics in such promiscuous religious meetings. [Acta Leonis XIII, Vol. 15, p. 323.]

*3. Beginning in 1910, the Episcopal Church in the United States sponsored a World Conference of Christian churches. In 1914, the Secretary of this Conference, in a letter to Cardinal Gasparri, asked the prayers of the Holy Father for its success, and received a gracious reply. In 1916, His Holiness, Benedict XV, [Brief of 25 Feb., 1916; AAS 9-61] gave pontifical approval to the "Church Unity Octave," Jan. 18-25, and enriched with indulgences certain prayers for the true unity of Christendom. In 1919, delegates from the Episcopal "World Conference" called upon the Holy Father and were graciously received; but **at the same time were informed that the Catholic***

doctrine on the unity of the visible Church of Christ made it impossible for the Pope to join in their meetings.

4. The attitude of the Holy See toward the "society for the union of Christendom" which was formed in London in 1857, was one of strict non-participation; and this attitude is continued in regard to later efforts of the same sort.

5. The so-called "Malines Conversations," begun in 1921 and participated in by Lord Halifax. and Cardinal Mercier, were discontinued in 1926; in 1927, Cardinal Van Roey, who had assisted at the meetings as Vicar General of the Archdiocese of Malines for Cardinal Mercier, informed Lord Halifax that there was little prospect of the "Conversations" being resumed.

6. On the occasion of the Lausanne Conference, 1927, the Holy Office repeated the prohibition against participation by Catholics."

7. The efforts of the Roman Pontiffs for the attainment and maintenance of Christian unity in the true sense, have been constant since the time of St. Peter. (Canon Law Digest I, 621-622)

Pius XI, in his Encyclical on the *Promotion of True Christian Unity* teaches:

2. A similar object is aimed at by some, in those matters which concern the New Law promulgated by Christ our Lord. For since they hold it for certain that men destitute of all religious sense are very rarely to be found, they seem to have founded on that belief a hope that the nations, although they differ among themselves in certain religious matters, will without much difficulty come to agree as brethren in professing certain doctrines, which form as it were a common basis of the spiritual life. For which reason conventions, meetings and addresses are frequently arranged by these persons, at which a large number of listeners are present, and at which all without distinction are invited to join in the discussion, both infidels of every kind, and Christians, even those who have unhappily fallen away from Christ or who with obstinacy and pertinacity deny His divine nature and mission. Certainly such attempts can nowise be approved by Catholics, founded as they are on that false opinion which considers all religions to be more or less good and praiseworthy, since they all in different ways manifest and signify that sense which is inborn in us all, and by which we are led to God and to the obedient acknowledgment of His rule. Not only are those who hold this opinion in error and deceived, but also in distorting the idea of true religion they reject it, and little by little, turn aside to naturalism and atheism, as it is called; from which it clearly follows that one who supports those who hold these theories and attempt to realize them, is altogether abandoning the divinely revealed religion.

4. Is it not right, it is often repeated, indeed, even consonant with duty, that all who invoke the name of Christ should abstain from mutual reproaches and at long last be united in mutual charity? Who would dare to say that he loved Christ, unless he worked with all his might to carry the desires of Him, Who asked His Father that His disciples might be "one." [1] And did not the same Christ will that His disciples should be marked out and distinguished from others by this characteristic, namely that they loved one another: "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another"?[2] All Christians, they add, should be as "one": for then they would be much more powerful in driving out the pest of irreligion, which like a serpent

daily creeps further and becomes more widely spread, and prepares to rob the Gospel of its strength. These things and others that class of men who are known as pan-Christians continually repeat and amplify; and these men, so far from being quite few and scattered, have increased to the dimensions of an entire class, and have grouped themselves into widely spread societies, most of which are directed by non-Catholics, although they are imbued with varying doctrines concerning the things of faith. This undertaking is so actively promoted as in many places to win for itself the adhesion of a number of citizens, and it even takes possession of the minds of very many Catholics and allures them with the hope of bringing about such a union as would be agreeable to the desires of Holy Mother Church, who has indeed nothing more at heart than to recall her erring sons and to lead them back to her bosom. But in reality beneath these enticing words and blandishments lies hid a most grave error, by which the foundations of the Catholic faith are completely destroyed.

7. And here it seems opportune to expound and to refute a certain false opinion, on which this whole question, as well as that complex movement by which non-Catholics seek to bring about the union of the Christian churches depends. For authors who favor this view are accustomed, times almost without number, to bring forward these words of Christ: "That they all may be one.... And there shall be one fold and one shepherd,"[14] with this signification however: that Christ Jesus merely expressed a desire and prayer, which still lacks its fulfillment. For they are of the opinion that the unity of faith and government, which is a note of the one true Church of Christ, has hardly up to the present time existed, and does not to-day exist. They consider that this unity may indeed be desired and that it may even be one day attained through the instrumentality of wills directed to a common end, but that meanwhile it can only be regarded as mere ideal. They add that the Church in itself, or of its nature, is divided into sections; that is to say, that it is made up of several churches or distinct communities, which still remain separate, and although having certain articles of doctrine in common, nevertheless disagree concerning the remainder; that these all enjoy the same rights; and that the Church was one and unique from, at the most, the apostolic age until the first Ecumenical Councils. Controversies therefore, they say, and longstanding differences of opinion which keep asunder till the present day the members of the Christian family, must be entirely put aside, and from the remaining doctrines a common form of faith drawn up and proposed for belief, and in the profession of which all may not only know but feel that they are brothers. The manifold churches or communities, if united in some kind of universal federation, would then be in a position to oppose strongly and with success the progress of irreligion. This, Venerable Brethren, is what is commonly said. There are some, indeed, who recognize and affirm that Protestantism, as they call it, has rejected, with a great lack of consideration, certain articles of faith and some external ceremonies, which are, in fact, pleasing and useful, and which the Roman Church still retains. They soon, however, go on to say that that Church also has erred, and corrupted the original religion by adding and proposing for belief certain doctrines which are not only alien to the Gospel, but even repugnant to it. Among the chief of these they number that which concerns the primacy of jurisdiction, which was granted to Peter and to his successors in the See of Rome. Among them there indeed are some, though few, who grant to the Roman Pontiff a primacy of honor or even a certain jurisdiction or power, but this, however, they consider not to arise from the divine law but from the consent of the faithful. Others again, even go so far as to wish the Pontiff Himself to preside over their motley, so to say, assemblies. But, all the same, although many non-Catholics may be found who loudly preach fraternal communion in Christ Jesus, yet you will find none at all to whom it ever occurs to submit to and obey the Vicar of Jesus

Christ either in His capacity as a teacher or as a governor. Meanwhile they affirm that they would willingly treat with the Church of Rome, but on equal terms, that is as equals with an equal: but even if they could so act. it does not seem open to doubt that any pact into which they might enter would not compel them to turn from those opinions which are still the reason why they err and stray from the one fold of Christ.

8. This being so, it is clear that the Apostolic See cannot on any terms take part in their assemblies, nor is it anyway lawful for Catholics either to support or to work for such enterprises; for if they do so they will be giving countenance to a false Christianity, quite alien to the one Church of Christ. Shall We suffer, what would indeed be iniquitous, the truth, and a truth divinely revealed, to be made a subject for compromise? For here there is question of defending revealed truth. Jesus Christ sent His Apostles into the whole world in order that they might permeate all nations with the Gospel faith, and, lest they should err, He willed beforehand that they should be taught by the Holy Ghost: [15] has then this doctrine of the Apostles completely vanished away, or sometimes been obscured, in the Church, whose ruler and defense is God Himself? If our Redeemer plainly said that His Gospel was to continue not only during the times of the Apostles, but also till future ages, is it possible that the object of faith should in the process of time become so obscure and uncertain, that it would be necessary to-day to tolerate opinions which are even incompatible one with another? If this were true, we should have to confess that the coming of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles, and the perpetual indwelling of the same Spirit in the Church, and the very preaching of Jesus Christ, have several centuries ago, lost all their efficacy and use, to affirm which would be blasphemy. But the Only-begotten Son of God, when He commanded His representatives to teach all nations, obliged all men to give credence to whatever was made known to them by "witnesses preordained by God," [16] and also confirmed His command with this sanction: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." [17] These two commands of Christ, which must be fulfilled, the one, namely, to teach, and the other to believe, cannot even be understood, unless the Church proposes a complete and easily understood teaching, and is immune when it thus teaches from all danger of erring. In this matter, those also turn aside from the right path, who think that the deposit of truth such laborious trouble, and with such lengthy study and discussion, that a man's life would hardly suffice to find and take possession of it; as if the most merciful God had spoken through the prophets and His Only-begotten Son merely in order that a few, and those stricken in years, should learn what He had revealed through them, and not that He might inculcate a doctrine of faith and morals, by which man should be guided through the whole course of his mortal life.

9. These pan-Christians who turn their minds to uniting the churches seem, indeed, to pursue the noblest of ideas in promoting charity among all Christians: nevertheless how does it happen that this charity tends to injure faith? Everyone knows that John himself, the Apostle of love, who seems to reveal in his Gospel the secrets of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and who never ceased to impress on the memories of his followers the new commandment "Love one another," altogether forbade any intercourse with those who professed a mutilated and corrupt version of Christ's teaching: "If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house nor say to him: God speed you." [18] For which reason, since charity is based on a complete and sincere faith, the disciples of Christ must be united principally by the bond of one faith. Who then can conceive a Christian Federation, the members of which retain each his own opinions and private judgment, even in matters which concern the object of faith, even though they be repugnant to the opinions

of the rest? And in what manner, We ask, can men who follow contrary opinions, belong to one and the same Federation of the faithful? For example, those who affirm, and those who deny that sacred Tradition is a true fount of divine Revelation; those who hold that an ecclesiastical hierarchy, made up of bishops, priests and ministers, has been divinely constituted, and those who assert that it has been brought in little by little in accordance with the conditions of the time; those who adore Christ really present in the Most Holy Eucharist through that marvelous conversion of the bread and wine, which is called transubstantiation, and those who affirm that Christ is present only by faith or by the signification and virtue of the Sacrament; those who in the Eucharist recognize the nature both of a sacrament and of a sacrifice, and those who say that it is nothing more than the memorial or commemoration of the Lord's Supper; those who believe it to be good and useful to invoke by prayer the Saints reigning with Christ, especially Mary the Mother of God, and to venerate their images, and those who urge that such a veneration is not to be made use of, for it is contrary to the honor due to Jesus Christ, "the one mediator of God and men." [19] How so great a variety of opinions can make the way clear to effect the unity of the Church We know not; that unity can only arise from one teaching authority, one law of belief and one faith of Christians. But We do know that from this it is an easy step to the neglect of religion or indifferentism and to modernism, as they call it. Those, who are unhappily infected with these errors, hold that dogmatic truth is not absolute but relative, that is, it agrees with the varying necessities of time and place and with the varying tendencies of the mind, since it is not contained in immutable revelation, but is capable of being accommodated to human life. Besides this, in connection with things which must be believed, it is nowise licit to use that distinction which some have seen fit to introduce between those articles of faith which are fundamental and those which are not fundamental, as they say, as if the former are to be accepted by all, while the latter may be left to the free assent of the faithful: for the supernatural virtue of faith has a formal cause, namely the authority of God revealing, and this is patient of no such distinction. For this reason it is that all who are truly Christ's believe, for example, the Conception of the Mother of God without stain of original sin with the same faith as they believe the mystery of the August Trinity, and the Incarnation of our Lord just as they do the infallible teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, according to the sense in which it was defined by the Ecumenical Council of the Vatican. Are these truths not equally certain, or not equally to be believed, because the Church has solemnly sanctioned and defined them, some in one age and some in another, even in those times immediately before our own? Has not God revealed them all? For the teaching authority of the Church, which in the divine wisdom was constituted on earth in order that revealed doctrines might remain intact for ever, and that they might be brought with ease and security to the knowledge of men, and which is daily exercised through the Roman Pontiff and the Bishops who are in communion with him, has also the office of defining, when it sees fit, any truth with solemn rites and decrees, whenever this is necessary either to oppose the errors or the attacks of heretics, or more clearly and in greater detail to stamp the minds of the faithful with the articles of sacred doctrine which have been explained. But in the use of this extraordinary teaching authority no newly invented matter is brought in, nor is anything new added to the number of those truths which are at least implicitly contained in the deposit of Revelation, divinely handed down to the Church: only those which are made clear which perhaps may still seem obscure to some, or that which some have previously called into question is declared to be of faith.

10. So, Venerable Brethren, it is clear why this Apostolic See has never allowed its subjects to take part in the assemblies of non-Catholics: for the union of Christians can only be promoted by

promoting the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it, for in the past they have unhappily left it. . . . (Cf. AAS 20-5; Periodica, 17-11 (Vermeersch).

As one who studies these documents can testify, there was not a change in the position the Church took toward the need of those separated from the unity of the faith to return to the Catholic Church and that Catholics cannot participate in, but only observe the event if assigned by proper ecclesiastical authority in the position of reporting on the event. A public debate between Catholics and non-Catholics would require the same, ecclesiastical approval and competency. This can be seen in its application when the Archbishop of Utrecht, Johannes Cardinal de Jong, wrote the following Pastoral Letter with the Bishops of Holland:

Beloved Faithful:

In the near future, from the 22nd of August to the 5th of September, the "Ecumenical Council of Churches" will hold a Congress to deal with the subject "The Plan of God and the Disorder of the World." This Congress on so vital a subject will be held in our own country, in Amsterdam, and will undoubtedly attract the attention of many of our Catholic people. For this reason alone, we deemed it Our duty to address a Pastoral Letter to you on the subject.

Many non-Catholic Christians have for a long time been distressed by the division which exists among Christians in religious matters. They see that this division is contrary to the precept of Our Lord Jesus Christ and that it necessarily leads to consequences which are harmful to the salvation of men. This anxiety has given rise to the so-called Ecumenical Movement, which seeks to bring about a new religious unity among all who are willing to acknowledge Jesus Christ as their God and Saviour. Shortly before the latest world war, this Movement achieved a more permanent organization by forming what is called the Ecumenical Council of Churches; and the Congress soon to be held in Amsterdam will be the first complete Congress of this Ecumenical Council of Churches.

Beloved Faithful, the Catholic Church too—and no one more than she—is grieved by the division among Christians in religious matters. She too understands how harmful are its consequences. Moreover, she freely grants that these efforts toward a new religious unity are motivated in many cases by a right intention. But notwithstanding all this she knows that she cannot take part; and consequently the Holy Catholic Church can in no way participate in the Amsterdam Congress.

*The reason why she holds aloof is not the fear of loss of authority, nor any merely tactical consideration; but it is this alone: **The Catholic Church knows that she must absolutely stand firm in the faithful performance of the commission entrusted to her by Jesus Christ.***

For she is the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, which Jesus Christ established, in order, through her, to make His work perennial; she is the Mystical Body of Christ, the Spouse of Christ. In her the unity which Christ willed exists forever, because of His promise that the gates of hell would not prevail against her (Matt. 16: 18). For this reason, the division among Christians can be ended in one way only, by return to the Church, by return to that unity which in her has remained intact. If the Church were to take part in the efforts to create a new religious unity, and were to do so on a par with others, she would by that very fact concede that the unity which Christ willed has not endured in her, and hence that strictly speaking the Church of Christ does not exist.

Never can she make such a concession: for she is the one holy Church of Christ, the one Mystical Body of Christ, the one Spouse of Christ. She must precisely by her abstention constantly proclaim that in her the unity which Christ willed has been preserved and that in her this unity is ever accessible to all.

There is also another reason which shows that this abstention is imperative. True unity cannot exist without unity of faith; and this is being daily more fully realized also by many members of the Ecumenical Movement. But how can this unity of faith be secured? Our Lord Jesus Christ commanded Peter and the other Apostles, and their successors, to preach the Gospel in His name and by His authority: "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me" (Luke 16: 10). To this end He promised them the assistance of His Holy Spirit. By the power of this Holy Spirit the Supreme Pontiffs and the Bishops, as the successors of Saint Peter and of the other Apostles, have preserved the revealed truth inviolate and proclaimed it with infallible authority; and they will not cease to do so until the second coming of the Lord. He who accepts their word accepts the word of Christ, and by that very fact enters into the unity of the faith. How, then, could the Supreme Pontiff and the Bishops enter into a discussion with others to consider whether they might not perhaps have misunderstood the word of divine revelation and taught human doctrine instead of divine truth? This would amount to defection from the faith, rejection of the promise of Christ, doubting the power of the Holy Spirit. Never could they do such a thing. They have but one course, to preach constantly the doctrine of Christ with infallible authority, and so preserve the unity of the faith.

For these reasons the question of participation by Catholics in the Amsterdam Congress cannot even be considered. Nevertheless, we will follow its proceedings with interest. For it springs from the deep and sincere desire of many persons who wish to acknowledge Christ as their God and Saviour, to attain to the unity which Christ willed. How indeed could We, who are placed by the Holy Spirit, under a Successor of Saint Peter, to keep the Church united and to extend it, remain indifferent or cold toward a sincere effort for unity? It cannot be a matter of indifference to Us whether this Congress is to be an advance or a retrogression; it will be an advance if it nourishes a desire for the Mother Church and for the unity which is hers; it would be a retrogression if it should result in the wide acceptance of a sort of unity very different from that which Christ gave.

A return to the Mother Church—that, Beloved Faithful, is the one way to true unity. Yet, as we all know, there is an inveterate prejudice against taking this course. Because of the divergences which existed at the time the division began, now that the breach has gone on widening for centuries, the dissidents are so far away from and so foreign to the Church that they no longer understand her language. In many cases a return to the Church is impossible without a grave interior struggle and great personal sacrifices. There can be no sincere return unless the human mind be enlightened and the human will be moved by the grace of God. And we know that God wants us to pray to Him for the outpouring of His grace.

Wherefore We earnestly invite you all, priests and faithful people, to pray fervently. Pray during these days for those who are taking part in the Congress and for the countless other non-Catholic Christians who eagerly look for unity, who really adhere to Christ and live in His love, who although separated from the flock of Christ, yet look to the Church, sometimes without fully realizing it, as the one door of salvation. Pray first for those who are in a position of leadership

among non-Catholic Christians; they have a great personal responsibility for the simple faithful depend on their guidance, having often not sufficient talents to arrive at a true understanding of the matter through their own efforts. Pray to our heavenly Father, who "will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2:4). Pray to Him through Jesus Christ, who is "always living to make intercession for us" (Heb. 7: 25). Pray to Him in the one Holy Spirit, who gives life to the one Mystical Body of Christ. Pray that all may attain to that true unity which is not man-made but was given to this world by Christ Our Lord.

But remember, Beloved Faithful, that your example is needed no less than your prayers. In other days, defection from the Church was occasioned by the unworthy lives of many Catholics. The Church herself put an end to that by the salutary reform which was effected (in the head and in the members) by the Council of Trent. And so now the greatest encouragement toward a return to the Church will be our manifestation of the holiness of our faith by the holiness of our lives and works.

If in other times, in their defense of Catholic unity, Catholics were not always guided by a spirit of charity, and were therefore not mindful of the words of the Apostle "doing the truth in charity" (Eph. 4:15), and consequently were not entirely free from blame for the alienation which took place between ourselves and non-Catholic Christians, such certainly was not the spirit of our Holy Mother the Church. For she is and ever remains the holy Church; holy in her worship, in her Sacraments, in her Sacrifice, and in the communication of the supernatural life which she imparts through these means. She remains holy in her doctrine, which comes from God and leads to God; holy in her laws, which aim only at the glory of God and the salvation of men; holy as the mother of great Saints in every age. And this holiness is a constant proof of her divine origin. The members of the Church, however, are and remain men; in whom what is human—sometimes indeed too human (Mit brennender Sorge)—may break out; and these human and at times too human elements can be a source of scandal and prevent many persons from seeing the true holiness of the Church.

And therefore also in these times we have a grave obligation in conscience. Now that a strong and manifest desire for unity has arisen among many persons who acknowledge Christ, it is imperative that our whole lives should be imbued with the spirit of Christ; and that in all our activities, in every walk of life, we should seek only Christ and the spread of His Kingdom. Now if ever we must especially observe that precept of Christ, "So let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven" (Matt. 5:16). Now if ever we must manifest in our own lives the holiness of the Church. God grant that all may recognize this duty; and in its fulfillment, may the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ, "help our infirmity" (Rom. 8: 26).

Finally, Beloved Faithful, We order that in all churches which belong to the ecclesiastical Province of the Netherlands, and in all chapels of which a rector is in charge, a solemn Mass or at least a Missa cantata be offered, to obtain from God that all may share in the unity of the Church. The Mass will be the one indicated in the Roman Missal as the votive Mass for the removal of schism. We trust that you will be united as closely as possible in this Holy Sacrifice. And let this Our Pastoral Letter be read in the usual way from the pulpit during all the Masses which are publicly announced, in all the churches of Our Ecclesiastical Province and in all chapels of which a rector is in charge, on Sunday the 22nd of August.

Given at Utrecht, 31 July, 1948.

Signed by the Archbishop of Utrecht and the Bishops of Breda, Roermond, Haarlem, and Bois-le-Duc. (Canon Law Digest III, 531-536; Periodica, 37-390 (Tromp). The Catholic Mind, 1948, p. 718.)

In light of these documents, when one reads the *Instructio de motione oecumenica* (Instructions on the Ecumenical Movement) of December 20, 1949, there is nothing new, even though it is the document Bea and the Ecumenists present as the green light to join non-Catholics. It is here presented:

De Motione Oecumenica
An Instruction of the Holy Office

Addressed to the ordinaries of places, given December 20, 1949.

The Catholic Church, although she does not take part in congresses and other conventions called "ecumenical," yet has never ceased, as is clear from many Pontifical documents, nor will she in future ever cease, to follow with the most intense interest and to promote by earnest prayers to God, all efforts toward the attainment of what is so dear to the Heart of Christ Our Lord, namely, that all who believe in Him "may be made perfect in one." [John 17:23]

For she embraces with truly maternal affection all who return to her as the true Church of Christ; and hence, worthy of all. praise and encouragement are all those plans and projects which, with the consent of Ecclesiastical Authority, have been undertaken and are being carried forward, either for the proper Catholic instruction of future converts or for the more thorough training of persons already converted to the faith.

Now in many parts of the world, as a result of various external events and changes of views on the part of people, but especially in consequence of the common prayers of the faithful through the grace of the Holy Spirit, there has grown constantly in the minds of many persons separated from the Catholic Church the desire for a return to unity on the part of all who believe in the Lord Christ. To the children of the Church this is surely a cause of true and holy joy in the Lord, and at the same time an invitation to help all those who sincerely seek the truth, by earnest prayer to God imploring for them the grace of light and strength.

However, some of the initiatives that have hitherto been taken by various individuals or groups, with the aim of reconciling dissident Christians to the Catholic Church, although inspired by the best of intentions, are not always based on right principles, or if they are, yet they are not free from special dangers, as experience too has already shown. Hence this Supreme Sacred Congregation, which has the responsibility of conserving in its entirety and protecting the deposit of the faith, has seen fit to recall to mind and to prescribe the following:

I. Since the above-mentioned "union" is a matter which pertains primarily to the authority and office of the Church, it should be attended to with special care by the Bishops, whom "the Holy Ghost hath placed to rule the Church of God." [Acts 20:28] They should, therefore, not only diligently and effectively watch over this entire activity, but also prudently promote and direct it,

for the purpose of both helping those who seek the truth and the true Church, and protecting the faithful against the dangers which may easily flow from the activity of this "Movement."

