

Every age has its problems. The necessary first step toward solution is identification—diagnosis. You can't cure a brain tumor by removing an appendix.

Our problem is UNITY. Everyone fights everyone because no one seems to know what it is or where it lies. But this has always been easy: with the priests, the bishops, the pope. All we need is agreement among them. That's the problem! Priests no longer agree; many turn schizoid in trying to reconcile what they were taught with their bishops' orders and policies. Bishops no longer run dioceses. They convene periodically to discuss interminably what Rome tells them to discuss, before voting as Rome indicates. But surely the papacy is the standard of unity?

The Catholics of Japan kept the faith more than two hundred years without priest or bishop, without contact with the popes. When priests were again admitted to Japan, these isolated Catholics recognized them by their identical doctrine and tradition. Suppose such a group were found today, isolated for only fifty years, how would they recognize a priest? Where is the identical doctrine? What has become of tradition? A standard is necessary. Trains travel on tracks gauged a uniform distance apart. If this gap varies trains will leave the rails and halt in screeching confusion. If the tracks won't take the gauge no one asks for a new gauge; the tracks must fit the existing gauge. The Church has left its rails and careers in utter confusion because we no longer have a standard gauge. We could survive without bishops, priests, or popes, as the Japanese Catholics did. The papacy has been vacant before. The problem is that we appear to have a pope, unfortunately a faulty standard to which mutually exclusive groups adhere on different days, a four-foot yardstick, a collapsible gauge.

This journal has but one purpose: **complete recovery of our Church**. We will never dodge an issue, refuse a pertinent question, or pull a punch. We will never shade, hide, or bury truth as too strong for the stomach. Any stomach unturned by Paul VI's postconciliar "Church" can stand even the truth.

We accept no responsibility for the chaos and heresy we fight. If neither existed, obviously we could fight or describe neither.

This journal is primarily polemic. We intend not to report all the news unfit to print, nor all views found in print. We are here for the **war**, which is necessary for our **purpose**. Complete recovery entails complete destruction of the postconciliar "Church" and its bases in fact and fancy, especially Vatican II, its "spirit," and the *novus ordo* "mass."

We seek no awards for urbanity or politeness. We will not pretend that all the "Catholic" priests, religious, bishops, cardinals, or "pope" act or omit in good faith. We shall accord respect to none of these. We believe that most are cowardly, stupid, or both—the charitable view. The sole alternative classes them with Judas—they betray Christ in His Mystical Body, actively or by non-interference with activists. We shall waste neither time nor space placating fools and traitors.

Nor shall we waste them on visions, seers, pious phrases, or calls to prayer. Only a fool requires exhortation to constant prayer in our time.

We demand return of the Catholic Church to parish, monastery, seminary, papacy. For only through the Church can we be saved. To any who impede, to all who promoted the current deviation, through act or omission, we most heartily wish the infernal end they have freely chosen.

OUR FIRST ISSUE ATTEMPTED TO CLEAR DECKS FOR ACTION,

to base our strategy, to express an attitude, to explain why we neither mince words nor avoid frankness.

If a pious hope that destroyers of our means of salvation benefit most abundantly from their own machinations be grievous matter, what shall we say of *Quo primum*, which invokes the wrath of Almighty God and the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul upon those who violate its provisions? Or of the synoptic Gospels? "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost shall never have forgiveness, but shall be guilty of an everlasting sin." (Mark iii. 29) "He that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come." (Matthew

xii. 32) “To him that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven.” (Luke xii. 10) Or of St. Paul? “For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and injustice of those men that detain the truth of God in injustice who changed the truth of God into a lie and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator and as they liked not to have God in their knowledge, God delivered them up to a reprobate sense filled with all iniquity deceit, malignity hateful to God proud, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents without fidelity, without mercy.” (Romans i) Or of St. John? “There is a sin unto death” (I Ep. v. 16-7).

Challoner comments: “..... it cannot be supposed that St. John would say this of every mortal sin, but only of some heinous sins which are very seldom remitted because such sinners very seldom repent. interpreters commonly understand a wilful apostasy from the faith, and from the known truth, when a sinner, hardened by his own ingratitude, becomes deaf to all admonitions, will do nothing for himself, but runs on to a final impenitence.”

Or is the sin unto death the unforgivable sin?—unforgivable because no sin is admitted! The innovator has done no wrong; he has merely improved—on Christ!

Who would dare question God’s mercy? Is not our own continued existence its proof? Do we not all hope for its continuing overflowing benefits? Yet which of us expects at the Last Judgment to encounter St. Arius, St. Mohamet, St. Martin Luther, St. Thomas Cranmer, St. Karl Marx? Modernist innovators, more culpable than all these if only for their example, have rejected the known truth, have changed the truth of God into a lie, have served the creature rather than the Creator, have blasphemed the Holy Ghost in calling upon His Authority for their lies. They lead those who believe them—because they masquerade as **Catholic** priests, bishops, and pope—to destruction. They have needlessly, deliberately, maliciously alienated others who believe the legitimacy of their position but cannot choke down their loathsome innovations. Should the despoiled be damned without their despoilers? God desires the salvation of all men. But are these men? Or devils? “They are the enemies of the Cross of Christ: whose end is destruction.” (Phil. iii. 18-9). “My people have been silent, because they had no knowledge. Because thou hast rejected knowledge I will reject thee, that thou shalt not do the office of the priesthood to Me.” (Osee iv. 6)

The Church has preached and sponsored wars and crusades. It has conducted inquisitions, and burned incorrigible propagators of heresy as the worst of criminals—murderers of souls. Christ Himself said that such scandalizers were better drowned with a millstone necklace in the depths of the sea. St. Paul said of Alexander the coppersmith (2Tim. iv. 14-15): “the Lord will reward him according to his works: whom do thou also avoid: for he hath greatly withstood our words.”

These modernists have greatly withstood the truth as they know it has been taught and understood by all generations of the whole Church. They have deliberately chosen the reward according fully with their works. They have steeped the Church in idolatry. They have stolen from God. Let them answer.

They cannot escape the charge of apostasy on the grounds that the current majority has followed them. What conceivable approval can render lies true? Did not St. Paul prophesy (2Thess. ii. 3) an apostasy before the end? Is an apostasy any less an apostasy for being reluctant or misled? Is not the ignorance which permits our present situation in itself culpable? Has history not shown us enough examples, even in the highest places? How many serious splits in Christendom have been led by laymen? How many rifts were necessary? How necessary is the current “papal” opposition to traditional Catholicism? Who was forced to qualify for my “curse?”