Hence they must in the first place be fully aware of everything that has been and is being done through this "Movement" in their dioceses. For this purpose they shall designate well-qualified priests who, according to the doctrine and norms prescribed by the Holy See, for example by the Encyclicals "Satis cognitum," [Acta Leonis XIII, Vol. 16 (1897), p. 157] "Mortalium animos," [AAS, Vol. 20 (1928), p. 5.] and "Mystici Corporis Christi," [Ibid., Vol. 35 (1943), p. 193.] shall pay close attention to everything which concerns the "Movement" and report thereon to the Bishops in the manner and at the time which they shall prescribe.

They shall watch with special care over publications which may be issued in any form by Catholics on this matter, and shall see that the canons "on the previous censure and prohibition of books" (canons 1384 seq.) are observed. And they shall not fail to do the same with regard to publications of non-Catholics on the same subject, in as far as these are published, or read, or sold by Catholics.

They shall also diligently provide whatever may be of service to non-Catholics who desire to know the Catholic faith; they shall designate persons and Offices to which these non-Catholics may go for consultation; and a fortiori they shall see to it that those who are already converted to the faith shall easily find means of more exact and deeper instruction in the Catholic faith, and of leading a more positively religious life, especially through appropriate meetings and group assemblies, through Spiritual Exercises and other works of piety.

II. As regards the manner and method of proceeding in this work, the Bishops themselves will make regulations as to what is to be done and what is to be avoided, and shall see that these are observed by all. They shall also be on guard lest, on the false pretext that more attention should be paid to the points on which we agree than to those on which we differ, a dangerous indifferentism be encouraged, especially among persons whose training in theology is not deep and whose practice of their faith is not very strong. For care must be taken lest, in the so-called "irenic" spirit of today, through comparative study and the vain desire for a progressively closer mutual approach among the various professions of faith, Catholic doctrine—either in its dogmas or in the truths which are connected with them—be so conformed or in a way adapted to the doctrines of dissident sects, that the purity of Catholic doctrine be impaired, or its genuine and certain meaning be obscured.

Also they must restrain that dangerous manner of speaking which generates false opinions and fallacious hopes incapable of realization; for example, to the effect that the teachings of the Encyclicals of the Roman Pontiffs on the return of dissidents to the Church, on the constitution of the Church, on the Mystical Body of Christ, should not be given too much importance seeing that they are not all matters of faith, or, what is worse, that in matters of dogma even the Catholic Church has not yet attained the fullness of Christ, but can still be perfected from outside. They shall take particular care and shall firmly insist that, in going over the history of the Reformation and the Reformers the defects of Catholics be not so exaggerated and the faults of the Reformers be so dissimulated, or that things which are rather accidental be not so emphasized, that what is most essential, namely the defection from the Catholic faith, be scarcely any longer seen or felt. Finally, they shall take precautions lest, through an excessive and false external activity, or

through imprudence and an excited manner of proceeding, the end in view be rather harmed than served.

Therefore the whole and entire Catholic doctrine is to be presented and explained: by no means is it permitted to pass over in silence or to veil in ambiguous terms the Catholic truth regarding the nature and way of justification, the constitution of the Church, the primacy of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, and the only true union by the return of the dissidents to the one true Church of Christ. It should be made clear to them that, in returning to the Church, they will lose nothing of that good which by the grace of God has hitherto been implanted in them, but that it will rather be supplemented and completed by their return. However, one should not speak of this in such a way that they will imagine that in returning to the Church they are bringing to it something substantial which it has hitherto lacked. It will be necessary to say these things clearly and openly, first because it is the truth that they themselves are seeking, and moreover because outside the truth no true union can ever be attained.

III. With regard especially to mixed assemblies and conferences of Catholics with non-Catholics, which in recent times have begun to be held in many places to promote "union" in the faith, there is need of quite peculiar vigilance and control on the part of Ordinaries. For if on the one hand these meetings afford the desired opportunity to spread among non-Catholics the knowledge of Catholic doctrine, which is generally not sufficiently known to them, yet on the other hand they easily involve no slight danger of indifferentism for Catholics. In cases where there seems to be some hope of good results, the Ordinary shall see that the thing is properly managed, designating for these meetings priests who are as well qualified as possible to explain and defend Catholic doctrine properly and appropriately. The faithful, however, should not attend these meetings unless they have obtained special permission from Ecclesiastical Authority, and this shall be given only to those who are known to be well instructed and strong in their faith. Where there is no apparent hope of good results, or where the affair involves special dangers on other grounds, the faithful are to be prudently kept away from the meetings, and the meetings themselves are soon to be ended or gradually suppressed. As experience teaches that larger meetings of this sort usually bear little fruit and involve greater danger, these should be permitted only after very careful consideration.

To colloquies between Catholic and non-Catholic theologians, none should be sent but priests who have shown themselves truly fit for such work by their knowledge of theology and their firm adherence to the principles and norms which the Church has laid down in this matter.

IV. All the aforesaid conferences and meetings, public and non-public, large and small, which are called for the purpose of affording an opportunity for the Catholic and the non-Catholic party for the sake of discussion to treat of matters of faith and morals, each presenting on even terms the doctrine of his own faith, are subject to the prescriptions of the Church which were recalled to mind in the Monitum, "Cum compertum," of this Congregation under date of 5 June, 1948. [AAS 40-257.] Hence mixed congresses are not absolutely forbidden; but they are not to be held without the previous permission of the competent Ecclesiastical Authority. The Monitum, however, does not apply to catechetical instructions, even when given to many together, nor to conferences in which Catholic doctrine is explained to non-Catholics who are prospective converts: even though the opportunity is afforded for the non-Catholics to explain also the doctrine of their church so

that they may understand clearly and thoroughly in what respect it agrees with the Catholic doctrine and in what it differs therefrom.

Neither does the said Monitum apply to those mixed meetings of Catholics and non-Catholics in which the discussion does not turn upon faith and morals but upon ways and means of defending the fundamental principles of the natural law or of the Christian religion against the enemies of God who are now leagued together, or where the question is how to restore social order, or other topics of that nature. Even in these meetings, as is evident, Catholics may not approve or concede anything which is in conflict with divine revelation or with the doctrine of the Church even on social questions.

As to local conferences and conventions which are within the scope of the Monitum as above explained, the Ordinaries of places are given, for three years from the publication of this Instruction, [The Date of this publication is 31 January, 1950.] the faculty of granting the required previous permission of the Holy See, on the following conditions:

- 1. That communicatio in sacris be entirely avoided;*
- 2. that the presentations of the matter be duly inspected and directed;*
- 3. that at the close of each year a report be made to this Supreme Sacred Congregation, stating where such meetings were held and what experience was gathered from them.*

As regards the colloquies of theologians above mentioned, the same faculty for the same length of time is granted to the Ordinary of the place where such colloquies are held, or to the Ordinary delegated for this work by the common consent of the other Ordinaries, under the same conditions as above, but with the further requirement that the report to this Sacred Congregation state also what questions were treated, who were present, and who the speakers were for either side.

As for the inter-diocesan conferences and congresses, either national or international, the previous permission of the Holy See, special for each case, is always required; and in the petition asking for it, it must also be stated what are the questions to be treated and who the speakers are to be. And it is not allowed before this permission has been obtained, to begin the external preparation of such meetings or to collaborate with non-Catholics who begin such preparation.

V. Although in all these meetings and conferences any communication whatsoever in worship must be avoided, yet the recitation in common of the Lord's Prayer or of some prayer approved by the Catholic Church, is not forbidden for opening or closing the said meetings.

VI. Although each Ordinary has the right and duty to conduct, promote, and preside over this work in his own diocese, yet the cooperation of several Bishops will be appropriate or even necessary in establishing offices and works to observe, study, and control this work as a whole. Accordingly it will rest with the Ordinaries themselves to confer together and consider how a proper uniformity of action and coordination can be obtained.

VII. Religious Superiors are bound to watch and to see to it that their subjects adhere strictly and faithfully to the prescriptions laid down by the Holy See or by the local Ordinaries in this matter.

In order that so noble a work as the "union" of all Christians in one true faith and Church may daily grow into a more conspicuous part of the entire care of souls, and that the whole Catholic people may more earnestly implore this "union" from Almighty God, it will certainly be of assistance that in some appropriate way, for example through Pastoral Letters, the faithful be instructed regarding these questions and projects, the prescriptions of the Church in the matter, and the reasons on which they are based. All, especially priests and religious, should be exhorted and warmly encouraged to be zealous by their prayers and sacrifices to ripen and promote this work, and all should be reminded that nothing more effectively paves the way for the erring to find the truth and to embrace the Church than the faith of Catholics, when it is confirmed by the example of upright living.

Given at Rome, from the Holy Office, 20 Dec., 1949.

(AAS 42-142; Holy Office, Instruction, 20 Dec., 1949. Periodica, 39-204 (Hürth); Monitor Ecclesiasticus, 1950, p. 21 (Boyer); The Jurist, 10 (1950), p. 206.; Canon Law Digest III, 536-542)

The teachings embodied by both *Mortalium animos* (1928) of Pius XI and the *Instructio* (1949) of Pius XII were upheld by Samuel Cardinal Stritch in his Pastoral Letter, which is also presented here as it was certainly fresh in the minds of all:

There are men outside the Church professing the Christian name who deplore the divisions which exist among them. They talk about setting up and establishing a Christian unity, or as they sometimes say, a unity of Christian action. They are mindful of the words of our Blessed Saviour to His apostles, spoken the night before He died: "Yet not for these only do I pray, but for those also who through their word are to believe in me, that all may be one, even as thou, Father in me and I in thee; that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory that thou hast given me, I have given to them, that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them and thou in me; that they may be perfected in unity. and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and that thou hast loved them even as thou hast loved me" (John 17: 20-23). They gather in international organizations; they hold congresses, conventions and assemblies. Wide publicity attends their meetings and assemblies. You are familiar with what they are doing, because you read of these conventions and assemblies and organizations in your daily newspapers.

Quite naturally the question arises in your minds, what should be the opinion of a Catholic, what his attitude with regard to these organizations and their activities? The answer of the Church to this question is: the Catholic Church does not take part in these organizations or in their assemblies or conferences. She does not enter into any organization in which the delegates of many sects sit down in council or conference as equals to discuss the nature of the Church of Christ or the nature of her unity, or to propose to discuss how to bring about the unity of Christendom, or to formulate a program of united Christian action. She does not allow her children to engage in any activity of conference or discussion based on the false assumption that Roman Catholics too are still searching for the truth of Christ. For to do so would be to admit that she is but one of the many forms in which the true Church of Christ may or may not exist; that she does not preserve in herself the unity of faith, government and worship willed by Our Lord for His Church; that she does not know the true meaning and nature of that unity and of those other God-given properties by which she is distinguished not only as the one but as the holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church founded by our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Such an admission she can never make,

for she is now as she has always been the one and only Spouse of Christ, the one and only Mystical Body of Christ, the one and only Church of Christ.

It cannot be admitted that the unity willed by Our Lord for His Church has never existed or does not exist today. For such an admission would falsely imply that the will and the preaching of Christ were inefficacious and that His prayer to the Father still remains unheard after almost two thousand years. It would mean that the Holy Spirit, poured out upon the Apostles and abiding forever in the Church founded on them, had failed in His mission. Such a failure is, of course, unthinkable. No, the unity Jesus gave to His Church is an evident and unmistakable thing. It consists, as we have indicated, very simply in three things. The first is that all the members of the Church believe the same truths, handed down by Sacred Scripture and divine tradition, as taught to them by the infallible teaching authority established in the Church by Christ Himself. The second is that all obey the divinely constituted authority of the Church in all that pertains to their moral life and the salvation of their souls. The third is that all share in the same worship of God and use the same means of sanctification, as directed and provided by the Church's teaching and ruling authority: in the concrete, that all participate in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the prayer of the Church, and that all admit and use according to their station in life the seven holy sacraments instituted and given to us by Jesus Christ Himself.

Now this unity, clear and obvious as it is, exists in the Church of Christ today. It is found in the Roman Catholic Church and in her alone. She and she alone is the true Church of Jesus Christ. There is only one way to the unity so anxiously sought by some men. That is the entrance into the fold of the Church of Christ, participation in her life, submission without reserve to her teaching and ruling authority. If we are asked, does the Roman Catholic Church desire the unity of all believing men, our reply is that she by all means desires unity, but not a unity forged according to fallible human conceptions. The unity she wishes for all Christians and offers to those who seek it is that which was established in her by Jesus Christ Himself and preserved in her always by His almighty power.

If the Catholic Church does not take in these international and national councils, conferences and assemblies, it is not because she is not interested in cooperating with Our Lord in bringing His other sheep into His fold. She longs for, prays for, and does all that she can to restore the complete unity once existing among believers in Christ. She spares no effort to repair the divisions which arose when men in the East during the 9th century and in the West during the 16th century separated themselves from the one flock of Christ, cut themselves off from the one Body of Christ. She always holds the door open and is ready to greet with outstretched arms all those who come into the unity established by Christ in His Church. She offers them the truth and prays ardently that they may receive the light of the Holy Spirit in their minds to see it, His love and courage in their wills to embrace it. Earnestly, incessantly, the Catholic Church prays that all men may come into that Christian unity which was established in her by Jesus Christ, her founder.

This attitude of the Church with regard to our separated brethren is not one of arrogance and pride. Far from it. It is rather that of a loving parent towards erring children. She knows her duty to Christ. She mingles love and firmness. Like Christ Our Lord, she is filled with compassion and sympathy towards those who grope in the darkness of error; but she cannot betray His trust to her, she cannot be false to the charge He has given her to preserve the deposit of faith confided to her, to keep it intact and uncontaminated by falsehood, to preach it to men in all its purity and integrity.

Some men will try to tell you that the Catholic Church became corrupt, that she corrupted the doctrine of Christ, and that to such an extent that some found it necessary in conscience to break away from her, that they themselves might preserve the truth of the Gospel. Your answer will be that the Church of the 16th century believed and taught nothing that was not believed and taught by the Church of the first and second centuries: a divinely established hierarchy, the primacy and infallibility of the Bishop of Rome, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the seven sacraments, the divine Maternity of Mary, most worthy of honor and devotion, and all the God-given truths contained in Holy Scripture and the divine tradition entrusted by Our Lord to His Apostles and through them to their successors. The Catholic Church has never tampered with the truth revealed by God through His Son Jesus Christ. She has never taken away a single tenet nor added a single doctrine to that revelation. If in the course of time, under the impulse and guidance of the Holy Spirit, she has come to a clear and explicit realization of beliefs which before she held and taught in an implicit manner, no reasonable man can say that she has thus invented man-made dogmas. That evils existed in the 16th century need not be denied. That the reformation of discipline and morals brought about by the great Council of Trent was indeed salutary should be admitted. But the truth of Christ always remained in His Church in all of its pristine purity uncontaminated. The institution that Jesus formed has by the power of God been preserved from the beginning, essentially the same throughout the ages. Christ promised that the gates of hell would never prevail against her. That promise was kept in the 9th and the 16th centuries, as it is kept in the 20th century, and will be kept until the end of time.

Accordingly, it is understood that the faithful of the Catholic Church may not in any capacity attend the assemblies or councils of non-Catholics seeking to promote unity of the Church. We ask you, however, to pray for our separated brothers and to beg God to give them the gift of Catholic faith. They need great graces to overcome prejudices, to break down the wall of misunderstanding which has long existed between us. Pray that they, with God's grace, may find the Church of Christ, the Mother Church which waits for them with open arms and longs to receive them. Pray that they may come to look upon Mary the Mother of Jesus as their own true Mother in Christ. Pray that, like the Magi of old, they may be given the star of faith to find "the Child with Mary, His Mother."

Our faith demands that we practice real Christian charity. We would be less than Christian if we excluded from that charity any man, no matter what his condition or what his professions. Holding firm to the faith that is in us, we shall live in charity with all our fellow citizens. With few exceptions, they believe in God, and many of them believe that our Blessed Saviour was God and man and the Saviour of all men. In this great country, which we love with a true patriotic love, there are things which we can do in cooperation with our fellow citizens. The great specter of an armed atheism is on the horizons of our free world. We know its hatred of religion, and we know how it has poured out that hatred principally on the Church in the countries in which it has obtained control by violence. There are many things as citizens which we with our fellow citizens can do and should do. We are ready to unite with them as citizens in the doing of these things. Their discussion of many of the social problems which confront us in our day will prove helpful to us. We are not an isolated group in our democracy. No group in our country is more devoted to our democracy than our Catholic people. We realize that in this day all men of good will, and particularly all men who kneel and pray to the living God, should unite against two common dangers: the danger of atheism, especially communistic atheism, and the danger of secularism,

which with specious rhetoric, at least in effect, would banish God from all our social thinking. If in the unity of the Church established by Christ we do not take any part in conventions or meetings or assemblies which have for their purpose establishing some sort of man-made unity among Christian sects, we are always ready and anxious on the civic and social levels to work together with our fellow citizens, particularly with those who worship the living God, for the good of our country and of society. Let Christian charity reign in you and let it be your motivating spirit in dealing and associating with your fellow citizens. In our country there obtain a variety of religious beliefs. In this condition and in these circumstances we shall live together in charity; and while we shall not sacrifice one iota of our faith taught us by Holy Mother Church, we shall collaborate earnestly and honestly with our fellow citizens against godlessness in public and social life, against the aggressions and encroachments of those evils which are attacking the very foundations of our democracy. To all men of good will we issue the invitation to join with us and to work with us, even with the limitations which obtain, for that measure of good which is possible for us to secure.

As by the faith which you profess in common with your fellow Catholics everywhere, you witness to the unity, catholicity and apostolicity of Christ's Church, take care also to show forth always in your lives her exalted holiness. Let everyone realize that it is especially by the example of his life lived in accord with the teachings of our faith. that those not of the fold will be inspired with the desire to know the Catholic Church better and even to accept her doctrine. Keep before your eyes the ineffable sanctity of Jesus, the Man-God, whose Sacred Heart is the abyss of all virtues. Look always to His Immaculate Mother, the sinless Virgin Mary, our Mother and protectress in the struggle against the forces of evil. Turn with eager devotion to your patron Saints in whom each one will find the model of that Christian virtue of which he stands most in need. Strive to grow stronger in faith, more confident in hope, and above all more generous and ardent in charity, in love of God and your fellow men. In this day of confusion, in this day when many hearts are yearning for peace, you, as Catholic people, in your daily lives, should be a beacon to all men. Remember that our Blessed Saviour prayed for the "other sheep" which were not of His fold, that there might be one sheepfold and one shepherd. Unite yourselves with Him in this prayer. Show forth in your daily lives the holiness of the Church. Let your fellow citizens who are not of the household of the faith see in you a shining example of Christian charity which embraces all men in the love of God.

We desire, dear sons and daughters in Christ, that you pray fervently to Saints Peter and Paul. Pray for yourselves and pray for our separated brothers that they may come to know the Church of Christ and that they may be given the grace to find peace and joy in it. In this Marian Year, when you are fervently praying to our Blessed Lady the Mother of God, remember your brothers and ask our Blessed Lady to bring them into the unity of the Church.

(Cardinal Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago, 29 June, Feast of Saints Peter and Paul, 1954; cf. *Canon Law Digest* IV, 378-84)

Unfortunately both Samuel Cardinal Stritch (+May 27, 1958) and Johannes Cardinal de Jong (+September 8, 1955) would not be at Vatican II; it would be their nemeses, Albert Meyer and Bernard Cardinal Alfrink.

The conclusion of the Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis reintegratio*, is that the Church is disunited and the neo-Modernists will unite the Church, acknowledging that there are various churches, i.e., faiths:

The restoration of unity among all Christians is one of the principal concerns of the Second Vatican Council. Christ the Lord founded one Church and one Church only. However, many Christian communions present themselves to men as the true inheritors of Jesus Christ; all indeed profess to be followers of the Lord but differ in mind and go their different ways, as if Christ Himself were divided. (1 Cor. 1,13.) Such division openly contradicts the will of Christ, scandalizes the world, and damages the holy cause of preaching the Gospel to every creature.

The discussion taken up on Religious Liberty was postponed because the opposition was definitely too strong, but that didn't stop those who wanted to change the teaching of the Church on this topic. Under Pius XII, John Courtney Murray's writings, as with the other Neo-modernists, were under suspect:

The Vatican did not initially appreciate Murray's writings, and he had to cease publishing them for a number of years. However, John Courtney Murray made a significant contribution at the Second Vatican Council, especially in The Declaration on Religious Freedom. Murray later wrote:

*The statements in Gaudium et Spes [The Church in the Modern World], like those in Dignitatis Humanae [Declaration on Religious Freedom], represent aggiornamento. And they are programmatic for the future. **From now on, the Church defines her mission in the temporal order in terms of the realization of human dignity, the promotion of the rights of man, the growth of the human family towards unity, and the sanctification of the secular activities of this world.** (John Courtney Murray, "The Issue of Church and State at Vatican Council II." *Theological Studies* 27 (1966): 601.)*

Another Schema, that would evolve into the Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, *Dei verbum* (18 November 1965), actually reveals the intent of the neo-Modernists to change the Faith, for Faith is based on Divine Revelation. Divine Revelation comes through Tradition and Sacred Scripture. In rejecting the Church, the Protestants turned to the Book. Yet, Christianity was not founded on the Books of the New Testament, but on the Church with Peter and the Apostles. The Apostles did not preach from the New Testament and did not have access to the Old Testament scrolls unless they preached in the Synagogues to the Jews. The Gospel was first Oral Tradition and then written. The Gentiles were first presented with the Faith merely on the words of the Apostles and disciples. The New Testament was not written until later. Matthew is the first to have written an account assumed to be in Aramaic, the other Gospels follow in Greek as also the Epistles and the Apocalypse, which was written by John the Apostle.

The Council of Trent, combatting the errors of the Protestant Innovators gave this teaching that must be believed:

The sacred and holy ecumenical and general Synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit, with the same three Legates of the Apostolic See presiding over it, keeping this constantly in view, that with the abolishing of errors, the purity itself of the Gospel is preserved in the Church, which

promised before through the Prophets in the Holy Scriptures 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 source of every saving truth and of instruction in morals [Matt. 28:19ff., Mark 16:15], and [the Synod] clearly perceiving that this truth and instruction are contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions, which have been received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the apostles themselves, at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, have come down even to us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand, [the Synod] following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and holds in veneration with an equal affection of piety and reverence all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament, since one God is the author or both, and also the traditions themselves, those that appertain both to faith and to morals, as having been dictated either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Spirit, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession. And so that no doubt may arise in anyone's mind as to which are the books that are accepted by this Synod, it has decreed that a list of the Sacred books be added to this decree. (Session IV (April 8, 1546); cf. DB 782)

Then follows the 72 books found in the Catholic Scriptures.