If the slightest chance exists that this “curse” will give any destroyer or replacer of tradition pause, will make him at least reflect upon or examine his actions or motives, then I will curse him before and after every meal—till he realizes that a changeable religion is a useless religion.

I must love **my** enemies, not the enemies of the Cross of Christ. Such an obligation would tie me to Satan himself. Where is it prescribed: **Thou shalt not curse or criticize evil**; or **Thou shalt love the devil**?

THE CROWNING DISLOYALTY TO GOD IS HERESY.

It is the sin of sins, the very loathsome of things which God looks down upon in this malignant world. Yet how little do we understand its excessive hatefulness! It is the polluting of God's truth, which is the worst of all impurities. Yet how light we make of it! We look at it, and are calm. We touch it, and do not shudder. We mix with it and have no fear. We see it touch holy things and we have no sense of sacrilege. We breathe its odor and show no signs of detestation or disgust. Some of us affect its friendship; and some even extenuate its guilt.

We do not love God enough to be angry for His glory. We do not love men enough to be charitably truthful for their souls. Having lost the touch, the taste, the sight, and all the sense of heavenly-mindedness, we can dwell amidst this odious plague in imperturbable tranquility, reconciled to its foulness, not without some boastful professions of liberal admiration, perhaps even with a solicitous show of tolerant sympathies.

Why are we so far below the old saints and even the modern apostles of these latter times in the abundance of our conversions? Because we have not the antique sternness. We want the old Church-spirit, the old ecclesiastical genius. Our charity is untruthful, because it is not severe; and it is unpersuasive because it is untruthful. We lack devotion to truth as truth, as God's truth.

Our zeal for souls is puny because we have no zeal for God's honor. We act as if God were complimented by conversions, instead of trembling souls rescued by a stretch of mercy. We tell men half the truth, the half that best suits our pusillanimity and their conceit; and then we wonder that so few are converted, and that of those few so many apostatize.

We are so weak as to be surprised that our half-truth has not succeeded as well as God's whole-truth. Where there is no hatred of heresy there is no holiness. A man, who might be an apostle, becomes a fester in the Church for want of this righteous abomination.

This flaming accusation erupted from the pen of a Church of England minister converted last century. No one could have convinced Frederick William Faber, this tractarian from the very pinnacle of the High Church, that Catholicism and Anglicanism could be reconciled. A convert appreciates heresy.

But fancy finding this quotation in Fatima International, whose editor has not acted in accordance therewith in refusing to publish my refutation (15 Feb. 1975) of Father (The International Catholic Priests' Association) Flanagan's "The *Novus ordo*, A Further Comment," published in his 4 Feb. issue. Mr. Bergin wrote (13 June):

"As you know I have always felt that the *novus ordo* is valid—much as I dislike it. And I do not wish to be responsible for dissuading our readers from attending a valid Mass. The debate had to be handled with that in mind."

Obviously, no debate exists when only one side is presented. Bergin is responsible that his readers, brainwashed by that great theologian-Latinist-canonist, Father Flanagan, never read or weighed our traditional argument—that they continue to participate in the Great Idolatry instead of the true Mass. Why? He **feels!**

He appears also to have felt the traditional argument unanswerable, or at least sufficiently convincing to dissuade his readers from attending the *novus ordo*, in which modernism, Arianism, and Judaism run rampant.

PROGRAM FOR AUSTRALIAN A.C.T

Our Catholic Church, Christ's Mystical Body, is scourged and crucified before our eyes. Can this not concern us? Leaving aside its necessity for salvation, its loyalty to mankind is irreproachable. Where is our gratitude to the body which taught and civilized us—which breathes reason, justice, mercy, and charity into our civilization. Pre-Christian civilizations were not known for such qualities. Some began on high planes, but deteriorated in ideals and practice. A post-Christian

civilization approaches contradiction in terms. It is re-descent into barbarism. It is rejection of Christ after knowing Him—more culpable than His original rejection by His Chosen People.

Greater culpability, more general guilt, merits greater, more general punishment. If we reject Christ, if we allow the crucifixion of His Mystical Body, Christ's world will no longer harbor us. "Naught shelters thee, who will not shelter Me." Neither time nor place will be fit to inhabit.

Each generation, as it ages, complains that the world is going to the dogs. We are to discount this universal judgment of experience. Look at Progress, Freedom, Modern Superiority! Look rather at myth and misconception.

Defense of Christ's Mystical Body, debilitated as it is, requires individual action by each blood cell. We must not be drained through the wounds. Australian ACT recommends, and tries to furnish ammunition for, a positive program—an alphabet of militant Catholicism.

Aggression The war is now. Do not hesitate. Fight habitually. Never miss a chance. Create chances. Hit first. Hit often.

Boldness in action and conception. Innovation is error, therefore indefensible. Discredit and eradicate it.

Charity A divine virtue, directed first to God and His rights, accorded men for God's sake. It is not charity to leave men ignorant where salvation is concerned.

Determination Intellectual conviction has never won a war. We must dedicate ourselves totally to total victory.

Effectiveness We shall have none if we keep to ourselves, if we preach to the converted, if we hide our light under a bushel, if we retire to convenient catacombs.

Faith This is God's war. He cannot lose. We may appear to sink; we may not live to see victory. But we must live and die on the winning side, both for our salvation and to provide weapons for God, Who regularly works through men.

Gratitude Thank God daily and hourly for the generations that preserved the faith for us. Emulate them so that future generations may have cause to thank God for us.

Hope Our goal is attainable: God, not becoming gods.

Intestinal fortitude Back down for nothing and no one not in proper exercise of authority. Suppression of Catholic practice can never be proper. Never fear, if necessary, to appear stupid, bigoted, or foolish.

Judgment Use the critical faculty, a vital difference between man and beast, given us to exercise intelligently to determine God's will.

Knowledge Neglect no opportunity to know our subject in the greatest conceivable depth. What we don't know we can't use.

Law Divine law is unchangeable. Ecclesiastical law preserves the Church. Use of law to distort or destroy the Church perverts law.

Mission The Church must grow or die. As it abandons missionary zeal to fit Vatican II's "Religious Freedom," the individual Catholic must take up the slack.

Necessity of the eternal view. "What doth it profit a man ..?"

Orthodoxy Traditional truth that God has revealed one body of doctrine to be taken in its entirety. Selective Catholicism or new interpretation are not Catholic.

Perseverance We may lose this or that battle. We cannot lose the war unless we quit.

Quickness Eagerness for the fray. Keenness of argument. Never settle for dull swords.

Rage at what Paul VI and Vatican II have done, or permitted done, to Christ's Church.

Security doctrinal and sacramental. Accept no variation from the universal practice of the Church. There is overwhelming authority for tradition, none for innovation.

Truth Clear, unequivocal. God has no need of our excuses or lies.

Unity with the Church of the ages, the Communion of Saints (article of faith).

Vigor in prosecution of our war. Why hit softly? Paralyze! Overkill!

War Our natural and supernatural climate if we are to survive.

XX Closest in shape to the great cross we bear: the Renewal.

Yell bloody murder at each new sacrilege! No effect likely on clergy or hierarchy, but

you may awaken the laity.

Zero Our monetary contribution to the postconciliar “Church.” This may awaken clergy and hierarchy.

All these we recommend to the individual. Our organization has no rules except fight—no holds barred—individually. We need no dead wood.

There are no substitutes for Victory or Salvation.

True religion cannot contradict itself. If I accept that a man can change the very heart of my religion’s purpose, worship of God, I must accept as also certain that he can change all else therein—that my religion is man-made and false.

But it is not! It follows necessarily that the man who imposes changes is not a member of my Church, no matter what his apparent status. He and I are not in inward union. He is wrong; he changes what he can only preserve. I am necessarily correct; I have changed nothing. If my religious beliefs were correct fifteen, twenty, fifty years ago, the same beliefs cannot now be wrong.

When I find doctrines singled out for condemnation by previous popes and councils taught in “Catholic” schools, I must admit contradiction. Whether the older teaching is right or wrong, no possibility exists that the innovator, invoking the same infallible authority, can be correct. He has removed his own base.

* * * * *

Where the scientists have gone wrong over causation is in looking in the past for the causes of things. The causes of the present are to be found in the future.

—Montini? No, George Bernard Shaw

“I NEVER ARGUE RELIGION OR POLITICS!”

But these are foremost among the very few things worth arguing. The militant Catholic is the most logical of men. Catholics are bound together: one God to glorify, one faith, one sacramental system, one sacrifice, one purpose, one charity. Charity obliges us to seek salvation, our own and others', Catholics' first. Catholics owe each other. When one sees another led away from the sources of grace—from his means of salvation—he must warn the other. If he raises a false alarm, the other is equally bound to show him his error. Error and ignorance, both consequences of sin, lead to hell.

The militant layman quickly becomes the target for every possible dogmatic and moral objection to the Church. He cannot dodge without tremendous sins of omission. Guilt will overpower him at promoting any but the purest Catholic doctrine. He hears arguments that most people would fear to bring to a priest, and cannot dismiss them with a priest's authority over passive parishioners, with mere statements of fact. He must win every argument or let down his opponent, his Church, and his God. He must research and prove his points against Catholic and atheist, genius and fool, logician and bigot, sincere and demonic. Diabolically clever arguments come his way. He may not select which he will answer; he must answer them all—satisfactorily; partial solutions leave the impression of insolubility, of error.

He may not quibble or bluff. He quickly realizes his lack of omniscience, and works unceasingly to overcome his deficiencies. He deepens his knowledge and develops his arguments out of necessity and charity. Failure might tend to sap his own faith, were he silly enough to pride himself on mental powers. Giants have preceded him. He consults them. He finds nearly everything he lacks.

He quickly discovers that not even popes are necessarily good, or even orthodox, that not all men will grant his premisses or accept his authorities, that not all men can follow reason, that many can be absolutely convinced and still refuse to believe. He often suspects that grace is lacking not so much in his prospective convert as in himself.

But through it all, he builds not so much faith, which is God's gift (Seek ye first the kingdom of God), but invincible conviction of a definite, defined body of doctrine—the most logical ever known. He cannot be convinced of what he doesn't know. Even in the area of mysteries—what no man can understand—he arrives logically at the inescapable conclusion that his Authority, his God, cannot have deceived him.

Catholic parents, Catholic priests, Catholic teachers raised me in the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church. I know what it is; if I could see it today I would recognize it.

One, for instance, applies equally to all ages of the Church. If the Church differs from what it was fifty or five hundred years ago it is not **one** with itself. If it were **one** it would be **one** also worldwide now. If $A = B$ & $A = C$ then $B = C$. But if B & C, encouraged to assimilate local or national customs, to spring simultaneously from sundry varying cultures, no longer equal A, no compelling reason exists to assume they equal each other.

As I survey the new “Church,” the fragmentation of disaster areas masquerading as One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, it is not enough to pray, to grieve, to wallow in untold misery, to desert the ship. For that which I allow I am responsible. If I permit those to whom I am bound by faith, hope, charity, and purpose to remain in ignorance, even in culpable ignorance, to remain on the road to hell, I cannot avoid responsibility. For the sake of your salvation and mine, for the love of God, attend to what I say. If you find error, correct me. If you find truth, adhere to it, no matter what authority demands otherwise.

It's nice to be the “people of God”—but we each face judgment alone.

“THE TRIDENTINE MASS TODAY” (The Australian Catholic Record, 1976, pp. 370-81) by Humphrey O'Leary, C.Ss.R. head of Melbourne's ecumenical Yarra Theological Union, where he lectured in Canon Law.

Humphrey begins with authority: Paul VI quoted in greater than usual absurdity: “What traditions? Is it for this group, or for the pope, the college of bishops, the ecumenical council to decide which among the innumerable traditions must be considered as the norm of faith?” Paul says here that he will select which traditions are the norm(?). Greek for selection is heresy. We adhere to all our tradition. Paul implies that no priests or laymen know our traditions, that we must wait for him and his programmed episcopal conferences to clew us in. Where was he when Christ revealed them? How have we become convinced Catholics without knowing our traditions? If we must depend on him, when will he condemn just a few of the heretics that howl from Catholic pulpits? He is most definite that adoption of the new rite of “mass” be not left to our free choice. We damage the Church by the identical actions by which we upheld the Church all our lives. And people, even theologians and canon lawyers, **believe** him! For this is a “papal” statement! And Paul would never lie, especially in referring to, but never quite specifying, “the inconsistency and often falsity of the doctrinal positions” on which our traditional behavior is based when we dare disagree with him.