The Vatican Council (I) affirmed the Decree of Trent and adds that these Scriptures have been given to the Church as having God as their author being they were *written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit* and contain no error:

Furthermore, this supernatural revelation, according to the faith of the universal Church, as declared by the holy synod of Trent, is contained "in the written books and in the unwritten traditions which have been received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself; or, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit have been handed down by the apostles themselves, and have thus come to us" [Council of Trent, see n. 783]. And, indeed, these books of the Old and New Testament, whole with all their parts, just as they were enumerated in the decree of the same Council, are contained in the older Vulgate Latin edition, and are to be accepted as sacred and canonical. But the Church holds these books as sacred and canonical, not because, having been put together by human industry alone, they were then approved by its authority; nor because they contain revelation without error; but because, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have God as their author and, as such, they have been handed down to the Church itself (can. 4). (DB 1787)

Canon 4. If anyone shall not accept the entire books of Sacred Scripture with all their divisions, just as the sacred Synod of Trent has enumerated them [Session IV], as canonical and sacred, or denies that they have been inspired by God: let him be anathema. (DB 1809)

Regarding the interpretation of Sacred Scripture, the Vatican Council goes on to teach:

But, since the rules which the holy Synod of Trent salutarily decreed concerning the interpretation of Divine Scripture in order to restrain impetuous minds, are wrongly explained by certain men, We, renewing the same decree, declare this to be its intention: that, in matters of faith and morals pertaining to the instruction of Christian Doctrine, that must be considered as the true sense of Sacred Scripture which Holy Mother Church has held and holds, whose office it is to judge

concerning the true understanding and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures; and, for that reason, no one is permitted to interpret Sacred Scripture itself contrary to this sense, or even contrary to the unanimous agreement of the Fathers. (DB 1788)

To somehow appease the Protestants, Augustine Bea and the neo-Modernists placed Scripture on the same level as the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist—something never dreamed of by the Apostles nor any Fathers or Doctors of the Church. Catholics venerate the Scriptures as inspired by God, but Catholics adore Christ present Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity in the Holy Eucharist. Yet, in the Conciliar Church there is the open bible on one table and the bread on the other. Christ is not sacramentally present in the Scriptures (the *Letter of the Law*). The following quote is from *Verbum Dei: The Church has always venerated the divine Scriptures just as she venerates the body of the Lord, since, especially in the sacred liturgy, she unceasingly receives and offers to the faithful the bread of life from the table both of God's word and of Christ's body. (Art. 21.)*

Not only that, but to give the excuse for the Septuagint was only to provide the faithful with a Bible—which is historical nonsense and should have been declared erroneous by all biblical scholars for the Septuagint was not used so the people had a Bible (the early Christians were also from the Jewish Community—which means the Scriptures were read in Hebrew when the Apostles went to the synagogues), but because the Apostles, in quoting Our Lord, has Him speaking as in the Septuagint and with references to Judith, Tobias, and the other books lacking in the Masoretic Text. In reality, no one had Bibles. Yet, *Verbum Dei* states:

Easy access to Sacred Scripture should be provided for all the Christian faithful. That is why the Church from the very beginning accepted as her own that very ancient Greek translation of the Old Testament which is called the septuagint; and she has always given a place of honor to other Eastern translations and Latin ones especially the Latin translation known as the vulgate. But since the word of God should be accessible at all times, the Church by her authority and with maternal concern sees to it that suitable and correct translations are made into different languages, especially from the original texts of the sacred books. And should the opportunity arise and the Church authorities approve, if these translations are produced in cooperation with the separated brethren as well, all Christians will be able to use them. (Art. 22.)

The Apostles, as anyone with common sense would know, did not go around carrying Bibles; they fulfilled the command of Christ: *Going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you (Matt. 28:19, 20; cf. Mark 16:15,16)* They committed, inspired by the Holy Ghost, many of those teachings to writing only later before they died so those teachings would be preserved, and which is now known as the New Testament.

Wiltgen mentions Bishop Enrico Romolo Compagnone, O.C.D. of Anagni, Italy, interjecting *that there should be no deviation from the doctrine of the Council of Trent and Vatican I, which affirmed that tradition was more extensive than Sacred Scripture, and that revelation was contained not only in Sacred Scripture but also in tradition.* The Bishop, perhaps in being overwhelmed by the majority approving such a disastrous document, then said in the words of Wiltgen: *Although the majority did not consider it opportune to introduce this teaching in the text,*

care should be taken to avoid giving the impression that the Council was turning its back on earlier decisions. (Op. cit., 177)

Wiltgen then goes on to write:

The International Group of Fathers sent a ten-page criticism of the schema to its mailing list with an accompanying letter stating that one in conscience could give an affirmative vote at the fourth session, if the enclosed amendments were adopted in the schema. The group urged that its amendments be submitted before the January 31 deadline, since experience proved that "suggestions and amendments made to Council Commissions have almost no weight unless they are supported by the largest possible number of signatures."

The effort was wasted, however, because the Theological Commission did not make a revision, in spite of the announcement made in the Council hall.

Voting on the schema took place early in the fourth session, between September 20 and 22, 1965. Contrary to Article 61, Section 3, of the Rules of Procedure, no report was read by a representative of the Theological Commission before the vote. In the course of six ballots, qualifications were submitted with 1498 affirmative votes. The Theological Commission, however, was not obliged to adopt any of these changes, because each part of the schema had received far more than the required two-thirds majority. (Ibid., 178)

As in previous Councils, e.g., Constance, a pope that was guided by the Holy Ghost through the charism of Infallibility, would have rejected the documents. Giovanni Montini, uninspired, pushed for the rejection of past teaching and promoted the introduction of novelties.

Understandably, these decisions occasioned great disappointment in the minority groups concerned, both inside and outside the Commission. Complaints immediately began to reach the Pope through numerous channels. Some periti maintained that the schema as it stood contained serious doctrinal error. Bishops pleaded urgently for an authoritative intervention by the Pope. And still others assured the Pope that there was no cause for alarm, and that there was no danger that a false interpretation might be given to the schema. . . . (Ibid., 180)

The Decree on the Catholic Eastern Churches met the same approval on the 21 November, 1964, as did the other two documents—even though, again, there was enormous opposition to the document. The result was felt on December 7, 1965, when Giovanni Montini and the Orthodox Patriarch Athenagoras II mutually removed the excommunications imposed, the shock being that Montini did not request any profession of faith or rejection of heresy on the part of the Orthodox. It was ecumenism without one faith—and equality of error with error (for by this time many Catholics were understanding that Giovanni Montini was not upholding the Catholic Faith).

Another document was that of the Church in the Modern World. After being completely rejected Wiltgen provides the following procedure to forcibly get it passed:

Cardinal Suenens proceeded to call some periti to Belgium to prepare a new draft. Strangely enough, during the second session no action was taken by the joint commission responsible for the

schema until November 29, 1963, the day on which eight liberal candidates proposed by the world alliance were added to the commission, making the liberals eight votes stronger. The new draft and the original draft were discussed at length on this day, but inconclusively. Finally, Bishop Pelletier of Trois-Rivieres, Canada, suggested that a central subcommission should be created to coordinate the work of five other subcommissions, which were to prepare further revisions of the five chapters of the supplement. This proposal was unanimously adopted.

The joint commission then elected the following six members for the central subcommission by secret ballot: Bishops Schroffer and Hengsbach of Eichstatt and Essen in Germany, Bishops Jacques Menager and Ancel of Meaux and Lyons in France, Auxiliary Bishop Mark McGrath of Panama City and Bishop Emilio Guano of Livorno, Italy. These six members were then authorized to add two others, and they chose Bishop Wright of Pittsburgh and Bishop Blomjous of Mwanza, Tanzania. Of these eight, all but Bishop McGrath had originally been elected to Commission seats as European alliance candidates; he had been associated with the alliance, however, from the very first days of the Council.

As a result of this meeting, the new schema was now completely in the hands of the European alliance policy-makers. And since the central subcommission wanted as little resistance as possible from conservative members of the Italian and Spanish hierarchies, it elected Italian-born Bishop Guano to serve as chairman and later to introduce the schema in the Council hall. The eight bishops then indicated the general lines of the new draft. A few days later, the session closed, and the bishops returned to their dioceses.

The bishops had chosen the liberal moral theologian, Father Bernard Haring, C.S.S.R., as secretary. Under the chairmanship of Bishop Guano, Father Haring, Monsignor Achille Glorieux, Father Raymond Sigmond, O.P., and Father Roberto Tucci, S.J., met several times during the month of December and in the first part of January, 1964. They determined more exactly the spirit of the schema, the general lines which it should follow, its content, its purpose and the persons to whom it was to be directed. They decided that the first draft should be written in French by Father Sigmond.

... The joint commission met again between June 4 and 6, and still further corrections and changes were suggested. It began to look as though the schema and supplement would not be ready by the third session. Finally, it was decided to print the schema despite its imperfections, and circulate it to the Council Fathers. Pope Paul gave his approval on July 3. Because of its position on the official list, it came to be called "the thirteenth schema." The supplement was still not ready. The liberal element was not yet strong enough to insert in the schema the teachings contained in the supplement, so it planned to have them inserted through speeches from the Council floor. Meanwhile, the periti began to work overtime on the supplement.

They worked so fast and so well that the 57-page supplement to the 29-page schema was ready for distribution to the Council Fathers on September 30, 1964, two weeks after the opening of the third session.

Queries were at once directed to Council authorities on the significance of the supplement and its origin. Since the front cover bore the official heading of Vatican II documents, and since inside was the statement that "the supplement is not to be discussed in the Council hall," some

explanation was called for. The Secretary General, upon instructions from the Council Presidency or the Moderators, announced that the supplement had been drawn up by the joint commission and "sent to the Secretariat for distribution as a purely private document, having no official status whatsoever." It had been drawn up "to make known the mind of the commission." In response to further queries, the Secretary General made a second announcement shortly after, which showed that the supplement had more authority than his initial announcement had indicated. "The supplement was drawn up by the joint commission," he said, "at the request of the Coordinating Commission. . . However, it is not a Council document and therefore will not be discussed in the hall."

When the press accused the Secretary General of conservative "intrigue" and "maneuvering" in making the first announcement, and stated that he had been obliged by the Cardinal Moderators to make the second one, he issued a communique calling these reports "inexact and tendentious." As Secretary General he never spoke in his own name, he said, "but always in the name of the Moderators or of the Presidency." In fact, the second announcement had been made on his initiative, after he had received the necessary "authorization of the Moderators."

Three weeks later, on October 20, the schema finally came up for discussion. . . . The Moderators had postponed the discussion until that date, announcing . . . that the "introductory reports" were not yet ready. The fourth speaker on that first day of discussion was Cardinal Lercaro of Bologna, one of the Moderators. "It seems difficult or well-nigh impossible," he said, "for a new revision of this schema and its final approval to take place during this session." Large numbers of Council Fathers had given notice of their wish to speak, he said, and it was also most important and necessary that this schema, on the Church in the modern world, should be discussed in detail on the Council floor. "It is even doubtful that there will be sufficient time for the task if the fourth session takes place next year," he said.

The enthusiastic applause which greeted this statement must have been most pleasing to Cardinal Suenens, to the eight bishops of the central subcommission and to their periti, for it meant that the Council Fathers were prepared to postpone final deliberation on the schema until the fourth session, an absolute necessity if the teachings contained in the supplement were to be incorporated in the schema itself. (Op. cit. 207-209)

Yet:

Archbishop Heenan of Westminster, England, who by this time had founded the opposition group known as St. Paul's Conference, called the schema "unworthy of an Ecumenical Council of the Church." He proposed that it should be taken away from the commission which was now handling it and referred to another commission, to be set up forthwith. "Then, after three or four years, let the fourth and final session of the Council be convened to discuss all the social problems," he said. The Council, he predicted, which had spent so much time on "theological niceties," would become "a laughingstock in the eyes of the world if it now rushed breathlessly through a debate on world hunger, nuclear war and family life."

He also pointed out that, according to instructions, the schema was to be debated, while the supplement was to be passed over without comment in the Council hall. "But if we fail to scrutinize

both documents with great care," he said, "the mind of the Council will have to be interpreted to the world by the periti who helped the Fathers of the commission to draw up the documents. God forbid that this should happen! I fear periti when they are left to explain what the bishops meant. . . It is of no avail to talk about a College of Bishops if periti in articles, books and speeches contradict and pour scorn on what a body of bishops teaches." He warned that "the theories of one or two theologians must not be mistaken for a general agreement among theologians. . . " Only this "general agreement" enjoyed special authority, he said. (Ibid., 210)

In the presence of Giovanni Montini, on November 21, 1964, only three documents were able to be imposed on the Council to vote and, as expected, the Fathers cast their votes unanimously in favor of these documents, despite knowing they contradicted past doctrinal teaching: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (*Lumen Gentium*); Decree on the Catholic Eastern Churches (*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*); and, Decree on Ecumenism (*Unitatis reintegratio*). The Heart of the Church, the Holy Eucharist, was approved to be surgically removed; now the Mystical Body of Christ was to be recast into the Frankenstein that neo-Modernists envisioned the Church should look like in the twentieth century: A piece of this and a part of that—but leaving nothing of the beauty the Spouse of Christ had before they violated her. The neo-Modernist Church became an authoritarian monster that had no reason to be but pretended to be the only reason in and of itself (Divine Authority does not exist in a merely human corporation). This left 1964 with little hope for the future, but forebode a loss of faith that would soon take root in the hearts of Catholics and drastically end the flow of grace.

Fifth Contradiction: Church: Indefectible or Defectible?

1965 was to be the beginning of the *Great Society*. Lyndon B. Johnson announced this in his January 4, 1965, State of the Union Address, where, among other Social Gospel utopian utterances, he declares:

. . . We seek the unity of man with the world that he has built—with the knowledge that can save or destroy him—with the cities which can stimulate or stifle him—with the wealth and the machines which can enrich or menace his spirit.

We seek to establish a harmony between man and society which will allow each of us to enlarge the meaning of his life and all of us to elevate the quality of our civilization. This is the search that we begin tonight.

. . . . These are some of the goals of the American Nation in the world in which we live.

For ourselves we seek neither praise nor blame, neither gratitude nor obedience.

We seek peace.

We seek freedom.

We seek to enrich the life of man.

For that is the world in which we will flourish and that is the world that we mean for all men to ultimately have.

. . . We are in the midst of the greatest upward surge of economic well-being in the history of any nation.

Our flourishing progress has been marked by price stability that is unequalled in the world. Our balance of payments deficit has declined and the soundness of our dollar is unquestioned. I pledge to keep it that way and I urge business and labor to cooperate to that end.

We worked for two centuries to climb this peak of prosperity. But we are only at the beginning of the road to the Great Society. Ahead now is a summit where freedom from the wants of the body can help fulfill the needs of the spirit.

We built this Nation to serve its people.

We want to grow and build and create, but we want progress to be the servant and not the master of man.

We do not intend to live in the midst of abundance, isolated from neighbors and nature, confined by blighted cities and bleak suburbs, stunted by a poverty of learning and an emptiness of leisure.

The Great Society asks not how much, but how good; not only how to create wealth but how to use it; not only how fast we are going, but where we are headed. . . .

Johnson then goes on to explain: Establish social programs that tax those who have and give to those who have not, i.e., a re-distribution of wealth. By giving an average (at that time) \$4000 dollars to each man and women below the poverty level, they were supposedly no longer poor—but it did not take them out of poverty—it rather paid them to be poor. The supposed success was that less people were under the poverty level (because they received assistance), but the reality was that more people were receiving assistance because they realized the benefits of not working. Such was the Great Society envisioned by the Democratic party then and even now (when, as of July 2016, the National deficit is \$19.3 trillion). This spirit of a Great Society seemed to be the universal theme of 1965 and the standard bearer was to be the United Nations. Johnson, in the same speech said:

Finally, we renew our commitment to the continued growth and the effectiveness of the United Nations. The frustrations of the United Nations are a product of the world that we live in, and not of the institution which gives them voice. It is far better to throw these differences open to the assembly of nations than to permit them to fester in silent danger.

He then continued with the words, quoted above, that equated the goals of the United Nations with those of the United States of America.

Giovanni Montini did not fail to also pay his tribute to the Great Society and the United Nations as though some unrevealed obligation of all world leaders to do so was discovered. The following is part of his speech on October 4 of the same year, which completely negates the role of Christ and the Church:

And we also make our own the voice of the poor, the disinherited, the suffering, of those who hunger and thirst for justice, for the dignity of life, for freedom, for well being and progress. The peoples of the earth turn to the United Nations as the last hope of concord and peace; we presume to present here, with their tribute of honor and hope, our own tribute also.

That is why this moment is great for you, also.

We feel that you are already aware of this. Hearken now to the continuation of our message. It becomes a message of good wishes for the future. The edifice which you have constructed must never fall; it must be perfected, and made equal to the needs which world history will present. You mark a stage in the development of mankind from which retreat must never be admitted but from which it is necessary that advance be made.

To the pluralism of states, which can no longer ignore one another, you offer an extremely simple and fruitful formula of coexistence. (Los Angeles Times, October 5, 1965, p. 7)

For many Catholics, this was a public betrayal of Christ, a Judas kiss, which sold Christ to the powers of darkness.

This was 1965, and nothing good would come as a result of humanistic efforts, only the beginning of the withdrawal of Catholics from the true faith and the means of grace. It started the drop in

Catholic attendance at Mass and loss of religious vocations; it was the beginning of religious leaving their orders and priest abandoning the priesthood.

For Americans, a war in South Vietnam that was promised not to be—for Kennedy was told that if Ngo Dinh Diem (a Catholic) was removed from office there would be peace—had become a full scale war with American soldiers involved. Johnson, who promised to promote peace, was promoting war; and the youth, the young men who would be sent to die, protested the deceit of a promised *Great Society*. The American adults, deceived by a Democratic President, felt torn between patriotism and seeing their sons needlessly sacrificed. The Blacks, supported by Marxists ideologues and Moscow, under the dissolute Martin Luther King, saw the opportunity to oppose the injustice of a segregated South held by Democrats. The riots and chaos that filled this year only distracted the public from what was really happening: The world was shifting from Christ to anti-Christ.

For the children, it was moving into the Space age. Spaceship after spaceship was being launched into space and, for the most part, they were shielded from the horrors of the transition of faith to secularism as they believed they would one day go to space—little knowing they would wake up to a faithless society when they reached adulthood and never reach space.

For the neo-Modernists, 1965 was the final opportunity to see the transition of a Roman Catholic Church to an Ecumenical Church—based on a false rationalism and an invented sociology that coincided with the Modern World of disbelief and secularism—before their Robber Council ended.

The Council was set to open again on September 14 and to close on December 8, 1965. The opposition by the faithful Bishops and clergy that stopped passage of several erroneous documents in the previous session gave more time to the neo-Modernists to propagate their ideas publicly without intervention from Giovanni Montini. Still, it also gave the Bishops defending the faith time to present their arguments and formally warn Montini of the errors of these neo-Modernists. Instead of heeding their warning, the master of deceit, Montini, had Cardinal Cicognani, the Vatican Secretary of State, admonish them for their opposition which he claimed was detrimental to the Council. This can be seen in Wiltgen's words:

Cardinal Cicognani, Vatican Secretary of State, replied to Bishop Carli on August 11, stating that Pope Paul had given careful attention to the proposals. "I must inform Your Excellency, however," he went on, "that some surprise was occasioned by the fact that the request had been presented on behalf of an 'International Group of Fathers, with similar views on theological and pastoral matters,' that is, by a particular group within the Council. This initiative might be deemed to authorize the official foundation of other 'alliances,' to the detriment of the Council assembly. As Your Excellency can well understand, this would in fact take from Council Fathers that freedom of judgment and of choice which must be ensured over and above every particular interest. It would also lead to the accentuation of tendencies and divisions among the Council Fathers themselves, whereas everything possible should be done to minimize them for the sake of serenity, concord, the happy outcome of the Council and the honor of the Church. The enterprise, therefore, cannot in itself be approved, and it would be well for this 'Group' not to function as an organ representing the positions of the Council Fathers belonging to it."

It should be recalled, in connection with this letter, that the Rules of Procedure of the Council as revised and approved by Pope Paul actually encouraged the formation of groups with similar views on theological and pastoral matters. Thus Article 57, Section 3, provided: "It is most desirable that Council Fathers who intend to present similar arguments should join together and choose one or several of their number to speak on behalf of all." As far back as August 5, 1964, Archbishop Sigaud had pointed out that the new ruling requiring a speaker to have collected seventy signatures in order to be permitted to speak after closure of debate forced the minority to organize itself, and he had cited Article 57, Section 3, as justifying such action. (Op. cit., 248)

In other words, the Fathers entering into the Fourth Session would be entering into a Council already determined to change the remaining teachings of the Church that opposed the goals of the neo-Modernists: A church built upon the ideas of *Liberty*, *Fraternity* and *Equality* based upon a sociological concept of the evolution of man that would obtain a utopian *Great Society* or *New World Order* where all would live in peace because there were no differences within mankind as all have the same origin and all have the same end (paradise on earth). To achieve this end, the eradication of differences would have to be achieved. The manner of obtaining the eradication of differences would be through directed dialogue demanding the abandonment of absolute truths (dogmas). In the last section one already saw that the word, *dogmatic*, was now to be understood as a teaching that was not infallible as the Note for the Vatican II document, *Lumen gentium*, makes very clear.

What is stated here is not new. The layman, Michael Davies, wrote about this in his three volume *Liturgical Revolution* (Angelus Press, 1977) in support of the Society of Pius X, and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre wrote about it in his book *I Accuse the Council*, (Angelus Press, 1982—first french edition 1976). **Unfortunately, the position of accepting a fallible pope and council by the Lefebvrists and Conciliarists, that is, condemning yet defending, has left the majority of Catholics believing in a defectible church.**

Wiltgen makes it clear that the Council was not to clarify and present Church teaching addressing the problems of the Modern Era, but to change the *Church of Christ* into a *Church of Men*, from a Divine institution to a human institution:

At a press conference held in Rome on September 13, the day before the opening of the fourth session, Cardinal Döpfner said that the Pope and a large majority of Council Fathers wanted the forthcoming session to be the last one. The work on the remaining schemas was so far advanced, he said, that the session could easily be closed before Christmas "without restricting the liberty of the Council Fathers and without strangulating the Council itself." He also stressed that the Rules of Procedure would be observed "in their entirety."

But despite Cardinal Döpfner's assurances, the Council during the fourth session was in fact "strangulated" more than ever before. This was because the cardinals nearly monopolized prime time. So many of them spoke each day that the interventions of bishops were often read only at a late hour when Council Fathers were either tired or missing from their places. And bishops were repeatedly silenced by closure of debate. Fifty-one cardinals, making up only 2 per cent of the general assembly, delivered 33 per cent of the oral interventions made during the fourth session. (Ibid., 249-250)

The day the Council opened, Montini claimed the Council wanted a synod of bishops to advise the pope and that he would initiate such a council with bishops he chose. The very next day, September 15, 1965, *Pope Paul formally constituted the Synod of Bishops, thereby [supposedly] fully complying with the wishes of the Council Fathers even before they had given formal approval to their own suggestion.* (Ibid.)

The first document to be considered at the opening of the fourth session was the document on Religious Liberty. The Vatican, during the reign of Pius XII, did not, according to a later apologist, appreciate Murray's writings, and he had to cease publishing them for a number of years. However, John Courtney Murray made a significant contribution at the Second Vatican Council, especially in *The Declaration on Religious Freedom*. Murray later wrote:

The statements in Gaudium et Spes [The Church in the Modern World], like those in Dignitatis Humanae [Declaration on Religious Freedom], represent aggiornamento. And they are programmatic for the future. From now on, the Church defines her mission in the temporal order in terms of the realization of human dignity, the promotion of the rights of man, the growth of the human family towards unity, and the sanctification of the secular activities of this world. (John Courtney Murray, "The Issue of Church and State at Vatican Council II." *Theological Studies* 27 (1966): 601.)