“In the Roman rite,” writes O’Leary, “the policy of one basic rite introduced by St. Pius V has been continued and confirmed by his successor Paul VI.” The policy has been replaced and the rite shattered by deliberate introduction of diffuse rites in creeping stages. Then a new rite promoting diversification and local option was imposed for the sake of the suddenly precious unity that Paul had deliberately destroyed in the first place—imposed ruthlessly, without slightest consideration for any but the old priest, who might otherwise have rebelled. Let the laity rebel all they like; they can’t say Mass!

O’Leary again: “..... the words of the Apostolic Constitution introducing the new Missal, *Missale Romanum*, clearly indicate that the earlier missal has been entirely replaced by that of 1969.” They indicate rather that *Missale Romanum* is the finest collection of sophistry, half-truth, double-talk, bluff, futility, and barefaced prevarication imaginable. It bears no perceptible earmarks of legislation. It concerns matters utterly beyond the competence of its supposed authority, and contradicts all Catholic tradition. Repeated instructions from Knox and Bugnini, the freemason who concocted the original *missa normativa* and modified it ever so slightly with help from six more heretics after the Roman Synod of 1967 rejected it, cannot make this fraudulent imposition legitimate. Certainly no one has yet heard of the infallibility of a secretary of a Roman congregation—nor of its competence to exterminate what it was set up to regulate.

A law, says O’Leary, is repealed if in a new law the competent legislator provides for the entire subject matter of the former law. Then he applies this law **concerning a law** to a **book**, a **missal**, a **rite**! Having twisted Canon 22 to fit his own twisted logic, he says the situation is not canonically in doubt.

He turns to that fraudulent mistranslation giving “force and effect” to what “we have set forth” (which is anything but clear) “concerning the new Roman Missal.” He quotes the Latin, then proves his incompetence in that language by being “not aware of any accepted view that the” (official) “English translation in common currency is incorrect. It is hard to find fault with the translation This appears a much more accurate rendering of the Latin than the version put forward namely, ‘Concerning all that we have just set forth concerning the new Roman Missal, we are pleased to end by drawing a conclusion.’” But the latter translation is correct, as even Sydney archdiocese implicitly agreed. It is years since anyone has seriously tried to bluff us with the fraudulent translation. Supposing, however, that the official translation could be correct, it could not confine the reader to its sole interpretation, and is not possibly a command, formal or implied.

O’Leary then shows that other apostolic constitutions from the same weaseling source use the same words (paragraph 15) to “enforce” compliance. He proves only that none is issued with proper authority. Two of them are used to replace sacraments, Confirmation and Holy Orders, both, like the Mass, beyond the competence of the council which “ordered” them, and of the pope, who also has no power over the substance of the sacraments.

O’Leary now returns to Latin to show that a derogation is an abrogation, at least according to some canonists. He cites Canon 22 again: “*Derogat*” is used in the sense of ‘total repeal’ and indeed as a

synonym for the word ‘*abrogat*’ employed in the same canon.” (*Abrogat* is not in the canon; it uses *obrogat* = a law replaces another in entirety.) “It is clear that in view of the several meanings ‘derogation’ can bear in canonical legislation that its peripheral use in the apostolic constitutions of Paul VI is insufficient to prove that there has been only partial repeal of the Bull of St. Pius V.” O’Leary, what have you done with logic? The word on which you hang your whole argument has become **peripheral** in its use! A word to which you allow no definite meaning can hardly be forced to your interpretation, even were it correct. You want to remove the classical legal meaning because legal Church Latin is post-classical. But the word survived long enough to go literally in its literal, classical meaning into several other languages and legal systems, even our own. Modernists ever love the loose term, the shifting definition, the universal evolution. How else can the Church evolve?

Next O’Leary romances through one pope’s control over another. Certainly no pope may “correct” or change his predecessor’s *ex cathedra* definition. Nor can he set up a new rite made in the image of Luther’s and Cranmer’s rites to replace the Mass which this definition protected against these rites.

If, as *Quo primum* states, the traditional Mass was a restoration of tradition, how is the *novus ordo* a restoration of tradition? Has the Church contrary traditions? God Himself cannot stand as authority for contraries. The *novus ordo* has the right to be called “conciliar?” Where has it not violated Vatican II’s every prescription concerning the Mass? But O’Leary says that the Magisterium agrees that the reform of the eucharistic rites is quite orthodox (prescinding from whether it is sacrilegiously irreverent and formally unworthy). This proves merely that the fraud’s perpetrators remain in sufficient control to strangle worldwide protest.

Let us lunge again with Humphrey at the language barrier. Christ spoke the words of consecration, he says, though it would be hard to prove, in Aramaic—which, being the language of a highly civilized, literate, commercially oriented people, had, it seems, no way to differentiate between **many** and **all**. Poor Barabbas!—unable to convey to his victim that he wanted **all** his money or goods, not merely **much** money or **many** items. They could have come to blows! This semantic defect, peculiar to this language alone, defied the power of Christ, the Almighty God, to overcome in this most central part of His revelation and religion, though in the previous sentence He appeared capable of saying: “**All** of ye drink this.” To bolster his argument O’Leary cites Bugnini’s publication, *Notitiae*, and Maximilian Zerwick, another heretic in Bugnini’s own image. All these modernists sit in circles and vouch for each other.

Now O’Leary cites our authority, **The Catechism of the Council of Trent**, in the pious hope that no one has ever seen it. He deliberately extrapolates: “We must confess that the Redeemer shed His Blood for the salvation of all.” In context: “For if we look to its value, we must confess that the Redeemer shed His Blood for the salvation of all; but if we look to the fruit which mankind have received from it, we shall easily find that it pertains not to all, but to many of the human race..... With reason, therefore, were the words for all not used, as in this place the fruits of the passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation, and this is the purport of the Apostle when he says: Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many; and also the word of our Lord in John: I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them whom Thou hast given Me, because they are thine. (John xvii, 9)” O’Leary’s limitation, then, is not merely inaccurate, it is completely unorthodox.

The real problem, says O’Leary, is that the Tridentine rite has become the symbol of distaste for recent ecumenical developments and rejection of shifts in doctrinal understanding (a fine euphemism for heresies) which are taken to involve denial of the (newly?) established teachings of the Church. The Mass becomes our battle-ground. This is why we are deprived of our true Mass (So reassuring to know there’s a reason.) But in Australia we were deprived long before this opposition for which we are given credit. It took two years to pry out that our Mass was proscribed. Even our hierarchy had more sense than publicly to admit such an absurdity. **Let the penalty precede the crime for the crime is inevitable.**

Generally, with the exception of tax laws and arbitrary, tyrannical laws, laws are enacted when necessary (just as definitions wait upon heresies), usually to enforce beliefs, morals, ethics, or customs when these are violated to the extent that what previously prevailed is endangered. Repeal of such a law will quickly return us to cause for its enactment.

Law is difficult to discern in the *novus ordo* promulgation. Paragraph 3 cites its authority, a council in flagrant disobedience to ecclesiastical law. Paragraph 4 cites an obvious absurdity, **interrupted traditions**, which must not be denied modern man, as though it were impossible to deliver these doubtful or invented “riches” without incorporating them in his worship. Paragraph 6 contains the only word of command, *iussimus*, which nearly all vernacular versions of the *novus ordo* have disobeyed in translating *pro multis* as **for all men**. Paragraphs 7 and 8 continue to quote unwarranted assumptions and outright lies of incompetent authority. Paragraphs 9 to 12 describe and rationalize further unwarranted innovations. Paragraph 13 carries the non-existent but officially translated “force of law” which epitomizes the intent of the whole “restoration,” which pretends to act in the tradition of St. Pius V while completely replacing and destroying him. Paragraph 14, the effective date, a primary legal requirement, was notoriously missing from the original promulgation. Paragraph 15 revokes nothing; it derogates something unspecified to the extent necessary (for what?). Not only must a law state unmistakably what it means and intends; it must provide penalties for non-compliance. This promulgation, itself an infraction of the law, an unenforceable bluff by incompetent authority, fails on every count.

Not even competent authority can controvert the tradition of the Church. Still less can it countermand *Quo primum*, which, law aside, fills all requirements for an infallible definition. If canon law, or any other law of the Church, is subject to the whim of the incumbent pope, we can change it at pleasure by assassination. Church law’s purpose is Church preservation. The Church cannot maintain its continuity, its identity, without its traditions. The Church’s primary purpose is worship of God, by which man attains salvation through Christ’s sacrifice on Calvary. This is the heart, the essence, of our religion. All Church laws, customs, and traditions must serve, conserve, and preserve this worship, and of all the laws for this purpose *Quo primum* is the most specific. Promulgated when the Reformation threatened the Mass, it cannot conceivably be abrogated till the Reformation has disappeared. The “Tridentine” Mass would then revert to its prior legal status, a nearly universal and exclusive centenary custom.

It is arguable that Paul VI could implement an ecumenical service, but not for Catholics, who have been from the beginning forbidden to take part in non-Catholic worship. That Vatican II (Ecumenism, 8) contradicts this necessary tradition (responsible for most of our martyrs) proves only that Vatican II has erred grievously.

Humphrey surfaced again. **THE CATHOLIC REVIEW**, May 1991, carried his timely five pages on Lefebvre’s June 30, 1988 episcopal consecrations(?).

Vatican II, says Humphrey, “initiated a dialogue within the Church and a dialogue between the Church and the world. It called for a revision of the liturgy. It opened the way to a new pluralism and moved away from a static, immobilist Church posture.” It “left many Catholics of more traditional outlook profoundly disturbed. It put to one side hallowed ways of Christian thinking and living which individuals and groups had found satisfactory means of relating to God and to neighbour. A great deal of themselves had been invested in those ways. Again, since not all the attempts to implement the council’s decisions were wise or well-conducted, there were genuine abuses to lament. For these and other reasons, there existed and still exists in the post-conciliar Church an understandably numerous body of conservative Catholics.”

“The Tridentist movement expresses, in extreme form, the dissatisfaction many have felt with what has happened in the last twenty-five years.” The basic (Tridentist) objection to revised rites, according to Humphrey: they express unorthodox and untraditional corruption of the Faith. Humphrey’s contacts with “Tridentists” have led him to conclude that many are a bit off. Not only that, but by switching a few words in a definition of Protestant fundamentalism Humphrey tags

Lefebvre's group "fundamentalist." Could he be correct? But somehow he identifies Lefebvre's group with a "Tridentist movement."

"There is no conception that, as Yves Congar has put it, there exists in the earlier teachings of the magisterium a basic substratum, an essential corpus of principles that must always be respected, but which were in the past expressed in an historical context that is no longer ours and which today should be respected in another way."—like the corpse of our beloved grandmother.

The traditional Catholic can't win. When he reacts normally to innovation and instability in his requirements for salvation, Humphrey makes him a Bible basher. When he insists that belief in Christ's revelation is paramount Humphrey sticks him with the likes of Congar and Raymond Brown, as though modern "theologians" had conserved, not radically reinterpreted, the message. When he puts forward reasons for his traditional Mass and sacraments Humphrey, who can't or won't follow an argument one millimeter, charges him with extreme rationalism and volunteers him into a "movement." Humphrey chides him for preferring essential certainty in his religion—"absolute inerrancy" (in his) "sources of belief"—"conviction that only those within the fold are on the right path." [Amazingly good reasons for a Catholic to adhere to his Church! Had he been unsure of it he would never have put up with its clergy.] "Hopefully in respect of these two criteria," says Humphrey, "we may have moved a distance away from fundamentalism over the past twenty-five years." [So all—even Humphrey—were fundamentalists only a quarter-century ago!]

"It is true that *Mortalium Animos*'s trenchant 1928 rejection of all ecumenical activity has been put behind us." Even Humphrey must realize that he has sunk himself. In *Mortalium Animos* Pope Pius XI insisted on the supremacy of God's established truth as expounded in and by His revealed religion. Now, with all this behind us, Humphrey continues to seek its warped remnant outside the Church, probably from fundamentalists, who have appropriated and cut our inspired Bible without Understanding, that gift of the Holy Ghost.

Nevertheless, are we not reassured that Humphrey has not marked time, but "may have moved a distance?"

ALL IS GRIST TO OUR MILL

Others have crusaded before us. We need not assume our unique privilege. It is odd that after so many redoubtable fighters have left us their plans we should need to work up our own strategy. Had we taken the trouble to consult our pugnacious predecessors, had we read and studied all we ought, none of our current calamities need have overtaken us. Since they have, let us neglect nothing that will advance our cause—even Blaise Pascal's Provincial Letters, formerly listed on the Roman Index. Montini and his apostate crew cannot cry foul; they themselves abolished the Index, for their own devious ends.

Pascal wasted polemic talent on an unworthy cause but, prescinding from the heresy he attempted to defend, no reason exists not to apply his legitimate arguments to a far apter set of circumstances. It is, for instance, by the faithful report of the senses that we determine the complete agreement between the new Vatican-Italian concordat and the last four condemned propositions of Pius IX's Syllabus of Errors:

77. At the present day it is no longer advantageous that the Catholic religion should be considered as the only religion of the state to the exclusion of all other forms of worship.