The document received a majority of votes needed, but, in answer to the opponents,

On December 3, Monsignor Giuseppe di Meglio, an Italian specialist on international law, circulated a letter stating that the voting figures indicated "that for a notable number of Council Fathers the teaching and practical applications of the schema are not acceptable in conscience. In fact, the fundamental principle of the schema has remained unchanged despite the amendments that have been introduced: that is, the right of error Since the declaration on religious freedom has no dogmatic value, the negative votes of the Council Fathers will constitute a factor of great importance for the future studies of the declaration itself, and particularly for the interpretation to be placed upon it."

Father Courtney Murray described Monsignor di Meglio's position as the "tolerance" theory, based on the principle that "truth has exclusive rights and error no rights." Those who held this position, he said, were of the opinion that Catholicism should be the State religion wherever possible. Where this was not possible, non-Catholic religions were merely to be tolerated as the "lesser evil." By contrast, the supporters of what Father Courtney Murray called "the more contemporary theory of religious freedom" were convinced that this freedom was "an exigency of the dignity of the human person." They favored religious freedom not for opportunistic reasons, but because it was sound doctrine. (Wiltgen, 251-252)

Here again the Fathers are told it is not a Dogmatic document, and open to interpretation. Giovanni Montini gave full support and, as faithful Catholics believing he is pope and cannot error, accepted the document on December 7, 1965. Yet, why is this document opposed to Catholic teaching? First, what is the teaching of the Church concerning Liberty? Leo XIII devoted an encyclical to the topic (*Libertas*, June 20, 1888) in which he defines it as follows: *Liberty, the highest of natural*

endowments, being the portion only of intellectual or rational natures, confers on man this dignity—that he is "in the hand of his counsel" [Ecclus. 15:14.] and has power over his actions. This shows a twofold consideration: 1) Man chooses and 2) man is responsible for his choice. This is seen first in the choice of Adam who chose to disobey the command of God and the consequences of his choice set forth in chapter 3 of the book of Genesis. Leo points to this when he writes:

Man, indeed, is free to obey his reason, to seek moral good, and to strive unswervingly after his last end. Yet he is free also to turn aside to all other things; and, in pursuing the empty semblance of good, to disturb rightful order and to fall headlong into the destruction which he has voluntarily chosen. (Ibid.)

Leo XIII, stating the fact that man has free will and that man is responsible for his choice, which can have dire consequences, one must know that to have free will is not as an end in itself, or an absolute, but a faculty to obtain an end and must be directed toward that end. This is not a deprivation, but a freedom in and of itself:

Yet there are many who imagine that the Church is hostile to human liberty. Having a false and absurd notion as to what liberty is, either they pervert the very idea of freedom, or they extend it at their pleasure to many things in respect of which man cannot rightly be regarded as free. (Ibid.)

The question, then, lies on what choice is to be based upon; for on this foundation choice becomes either good or evil. If choice is to obtain a good, then, again, that good must be based on what determines it to be absolutely good. Animals seemingly randomly choose but there is no choice, the animals are only acting upon instinct, which is the only basis of their choice. But man possesses an intellect, wherein are knowledge and memory which provides understanding in choice. This gives rise to acceptance of a conscious person choosing—a soul in a body that has life in this world.

Liberty, then, as We have said, belongs only to those who have the gift of reason or intelligence. Considered as to its nature, it is the faculty of choosing means fitted for the end proposed, for he is master of his actions who can choose one thing out of many. Now, since everything chosen as a means is viewed as good or useful, and since good, as such, is the proper object of our desire, it follows that freedom of choice is a property of the will, or, rather, is identical with the will in so far as it has in its action the faculty of choice. But the will cannot proceed to act until it is enlightened by the knowledge possessed by the intellect. In other words, the good wished by the will is necessarily good in so far as it is known by the intellect; and this the more, because in all voluntary acts choice is subsequent to a judgment upon the truth of the good presented, declaring to which good preference should be given. No sensible man can doubt that judgment is an act of reason, not of the will. The end, or object, both of the rational will and of its liberty is that good only which is in conformity with reason. (Ibid., 5.)

Now if man was in a state of perfection, that is, he knew what was absolutely good, he would know unmistakably what he should choose and could be left to choose. But man is not in a perfect state (since the fall from grace), therefore he cannot be left to choose alone but must be assisted. Error

in choice is not from freedom of choice, but from a defect in judgment influenced by ignorance or concupiscence or external forces (world, Satan).

*Since, however, both these faculties are imperfect, it is possible, as is often seen, that the reason should propose something which is not really good, but which has the appearance of good, and that the will should choose accordingly. For, as the possibility of error, and actual error, are defects of the mind and attest its imperfection, so the pursuit of what has a false appearance of good, though a proof of our freedom, just as a disease is a proof of our vitality, implies defect in human liberty. The will also, simply because of its dependence on the reason, no sooner desires anything contrary thereto than it abuses its freedom of choice and corrupts its very essence. Thus it is that the infinitely perfect God, although supremely free, because of the supremacy of His intellect and of His essential goodness, nevertheless cannot choose evil; neither can the angels and saints, who enjoy the beatific vision. St. Augustine and others urged most admirably against the Pelagians that, if the possibility of deflection from good belonged to the essence or perfection of liberty, then God, Jesus Christ, and the angels and saints, who have not this power, would have no liberty at all, or would have less liberty than man has in his state of pilgrimage and imperfection. This subject is often discussed by the Angelic Doctor in his demonstration that the possibility of sinning is not freedom, but slavery. It will suffice to quote his subtle commentary on the words of our Lord: "Whosoever committeth sin is the slave of sin." [John 8:34.] "Everything," he says, "is that which belongs to it naturally. When, therefore, it acts through a power outside itself, it does not act of itself, but through another, that is, as a slave. But man is by nature rational. When, therefore, he acts according to reason, he acts of himself and according to his free will; and this is liberty. Whereas, when he sins, he acts in opposition to reason, is moved by another, and is the victim of foreign misapprehensions. Therefore, 'Whosoever committeth sin is the slave of sin'." [Thomas Aquinas, *On the Gospel of St. John*, cap. VIII, lect. 4, n. 3 (ed. Vives, Vol. 20 p. 95).] Even the heathen philosophers clearly recognized this truth, especially they who held that the wise man alone is free; and by the term "wise man" was meant, as is well known, the man trained to live in accordance with his nature, that is, in justice and virtue. (Ibid., 6)*

Therefore, because of this imperfection, man needs help in order to be free to make the right choices.

Such, then, being the condition of human liberty, it necessarily stands in need of light and strength to direct its actions to good and to restrain them from evil. Without this, the freedom of our will would be our ruin. First of all, there must be law; that is, a fixed rule of teaching what is to be done and what is to be left undone. This rule cannot affect the lower animals in any true sense, since they act of necessity, following their natural instinct, and cannot of themselves act in any other way. On the other hand, as was said above, he who is free can either act or not act, can do this or do that, as he pleases, because his judgment precedes his choice. And his judgment not only decides what is right or wrong of its own nature, but also what is practically good and therefore to be chosen, and what is practically evil and therefore to be avoided. In other words, the reason prescribes to the will what it should seek after or shun, in order to the eventual attainment of man's last end, for the sake of which all his actions ought to be performed. This ordination of reason is called law. In man's free will, therefore, or in the moral necessity of our voluntary acts being in accordance with reason, lies the very root of the necessity of law. Nothing more foolish can be uttered or conceived than the notion that, because man is free by nature, he is therefore exempt

from law. Were this the case, it would follow that to become free we must be deprived of reason; whereas the truth is that we are bound to submit to law precisely because we are free by our very nature. For, law is the guide of man's actions; it turns him toward good by its rewards, and deters him from evil by its punishments. (Ibid., 7)

And Leo XIII, then, gives us the basis of liberty, that is, what liberty must be based upon:

*From this it is manifest that the eternal law of God is the sole standard and rule of human liberty, not only in each individual man, but also in the community and civil society which men constitute when united. Therefore, the true liberty of human society does not consist in every man doing what he pleases, for this would simply end in turmoil and confusion, and bring on the overthrow of the State; but rather in this, that through the injunctions of the civil law all may more easily conform to the prescriptions of the eternal law. Likewise, the liberty of those who are in authority does not consist in the power to lay unreasonable and capricious commands upon their subjects, which would equally be criminal and would lead to the ruin of the commonwealth; but the binding force of human laws is in this, that they are to be regarded as applications of the eternal law, and incapable of sanctioning anything which is not contained in the eternal law, as in the principle of all law. Thus, St. Augustine most wisely says: "I think that you can see, at the same time, that there is nothing just and lawful in that temporal law, unless what men have gathered from this eternal law." [Augustine, *De libero arbitrio*, lib. I, cap. 6, n. 15 (PL 32, 1229).] If, then, by anyone in authority, something be sanctioned out of conformity with the principles of right reason, and consequently hurtful to the commonwealth, such an enactment can have no binding force of law, as being no rule of justice, but certain to lead men away from that good which is the very end of civil society. (Ibid., 10)*

In the words, then, of Pope Leo XIII, Freedom or Liberty is in choosing to live according to right reason, and choosing to live according to right reason is choosing to live according to the eternal law of God, be it written in the heart or as taught through divine revelation as held by the Church.

Therefore, the nature of human liberty, however it be considered, whether in individuals or in society, whether in those who command or in those who obey, supposes the necessity of obedience to some supreme and eternal law, which is no other than the authority of God, commanding good and forbidding evil. And, so far from this most just authority of God over men diminishing, or even destroying their liberty, it protects and perfects it, for the real perfection of all creatures is found in the prosecution and attainment of their respective ends; but the supreme end to which human liberty must aspire is God.

These precepts of the truest and highest teaching, made known to us by the light of reason itself, the Church, instructed by the example and doctrine of her divine Author, has ever propagated and asserted; for she has ever made them the measure of her office and of her teaching to the Christian nations. As to morals, the laws of the Gospel not only immeasurably surpass the wisdom of the heathen, but are an invitation and an introduction to a state of holiness unknown to the ancients; and, bringing man nearer to God, they make him at once the possessor of a more perfect liberty. Thus, the powerful influence of the Church has ever been manifested in the custody and protection of the civil and political liberty of the people. The enumeration of its merits in this respect does not belong to our present purpose. It is sufficient to recall the fact that slavery, that old reproach

of the heathen nations, was mainly abolished by the beneficent efforts of the Church. The impartiality of law and the true brotherhood of man were first asserted by Jesus Christ; and His apostles re-echoed His voice when they declared that in future there was to be neither Jew, nor Gentile, nor barbarian, nor Scythian, but all were brothers in Christ. So powerful, so conspicuous, in this respect is the influence of the Church that experience abundantly testifies how savage customs are no longer possible in any land where she has once set her foot; but that gentleness speedily takes the place of cruelty, and the light of truth quickly dispels the darkness of barbarism. Nor has the Church been less lavish in the benefits she has conferred on civilized nations in every age, either by resisting the tyranny of the wicked, or by protecting the innocent and helpless from injury, or, finally, by using her influence in the support of any form of government which commended itself to the citizens at home, because of its justice, or was feared by their enemies without, because of its power. (Ibid., 11-12)

And it is in this sense that one can understand those passages of Scripture that speak of liberty, such as the following:

Saint Paul: For you, brethren, have been called unto liberty: only make not liberty an occasion to the flesh, but by charity of the spirit serve one another. (Gal. 5:13)

Saint James: But he that hath looked into the perfect law of liberty, and hath continued therein, not becoming a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work; this man shall be blessed in his deed. (James 1:25) So speak ye, and so do, as being to be judged by the law of liberty. (Ibid. 2:12)

Saint Peter: As free, and not as making liberty a cloak for malice, but as the servants of God. (1 Peter 2:16) Promising them liberty, whereas they themselves are the slaves of corruption. For by whom a man is overcome, of the same also he is the slave. (2 Peter 2:19)

Therefore, one is free to do the Will of God and therefore one has the obligation to find out what is the Will of God. One is not free to do whatever one wants. Courtney Murray wanted to separate Church and State and therefore separate Freedom and Divine Law, making the state, as the will of the people, supreme as understood by Freemasonic Republics, not the Will of God as taught by the Church. Leo XIII, in writing his encyclical knew full well this was the intention of those who propagated freedom of conscience and so he continues to reveal and condemn this notion:

... But many there are who follow in the footsteps of Lucifer, and adopt as their own his rebellious cry, "I will not serve"; and consequently substitute for true liberty what is sheer and most foolish license. Such, for instance, are the men belonging to that widely spread and powerful organization, who, usurping the name of liberty, style themselves liberals.

What naturalists or rationalists aim at in philosophy, that the supporters of liberalism, carrying out the principles laid down by naturalism, are attempting in the domain of morality and politics. The fundamental doctrine of rationalism is the supremacy of the human reason, which, refusing due submission to the divine and eternal reason, proclaims its own independence, and constitutes itself the supreme principle and source and judge of truth. Hence, these followers of liberalism deny the existence of any divine authority to which obedience is due, and proclaim that every man is the law to himself; from which arises that ethical system which they style independent morality, and which, under the guise of liberty, exonerates man from any obedience to the commands of

God, and substitutes a boundless license. The end of all this it is not difficult to foresee, especially when society is in question. For, when once man is firmly persuaded that he is subject to no one, it follows that the efficient cause of the unity of civil society is not to be sought in any principle external to man, or superior to him, but simply in the free will of individuals; that the authority in the State comes from the people only; and that, just as every man's individual reason is his only rule of life, so the collective reason of the community should be the supreme guide in the management of all public affairs. Hence the doctrine of the supremacy of the greater number, and that all right and all duty reside in the majority. But, from what has been said, it is clear that all this is in contradiction to reason. To refuse any bond of union between man and civil society, on the one hand, and God the Creator and consequently the supreme Law-giver, on the other, is plainly repugnant to the nature, not only of man, but of all created things; for, of necessity, all effects must in some proper way be connected with their cause; and it belongs to the perfection of every nature to contain itself within that sphere and grade which the order of nature has assigned to it, namely, that the lower should be subject and obedient to the higher. (Libertas, 14, 15)

Freedom of Religion must be distinguished from civil freedom of religion, that is, the state's obligation to not interfere with religion, and freedom of religion as in the right to choose any religion or none at all. Without fear of what non-Catholics may object, the Church will insist on the State allowing the Catholic freedom of his religion based on the civil Constitution, but cannot tolerate freedom of religion that is in opposition to the acceptance of the absolute truth of Divine Revelation, which must be accepted. Therefore, again, quoting Pope Leo XIII:

To make this more evident, the growth of liberty ascribed to our age must be considered apart in its various details. And, first, let us examine that liberty in individuals which is so opposed to the virtue of religion, namely, the liberty of worship, as it is called. This is based on the principle that every man is free to profess as he may choose any religion or none.

But, assuredly, of all the duties which man has to fulfill, that, without doubt, is the chiefest and holiest which commands him to worship God with devotion and piety. This follows of necessity from the truth that we are ever in the power of God, are ever guided by His will and providence, and, having come forth from Him, must return to Him. Add to which, no true virtue can exist without religion, for moral virtue is concerned with those things which lead to God as man's supreme and ultimate good; and therefore religion, which (as St. Thomas says) "performs those actions which are directly and immediately ordained for the divine honor,"[Summa theologiae, Ila-IIae, q. lxxxii, a. 6. Answer.] rules and tempers all virtues. And if it be asked which of the many conflicting religions it is necessary to adopt, reason and the natural law unhesitatingly tell us to practice that one which God enjoins, and which men can easily recognize by certain exterior notes, whereby Divine Providence has willed that it should be distinguished, because, in a matter of such moment, the most terrible loss would be the consequence of error. Wherefore, when a liberty such as We have described is offered to man, the power is given him to pervert or abandon with impunity the most sacred of duties, and to exchange the unchangeable good for evil; which, as We have said, is no liberty, but its degradation, and the abject submission of the soul to sin.

This kind of liberty, if considered in relation to the State, clearly implies that there is no reason why the State should offer any homage to God, or should desire any public recognition of Him; that no one form of worship is to be preferred to another, but that all stand on an equal footing,

no account being taken of the religion of the people, even if they profess the Catholic faith. But, to justify this, it must needs be taken as true that the State has no duties toward God, or that such duties, if they exist, can be abandoned with impunity, both of which assertions are manifestly false. For it cannot be doubted but that, by the will of God, men are united in civil society; whether its component parts be considered; or its form, which implies authority; or the object of its existence; or the abundance of the vast services which it renders to man. God it is who has made man for society, and has placed him in the company of others like himself, so that what was wanting to his nature, and beyond his attainment if left to his own resources, he might obtain by association with others. Wherefore, civil society must acknowledge God as its Founder and Parent, and must obey and reverence His power and authority. Justice therefore forbids, and reason itself forbids, the State to be godless; or to adopt a line of action which would end in godlessness – namely, to treat the various religions (as they call them) alike, and to bestow upon them promiscuously equal rights and privileges. (Ibid., 19-21)

In the United States, its citizens live in a pluralistic society where the state supposedly does not give preference to any religion, therefore in the civil sphere, as citizens of a Republican form of government, Freedom of Religion, according to the Constitution of the United States, is granted as viewed under Article VI, in which one reads:

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.

And the Bill of Rights, First Amendment, the very first words which declares: *Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . .*

But this was 1965 and several Countries (e.g., Spain, Portugal, Malta) still upheld Catholicism as the State religion and based their laws according to Catholic teaching. It was a direct attack on these Countries which one witnessed after Vatican II, for Catholic Statesmen were attacked by the Conciliar Hierarchy for upholding Catholic laws. Why, because the Declaration on Religious Liberty, *Dignitatis humanae*, now taught the opposite of what the Catholic Church held:

A sense of the dignity of the human person has been impressing itself more and more deeply on the consciousness of contemporary man, and the demand is increasingly made that men should act on their own judgment, enjoying and making use of a responsible freedom, not driven by coercion but motivated by a sense of duty. The demand is likewise made that constitutional limits should be set to the powers of government, in order that there may be no encroachment on the rightful freedom of the person and of associations. This demand for freedom in human society chiefly regards the quest for the values proper to the human spirit. It regards, in the first place, the free exercise of religion in society. This Vatican Council takes careful note of these desires in the minds of men. It proposes to declare them to be greatly in accord with truth and justice. To this end, it searches into the sacred tradition and doctrine of the Church-the treasury out of which the Church continually brings forth new things that are in harmony with the things that are old.

. . . Religious freedom, in turn, which men demand as necessary to fulfill their duty to worship God, has to do with immunity from coercion in civil society. Therefore it leaves untouched traditional Catholic doctrine on the moral duty of men and societies toward the true religion and toward the one Church of Christ.

Over and above all this, the council intends to develop the doctrine of recent popes on the inviolable rights of the human person and the constitutional order of society.

2. This Vatican Council declares that the human person has a right to religious freedom. This freedom means that all men are to be immune from coercion on the part of individuals or of social groups and of any human power, in such wise that no one is to be forced to act in a manner contrary to his own beliefs, whether privately or publicly, whether alone or in association with others, within due limits.

The council further declares that the right to religious freedom has its foundation in the very dignity of the human person as this dignity is known through the revealed word of God and by reason itself. (Cf. John XXIII, encycl. "Pacem in Terris", April 11, 1963: AAS 55 (1963), pp. 260-261; Pius XII, radio message, Dec. 24, 1942: AAS 35 (1943), p. 19; Pius XI, encycl. "Mit Brennender Sorge", March 14, 1937: AAS 29 (1937), p. 160; Leo XIII, encycl. "Libertas Praestantissimum", June 20, 1888: Acts of Leo XIII 8 (1888), p. 237-238.) This 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 is in accordance with their dignity as persons—that is, beings endowed with reason and free will and therefore privileged to bear personal responsibility—that all men should be at once impelled by nature and also bound by a moral obligation to seek the truth, especially religious truth. They are also bound to adhere to the truth, once it is known, and to order their whole lives in accord with the demands of truth. However, men cannot discharge these obligations in a manner in keeping with their own nature unless they enjoy immunity from external coercion as well as psychological freedom. Therefore the right to religious freedom has its foundation not in the subjective disposition of the person, but in his very nature. In consequence, the right to this immunity continues to exist even in those who do not live up to their obligation of seeking the truth and adhering to it and the exercise of this right is not to be impeded, provided that just public order be observed.

What is here presented is a rejection of ordering liberty upon the laws of God, which the State has the obligation to do, a rejection of seeking conversions to the Catholic faith, and it initiates even bringing up children in the faith of the non-believing parents. It is difficult to accept that the Council Fathers were so inept as to accept such a document unless they believed they had to just rubber stamp whatever was presented as approved by Giovanni Montini. But this document gets worse.

If, in view of peculiar circumstances obtaining among peoples, special civil recognition is given to one religious community in the constitutional order of society, it is at the same time imperative that the right of all citizens and religious communities to religious freedom should be recognized and made effective in practice.

Finally, government is to see to it that equality of citizens before the law, which is itself an element of the common good, is never violated, whether openly or covertly, for religious reasons. Nor is there to be discrimination among citizens.

It follows that a wrong is done when government imposes upon its people, by force or fear or other means, the profession or repudiation of any religion, or when it hinders men from joining or leaving a religious community. All the more is it a violation of the will of God and of the sacred rights of the person and the family of nations when force is brought to bear in any way in order to destroy or repress religion, either in the whole of mankind or in a particular country or in a definite community.

7. The right to religious freedom is exercised in human society: hence its exercise is subject to certain regulatory norms. In the use of all freedoms the moral principle of personal and social responsibility is to be observed. In the exercise of their rights, individual men and social groups are bound by the moral law to have respect both for the rights of others and for their own duties toward others and for the common welfare of all. Men are to deal with their fellows in justice and civility.

Furthermore, society has the right to defend itself against possible abuses committed on the pretext of freedom of religion. It is the special duty of government to provide this protection. However, government is not to act in an arbitrary fashion or in an unfair spirit of partisanship. Its action is to be controlled by juridical norms which are in conformity with the objective moral order. These norms arise out of the need for the effective safeguard of the rights of all citizens and for the peaceful settlement of conflicts of rights, also out of the need for an adequate care of genuine public peace, which comes about when men live together in good order and in true justice, and finally out of the need for a proper guardianship of public morality.

These matters constitute the basic component of the common welfare: they are what is meant by public order. For the rest, the usages of society are to be the usages of freedom in their full range: that is, the freedom of man is to be respected as far as possible and is not to be curtailed except when and insofar as necessary.

In other words, as mentioned above, Catholic countries could no longer hold the Catholic faith as the only true religion, but one among many, and in the public square they would be forced to allow non-Catholics to hold offices in a Catholic country. And, if the government felt, such as witnessed today, that Catholics were abusing Freedom of Religion, i.e., by refusing to allow divorce, homosexual relationships, or perform abortions, it has the right to ask the juridical arm (courts of law) to force them to allow divorce, allow homosexuality and perform abortions. One can say that the Conciliar Church tied its own hands behind its own back because it surrendered any ability to defend itself against the state.

To gather support for this document, Giovanni Montini pulled the Archbishop of Prague, Josef Beran, out of Czechoslovakia as a witness to state suppression of the Church and support of the concept of religious liberty contained in Courtney Murray's document. Standing before the Council Fathers on September 20, 1965, this Archbishop didn't point out the Communist

government as denying religious liberty to Catholics but blamed the Catholic Church for denying religious liberty to John Hus and the Hussites:

. . . also in my country the Catholic Church still suffers for that what was performed in her name against freedom of conscience as the burning of the priest John Hus, or the external coercion of a large part of the Czech nation to accept again the Catholic Faith. . . .

Calling for repentance of the part of the Church he asked that *the principle of religious freedom and freedom of conscience . . . be set forth clearly and without any restriction flowing from opportunistic considerations*. It was a complete betrayal to the Catholics suffering at the hands of the Communist Antonin Novotny! Josef Beran had already betrayed the Catholics when he had the *Te Deum* sung in the Cathedral upon the election of the Communist Klement Gottwald. In contrast, Cardinal Jozsef Mindszenty was forced to leave Hungary (28 September, 1971) by the Americans and be accepted by Montini as a *victim of history* (not a martyr under Communism); Montini then annulled all of Mindszenty's acts against the Communists of Hungary.

In 1960 Communism was threatening half the world with its terrorism and elimination of Catholic institutions, as well as the destruction of family life and human advancement in the attainment of economic development. From the very beginning bishops made it known that if there was to be a document of the Church in the Modern World, it would need to contain a section on how the Church was to address the horrific criminality of atheistic Communism, which can be evidenced in Wiltgen's treatment of the topic. Rather puzzled or perhaps simply amused, Wiltgen narrates the events of how Paul VI and the Vatican Council Commission set up for the drafting of the document (which included Karol Wojtyla) stopped any attempt to condemn Communism.

Archbishop Paul Yu Pin of Nanking, China, speaking two days later [October 23, 1965] in the name of 70 Council Fathers, asked for the addition of a new chapter on atheistic communism. The Council must not neglect to discuss it, he said, "because communism is one of the greatest, most evident and most unfortunate of modern phenomena." It had to be treated in order to satisfy the expectations of all peoples, "especially those who groan under the yoke of communism and are forced to endure indescribable sorrows unjustly."

Josef Cardinal Beran, exiled archbishop of Prague, residing in Rome, received a Czechoslovakian newspaper clipping which boasted that communists had succeeded in infiltrating every commission at the Vatican Council.

On April 7, 1965, while the schema was being revised, Pope Paul founded a Secretariat for Non-Believers, with the purpose of fostering dialogue with atheists. Cardinal König of Vienna, who had frequently served in a liaison capacity for the Vatican with the governments of communist countries, was placed in charge.

By September 14, 1965, the opening date of the fourth session, a revision of the atheism section in the schema on the Church in the modern world was in the hands of the Council Fathers, but once again it contained no explicit reference to communism. The silence prompted the circulation of a letter, dated September 29, 1965, signed by 25 bishops, giving ten reasons why Marxist communism should be treated by the Council. A petition in the form of a written intervention

requesting such treatment accompanied the letter, which was widely distributed among the Council Fathers.

The letter maintained that eventual silence by the Council on communism, after the latest Popes and the Holy Office had said so much about it, would be "equivalent to disavowing all that has been said and done up till now." Just as Pope Pius XII was at present being publicly reprimanded—but unjustly—for having kept silent on the Jews, the letter warned, so one could well imagine that "tomorrow the Council will be reproved—and justly so—for its silence on communism, which will be taken as a sign of cowardice and conniving." This lengthy letter had been written by Bishop Carli and was distributed by Archbishops Sigaud and Lefebvre, but their names were not included among the 25 signatures. They had purposely withheld them because there was great antagonism against them, both in the liberal camp and in the press. . .

Bishop Carli sent a letter of protest to the Council Presidency, responsible for the enforcement of Council rules, and copies of it to the Cardinal Moderators, General Secretariat and Administrative Tribunal, for their information. He called attention to the fact that "450 Council Fathers," and himself among them, had presented "a certain amendment to the General Secretariat within the prescribed time," which the commission in making its revision had completely ignored. After quoting several directives from the Rules of Procedure, he stated that they clearly signified that "all amendments must be printed and communicated to the Council Fathers, so that they can decide by vote whether they wish to admit or reject each one."

He also labeled as illegal the action taken by the joint commission, and charged that "this manner of admitting or rejecting amendments of the Council Fathers—and, in our case, even without giving reasons for doing so—turns a commission of no more than 30 persons into a judicial body against which there is no appeal." And although the Council Fathers together with the Supreme Pontiff were in reality the true judges, for all practical purposes they were merely being asked by the commission to state whether or not they were pleased with the decisions taken by the commission. This made it appear, he said, that "the commission members, rather than the Council Fathers, constitute the Council." (Op. cit., 273-275)

**See Appendix.*

Wiltgen goes on to relate how the Commissions, under Paul VI, denied knowing anything of the documents, then how it was covered up, finally providing a scapegoat and confirming that it was received but now it was too late (and making sure by giving free tickets to the Council Fathers to take a trip to Florence to honor Dante), with a promise of a footnote. And, speaking of footnotes, what are Catholics to understand when, attached to *Gaudium et spes* there is this footnote that this document has a *pastoral slant* and *doctrinal slant*, *id est*, it isn't pastoral and it isn't doctrinal, so what is it? An evolving teaching that changes with the *changeable circumstances* as evidenced in the footnote:

The Pastoral Constitution "De Ecclesia in Mundo Huius Temporis" [Gaudium et spes] is made up of two parts; yet it constitutes an organic unity. By way of explanation: the constitution is called "pastoral" because, while resting on doctrinal principles, it seeks to express the relation of the Church to the world and modern mankind. The result is that, on the one hand, a pastoral slant is present in the first part, and, on the other hand, a doctrinal slant is present in the second part. In

*the first part, the Church develops her teaching on man, on the world which is the enveloping context of man's existence, and on man's relations to his fellow men. In part two, the Church gives closer consideration to various aspects of modern life and human society; special consideration is given to those questions and problems which, in this general area, seem to have a greater urgency in our day. As a result in part two the subject matter which is viewed in the light of doctrinal principles is made up of diverse elements. Some elements have a permanent value; others, only a transitory one. Consequently, the constitution must be interpreted according to the general norms of theological interpretation. Interpreters must bear in mind—especially in part two—the changeable circumstances which the subject matter, by its very nature, involves. (Footnote 1, *Gaudium et spes*.)*

With Giovanni Montini's visit to the United Nations on October 4, 1965, where all the political leaders gather for peace between nations, it seems Montini wanted *Gaudium et spes* to be a charter with Rome the center for a United Religions that brought Religious Leaders together to discuss differences among religions and to work for "peace" among religions—the outcome can be seen with Assisi in 1986 where Karol Wojtyla, who helped Montini author *Gaudium et spes*, addressed the leaders on October 27 in these words:

*My Brothers and Sisters,
Heads and Representatives of the Christian Churches
and Ecclesial Communities and of the World Religions,*

Dear Friends,

I have the honor and pleasure of welcoming all of you for our World Day of Prayer in this town of Assisi. Let me begin by thanking you from the bottom of my heart, for the openness and good will with which you have accepted my invitation to pray at Assisi.

As religious leaders you have come here not for an interreligious Conference on peace, where the emphasis would be on discussion or research for plans of action on a worldwide scale in favour of a common cause.

The coming together of so many religious leaders to pray is in itself an invitation today to the world to become aware that there exists another dimension of peace and another way of promoting it which is not a result of negotiations, political compromises or economic bargainings. It is the result of prayer, which, in the diversity of religions, expresses a relationship with a supreme power that surpasses our human capacities alone.

We come from afar, not only, for many of us, by reason of geographical distance, but above all because of our respective historical and spiritual origins.

The fact that we have come here does not imply any intention of seeking a religious consensus among ourselves or of negotiating our faith convictions. Neither does it mean that religions can be reconciled at the level of a common commitment in an earthly project which would surpass them all. Nor is it a concession to relativism in religious beliefs, because every human being must sincerely follow his or her upright conscience with the intention of seeking and obeying the truth.

Our meeting attests only - and this is its real significance for the people of our time - that in the great battle for peace, humanity, in its very diversity, must draw from its deepest and most vivifying sources where its conscience is formed and upon which is founded the moral action of all people. (cf. http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/speeches/1986/october/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19861027_prayer-peace-assisi.html.)

Vatican Council II ended on December 8, 1965 after finishing the approval of the *Declaration on Religious Liberty*, *Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity*, *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests*, and the *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* on December 7, 1965. Tragically all the bishops present signed all the documents with few exceptions. Giovanni Montini, like Martin Luther and Henry VIII, was given his Novus Ordo Church by the very ones who should have fought to preserve the Catholic Faith from the innovators.

As banal as it may seem, the New Mass was already in the making and the evil spirit of Vatican II was invading the once sacred sanctuaries of the Roman Catholic Church: Missale Romanums were being marked up to indicate the easy changes of elimination (the sacredness of the Missale was already done away when the priests marked up their Missales for the changes of 1962—previously there would be an insert for a new Saint's Mass—never did the Ordinary change), tables were being introduced for the more innovative liturgists among the clergy, more and more vernacular was being used and less Latin, songs were being introduced that were better suited for the local Protestant revival or campfire, statues were being removed in a neo-iconoclastic program to remove everything devotional and/or offensive to the Protestants, and church architecture began to address the building as a pantheon (in the round, but also translated as “all the gods”) or triangular (Grand Architect—masonic?). Each week brought some novelty and each service was different—from a quiet Latin Mass at 6:00 am attended by the elderly to the hootenanny Mass (by 1967) at 5:30 pm attended by the teenagers. Though the laity and clergy who complained were told these were just abuses, none of the abuses stopped; rather, the laity who complained were told to go elsewhere and the clergy who complained were removed to some isolated hole in the ground as a punishment for being too rigid. Despite the Vatican supposedly replying against the innovations when groups of laity and clergy sent massive amounts of letters, each document coming from Rome was a further affirmation of or introduction to innovations. The local Catholic Church where one was baptized before 1960 no longer looked the same after 1965.

The world, too, was no longer the same. Instead of peace, there was war. Instead of economic success, poverty was increasing. Instead of stable marriages, divorce was now becoming something every family was beginning to experience. Instead of vocations to the religious life or priesthood increasing, from the close of Vatican II there began a decrease, and, as in the time of the Protestant Reformation, a flight of religious from convents and monasteries and priests leaving and marrying. Instead of more people assisting at Mass, there were less people attending the sterile travesties now offered in place of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Catholics went from converting Protestants to being converted to Protestants (and now also Mohammedans).

Those who followed Vatican II changed. They no longer had the Faith that was unchangeable but a Church that would constantly change and see itself as defectible as it continuously apologizes to the world for its errors of the past. Those who follow the Conciliar Church no longer accepted that

man was condemned to eternal perdition and all men are lost unless they become members of the one true Church (that is, they become a living member of the Mystical Body of Christ); this Conciliar Church teaches that all men are on the path to heaven unless they absolutely don't want to be (and even then, some Conciliar theologians will say they still are but just don't know it.)

Is the Chair of Peter Vacant?

Sixth Contradiction: Holy Mass: A Sacrifice or a Meal?

If you turn a 9 topsy-turvy, you have a 6 and place with '66 it truly has significance when one arrives at the year 1966. Everything began to become topsy-turvy and antichrist: A war we were told we were winning in Vietnam we were losing. Peace that was to be obtained by a United Nations was confronted by more civil wars than ever before. The young people were turning away from respect of elders and, obedient to the Rock music to which they were listening, they rebelled against the moral order. By March 4, John Lennon of the Beatles could tell Maureen Cleave of the *London Evening Standard* that the Beatles are "more popular than Jesus now". And on April 8 the *Time* magazine cover story asks "Is God Dead?" The contents called religious leaders to no longer stress belief in God as living the ideas of their religion since modern science was now able to answer all the "mysteries" of the ancients and medicine would eventually be able to find all the cures to suffering and illness, eliminating a need to turn to God for the answers. Scientists were able to send rockets into space, even to the moon and beyond, as the Russian space probe, Venera 3, reached Venus on March 1 and United States Surveyor 1 landed in the Oceanus Procellarum on the Moon on June 2, so the Earth was no longer the center of the Universe in the psyche of human beings although self still remained the center of purpose.

The dark side was appearing even more prevalent with Anton LaVey founding the Church of Satan in San Francisco with a numbers of followers; while on April 20, Timothy Leary would start the League for Spiritual Discovery with LSD as its sacrament and giving birth to the drug culture. The apex would not be Woodstock in 1969, but when Nico [Christa Päffgen] and the Tangerine Dreams performed in the Rheim's Cathedral on December 13, 1974, with the approval of the Conciliar Church, and in which drug use was part of the "religious experience". The scene inside this ancient landmark of Catholic Faith in France was a chaotic medley of young people sprawled throughout the Cathedral interior while high on drugs to participate in their "religious experience", saturated with the smell of relieved urine and feces that erased away the centuries of incensed offered to God.

Meanwhile, the Conciliar Church was busy with its committees selectively choosing progressive narcissists to develop new liturgical forms that stressed humanism rather than the divine (the only divine acknowledged was the claim of the divine in humanity). Though these committees were generally futile, since Giovanni Montini already had Annibale Bugnini working with seven protestants to formulate a Novus Ordo service, it did serve well to have a cheerleading squad to welcome the unwelcomed.

By 1967, instead of the nations turning to God they were turning from God. Albania declared itself an atheist state while The Rolling Stones released (December 8) an album called *Their Satanic Majesties Request*. *Hair*, a Rock Musical portrayal of a Bohemian group's communal life of rebellion, was put on stage and became so successful that it grew into a Broadway hit the following year—even though it was no more than a portrayal of anti-war drug addicts engaging in promiscuous sex and capable of only verbalizing obscenities. Such seeming absurdity of

acceptance of the appalling is attributed to the hypnotic beat (rock) music by some, though its promotion must have been well financed that allowed what was not only counter-culture but degradation for it to become mainstream. Apparently this was the direction Giovanni Montini was moving the Conciliar Church in, for as he wrote in his encyclical *Populorum progressio* on March 26, 1967, by which he states:

The progressive development of peoples is an object of deep interest and concern to the Church. This is particularly true in the case of those peoples who are trying to escape the ravages of hunger, poverty, endemic disease and ignorance; of those who are seeking a larger share in the benefits of civilization and a more active improvement of their human qualities; of those who are consciously striving for fuller growth.

Giovanni Montini seemed to be another Nero playing the violin while Rome burned. Instead of seeing the destruction of the Church, Montini could only see a new world order built upon a humanity he seemed to not understand was unable to progress without grace. And, with the Council's call to protest against *state overstepping its competence* and for *the benefit of the whole human family*, . . . *contribute to the formation of a type of man who will be cultivated, peace-loving and well-disposed towards all his fellow men* (*Gaudium et spes*, 74) there were no longer Masses and Novenas led by the Clergy and Religious; rather you had Phillip and Daniel Berrigan and other priests leading protests and burning draft cards along with Nuns in habits. It would become apparent that one would no longer associate Sisters in a convent, but on the streets with Martin Luther King, Caesar Chavez, and other Communist supported activists. Today, of course, they don't wear habits, but these women still claim to be nuns having a vocation tackling *social issues* rather than leading our young women to sanctity as witnessed with the "Nuns on the Bus" in the present day. This is not to say that the social issues are not a concern—for justice is what all must strive for and charity compels the individual to assist one in need when able: ***He that hath the substance of this world, and shall see his brother in need, and shall shut up his bowels from him: how doth the charity of God abide in him?*** (1 John 3:17) Still, when one came to him to complain of injustice, Our Lord refused to interfere:

And one of the multitude said to him: Master, speak to my brother that he divide the inheritance with me. But he said to him: Man, who hath appointed me judge, or divider, over you? And he said to them: Take heed and beware of all covetousness; for a man's life doth not consist in the abundance of things which he possesseth. (Luke 12:13-15)

Instead of Catholic young men and women flocking to the Seminaries and Convents, there was the opposite effect. The following chart of USA statistics is from:

<http://cara.georgetown.edu/frequently-requestested-church-statistics/> (Retrieved August 2. 2018):

Clergy & Religious - USA	1965	1975	1985	1995	2005	2015	2017
--------------------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Total priests	58,632	58,909	57,317	49,054	41,399	37,578	37,181
Diocesan priests	35,925	36,005	35,052	32,349	28,094	25,868	25,757
Religious priests	22,707	22,904	22,265	16,705	13,305	11,710	11,424
Priestly ordinations	994	771	533	511	454	515	504
Graduate-level seminarians	8,325	5,279	4,063	3,172	3,308	3,650	3,405
Religious sisters	179,954	135,225	115,386	90,809	68,634	48,546	45,605
Religious brothers	12,271	8,625	7,544	6,535	5,451	4,200	4,007

1965 was considered the apex of vocations. Michael Davies (*Liturgical Revolution*, Vol. II, 304) has quoted the *Times* of May 24, 1976, that in the United States alone over 10,000 priests left the priesthood since 1965 and 35,000 nuns had abandoned their convents. One can only recall the Protestant Reformation and the rejection of the Catholic faith to bring such an apostasy of priests and religious. 1967 began the avalanche of lay Catholics leaving the Church as the teachings of Vatican II began to show its fruits. When the introduction of Conciliar changes to the Mass began to take place in January 1965, immediately it was universally denounced by Catholics who saw the consequences of the Document by the introduction of the vernacular in the Mass and the use of the table, whereby the priest faced the congregants. To Catholics gathered in Rome to protest such changes, Giovanni Montini addressed them with these words:

Beloved Sons and Daughters! At an audience like this, our friendly conversation must deal with the subject of the day: the application of liturgical reform to the celebration of Holy Mass. If the public nature of this meeting didn't make it impossible, We would like to ask—as We do in private conversations—about your impressions of this great new event. It deserves the attention of everyone. We believe, however, that your reply to Our question would not be very different from those that We have been receiving these days.

Liturgical reform? You can reduce the replies to two categories. The first comprises the replies that indicate a certain confusion, and hence a certain amount of annoyance. Previously, according to these observers, everything was peaceful; everyone could pray as he wished; we understood all about the way in which the ceremony was carried on. Now, everything is new, surprising, changed; even the ringing of the bells at the Sanctus has been done away with. And then those prayers that one doesn't know where to find; Communion being received standing up; and Mass ending cut short with a blessing. Everyone responding, a lot of people moving around, ceremonies and readings recited out loud. . . In short, there is no longer any peace, and we understand less than we did before; and so on.

We won't offer a criticism of these observations, because We would have to point out how they reveal very little penetration into the meaning of the religious rites and give evidence not of true devotion and a true sense of the meaning and value of Holy Mass, but rather a certain spiritual laziness that isn't personal effort on understanding and participating in order to better comprehend and carry out the most sacred of religious acts, in which we are invited, and indeed obliged, to join.

*We will just repeat what is being said over and over again these days by all priests who are pastors of souls and by all the good teachers of religion. First, it is inevitable that there be a certain amount of confusion and annoyance in the beginning. It is in the very nature of a reform of age-old religious customs that have been piously observed, a reform that is practical-not to mention spiritual-that it should produce a little agitation that will not always be pleasant. But, secondly, a little bit of explanation, a little bit of preparation, a little bit of careful help, will quickly remove the uncertainties and soon produce a feeling and a taste for the new order. **For, thirdly, you mustn't believe that after a while people are going to go back to being quiet and devout, or lazy, as they were before.***

No, the new order will have to be something different; and it will have to prevent and strike at the passivity of the faithful present at Holy Mass. Before, it was enough to attend; now, it is necessary to participate. Before, presence was enough; now, attention and action are demanded. Before, a person could doze and perhaps even chat, but no longer; now, he has to listen and pray.

We hope that the celebrants and the faithful will soon have the new liturgical books, and that these, in their literary and their typographical form, will reflect the dignity of the ones that went before. The assembly is becoming alive and active. Being present means allowing the soul to enter into activity in the form of attention, response, singing, action. The harmony of a community act that is carried out not just with an external gesture, but with an inner movement of the sentiment of faith and devotion, impresses a very special strength and beauty upon the rite. It becomes a chorus, a concert; it turns into the rhythm of an immense wing soaring toward the heights of divine mystery and joy.

The second category of comments reaching Us after the first celebrations of the new liturgy is marked by enthusiasm and praise. These people say: at last we can understand the complicated, mysterious ceremony, and follow it; at last we really enjoy it; at last the priest is talking to the faithful, and you can see that he is acting with them and for them.

We have very moving statements from ordinary people, from children and teenagers, from critics and observers, from pious persons who are eager for fervor and for prayer, from men of long and solid experience and lofty training. They are positive statements. A very distinguished old gentleman of great heart, and of a spirituality so deep as to be never fully satisfied, felt obliged to go to the celebrant after the first celebration of the new liturgy to tell him quite frankly of his happiness at having finally taken part in the holy Sacrifice to the full spiritual measure-perhaps for the first time in his life.

Perhaps this admiration and this kind of holy excitement will calm down and soon dissolve into a new kind of peaceful habit. What is there that man doesn't get used to? But it is to be believed that the note of religious intensity that the new form of the rite calls for, will not grow less; and along with it the awareness of an obligation to carry out two spiritual acts simultaneously: one of true, personal participation in the ceremony, with all the essentially religious qualities that this implies; the other of communion with the assembly of the faithful, with the "ecclesia". The first of these acts tends towards love of God; the second, toward love of neighbor. Here you have the Gospel of charity, which is being made real and active in the souls of our time. It is really something beautiful, something new, something great, something full of light and hope.

But you understand very well, beloved Sons and Daughters, that this new liturgy, this spiritual rebirth, cannot come about without your cooperation, without your wholehearted and serious participation. This compliance on your part is so important to Us that, as you can see, We have made it the subject of this talk of Ours. With confidence that you will really welcome it warmly, We promise you many, many graces from the Lord, which, with Our Apostolic Blessing, We wish to assure for each of you from this moment on. (English translation quoted from *Liturgical Revolution* Vol. III, 547-549; original Italian: http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/it/audiences/1965/documents/hf_p-vi_aud_19650317.html.)

It was a call to reject the Mass as the renewal of the Sacrifice on Calvary. One could not be *quiet and devout*, for then one would be *lazy*. In other words, those who had spent their school years learning Latin, studying the Mass with all its history and symbolism, meditated upon and prepared to properly participate by receiving holy Communion through freeing one's soul from sin and fostering virtue were lazy. And those who didn't care about Mass and wanted to be entertained had now the true understanding of Mass? Chatting? Attend a Novus Ordo service and that is all one hears today; but if one attends the holy Sacrifice of the Mass then one will see the attention of the faithful. But these words of Giovanni Montini would be repeated over and over to all Catholics who would voice objection to the sacred "Changes" of his religion.

On January 15, 1967, Louis Leakey announced he discovered pre-human fossils in Kenya. Calling it *Kenyapithecus africanus*, he tried to pass it on as an early development of man—but later it was proved to be only an early ape with no more closeness to humans than modern apes. Giovanni Montini, too, was trying to develop the theory for Catholics that supposedly early forms of Mass were discovered by his Conciliar Liturgists that were closer to the Holy Mass offered by Christ when in reality these forms they invented were closer to the Protestant Lord's Meal and in no way represented the Sacrifice Christ offered.

The changes, as experimentation, were gradually transforming Churches more and more into Protestant halls. Statues were thrown out, altars were removed and tables inserted. Latin was no longer being heard; Communion was being passed out like bread to the line of recipients as in a soup kitchen; music was becoming more and more profane and befitting the dance hall or orgies of a night club.

This was why faithful Catholics were no longer attending their parish church, but seeking a parish where the priest still offered the Holy Mass (Yes, in resistance—but somehow the bishops had not dared to forbid priests to say the Tridentine Mass yet.).