78. Accordingly, it is a matter for commendation that, in certain Catholic countries, the law has provided that foreigners who come to live there enjoy the public exercise of their particular form of religious worship. (A mosque in Rome?)

79. It is false to hold that the according of liberty to all religious denominations and the complete power granted to all to manifest outwardly and publicly all opinions and views of any kind, more easily bring about the corruption of morals and ideas among peoples and spread the pest of indifferentism.

80. The Roman Pontiff can and ought to be reconciled and come to terms with progress, liberalism,

and modern culture (or civilization).

But what should we expect of a bogus pope and his deputy, Casaroli? Habits, even of betrayal and treachery, are hard enough to overcome when some attempt is made.

All feeble spirits live naturally in the future, because it is featureless; it's a soft job; you can make it what you like It requires real courage to face the past.

—G. K. Chesterton

[Of **Nicholas Patrick Wiseman, cardinal, first Archbishop of Westminster**, Cardinal Newman wrote: "He can speak with readiness and point in half-a-dozen languages, without being detected for a foreigner in any one of them." In 1835 Wiseman delivered **Twelve Lectures on the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion**. With the greatest pleasure I quote from this sparkling collection of jewels a real emerald (he was Irish), the conclusion of his Lecture the Second, wherein he had discussed features of all the world's languages that suggest a common origin.]

But we are not, I think, to imagine that Divine Providence, in distributing to different human families this holy gift of speech, had no farther purpose than the material dispersion of the human race, or the bestowing on them varied forms of utterance: there was doubtless therein a deeper and more important end—the sharing out among them of the intellectual powers. For language is so manifestly the embodying power, the incarnation, so to speak, of thought, that we can almost as easily imagine to ourselves a soul without a body, as our thoughts unclothed by the forms of outward expression. And hence these organs of the spirit's conceptions must, in their turn, mould, control, and modify its peculiar character, so that the mind of a nation must necessarily correspond to the language it possesses.

The Semitic family, destitute of particles and grammatical forms suited to express the relations of things, stiffened by an unyielding construction, and confined by the dependence of words upon verbal roots, to ideas of outward action, could not lead the mind to abstract or abstruse ideas; and hence its dialects have been ever adapted for the simplest historical narratives, and for the most exquisite poetry, where mere impressions or sensations are felt and described in the most rapid succession; while not a school of native philosophy has risen within their pale, not an element of metaphysical thought occurs in their sublimest compositions. Hence are the deepest revelations of religion, the awfullest denunciations of prophecy, the wisest lessons of virtue, clothed, in Hebrew, under imagery drawn from outward nature. And in this respect, the author of the Koran necessarily followed the same course.

But to the Indo-European was given a wonderful suppleness in expressing the inward and outward relations of things, by flexion in its nouns, by conditional and indefinite tenses in its verbs, by the tendency to make or adapt innumerable particles, but principally by the powerful and almost unlimited faculty of compounding words; joined whereunto is the facility of varying, inverting, and involving the construction, and the power of immediately and completely transferring the force of words, from a material to a purely mental representation. Hence, while it is a fit instrument for effecting the loftiest designs of genius, it is no less powerful in the hands of the philosopher; and in it, and by it, have arisen those varied systems, which, in ancient India, and in later Greece, and in modern Germany, have attempted to fathom the human understanding, and analyze to their primitive elements the forms of our ideas.

And do you not see in all this, a subserviency to still nobler designs, when, in conjunction with these reflections, you look back at the order observed by God in the manifestations of His religion? For so long as His revelations were rather to be reserved than propagated, while His truths regarded principally the history of man and his simplest duties towards God, when His law consisted of precepts rather of outward observance than inward constraint, while the direction of men was managed rather by the mysterious agency of seers into futurity, than by the steady rule of unalterable law, the entire system of religion was deposited in the hands of that human family whose intellectual character and language were admirably framed for clinging with tenacity to

simple traditions of early days, and for describing all that was on the outside of man, and lent themselves most effectually to the awful ministry of the prophet's mission.

But no sooner is a mighty change introduced into the groundwork of His revelation, and the faculties unto which it is addressed, than a corresponding transfer manifestly takes place in the family whereunto its ministration and principal direction are obviously committed. The religion now intended for the whole world, and for each individual of the human race, requiring in consequence a more varied evidence, to meet the wants and satisfy the longings of every tribe and every country and every age, is handed over "to other husbandmen," whose deeper power of thought, whose ever eager impulse to investigate, would more easily discover and bring to light its inexhaustible beauties; who would search out its connections with every other order of truth, every other system of God's dispensation; thus ever bringing forth new motives of conviction, and new themes of praise. And in this manner Divine Wisdom, while it hath made the substance of religion one and immutable, hath yet in a manner tied its evidences to the restless wheel of men's endeavour, and mingled them with the other motives of his impelling desires: that so every step made in the prosecution of sound study and humble inquiry, may give them also a new advance, and a varied position; on which the reflecting mind may dwell with surpassing admiration.

* * * * *

Let us now refer Wiseman's conclusions to our own plight. What facts would it stretch to assert that our generation's failure to understand the depth of the current religious crisis flows from its lameness in logic? Or that this in turn originates in loss of the language of logic and abstract thinking? Where is Greek taught? Even in the seminaries, where is Latin taught? Even when they were taught, Dr. Austin Woodbury, Australia's foremost Thomist, based his success as a seminary professor on the "realization" that it is impossible to teach Australians and New Zealanders their philosophy and theology in Latin. So either they had insufficient grounding in the language (in which all their laws and doctrines are established) or their skulls are impregnable to reason. Either way the whole community suffered.

Anything left to itself will decay—even an educational system. When subjects become unavailable because there is little demand, the entire community loses. It is even further divorced from the brilliant Greek philosophers and the great mediaeval theologians. The better minds are hindered from proper education and sufficient mental exercise. The poorer minds, who would not attempt such studies, are denied their former association with clear thinkers. Older people retain some grasp of reality; they grew up in families where it yet prevailed. But osmosis has its limits. Modern schools leave their graduates rationally defenseless, and all but illiterate. The system must be democratic, so no one may be given the chance to excel the slowest or stupidest. School must be enjoyed—a self-fulfilling experience in self-esteem; let no one force the "student" to learn, particularly by boresome repetition. Nothing can be absorbed unless pictured, diagrammed, or physically demonstrated.

In such a climate religion withers. Moral decay results. No government, not even the usurped government of the Catholic Church, will face these facts. They all know the situation and deliberately prolong it—refrain from correcting it. After all, universal stupidity needs no brilliant language. Universal apostasy feeds on lawlessness and ignorance. And the ignorant are more easily controlled.

We all hone our wits on each other. When the sharper wits of the past are excluded, when the general standard drops, the limits drop correspondingly. We tend to lose our ability to follow patterns of reason, logic, and consistency. We incline to follow glib, insufficiently educated men who cannot draw logical conclusions from clear evidence.

Perhaps realization of our plight lay behind Cardinal Heenan's sworn testimony that he might be the most intelligent man in England. Though intelligence and education are not identical, he knew what he and his ilk had done to the Church's educational system. The intellect thrives on solid meat, lacking which it may not reach its potential. Areas of faith exist, naturally (supernaturally?),

but too many let them overlap into the area of reason, largely because of the general decay of reason. One who cannot reason will almost automatically assign what exceeds his own competence to faith. In a way this is pride: "If I can't understand this, no one else can understand it either." We must not sell our intelligence short; it is no credit to us but rather God's gift. Let us never assume that He has not given more or of different kinds to others. History overflows with examples. And the greatest created intelligence is Satan.

* * * * *

Back to Wiseman in his Lecture the Twelfth (minimally edited excerpts):

What addition have I made to the evidences of Christianity? These are something too inwardly and deeply seated in the heart to be augmented or diminished easily by the power of outward considerations. However we may require and use such proofs of its truths as learned men have ably collected, when reasoning with opponents of Christianity no one is conscious of clinging to its sublime doctrines and its consoling promises on the ground of such logical demonstration; even as an able theorist shall show you many cogent reasons founded on the social and natural laws, why ye should love your parents, and yet both he and you know that not for those reasons have you loved them, but from a far holier and more inward impulse. And so, when we once have embraced true religion, its motives or evidences need no longer be sought in the reasoning of books; they become incorporated with our holiest affections; they result from our finding the necessity, for our happiness, of the truths they uphold; in our there discovering the key to the secrets of our nature, the solution of all mental problems, the reconciliation of all contradictions in our anomalous condition, the answer to all the solemn questions of our restless consciousness.

With the true internal proofs of the Christian religion we have not dealt: but by removing objections against the external form of manifestations in which this religion appears, and against the documents in which its proofs and doctrines are recorded, and against many of the specific events therein registered, we may in some measure hope that the native force of those grounds of evidence will be increased and fitted for receiving a more powerful development in our minds.

Every security which an endless variety of tests, applied to a system without injuring it, can give of its truths, the Christian religion and its evidences may justly boast. The consequence presents a ground of confidence for the future, such as no other form of argument could present. Had the first stages of every science been the most favorable to our cause, and had its further improvement diminished what we had gained, we might indeed be alarmed about any ulterior prosecution of learning. But seeing that the order of things is precisely the reverse, that the beginnings of sciences are least propitious to our desires. and their progress most satisfactory, we cannot but be convinced that future discoveries, far from weakening, must necessarily strengthen the evidences we possess.

The Christian religion can have no interest in repressing the cultivation of science and literature, nor any reason to dread their general diffusion, so long as this is accompanied by due attention to sound moral principles and correctness of faith. For if the experience of the past has given us a security that the progress of science uniformly tends to increase the sum of our proofs, and to give fresh lustre to such as we already profess, in favor of Christianity, it surely becomes her interest and her duty to encourage that constant and salutary advance. Yet from the beginning of the Church there have been found men who professed a contrary opinion:

1) well-meaning Christians who, in all ages, have fancied that science and literature are incompatible with application to more sacred duties, or that they draw the mind from the contemplation of heavenly things, and are an alloy to that constant holiness of thought which a Christian should ever strive to possess; or else that such pursuits are clearly condemned in Scripture, wherever the wisdom of this world is reprov'd. This class of timid Christians first opposed that philosophy which so many of the Fathers, especially of the Alexandrian school, endeavored to join and reconcile with Christian theology. strenuously attacked and confuted by Clement of Alexandria, who devoted several chapters of his learned *Stromata* to the vindication of

his favorite studies. He observes very justly that “varied and abundant learning recommends him who proposes the great dogmas of faith, to the credit of his hearers, inspiring his disciples with admiration, and drawing them towards the truth.” Cicero says : “Great is the force of knowledge to persuade.” Back to Clement:

“Some, having a high opinion of their good dispositions, will not apply to philosophy or dialectics, nor even to natural philosophy, but wish to possess faith alone and unadorned: as reasonably as though they expected to gather grapes from a vine which they have left uncultivated. Our Lord is called, allegorically, a vine, from which we gather fruit, by a careful cultivation, according to the eternal Word. We must prune, and dig, and bind, and perform all other necessary labor. And, as in agriculture and in medicine, he is considered the best educated who has applied to the greatest variety of sciences, useful for tilling or for curing, so must we consider him most properly educated who makes all things to bear upon the truth; who from geometry, and music, and grammar, and philosophy itself, gathers whatever is useful for the defense of the faith. But the champion who has not trained himself well will surely be despised.”

St. Basil the Great earnestly recommends the study of elegant literature at that age when, according to him, the mind is too weak to bear the more solid food of God’s inspired Word. He expressly says that by the perusal of such writers as Homer the youthful mind is trained to virtuous feelings.

St. Gregory of Nyssa speaks of him with great praise, because he practically brought these principles to bear upon religion, and illustrated them with his great learning. “Many,” he writes, “present profane learning as a gift to the Church; among whom was the great Basil, who, having in his youth seized on the spoil of Egypt and consecrated it to God, adorned with its wealth the tabernacle of the Church.”

St. Gregory of Nazianzen had been Basil’s schoolfellow at Athens; where both, animated by the same religious spirit, had devoted themselves with signal success to the prosecution of study, considering truth, according to the expression of St. Augustine, “wherever found, to be the property of Christ’s Church.” Indeed, so well did their schoolmate, Julian, understand the value which they and other holy men of their time attached to human learning, and the powerful use they made of it to overthrow idolatry and error that, upon his apostasy, he issued a decree whereby Christians were debarred from attending public schools and acquiring science. And this was considered by them a grievous persecution. We find that many of the bishops and fathers of the Church were well versed in the knowledge of the heathens, insomuch that the Emperor Julian’s edict was accounted a more pernicious engine against the Church than the sanguinary persecutions of his predecessors. The Christian Church, among the inundations of the Scythians and Saracens, preserved in her bosom the relics of even profane learning, which had otherwise been utterly extinguished.