The year 1968 brought the Prague Spring under Alexander Dubcek, but it would be crushed before the end of August. In 1968 Catholics were seeking Churches where an elderly pastor insisted on saying the Tridentine Mass, but they too would eventually find out that he had been forced to retire and some new, long-haired narcissist was ready to introduce the radical changes that "were long overdue."

The results of a commission that was set up by Angelo Roncalli during the Second Vatican Council (March, 1963) to study the possibility of the use of contraceptives, was released in 1968. Just by

announcing a commission unscrupulous Catholics had interpreted it as a signal that contraceptives are permissible. By July of 1965 in a Gallup poll asking Catholic in the United States if the Church would approve of contraceptives, sixty-one percent said yes. They were stunned when Giovanni Montini released *Humanae vitae* on July 25, 1968, in which he declared, and rightly:

We are obliged once more to declare that the direct interruption of the generative process already begun and, above all, all direct abortion, even for therapeutic reasons, are to be absolutely excluded as lawful means of regulating the number of children. Equally to be condemned, as the magisterium of the Church has affirmed on many occasions, is direct sterilization, whether of the man or of the woman, whether permanent or temporary.

Similarly excluded is any action which either before, at the moment of, or after sexual intercourse, is specifically intended to prevent procreation—whether as an end or as a means. (Par. 14)

But it was the *Tale of Two Cities*. For those caught in the Vatican II spirit, it was the moment to reject Church authority and, as John Courtney Murray in *Dignitas Humanae*, claim *that men should act on their own judgment, enjoying and making use of a responsible freedom, not driven by coercion but motivated by a sense of duty.* (Par. 1) For those not wanting to believe Giovanni Montini had completely given up the faith it was a moment that, shaken by the faith-shattering documents of Vatican II and Montini, finally something sounded Catholic again. It is the only document brought up by conservatives within the Conciliar Church that they can point to and say: The Church hasn't changed, and why the anti-abortion/pro-life movement seems the only stance they cling to in the Conciliar Church. Yet, in that same Church, by 1970 there were as many Catholics as non-Catholics using the pill, that is, two-thirds of all Catholic women (three-quarters of women under 30) were taking the pill as a means of contraception. Nothing close to Catholicism would be issued from the Vatican after this encyclical.

The 1968 presidential elections in the United States highlighted the aggressive radicalism prevalent in society with riots and assassinations, but still conservatism was strong and most of the population still rejected the overthrow of order in society. For the Catholics the radical spirit of Vatican II was overtaking their churches. *Kumbaya* was now being sung in the Church with a plea for social justice and help for the starving people of Biafra. As Montini said, you didn't go to Church to pray any more, you went there to participate in a movement. Were true Catholics cold toward the starving children of Biafra? No! But forgetting to pray meant that man without God could solve the problems of the world and it made the Sunday Mass a fundraiser for charity and no longer to give adoration to God. The Church was becoming even more empty. Priests were once thought to lead Catholics in prayer, and now they seemed to lead them in protests and movements. Nuns were once thought to exemplify the faith of Christ in their self-sacrificing life to the least of the brethren in schools, hospitals and orphanages; now they were only seen demonstrating in front of government buildings. Definitely the Catholic could see that such actions were not conducive to spirituality and how to get to heaven. Again, here are the words Our Lord spoke to Pilate: *My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would certainly strive that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now my kingdom is not from hence.* (John 18:36)

By 1969 it was clear that college youth had lost a sense of community and in the search of identity were increasingly being hooked on drugs and rock-and-roll that would produce both Woodstock between August 15-18 and the Altamont Free Concert on December 6, and only produced scenes of hedonism mixed with disorientation and anarchy. When police raided the Stonewall Inn on June 28, where sodomists localized, the sodomists turned it into an opportunity to riot for their immorality—but coincidentally it was also when the strain of the AIDS virus (HIV) began its entry into the United States and would spread among and affect these sodomists (cf. <http://www.voanews.com/a/a-13-2007-10-30-voa66/331077.html> —Retrieved September 2, 2016.). Even further into depravity, the followers (mostly young women) of a psychopath named Charles Manson would live in a commune that thrived on theft and drugs and would eventually go on a murder spree from August 9-10 at the bidding of their guru. But a following of a cult leader, no matter where it led, seemed to be what was happening within the Conciliar Church, for Giovanni Montini was leading Catholics from the Faith into a New Order religion and, despite the extent of allowing the worship of man in the sanctuary and removing the presence of Christ, his followers were willing to accept whatever their guru Giovanni Montini demanded.

Instead of providing a sense of stability, the Conciliar Church would add to the sense of identity lost, not only for its youth, but for all its members. Catholics could no longer say: I believe in one, holy Church, for unity of faith was lost and holiness was lost to those now assisting at the experimentations and witnessing the weekly changes. How? No longer were Catholics believing the same, for some Catholics held to the belief of no salvation outside the Church and others believed in universal salvation. Some Catholics believed in transubstantiation and the Mass as the renewed Sacrifice on Calvary and others believed in transignification and Mass as a memorial of the Lord's Supper. Holiness was no longer witnessed during the narcissistic celebrations which called participants to brotherhood instead of sanctification—in fact attendance at Mass was plummeting—attendance at Mass always being expression of one's commitment to God. Instead of renouncing the world and serving Christ in holiness, nuns were told to cast off their habits and go out and embrace the world. As the young people in the world embraced rock-and-roll, so the Conciliar Church embraced rock-and-roll for the young people in the Church. By February 14, 1969, Catholics were told that the popular Saints they prayed to, such as St Valentine, St Christopher, St Ursula, St George, etc., were not saints, but myths, and now they would no longer be celebrated. If the Church lied about these Saints (that is, that they were Saints) then what else did the Church lie about? If, as our youth were told now by Conciliar clergy, the Church was not correct to tell its members children must obey their parents—such as when they say not to date when too young, not to listen to rock-and-roll or attend rock-and-roll concerts, to be home at a specific time—or it was a sin, what is that Church now telling its members is a sin or will no longer be? That is what the Conciliar Church hatched: Unfettered, untrained, untaught and inexperienced youth trying to live free and discover happiness but realizing the world is not free nor does it bring happiness and so they rebelled against the Church.

On April 3, 1969, Paul VI presented his *moto proprio Missale Romanum*, where he set aside adoration and expiation for celebration (understood as “party”) in a humanistic service:

In conclusion, we wish to give the force of law to all that we have set forth concerning the new Roman Missal. In promulgating the official edition of the Roman Missal, Our predecessor, St. Pius V, presented it as an instrument of liturgical unity and as a witness to the purity of the worship the

Church. While leaving room in the new Missal, according to the order of the Second Vatican Council, "for legitimate variations and adaptations," we hope nevertheless that the Missal will be received by the faithful as an instrument which bears witness to and which affirms the common unity of all. Thus, in the great diversity of languages, one unique prayer will rise as an acceptable offering to our Father in heaven, through our High-Priest Jesus Christ, in the Holy Spirit.

It was just as one saw in 1964, with the double-speak of the motu proprio *Sacram Liturgiam* on January 25, which said to wait—yet not to wait—in implementing the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* of Vatican II, which included the vernacular and unleashed all the committees coming up with unorthodox translations to offer for using vernacular in the Mass and Sacraments, so too, this document spells out changes not yet changed:

*For these reasons it is apparent to all that it is our uppermost concern that all Christians, and especially all priests, should consecrate themselves first of all to the study of the already-mentioned Constitution and from now on, resolve to implement its individual prescriptions in good faith **as soon as they enter into force**. And since it is necessary by the very nature of things that the prescriptions concerning the knowledge and spread of the liturgical laws should take place immediately, we earnestly exhort shepherds of dioceses that with the help of the sacred ministers, "dispensers of God's mysteries" (CONSTITUTION, Article 19), they should hasten to act in order that the faithful entrusted to their care may understand, to the degree permitted by age, by the conditions of their own life and by their mental formation, the strength and inner value of the liturgy and at the same time participate very devoutly, internally and externally, in the rites of the Church (CONSTITUTION, Article 19).*

Likewise *Memoriale Domini* of May 29, 1969, was also double-speak, for while declaring it wanted to preserve tradition it also directed the liturgy to be open to change. The Conciliar Church seemed to be like most other cults at this time: wild, experimental, free to do as one pleases. But like the cults of this time, the leader would expel anyone who contradicted his illogical decrees, and as everyone wanted to be part of the movement so they would agree to everything the leader said however illogical, however criminal (such as the followers of Charles Manson), however sacrilegious (such as placing the Body of Christ in the hands of laity):

For this reason it is of great concern that the Eucharist be celebrated and shared in most worthily and fruitfully, by observing unchanged the tradition that has reached us step by step, the tradition whose riches have been poured into the practice and life of the Church. The documents of history demonstrate that the ways of celebrating and receiving the holy Eucharist have been diverse. Even in our time many and important ritual changes have been introduced into the celebration of the Eucharist in order to bring it into accord with the spiritual and psychological needs of men today. Because of circumstances, communion under both kinds, bread and wine, which was once common in the Latin rite but had fallen into disuse little by little, has again been made a part of the discipline governing the faithful's mode of receiving the holy Sacrament. At the time of the Council of Trent a different situation had arisen and was in effect everywhere; the Council approved and defended it as suited to the conditions of that period. (1)

With the renewal of the modes of communicating, however, the sign of the Eucharistic meal and the complete fulfillment of Christ's mandate have been effected more clearly and vividly. At the

same time a full sharing in the celebration of the Eucharist, expressed through Sacramental communion, has recently stirred up in some places the desire to return to the practice by which the Eucharistic bread is placed in the hand of the faithful who communicates himself by putting it in his mouth.

In some communities and localities this rite has even been performed without obtaining the prior approval of the Apostolic See and occasionally without appropriate preparation for the people. It is true that, according to ancient usage, it was once permitted for the faithful to take the sacred food in their hands and themselves to place it in their mouths and even, in the earliest period, to carry the holy Sacrament with them from the place of celebration, especially in order to receive it as viaticum if they should have to suffer for the profession of the faith.

Why is this said? Because every innovation was either introduced with a committee to study the matter or a prohibition that was followed by an explanation that then approved the innovation under certain conditions that evolved into the general norm. The question always arose on one side, did he condemn? While on the other, did he approve? This led to some *laissez-faire* approach where priests did whatever they wanted and if there was no general uproar it became accepted. In fact, when the protest became too pronounced as to draw world attention, Giovanni Montini, as shrewd as he was, would send out a letter denying what he was doing, such as *Sacrificum laudis* of August 15, 1966, in which Montini states:

Yet, from letters which some of you have sent, and from many other sources, We learn that discordant practices have been introduced into the sacred liturgy by your communities or provinces. (We speak of those only that belong to the Latin Rite.) For while some are very faithful to the Latin language, others wish to use the vernacular within the choral office. Others, in various places, wish to exchange that chant which is called Gregorian for newly-minted melodies. Indeed, some even insist that Latin should be wholly suppressed.

We must acknowledge that We have been somewhat disturbed and saddened by these requests. One may well wonder what the origin is of this new way of thinking and this sudden dislike for the past; one may well wonder why these things have been fostered.

On the other hand it was Giovanni Montini himself that insisted on the vernacular and in which he, himself, participated in using. The *Una Voce* had been formed by this time to insist on the right to the Tridentine Mass, but it became a stumbling block as members were rejected who became too critical of Giovanni Montini. One member, the well-known author Tito Casini, wrote a scathing letter to Giacomo Cardinal Lercaro, who was President of the *Consilium* [*Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de sacra Liturgia*, or Committee to execute the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, shortened to *Consilium*]. It is now apparent, that like Angelo Roncalli, Giovanni Montini was playing two decks at the same time. For while it cannot be denied that Giacomo Cardinal Lercaro was President of the *Consilium*, he was unaware of what Bugnini and Montini were also doing without his knowledge. As the Catholic populace placed the blame on Lercaro, Montini was left unscathed and no one looked to Bugnini. The published letter, *The Torn Tunic*, in March, 1967, with a forward by Antonio Cardinal Bacci, drove Cardinal Lercaro to return to Bologna. Piero Marini in his book *A Challenging Reform: Realizing the Vision of the Liturgical Renewal* (137) states:

While the eighth plenary was meeting a book was published entitled *La tunica stracciata: Lettera di un cattolico sulla 'Riforma liturgica'* ("The Shredded Tunic: A Letter from a Catholic on the Liturgical Reform"). The volume, written by Tito Casino was a harsh attack on the work of the Consilium and especially on Cardinal Lercaro, to whom the book was addressed in the form of a letter. [Cattaneo, *Il culto cristiano*, 658.] The publication caused considerable reaction, particularly because the preface was written by a member of the Roman Curia, Cardinal Bacci. He started the preface with an admission that the book was disrespectful of those involved in the reform, but then went on to support and finally approve it.

Lercaro, seeing the publicity given to the book in the press and aware that the Holy See had not challenged the book's characterizations, sent a written protest to Cardinal Eugene Tisserant, dean of the Sacred College of Cardinals. He then returned to Bologna, leaving the following telegram for Bugnini, making reference to an article about the incident in a Rome newspaper, *Il Messaggero*: "I am leaving for Bologna on a one-way ticket." Later there were official challenges to the claims of this book, and the situation became less tense. Nevertheless, this episode stands as yet another sign of the fierce hostility in certain circles toward the implementation of the reform.

Apparently *Coetus X* of the Consilium, which was developing the Mass of Paul VI, became nervous, for:

It was decided to establish a Consilium Praesidentiae [13 See Notitiae 3 (1967) 47.] to solve more urgent questions that might arise between plenary meetings. It would also maintain communication between plenary group and Consulta. The main purpose of the Consilium Praesidentiae, however, was to give greater weight to decisions made by the presidency and the secretariat and, in the absence of the plenary group, to render the Consilium less vulnerable to attacks from conservative circles, particularly from within the Curia. On October 11 seven members were elected to form the Consilium Praesidentiae. The bishops chosen were among the most open-minded and supportive of the Consilium's role. None of them belonged to the Roman Curia. [The result of the vote was as follows: Rene Boudon, 31; Michele Pelegrino, 30; Otto Spulbeck, 29; Vincente Enrique y Tarancon, 28; William Conway, 27; Clemente Isnard, 25; Jan Bluysen, 24.] (Marini, 136-37)

The Consilium introduced the *Missa Normativa*, which was a butchered rendition of the Tridentine Mass with the addition of the *Prayer of the Faithful* or so-called *General Intercessions* and more readings. Presented on October 24, 1967, before an extraordinary synod of bishops, it was rejected. By January 1968, Lercaro, Larraona, and Ottaviani were retired from their posts (cf. Roman Catholics: Changing the Old Guard, *Time Magazine*, Friday, Jan. 19, 1968). By replacing Ottaviani—who was blind and depended on what he was told—as Secretary of the Holy Office and Lercaro and Larraona with Benno Gut, there was no one to question Bugnini's intentions, guaranteeing Bugnini would have no further opposition within the Consilium because Benno Gut was already unable to take on the task as President of the Consilium (Benno Gut died December 8, 1970).

This organ or agency of the Pope technically fell under the presidency of Cardinal Lercaro and then later Cardinal Benno Gut, yet it is generally recognized that the Consilium's moral leadership really depended on the monumental figure of its secretary Annibale Bugnini. (Kappes, 17-18)

As Kappes goes on to say: *This rejection [of the experimental Normative Mass] was attributed by some important periti to be in no small part due to a lack of modern liturgical understanding and education on the part of many ecclesiastics (Ibid., 20)* This is true, for there is no *modern liturgical understanding* when the liturgy has two thousand years precedence of understanding. That is, the understanding is taught by the apostolic tradition of the Church which is to be safeguarded, not rejected. The author goes on later to state:

This prompted a more inventive and creative effort that would become the Novus Ordo Missae. [For instance, it was a creative invention to use a substantially medieval private Confiteor as the basis of a public communal confession of sin in the Novus Ordo Missae. Another example would likewise be the transformation of the private Trinitarian formula and sign of the cross, beginning the old prayers at the foot of the altar, into a public and joint act of the priest and faithful together. A Final example would be to use the eucharological Quod ore sumpsimus as a cleansing prayer for the vessels, which is merely the default Post-communion of the Gelasian sacramentary.] The Novus Ordo Missae represented an effort to enrich the Mass with both modern and medieval gestures and communal prayers in order to reach the minds and hearts of those who had rejected the Normative Mass as something deficient and stark. (ibid., 55)

Marini, who is another defender of the *Novus Ordo*, reflects on the *Consilium* as follows:

But more important than the quantity was the outstanding quality of the work achieved by the Consilium. The new liturgy, thanks to the extremely qualified and scholarly work of the Consilium's experts, became a model that not only expresses the genuine liturgical tradition of the Roman Rite, but that can be used as a basis for liturgical adaptation in different nations and cultures. For the first time in the history of the church, we have a liturgy today which, rather than being an expression of a particular church, responds to the concept of the church universal. "What is essential for liturgy is that it not be the product of one epoch or one nation, but rather that it be Christian—that is, an express of the timeless faith of the church." [63 6 «L'essentiel d'une liturgie, ce n'est pas d'être d'un siècle ou d'une nation, c'est d'être chrétienne, c'est-à-dire d'être l'expression de la foi de l'Eglise qui est de tous les temps.» B. Botte. Le mouvement liturgique. Témoignage et souvenir (Tournai: Desclee, 1973) 38.] This, it would seem, is the fundamental characteristic of the liturgy of Vatican II implemented by the Consilium. (Marini, 153)

What he is saying is the work of the *Consilium* was to create a liturgy—not renew the sacrifice of Christ—that was adaptable for all people to celebrate, which means nothing because it could mean everything. There is no liturgical tradition to be found in the *Novus Ordo* because, contrary to what the conciliar authors state, there is no continual change in the Roman Rite, but a preservation of apostolic tradition that the Church, inspired by the Holy Ghost, infallibly hands down so that the faithful will unquestionably receive the same Eucharistic Sacrifice. That is not the case with a liturgy created to meet the modern world, because the Holy Eucharist is not what man chooses to give to God, but what Christ gave to the Church to be offered until His return. Alcuin Reid, writing for *Antiphon* (10.3 (2006): 277-295) a traditional publication of those attached to the Conciliar Church, quotes Bugnini:

All these details show how disagreeable many of the Fathers found the path of reform. It is not easy to cut one's ties with age-old practices, open oneself to new horizons, and force oneself to accept the demands expressed in the signs of the times. That which may seem obvious in theory must come to grips in practice with armour-clad contingencies. (Reform of the Liturgy, 356)

Whereon Reid continues:

Alternatively, one might argue that the Fathers reacted against radical innovation when moderate, organic reform had been expected and indeed had been already tasted in 1965. After all, the Fathers of the Synod were, with but few exceptions, ignorant of the workings of the Consilium and its study group 10, of which Bugnini writes: "On April 17, 1964, a sturdy, powerful machinery was set in motion that in five years' time would bring in the 'new' Mass." [Bugnini, Reform of the Liturgy, 341] And the vast majority of them, having been Fathers of the Council, had been told: "The current Ordo Missae, which has grown up in the course of the centuries, is to be retained."

In terms of the implementation of Sacrosanctum concilium, the 1969 Ordo is a mixed bag of some things called for and foreseen, and many things that were not. One key issue in evaluating this reform is the seemingly disproportionate quantity of changes, which it makes when it is compared with the Ordo Missae that Sacrosanctum concilium intended to reform. In so many ways, both large and small, it is a substantially different entity and not an organic development of its predecessor. . . . (293-94)

Of course Reid is sure to still claim that the *Novus Ordo* of Giovanni Montini is valid because he accepts him as pope, though he goes far enough to say Giovanni Montini made a *mistake*.

These papers written decades after only repeat what was stated by many Catholic authors of that period. Few bishops and priests were willing to publicly oppose the changes for fear of being left out in the cold (cf. Yves Normandin, *Pastor out in the Cold*); it was the laity who took up the pen as Tito Casini did. Patrick Omlor wrote *Questioning the Validity of the Masses Using the New, All-English Canon* in 1968. It pointed directly to the invalidity of the *Novus Ordo Missae* by perverting the Canon, specifically the words of Consecration. This raised the laity and clergy alike to face the fact that the Holy Eucharist, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, was being removed. Guerard des Laurier, a Dominican priest teaching at the Lateran and Angelicum, upon examining the *Novus Ordo* to be published by Giovanni Montini, wrote *A Short Critical Study of the New Ordo of Mass* on June 5, 1969. This was given to Giovanni Montini with the signatures Cardinal Ottaviani and Bacci signed September 25, 1969. It was called *The Ottaviani Intervention*, where the letter states:

. . . Despite its brevity, the study shows quite clearly that the Novus Ordo Missae—considering the new elements widely susceptible to widely different interpretations which are implied or taken for granted—represents, both as a whole and in its details, a striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Mass as it was formulated in Session 22 of the Council of Trent. The "canons" of the rite definitively fixed at that time erected an insurmountable barrier against any heresy which might attack the integrity of the Mystery.

The pastoral reasons put forth to justify such a grave break, even if such reasons could still hold good in the face of doctrinal considerations, do not seem sufficient. The innovations in the Novus Ordo and the fact that all that is of perennial value finds only a minor place—if it subsists at all—could well turn into a certainty the suspicion, already prevalent, alas in many circles, that truths which have always been believed by the Christian people can be changed or ignored without infidelity to that sacred deposit of doctrine to which the Catholic faith is bound forever. The recent reforms have amply demonstrated that new changes in the liturgy could not be made without leading to complete bewilderment on the part of the faithful, who already show signs of restiveness and an indubitable lessening of their faith. Among the best of the clergy, the result is an agonizing crisis of conscience, numberless instances of which come to us daily.

The *Ottaviani Intervention* was sent by Giovanni Montini to Franjo Seper of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (created in 1965). First there was the decree on October 20, 1969, that starting the First Sunday of Advent, November 30, 1969, the *Novus Ordo* would be adopted as the new liturgy by all priest celebrating publicly (It would be delayed to Palm Sunday 1970 because the *Novus Ordo* wasn't even published or translated in the various languages). This was followed by a reply to objections on November 12, 1969, which was never published but Bugnini (285) mentions his reply that *The work, Short Critical Study. . . contains many statements which are superficial, exaggerated, inexact, impassioned and false.* Giovanni Montini, on November 19, 1969, found it necessary to address publicly a rebuttal to the *Ottaviani Intervention* which had spread throughout much of the Catholic World. In doing so, he confirms, rather than disproves, the rejection by faithful Catholics as well founded. He points to the Council, but the Council Fathers did not agree to rejecting the codified Tridentine Mass. It was understood that the Council of Trent already purified the Mass of any extraneous elements and imposed the Canon at its twenty-second session on September 17, 1562:

And since it is fitting that holy things be administered in a holy manner, and this sacrifice is of all things the most holy, the Catholic Church, that it might be worthily and reverently offered and received, instituted the sacred canon many centuries ago, so free from all error [can. 6], that it contains nothing in it which does not especially diffuse a certain sanctity and piety and raise up to God the minds of those who offer it. For this consists both of the words of God, and of the traditions of the apostles, and also of pious instructions of the holy Pontiffs. (Cf. DB 942)
Canon 6. If anyone says that the canon of the Mass contains errors, and should therefore be abrogated: let him be anathema. (Cf. DB 953).

The Fathers (Bishops) of the Vatican Council knew they could not change Trent. They knew they could not oppose the constant teaching of the Church where, as this same Session of the Council of Trent states:

Although the Mass contains much instruction for the faithful, it has nevertheless not seemed expedient to the Fathers that it be celebrated everywhere in the vernacular [can. 9]. For this reason, since the ancient rite of each church has been approved by the holy Roman Church, the mother and teacher of all churches, and has been retained everywhere, lest the sheep of Christ suffer hunger, and "little ones ask for bread and there is none to break it unto them" [cf. Lam. 4:4], the holy Synod commands pastors and everyone who has the care of souls to explain frequently during the celebration of the Masses, either themselves or through others, some of the

things which are read in the Mass, and among other things to expound some mystery of this most holy Sacrifice, especially on Sundays and feast days. (Cf. DB 946)

And issued the following Canon:

Canon 9. If anyone says that the rite of the Roman Church, according to which a part of the canon and the words of consecration are pronounced in a low tone, is to be condemned, or that the Mass ought to be celebrated in the vernacular only, or that water should not be mixed with the wine that is to be offered in the chalice because it is contrary to the institution of Christ: let him be anathema. (Cf. DB 956)

Therefore, to all the inquiries whether the Tridentine Mass would change, the Vatican II document, *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, was touted as a guarantee that the Tridentine Mass, in essence, that is, the Offertory and Canon, would not be changed and would be said in Latin, referencing this section of the Constitution: 36. 1. *Particular law remaining in force, the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites.* Then only those parts that could change (*Propers*), that is, the Mass of the Catechumens and extraneous ceremonies, i.e., such as what was restored in the Holy Week Liturgy, would be revised, as the Conciliar document continued:

But since the use of the mother tongue, whether in the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, or other parts of the liturgy, frequently may be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its employment may be extended. This will apply in the first place to the readings and directives, and to some of the prayers and chants, according to the regulations on this matter to be laid down separately in subsequent chapters. (Sacrosanctum Concilium)

To change the Mass, or even to change to the vernacular would go contrary to the Constitution, *Auctorem fidei* of August 28, 1794, where Pius VI condemned the following errors of the heretical Synod of Pistoia:

33. The proposition of the synod by which it shows itself eager to remove the cause through which, in part, there has been induced a forgetfulness of the principles relating to the order of the liturgy, "by recalling it (the liturgy) to a greater simplicity of rites, by expressing it in the vernacular language, by uttering it in a loud voice"; as if the present order of the liturgy, received and approved by the Church, had emanated in some part from the forgetfulness of the principles by which it should be regulated,—rash, offensive to pious ears, insulting to the Church, favorable to the charges of heretics against it. (Cf. DB 1533)

Catholics also remembered the recent words of Pope Pius XII, who reminded the clergy that there were certain things that could not be changed, in his encyclical, *Mediator Dei*, of November 20, 1947:

59. The Church is without question a living organism, and as an organism, in respect of the sacred liturgy also, she grows, matures, develops, adapts and accommodates herself to temporal needs and circumstances, provided only that the integrity of her doctrine be safeguarded. This notwithstanding, the temerity and daring of those who introduce novel liturgical practices, or call for the revival of obsolete rites out of harmony with prevailing laws and rubrics, deserve severe

reproof. It has pained Us grievously to note, Venerable Brethren, that such innovations are actually being introduced, not merely in minor details but in matters of major importance as well. We instance, in point of fact, those who make use of the vernacular in the celebration of the august eucharistic sacrifice; those who transfer certain feast-days—which have been appointed and established after mature deliberation—to other dates; those, finally, who delete from the prayerbooks approved for public use the sacred texts of the Old Testament, deeming them little suited and inopportune for modern times.

60. The use of the Latin language, customary in a considerable portion of the Church, is a manifest and beautiful sign of unity, as well as an effective antidote for any corruption of doctrinal truth. In spite of this, the use of the mother tongue in connection with several of the rites may be of much advantage to the people. But the Apostolic See alone is empowered to grant this permission. It is forbidden, therefore, to take any action whatever of this nature without having requested and obtained such consent, since the sacred liturgy, as We have said, is entirely subject to the discretion and approval of the Holy See.

61. The same reasoning holds in the case of some persons who are bent on the restoration of all the ancient rites and ceremonies indiscriminately. The liturgy of the early ages is most certainly worthy of all veneration. But ancient usage must not be esteemed more suitable and proper, either in its own right or in its significance for later times and new situations, on the simple ground that it carries the savor and aroma of antiquity. The more recent liturgical rites likewise deserve reverence and respect. They, too, owe their inspiration to the Holy Spirit, who assists the Church in every age even to the consummation of the world. [Cf. Matt. 28:20.] They are equally the resources used by the majestic Spouse of Jesus Christ to promote and procure the sanctity of man.

62. Assuredly it is a wise and most laudable thing to return in spirit and affection to the sources of the sacred liturgy. For research in this field of study, by tracing it back to its origins, contributes valuable assistance towards a more thorough and careful investigation of the significance of feast-days, and of the meaning of the texts and sacred ceremonies employed on their occasion. But it is neither wise nor laudable to reduce everything to antiquity by every possible device. Thus, to cite some instances, one would be straying from the straight path were he to wish the altar restored to its primitive tableform; were he to want black excluded as a color for the liturgical vestments; were he to forbid the use of sacred images and statues in Churches; were he to order the crucifix so designed that the divine Redeemer's body shows no trace of His cruel sufferings; and lastly were he to disdain and reject polyphonic music or singing in parts, even where it conforms to regulations issued by the Holy See.

63. Clearly no sincere Catholic can refuse to accept the formulation of Christian doctrine more recently elaborated and proclaimed as dogmas by the Church, under the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit with abundant fruit for souls, because it pleases him to hark back to the old formulas. No more can any Catholic in his right senses repudiate existing legislation of the Church to revert to prescriptions based on the earliest sources of canon law. Just as obviously unwise and mistaken is the zeal of one who in matters liturgical would go back to the rites and usage of antiquity, discarding the new patterns introduced by disposition of divine Providence to meet the changes of circumstances and situation.

64. *This way of acting bids fair to revive the exaggerated and senseless antiquarianism to which the illegal Council of Pistoia gave rise. It likewise attempts to reinstate a series of errors which were responsible for the calling of that meeting as well as for those resulting from it, with grievous harm to souls, and which the Church, the ever watchful guardian of the "deposit of faith" committed to her charge by her divine Founder, had every right and reason to condemn. [Cf. Pius VI, Constitution Auctorem fidei, August 28, 1794, nn. 31-34, 39, 62, 66, 69-74.] For perverse designs and ventures of this sort tend to paralyze and weaken that process of sanctification by which the sacred liturgy directs the sons of adoption to their Heavenly Father of their souls' salvation.*

65. *In every measure taken, then, let proper contact with the ecclesiastical hierarchy be maintained. Let no one arrogate to himself the right to make regulations and impose them on others at will. Only the Sovereign Pontiff, as the successor of Saint Peter, charged by the divine Redeemer with the feeding of His entire flock, [Cf. John, 21:15-17.] and with him, in obedience to the Apostolic See, the bishops "whom the Holy Ghost has placed . . . to rule the Church of God," [Acts, 20:28.] have the right and the duty to govern the Christian people. Consequently, Venerable Brethren, whenever you assert your authority - even on occasion with wholesome severity - you are not merely acquitting yourselves of your duty; you are defending the very will of the Founder of the Church.*

The Latin language guaranteed the unity of the faith because it allowed all peoples of all nations to assist at the Sacrifice of the Mass and all would know what they were witnessing; but none could claim it as their own for it belonged to all and not just one people. The destruction of the unity in language was already expressed in Genesis, chapter eleven (verses 1-10), where the following is read:

And the earth was of one tongue, and of the same speech. And when they removed from the east, they found a plain in the land of Sennaar, and dwelt in it. And each one said to his neighbour: Come, let us make brick, and bake them with fire. And they had brick instead of stones, and slime instead of mortar. And they said: Come, let us make a city and a tower, the top whereof may reach to heaven: and let us make our name famous before we be scattered abroad into all lands. And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of Adam were building.

And he said: Behold, it is one people, and all have one tongue: and they have begun to do this, neither will they leave off from their designs, till they accomplish them in deed. Come ye, therefore, let us go down, and there confound their tongue, that they may not understand one another's speech. And so the Lord scattered them from that place into all lands, and they ceased to build the city. And therefore the name thereof was called Babel, because there the language of the whole earth was confounded: and from thence the Lord scattered them abroad upon the face of all countries.

What built up the Body of Christ, was now destroyed as what united (Latin) was taken away and the vernacular became the source of division as various peoples with different languages in the same region fought over what language services should be said in the church.

Also, in the administration of the Sacraments Latin was a guarantee that the Sacrament was, according to form, absolutely valid without question. This was one of the intents of the Council of Trent, after the Innovators devised various liturgies, and to stop abuses that led to Catholics not knowing whether a priest was truly offering Holy Mass.

Faced with great opposition to his *Novus Ordo*, Giovanni Montini replied on November 19, 1969:

4. How could such a change be made? Answer: It is due to the will expressed by the Ecumenical Council held not long ago. The Council decreed: "The rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts, as also the connection between them, can be more clearly manifested, and that devout and active participation by the faithful can be more easily accomplished. . . .

6. The reform which is about to be brought into being is therefore a response to an authoritative mandate from the Church. It is an act of obedience. It is an act of coherence of the Church with herself. It is a step forward for her authentic tradition. It is a demonstration of fidelity and vitality, to which we all must give prompt assent. . . .

*10. You will see for yourselves that they consist of many new directions for celebrating the rites. Especially at the beginning, these will call for a certain amount of attention and care. Personal devotion and community sense will make it easy and pleasant to observe these new rules. But keep this clearly in mind: Nothing has been changed of the substance of our traditional Mass. Perhaps some may allow themselves to be carried away by the impression made by some particular ceremony or additional rubric, and thus think that they conceal some alteration or diminution of truths which were acquired by the Catholic faith for ever, and are sanctioned by it. They might come to believe that the equation between the law of prayer, *lex orandi* and the law of faith, *lex credendi*, is compromised as a result.*

11. It is not so. Absolutely not. Above all, because the rite and the relative rubric are not in themselves a dogmatic definition. Their theological qualification may vary in different degrees according to the liturgical context to which they refer. They are gestures and terms relating to a religious action—experienced and living—of an indescribable mystery of divine presence, not always expressed in a universal way. Only theological criticism can analyze this action and express it in logically satisfying doctrinal formulas. The Mass of the new rite is and remains the same Mass we have always had. If anything, its sameness has been brought out more clearly in some respects.

*12. The unity of the Lord's Supper, of the Sacrifice on the cross of the re-presentation and the renewal of both in the Mass, is inviolably affirmed and celebrated in the new rite just as they were in the old. **The Mass is and remains the memorial of Christ's Last Supper.** At that Supper the Lord changed the bread and wine into His Body and His Blood, and instituted the Sacrifice of the New Testament. He willed that the Sacrifice should be identically renewed by the power of His Priesthood, conferred on the Apostles. Only the manner of offering is different, namely, an unbloody and sacramental manner; **and it is offered in perennial memory of Himself, until His final return** (cf. De la Taille, *Mysterium Fidei*, Elucid. IX).*

13. *In the new rite you will find the relationship between the Liturgy of the Word and the Liturgy of the Eucharist, strictly so called, brought out more clearly, as if the latter were the practical response to the former (cf. Bonyer). You will find how much the assembly of the faithful is called upon to participate in the celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice, and how in the Mass they are and fully feel themselves "the Church." You will also see other marvelous features of our Mass. But do not think that these things are aimed at altering its genuine and traditional essence.*

14. *Rather try to see how the Church desires to give greater efficacy to her liturgical message through this new and more expansive liturgical language; how she wishes to bring home the message to each of her faithful, and to the whole body of the People of God, in a more direct and pastoral way.*

15. *In like manner We reply to the third question: What will be the results of this innovation? The results expected, or rather desired, are that the faithful will participate in the liturgical mystery with more understanding, in a more practical, a more enjoyable and a more sanctifying way. That is, they will hear the Word of God, which lives and echoes down the centuries and in our individual souls; and they will likewise share in the mystical reality of Christ's sacramental and propitiatory sacrifice.*

16. *So do not let us talk about "the new Mass." Let us rather speak of the "new epoch" in the Church's life.*

The ending paragraph rejects calling the New Mass the New Mass, though he had begun his General Audience with: *We wish to draw your attention to an event about to occur in the Latin Catholic Church: the introduction of **the liturgy of the new rite of the Mass**.* Yet, he confirmed that there was a departure from the past: *The Mass will be celebrated in a rather different manner from that in which we have been accustomed to celebrate it in the last four centuries, from the reign of St. Pius V, after the Council of Trent, down to the present.* Even though it points to Trent, it is historically accurate to say that the Tridentine Mass had been celebrated in its present form previous to Trent, going back to the earliest documentation, such as Pope Cornelius (+253) as even Joseph Jungmann references (Cf. *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, 37-39) with little variation and that being in chiefly in the propers or additions, such as the Gloria and Credo. The argument that there is no complete Latin text of the Roman Liturgy until after the sixth century does not mean that there was no Roman Liturgy or that it is not what it was in the sixth century (Pope Gregory the Great (590-604).

There is also Canon 3 of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII), which stated

*If anyone says that the sacrifice of the Mass is **only one of praise and thanksgiving, or that it is a mere commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the Cross**, but not one of propitiation; or that it is of profit to him alone who receives; or that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities: let him be anathema. (cf. DB 950)*

And declaring to all faithful Catholics the teaching:

And since it is fitting that holy things be administered in a holy manner, and this sacrifice is of all things the most holy, the Catholic Church, that it might be worthily and reverently offered and received, instituted the sacred canon many centuries ago, so free from all error [can. 6], that it contains nothing in it which does not especially diffuse a certain sanctity and piety and raise up to God the minds of those who offer it. For this consists both of the words of God, and of the traditions of the apostles, and also of pious instructions of the holy Pontiffs. (Cf. DB 950)

Adding the following Canon (6): *If anyone says that the canon of the Mass contains errors, and should therefore be abrogated: let him be anathema. (Cf. DB 953).*

It became obvious that the *Novus Ordo* was being foisted upon a populace that was expected to be ignorant of the faith, ignorant of the liturgy, and agreeable to change as a sign of progress. It must have been forgotten that the Liturgical Movement was not founded to change the Liturgy, but to teach an understanding of the Liturgy. The years—starting with Gueranger and renewed under Pope St. Pius X—of the Liturgical Movement was to make available a vast array of books and papers on the origin and meaning of the Liturgy which assisted the clergy and laity to deepen their knowledge of the Mass, not a desire to change the Mass. Receiving this gift and better appreciating the value of the Mass, they were now told that what they were previously encouraged to read to become familiar with Holy Mass was meaningless and the Mass needed to be changed to have some meaning—a meaning that completely conformed to what these texts previously taught was the same concept the Protestant Innovators had of the liturgy. In fact, it came to light that there were seven Protestant moderators participating in the changes:

October 1966, for the first time, the members of non-Catholic Christian confessions were admitted to be observers at the general adunanze of the Consilium. The Observers were Professors Raymond George (World Council of Churches), Canon Ronald C. Jasper and Dr. Massey Hamilton Shepherd (Anglican Communion), Rev. Friedrich Wilhelm Künneth (World Lutheran Federation), and Brother Max Thurian (Taizé). [CONSILIUM, «VII Sessio Plenaria “Consilii”», Ephemerides Liturgicae 80 (1966) 402.]

*For example, A. Bugnini recorded the fact that various Protestant confessions were asked for their opinions and suggestions on the reform of the lectionary in one Plenary Audience of the Members and periti. This is recorded in his memoirs as secretary of the Consilium. This obviously shows that the Consilium was in close communication with various separated Christians in order to create a lectionary revision that would be acceptable and anticipated by confessions other than the Catholic Church, and thus be truly universal. [A. BUGNINI, *The Reform of the Liturgy*, 415-416.]*

*Furthermore, their opinions and interaction were sought on some other topics. [CONSILIUM, «Septima sessione plenaria “Consilii”», Notitiae 2 (1966) 312-313.] For instance, they aided Coetus VIIIbis in the composition of the various petitions and intercessions in the Liturgy of the Hours at the official request of the Consilium. Lastly, the responsories of the Divine Office took some of their inspiration from the mixed Catholic-Protestant community of Taizé, especially from the contributions from one of its leaders, Brother Max Thurian. [A. BUGNINI, *The Reform of the Liturgy*, 556-557.] In effect, these reforms and a few others relied on collaboration between the Consilium and non-Catholics in order to adopt seemingly successful modern forms of worship*

which could speak to modern man and inculcate the wisdom of communities that had long been worshiping in the vernacular. For many years these communities had composed texts by principally relying on readings of the Bible and creative-prayer writing. These facts are very important for an additional reason. The participation of non-Catholic observers functioned efficiently and productively for the Consilium. In contrast, as will be explained further below, the Consulta, Ordinary Audiences (adunanze ordinaria), and Consilium Praesidentiae were groups erected by Cardinal Lercaro, following the approval of Paul VI in private audiences. Nonetheless, M. Barba and A. Bugnini have both noted that these theoretical organizations accomplished little and can be said to have been inefficient and ultimately failures. The observers, on the other hand, were able to assist and speak ad instar peritorum (even if they were not official Members), and were deemed by all as very helpful.

They were able to assist successfully in the reform process. They performed a function greater than what was initially foreseen by their establishment through the Secretary of State. On the other hand the Consulta and Consilium Praesidentiae were ineffective appendages to the organ of the Consilium.

*In summary, as a principle, ecumenical concerns do officially at least influence the liturgical reform in one way. The document *In ecclesiasticam futurorum sacerdotum* (3 June 1979) [SACRA CONGREGATIO DE INSTITUTIONE CATHOLICA, «*In ecclesiasticam futurorum sacerdotum*», *Notitiae* 15 (1979) 526-556. See especially the Appendix nn. 1-7.] repeated and clarified the Ecumenical Directory of the Secretariat for Christian Unity of 14 May 1967. [SECRETARIATUS AD CHRISTIANORUM UNITATEM FOVENDAM, «*Directorium Oecumenicum*», *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 59 (1967), 574-592.] Ecumenical concerns influence the liturgy, in the view of these two organs of the Holy See. Several ecumenical questions are indeed liturgical. According to the explanations provided by these two texts, the liturgical reform needs to keep in view actual and historical controversies among Christians when reforming the liturgy. This is because the object of the Church's overtures toward non-Catholic Churches and communities is to eventually unite together in mutual communal worship (*communicatio in sacris*). In practice, it seems to direct avoiding anything that might accentuate historical divisions between Christian confessions. In fact, *Unitatis Redintegratio* (UR no. 6) explicitly links the ecumenical and liturgical movements. The liturgical movement is considered one of the developing factors that allowed ecumenism to be fostered in the first place. [CONCILIUM Oecumenicum VATICANUM II, «*Unitatis redintegratio*», *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965) 90-107. See especially numbers 243-274.]*

*Even if not a formal principle, ecumenism was treated as if it were an operational principle of the reform. Hopefully, further observations of the various rites of the Normative Mass will elucidate that fact. The question remains, however, as to whether or not it constitutes a technical violation of the official reform of the Mass to base some mutations purely on ecumenical motives, since they are still not actual principles. The Liturgy Constitution gives no such directives, while the Consilium itself was given no discernable explicit mandate to make this a real principle of reform. However, in response to such an objections it must be remembered that the Pope himself and certain curial agencies were very supportive of any explicit efforts to adapt the liturgy to ecumenical concerns. Given the reality of *Unitatis Redintegratio*, the ecumenical directory, and the above cited examples of ecumenical cooperation in the liturgical reform, there seems to be every positive reason to consider the ecumenical aspect of the liturgical reform as a de facto*

guiding principle. In conclusion, it may merit a place in the evaluation of certain parts of the Normative Mass. Therefore ecumenism should be presumed as a methodological element in reforming rites. The Consilium will take into account both the Oriental and Protestant traditions when deleting, augmenting, and changing individual rites of the various liturgical offices. Ecumenism will be treated as a factual principle of reform in the this work's evaluation of the various parts of the Missa normativa's Order of Mass. (Kappes, 70-73)

The Ottaviani Intervention on the part of these Cardinals (Ottaviani and Bacci) would confirm what faithful Catholics suspected and would justify faithful Catholics in refusing to attend the *Novus Ordo* as a Protestant meal service surrogate. Giovanni Montini promulgated an heretical and blasphemous service that was contrary to Catholic Faith. If he held apostolic authority, Catholics would be obliged to knowingly attend an heretical sacrilegious service, that is, refusal would be to seemingly reject papal authority and infallibility; but to attend would mean apostasy from the faith. As no Pope could command one to apostatize while being faithful to the Catholic Church it was apparent that Giovanni Montini was not pope, but a usurper to the Chair of Peter. Initially the clergy were cautious in expressing this truth, knowing that they would lose their status in the now Conciliar Church; but there were clergy willing to sacrifice position for their faith.

In the United States the Clergy were reluctant to speak out, until Francis Schuckardt (1937-2006), a layman but International Secretary General of the Blue Army, used his position to speak of the aberrations of Vatican II and the bishops and their apostasy starting from 1967. He was able to gather priests who agreed with his position and who would offer Mass for the laity. Whatever the personality and moral character of Francis Schuckardt, it kept alive the aspirations of Catholic Americans to continue fighting for the faith. When he attempted, purportedly at the advice of Burton Fraser, S.J., to receive consecration from the Old Catholic lineage, the majority of clergy abandoned him along with many faithful Catholics. The foundation (Congregation of Mary Immaculate Queen) he started continues to be the bedrock of traditional Roman Catholicism in the United States under the leadership of Bishop Mark Pivarunas (1958-).

At the same time Joaquín Sáenz y Arriaga (1899-1976) a Jesuit priest in Mexico, one of the authors of *Plot against the Church* (1962) and *The New Montinian Church* (1971), also wrote that Giovanni Montini could not be Pope. He would be excommunicated by the Conciliar Bishops of Mexico in 1972. Together with Padres Moises Carmona (1912-1991) and Adolfo Zamora (1910-1987), he founded Unión Católica Trento.

In Europe Abbe Georges de Nantes (1924-2010) was also publicly denouncing the Conciliar Church. Suspended already by the Bishop of Troyes in 1963 and again in 1966 because of his publishing letters showing the errors of the Second Vatican Council and Giovanni Montini. Considering himself a faithful Catholic, he appealed to Giovanni Montini to reject the errors through a letter. In response, the Conciliar Church's new Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith under Seper condemned him for rejecting the teaching authority of Giovanni Montini. Realizing there was no recourse, he formed the Ligue de la Contre-Réforme Catholique.

In Brazil Arnaldo Vidigal Xavier da Silveira was also writing in opposition to the errors of Giovanni Montini and raising the possibility of a heretical Pope. Under Bishop Antônio de Castro Mayer of Campo (1904-1991), Silveira refused to reject Giovanni Montini as a false pope and they

accepted a sede-privationism—as propounded by Guerard des Laurier—and attached themselves to Marcel Lefebvre. They convinced the vast majority of the Diocese of Campo to reject the changes and prevented, for the most part, their implementation until his resignation in 1981. Like all places where there was not a complete rejection of the Conciliar Church, most of the laity and clergy soon became part of the Conciliar Church with its changes; but at the time (1969-74) it also showed the universal rejection of Vatican II and the understanding that Giovanni Montini had no legitimacy to impose the non-Catholic teachings of the neo-Modernists on the Catholic Faithful—meaning no papal authority, translated as not a true pope: *And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.* (Matt. 16:19) The Council was also not accepted as legitimate, for speaking to the Apostolic College Christ also said: *Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven.* (Matt. 18:18) Authority, Infallibility and Indefectibility are inseparable attributes of the Church; one presupposes the other and are inherent in the nature of the Church Christ founded.

From 1970, as the *Novus Ordo* was forced on an unwilling Catholic people and more and more priests found themselves suspended and removed from their parishes if they continued to teach and administer the Sacraments as they had always done since ordination and as the Sacraments had always been taught and received since baptism—but it awakened them to the reality that they were not alone as the Catholic faithful begged them to provide them with the Sacraments and Holy Mass. This was not just in one or two countries, one or two continents, but universally and showing that it was Catholic: all times, all places and all peoples having the same faith, same sacraments and sacrifice and united in upholding the teachings of the Church expressed by her unchanging magisterium.

That there needed to be an apostolic succession, as the Church is apostolic, it was found first in Bishops, like Antonio Castro de Mayer (1904-1991) and Alfredo Méndez-Gonzalez CSC (1907-1995), as also Blasius Kurtz (1894-1973) and Marcel Lefebvre (1905-1991) among others who assisted the priests with the sacred oils and ordained new priests. Marcel Lefebvre would start his own society that would disenfranchise all who would not accept his leadership and he would soon denounce within his organization all who would claim the illegitimacy of Vatican II and Giovanni Montini. Blasius Kurtz was deceased, Antonio Castro de Mayer restricted his activity to Brazil and Alfredo Mendez would refuse to assist. Faithful Catholics were concerned with a continuation of apostolic succession as the aging clergy were dying and leaving vacant centers of Catholic Faithful. Though many turned to Marcel Lefebvre and his Society, those who rejected Vatican II, Montini, Wojtyla and the *Novus Ordo* would not compromise and knew that Marcel Lefebvre, too, would not live forever—leaving the same predicament to remain even for his Society: apostolic succession.

There needed to be a bishop or bishops who would continue consecrating new bishops and priests within the Catholic Church to minister to Catholics throughout the world. An Archbishop, who had suffered because of his anti-Communist stance and Catholic faith was the Vicar Apostolic of Vinh Long (Vietnam), Pierre Martin Ngô-Dinh-Thuc. Permitted at the request of Giovanni Montini to attend the Second Vatican Council, he was spared when the CIA had his brothers assassinated, of whom one, Ngo Dinh Diem, was President of Vietnam. Exiled, he seemed to be

known as expressing disapproval of the Second Vatican as apparently a monk in Palmar de Troya, during the same year, 1975, when Vietnam completely fell to the Communists, was able to convince him that Mary wanted the Bishop to consecrate him and several others as bishops to save the Catholic Church. Recognizing afterwards the deception, he regretted his actions. It did not stop him from still looking to save the Church and joining those involved with resisting the changes. In 1981, (Arch)bishop Pierre Martin Ngo Dinh Thuc was approached again as to the possibility of consecrating a bishop that would continue Apostolic Succession. The choice was Michel-Louis Guérard des Lauriers O.P, a renowned Dominican. Guérard des Lauriers was previously an advisor to Pius XII and professor at the Pontifical Lateran University—and known as the main author of the *Ottaviani Intervention*. Guérard des Lauriers was consecrated on May 7, 1981. Refusing, afterwards, to take a full *sede vacante* position, Guérard des Lauriers was disregarded by the strict Sedevacantists who again appealed to Bishop Ngo Dinh Thuc to consecrate the two Mexican priests well known for their sedevacantist view. Fathers Moises Carmona and Adolfo Zamora were then consecrated on October 17, 1981. To bring clarity to the situation of the state of the Roman Catholic Church, (Arch)bishop Pierre Martin Ngô-dinh-Thuc signed the *Declaration on the Vacancy of the Roman See* on February 25, 1982 and then read it publicly in Munich on March 21, 1982:

Declaration of Archbishop Ngo-Dinh-Thuc

How does the Catholic Church appear today as we look at it? In Rome, John Paul II reigns as “Pope,” surrounded by the body of Cardinals and of many bishops and prelates. Outside of Rome, the Catholic Church seems to be flourishing, along with its bishops and priests. The number of Catholics is great. Daily the Mass is celebrated in so many churches, and on Sundays the churches are full of many faithful who come to hear the Mass and receive Holy Communion.

But in the sight of God, how does today’s Church appear? Are the Masses — both the daily ones and those at which people assist on Sundays — pleasing to God? By no means, because that Mass is the same for Catholics as it is for Protestants — therefore it is displeasing to God and invalid. The only Mass that pleases God is the Mass of St. Pius V, which is offered by few priests and bishops, among whom I count myself.

Therefore, to the extent that I can, I will open seminaries for educating candidates for that priesthood which is pleasing to God.

Besides this “Mass,” which does not please God, there are many other things that God rejects: for example, changes in the ordination of priests, the consecration of bishops, and in the sacraments of Confirmation and of Extreme Unction.

Moreover, the “priests” now hold to:

- 1) modernism;*
- 2) false ecumenism*
- 3) the adoration [or cult] of man;*
- 4) the freedom to embrace any religion whatsoever;*
- 5) the unwillingness to condemn heresies and to expel the heretics.*

Therefore, in so far as I am a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, I judge that the Chair of the Roman Catholic Church is vacant; and it behooves me, as bishop, to do all that is needed so that the Roman Catholic Church will endure in its mission for the salvation of souls.

February 25, 1982

Munich

+Peter Martin Ngo-dinh-Thuc

Archbishop

The ultimate question that must be answered is this: Is the Church for Peter or is Peter for the Church? If the Church was founded for Peter, faith does not matter. But Scripture points to faith as do all Church documents prior to Vatican II. If Peter is for the Church, then Peter has the obligation (and understood the charisma) to preserve the Church in all its pristine faith as the source of salvation. If one claims to be the leader and betrays Christ with a kiss, that one was Judas, for Peter stood with the sword to defend Christ (cf. John 18:2-11; Matthew 26:47-52.) If Peter is by the fire and denies he knows the Christ, Christ said to him: *And thou, being **once** converted, confirm thy brethren* (Luke 22:32). Therefore, John is at the foot of the Cross with Mary and the faithful followers, not Peter (cf. John 19:25-27). Saint Paul reminds the Thessalonians: *And now you know what withholdeth, that he may be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity already worketh; only that he who now holdeth, do hold, until he be taken out of the way.* (II Thessalonians 2:6-7) Sedevacantists hold the perennial faith that Peter is for the Church and therefore, as members of the Church, sedevacantists cannot recognize someone who betrays Christ, denies Christ and is not present at the foot of the Cross (which is perpetually renewed in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass) as possessing the authority of Peter holding the keys of Peter who says: *We ought to obey God, rather than man.* (Acts. 5:29).

Appendix – Comments from Readers

Concerning Paul VI's visit to India

In today's letter you have referred to Paul VI's visit to the Holy Land. That visit was sinister from yet another angle - it was a precursor to his visit to Bombay, India, a year later for the 38th. International Eucharistic Congress, a country which, on December 18, 1961, had invaded and occupied the Rome of the East, Goa, with no declaration of war, no provocation from Portugal, and practically no political movement to that effect in Goa. Paul VI had already confirmed secretly to Valerian Cardinal Gracias, Archbishop of Bombay, in December 1963 or even earlier that he would be coming to Bombay a year later in December 1964 but it was kept a secret till the close of office hours on the last Friday of October 1964.

The visit was to have included Goa as well in order to sanctify the Indian invasion of Goa but Paul VI was pressured to desist from such a visit both by Manuel Cardinal Goncalves Cerejeira, Patriarch of Lisbon, and the Government of Portugal which threatened to meet his visit with the severance of diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

When the announcement was made of Paul VI's visit to India at the closure of office hours on the last Friday of October 1964, to the dismay of Dr. Antonio Faria, Ambassador of Portugal to the Holy See, whose inquiries all along had drawn a blank, Valerian Cardinal Gracias opened his big mouth and announced to the press that the visit had been decided by Paul VI a year earlier! Thereupon Dr. Antonio Faria called on the Vatican Secretary of State the following Monday and told him that as it appeared that he (the Secretary of State) had no faith in him (the Portuguese Ambassador) he would be advising his government to recall him.

Despite the manifold services of Portugal to the spread of Catholicism in the East through the Portuguese Patronage of the Catholic Church, after India invaded and occupied Portuguese India in violation of the United Nations Charter the Holy See did not publicly utter a word of regret or sorrow. Instead John XXIII (The Second) privately sent for His Eminence, Dom Jose Cardinal da Costa Nunes of Portugal, shed some crocodile tears and told him to convey to the Portuguese government his personal sorrow at the loss of Goa. I have known of all these developments through my then contacts with persons in the Portuguese Foreign Office. I hail originally from Goa but live in Bombay, now re-named Mumbai. My ancestors were converted to Catholicism from Hinduism by Portuguese missionaries around 500 years ago.

Yours respectfully,
John Menezes
August 19, 2017

Concerning Archbishop Beran

Archbishop Joseph Beran was no true martyr, no matter how many years of internment might be seducing to accept his martyrdom. In 1965, with the agreement of communist authorities, he left for Rome where he still managed to deliver a reprehensible speech for approval of the Declaration of freedom of religion together with freedom of conscience before the end of so called Vatican II. In that context he delivered a sentence which is worth citing and which is truly erroneous: “. . . *also in my country the Catholic Church still suffers for that what was performed in her name against freedom of conscience as the burning of the priest John Hus, or the external coercion of a large part of the Czech nation to accept again the Catholic Faith. . . .*“

To explain that, Hus was condemned by the Church, as it was also her duty, for heresies, on which he obstinately remained till his death, sentenced and affected with the ecclesiastical punishment. The subsequent burning was already within the state law authority, the Church had no authority to punish with the burning. After all it was also the Council which begged for Hus to be spared from the capital punishment, when Hus was surrendered for the execution of the sentence to the Emperor. The Emperor Sigismund did not comply with it. That is, Hus was not burned on behalf of the Church as Archbishop Beran delivered falsely, but on behalf of the state, or more precisely the Emperor. It was Beran's duty to acquaint himself thoroughly with legislation in force, before he delivered publicly his nonsense. This way he only embarrassingly repeated communist propaganda and other enemies of the Catholic Church. It is necessary to be added to this point that Hus himself held an opinion that every heretic must be burned even if it was he himself!

Regarding the 17th century, and the alleged “external coercion of a big part of the Czech nation to accept again the Catholic Faith”, the thing is also otherwise. It was the Czech nation from whom was the Faith taken away by force of Hussite terrorists and subsequently heretic sects in the 16th, and in the beginning of 17th century, and to whom tens of new heretic faiths were imposed. After the glorious battle on the White mountain on November 8th, 1620, thanks to enthusiastic apostolate of priests of the Jesuit order especially, the vast majority of inhabitants of the kingdom was brought back to the Catholic Church. The one who refused to accept the Catholic Faith was allowed to leave the country even with his property (!), which was comparatively reduced especially in the case of town upstart aristocracy whose ancestors gained the in question property by robbery from the Catholic Church, Catholic nobility, and common believers firstly by Hussite mobs, and also by protestant sectarians in the next century. The Czech Catholic ecclesiastical historians state that people in their vast majority accepted the Catholic Faith voluntarily and remained in it for generations.

Archbishop Beran opposed openly the infallible decision of the Catholic Church in the Council of Constance which once forever condemned the heresies of Wicleff, and Hus what was confirmed by Pope Martin V too. Archbishop Beran transgressed in his defense of “freedom of religion“ and “freedom of conscience“ as well. We clearly experience consequences of these false principles today.

Dr Bretislav Klominsky
Jablonec, Czech Republic

Bibliography

Aquinas, T. (1939). *The Apostle's Creed*. (Transl. by Joseph B. Collins). New York: Benziger.

Aquinas, T. (1920) *Summa Theologica* (Transl. English Dominicans). New York: Benziger.

Augustine, A. (1888) *Exposition on the Psalms*. (Translated by J.E. Tweed). From Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. 8. Edited by Philip Schaff. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing.

Augustine, A. (1887) *Letter 93*. (Transl. J.G. Cunningham). From *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, Vol. 1. Edited by Philip Schaff. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing.

Augustine, A. (1887) *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians* (Book I). From Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. 4. Edited by Philip Schaff. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing.

Augustine, A. (1837) *Opera omnia*. Edited by the Monks of Saint Benedict. Paris: Gaume.

Athanasius. (1892). *Letter 59*. (Transl. by Archibald Robertson). From *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, Vol. 4. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing.

Bartman, B. (1923) *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder

Bea, A. (1963). *The Unity of Christians*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Bouscaren, T. (1934). *The Canon Law Digest I*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing.

Bouscaren, T. (1943). *The Canon Law Digest II*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing.

Bouscaren, T. (1954). *The Canon Law Digest III*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing.

Bouscaren, T. (1958). *The Canon Law Digest IV*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing.

Bouscaren, T. (1963). *The Canon Law Digest V*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing.

Bouyer, L. (1982). *The Church of God*. (Transl. Charles Quinn). Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press.

Bugnini, A. (1990). *The Reform of the Liturgy (1948-1975)*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.

Camp, R. (1969). *The Papal Ideology of Social Reform: A Study in Historical Development 1878-1967*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Carrillo, E. (1991). *The Catholic Historical Review* Vol. 77, No. 4 (Oct., 1991), pp. 644-657. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.

Casino, T. (1971). *The Last Mass of Paul VI*. Devon, England: Britons Publishing Company.

Casino, T. (1967). *The Torn Tunic*. Hawthorne: Christian Book Club of America.

Connell, F. (1943). *Baltimore Catechism No. 3*. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Coomaraswamy, R. (1990). *The Problems with the New Mass*. Rockford, IL: Tan.

Cyprian, C. (1886). *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 5. Edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Davies, M. (1976). *Liturgical Revolution: Cranmer's Godly Order*. Devon, England: Augustine Publishing.

Davies, M. (1977). *Liturgical Revolution: Pope John's Council*. Devon, England: Augustine Publishing.

Davies, M. (1980). *Liturgical Revolution: Pope Paul's New Mass*. Kansas City: Angelus Press.

Davies, M. (1983). *The Ottaviani Intervention: Part I*.

Daniel-Rops, H. (1962). *The Second Vatican Council*. New York: Hawthorne Books.

Dégert, A. (1909). Gallicanism. In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

Denziger, H. (1955). *The Sources of Catholic Dogma* (30th). Transl. Roy Deferrari. Reprint Fitzwilliam, NH: Loreto Publications.

Denziger, H. (2012). *Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals* (43rd). Transl. Peter Hünermann. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.

De Pauw, G. (1970). *The CANONICAL, MORAL and DOGMATIC Grounds for Rejecting the NEW "MASS" and Retaining the TRUE MASS*. Facsimile.

Des Laurier, G. (1969). *A Short Critical Study of the New Ordo of Mass*. Facsimile.

Devivier, W. (1903) *Christian Apologetics A Defense of the Catholic Faith*. New York. Benziger

Donovan, J. (1829) *Catechism of the Council of Trent*—transl. Fielding Lucas. Baltimore. Reprinted (1971) by Christian Book Club, Hawthorne, CA.

Eppstein, J. (1971). *Has the Catholic Church Gone Mad?* New Rochelle, NY: Arlington House.

Gibson, H. (1979) *Is the Pope Catholic?* Victoria: Groupacumen.

Gregory the Great. (1895) *Registrum Epistolarum*. (Transl. J. Barmby) From *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, Vol. 12. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing.

Fenton, J. (1958). *The Catholic Church and Salvation*. Westminster, MA: Newman Press.

Fenton, J. (1951). The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation. In *American Ecclesiastical Review* February. Washington, DC: Catholic University Press.

Fessler, J. (1875). *The True and False Infallibility of the Popes*. New York: Catholic Publications Society.

Flannery, A. (1975). *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and post Conciliar Documents*. Northport, New York: Costello Publishing.

Fortescue, A. (1908). Canon of the Mass. In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company

Friedan, B. (1963). *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.

Garrigou-Lagrange, R. (1946). *La nouvelle théologie où va-t-elle?* Angelicum 23 (1946) 126-145. Rome: Athenaeum.

Gigot, F. (1910). Judaism. In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

Gussoni, L. and Brunello, A. (1954). *The Silent Church*, New York: Veritas Publishers.

Hebblethwaite, P. (1993). *Paul VI: The First Modern Pope*. New York: Paulist Press.

Horton, D. (1966). *Vatican Diary 1965 A Protestant Observes the Fourth Session of Vatican Council II*. Philadelphia: United Church Press.

Hunter, S. (1895). *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

Ignatius of Antioch. (1885) *Letter to the Ephesians*. (Transl. by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson). From *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1. Edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing.

Irenaeus of Lyon. (1885) *Against Heresies*. (Translated by Alexander Roberts and William Rambaut). From *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1. Edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing.

Joyce, G. (1908). The Church. In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

Jungman, J. (1959). *The Mass of the Roman Rite*. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Kappes, C. (2012). *The “Missae Normativa” of 1967; Its History and Principles as Applied to the Liturgy of the Mass*. Rome: Pontificum Athenaeum S. Anselmi de Urbe.

Kelly, T. (2009). *The Transformation of American Catholicism the Pittsburgh Laity and the Second Vatican Council, 1950-1972*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame.

Koesters, L. (1938). *The Church Its Divine Authority*. Transl. Edwin Kaiser. Saint Louis: Herder.

Marini, P. (2007). *A Challenging Reform: Realizing the Vision of the Liturgical Renewal, 1963-1975*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.

McBrien, R. (1995). *The HarperCollins Encyclopedia of Catholicism*. San Francisco: Harper

Montini, G. (1969). *Missale Romanum*.

Moore, D. (1989). *The Human and the Holy: The Spirituality of Abraham Joshua Heschel*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Normandine, Y. (1978). *Pastor Out In The Cold*. Sherbrooke, QC: Saint Raphael's Publications.

Omlor, P. (1969) *Questioning the Validity of the Masses Using the New, All-English Canon*. Reno: Athanasius.

Orchard, B. (1953) *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*. Thomas Nelson. New York.

Ott, L. (1954) *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*. Ed. Bastible, J. Herder. St. Louis.

Peters, E. (2001). *The 1917 Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.

Popes:

Pius V (1570). *Quo primum*.

Pius IX (1847). *Ubi primum*.

Leo XIII. (1888). *Libertas*

Leo XIII. (1896). *Satis Cognitum*

Leo XIII. (1899). *Testem Benevolentiae*.

Pius X (1907). *Pascendi gregis*.

- Pius XI. (1928). *Mortalium animos*.
- Pius XI. (1937). *Divini Redemptoris*.
- Pius XII (1943). *Mystici Corporis*.
- Pius XII (1945). *Orientales omnes Ecclesias*.
- Pius XII (1947). *Mediator Dei*.
- Pius XII (1949). Decree of the Holy Office , July 1, 1949 [A.A.S., Vol. XLI (1949), 334].
- Pius XII (1950). *Humanum generis*.
- Pohle, J. (1948) *The Sacraments: Volume II The Holy Eucharist*. Herder. St. Louis.
- Post, L. (1970?). “*Mass*” *Deception*.
- Radecki, F. and Radecki, D. (1994). *What Has Happened to the Catholic Church?* Aylmer, Ontario: The Aylmer Express.
- Rahner, K. (1991) *Encyclopedia of Theology The Concise Sacramentum Mundi*. New York: Crossroad.
- Reid, A. (2006). *Sacrosanctum concilium* and the Reform of the Ordo Missae in *Antiphon* 10.3 (2006): 277-295. Hanover, PA: Sheridan Press
- Romano, J. (2007). The Fates of Liturgies: Towards a History of the First Roman *Ordo* in *Antiphon* 11.2 (2007): 277-295. Hanover, PA: Sheridan Press
- Roncalli, Angelo
- Mater et Magistra*. (1961)
- Pacem in terris*. (1963)
- Rowland, T. (2008). *Ratzinger’s Faith: The Theology of Pope Benedict XVI*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rynne, X. (1964). *The Second Session*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Company.
- Saenz y Arriaga, J. (2000). *Plot Against the Church*. Palmdale, CA: Christian Book of America.
- Saenz y Arriaga, J. (1985). *The New Montinian Church*. Trans. Edgar Lucidi. La Habra, CA: Edgar Lucidi

Sägmüller, J.B. (1908). Cardinal. In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

Seasoltz, R. (1979). *New Liturgy, New Laws*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.

Senn, F. (1987). *New Eucharistic Prayers An Ecumenical Study of their Development and Structure*. New York: Paulist Press.

Solesmes (1962). *The Liturgy*. Transl. Daughters of St. Paul. Boston: Daughters of Saint Paul.

Suenens, L. (1974). *A New Pentecost*. New York: Seabury Press.

Tanquerey, A. (1959). *A Manual of Dogmatic Theology*, transl. John Byrnes. New York. Desclee.

Tertullian, Q. (1885). *Prescription against Heretics*. (Transl. Peter Holmes) From *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing.

Tromp, S. (1972). *Corpus Christi Quod Est Ecclesia, Pars Quarta: De Virgine Dei Para Maria Corde Mystici Corporis*. Rome: Gregorian University Press.

Vatican II Documents:

The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum concilium*, 4 December, 1963.

Decree on the Means of Social Communication, *Inter mirifica*, 4 December, 1963.

Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, 21 November 1964.

Decree on the Catholic Eastern Churches, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, 21 November 1964.

Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis reintegratio*, 21 November 1964.

Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions, *Nostra aetate*, 28 Oct 1965.

Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, *Dei verbum*, 18 Nov. 1965.

Decree on the Apostolate of Lay People, *Apostolicam actuositatem*. 18 Nov. 1965.

Declaration of Religious Liberty, *Dignitatis humanae*, 7 Dec. 1965

Vennari, John. (2015) Major New Work on Sedevacantism in *Catholic Family News* December 2015 issue. Niagara Falls, NY.

Van Hove, A. (1910). Hierarchy. In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

Van Noort, G. (1957). *Dogmatic Theology Volume II Christ's Church*. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press.

Von Hildebrand, D. (1967). *Trojan Horse in the City of God*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press.

Wathen, J. (1971). *The Great Sacrilege*. Rockford, IL: TAN.

Williamson, H. (1970). *The Great Betrayal*. Rockford, IL: TAN

Williamson, H. (1970) *The Modern Mass*. Rockford, IL: TAN

Wiltgen, R. (1967). *The Rhine flows into the Tiber*. New York: Hawthorne.

Bible: Douay Rheims translation.

Publications:

Civiltà Cattolica, Anno 110, Vol. II, 449 (May 30, 1959)

L'Osservatore Romano, 19 October, 1960.

Web sites:

<http://sites.jcu.edu/suenens/pages/cardinal-suenens/>

<http://www.nytimes.com/1995/06/24/obituaries/yves-congar-french-cardinal-dead-91-vigorous-ecumenist-promoter-laity.html>

<http://www.tabletmag.com/jewish-life-and-religion/196727/the-apostasy-of-rabbi-zolli>

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000626_message-fatima_en.html

<http://georgiabulletin.org/news/2013/06/looking-back-june-1963/>

<http://americamagazine.org/issue/active-presence>

<http://cara.georgetown.edu/frequently-requested-church-statistics/> (Retrieved August 27, 2016)

http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/it/audiences/1965/documents/hf_p-vi_aud_19650317.html.)