St. Gregory Nazianzen (at Basil’s funeral): “I think that all men of sound mind must agree that learning is to be reckoned the highest of earthly goods. I speak not merely of that noble learning which is ours, and which, despising all outward grace, applies exclusively to the work of salvation and the beauty of intellectual ideas, but also of that learning which is from without, which some ill-judging Christians reject as wily and dangerous, and as turning the mind from God.” After observing that the abuse of such learning by the heathens is no reason for its rejection, any more than their blasphemous substitution of the material elements for God can debar us from their legitimate use, he proceeds: “Therefore must not erudition be reprovèd because some men choose to think so; on the contrary, they are to be considered foolish and ignorant who so reason, who would wish all men to be like themselves, that they may be concealed in the crowd, and no one be able to detect their want of education.”

Turning to the great lights of the Western Church, we find no less severity. St. Jerome speaks even harshly of those who “mistake ignorance for sanctity, and boast that they are the disciples of poor fishermen.” On another occasion he illustrates the Scripture from many topics of heathen philosophy, concluding: “We take these few things from Scripture to show their agreement with the philosophers.”—an interesting study, not unworthy of a Christian, to trace connections between revealed truths and human learning.

St. Augustine, speaking of the qualities requisite for a well-furnished theologian, enumerates mundane learning among them as of great importance. "If they who are called philosophers have said any true things, which are conformable to our faith, so far from dreading them, we must take them for our use, as a possession which they unjustly hold."

St. Bernard: "I may, perhaps, appear to depreciate learning too much, and almost to reprove the learned, and forbid the study of letters. God forbid! I am not ignorant how much learned men have benefited and now benefit the Church, whether by confuting those who oppose her or by instructing the ignorant. And I have read 'because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will reject thee; that thou shalt not do the office of the priesthood to me.' (Osee iv, 6)"

Perhaps the best answer which can be given to such inconsiderate Christians as say that religion needs not such foreign and meretricious aids is that of Dr. South: "If God hath no need of our learning, He can have still less of your ignorance."

2) Those enemies of revelation against whom these Lectures have been principally directed, and who pretend that the onward course of science tends to overthrow or weaken the evidence of revealed religion. This ungrounded reproach was not made for the first time by the modern adversaries of Christianity, but is in fact the oldest charge brought against it. Celsus, one of the most ancient impugnors of its truth, whose objections are on record, especially taunted us with this hostility to science, from a fear of its weakening our cause. But he met with an able and victorious opponent in the learned Origen, who triumphantly rebuts the calumny and draws from it a conclusion which I cannot refrain from quoting:

"If the Christian religion shall be found to invite and encourage men to learning, then must they deserve severe reprehension who seek to excuse their own ignorance, by so speaking as to draw others away from application."

St. John Chrysostom (*De Sacerdote*): "We must take all pains that the doctrine of Christ dwell abundantly within us. For the preparations of the enemy's battle are not of one form; for the war is in itself various, and waged by divers foes. All use not the same arms, nor conduct their assault on the same plan. He, therefore, who undertakes to fight them all, must understand the arts of each. He must be at once an archer and a slinger, subaltern and commander, soldier ahorse or afoot, equally able to fight in the ship and on the bulwark. For in ordinary warfare each opposes his adversary after that manner whereunto he hath been trained; but in this conflict it is far otherwise; since, should he who must gain the victory be not acquainted with every separate art, the devil well knows how to take advantage of some unguarded point, and introduce his despoilers to seize and tear the flock. This is not the case where he knows the shepherd to be provided with every acquirement, and aware of his deceits. It behoveth us, therefore, to be prepared on every side."

[Contrast this with our modern(ist) shepherd, secure in the knowledge that he knows nothing—having passed imperviously through the seminary by the skin of his teeth—and must take his form from his bishop (who probably passed through the same seminary in the same way) and his "pope" (who may have passed through a seminary on a short tour of inspection). Our modern(ist) shepherds belong in that parable with the profitless servant, whom they appear to have surpassed: they have buried their no-talent.]

Wiseman ends his Lecture the Fourth: As no race could ever have gone out of its own physical characteristics for its type of ideal perfection, in the beauty of form; as the Egyptian never could, by any abstraction, have generated a style of art in which the color, shape, and features of his divinity should be purely European; nor the Greek have given his hero the tawny hue, narrow eyes, and protruding lips of the Egyptian—for each to the other must have seemed deformity—so could neither they, nor the men of any other nation, have framed to themselves an ideal type or canon of moral perfection of character which arose not from what, to them, seemed most beautiful and perfect. A Hindu cannot conceive his Brahman saint other than as possessing in perfection the abstemiousness, the silence, the austerity, and the minute exactness in every trifling duty which he admires, in different degrees, in his living models. Plato's Socrates, the perfection of the

philosophical character, is composed of elements perfectly Greek, being a compound of all those virtues which the doctrines of his school deemed necessary to adorn a sage.

Now this has often appeared to me the strongest internal proof of a superior authority stamped upon the Gospel history, that the holy and perfect Character it portrays not only differs from, but expressly opposes, every type of moral perfection which they who wrote it could possibly have conceived. We have, in the writings of the Rabbins, ample materials wherewith to construct the model of a perfect Jewish teacher; the sayings and actions of Hillel and Gamaliel, and Rabbi Samuel, all perhaps in great part imaginary, but all bearing the impress of national ideas, all formed upon one rule of imaginary perfection. Yet nothing can more widely differ than their thoughts, principles, actions, and character, and those of our Redeemer. Lovers of wrangling controversy, proposers of captious paradoxes, jealous upholders of their nation's exclusive privileges, zealous, uncompromising sticklers for the least comma of the law, and most sophisticated departers from its spirit, such mostly are these great men—the exact counterpart and reflection of those scribes and Pharisees so uncompromisingly reprov'd as the very contradiction of Gospel principles.

How comes it that men, not even learned, contrived to represent a character in every way departing from their national type—at variance with all those features which custom, education, patriotism, religion, and nature seemed to have consecrated as of all most beautiful? And the difficulty of considering such a character the invention of man, as some have impiously imagined, is still further increased by observing how writers recording different facts, as St. Matthew and St. John, lead us, nevertheless, to the same representation and conception. Yet herein we have a key to the solution of every difficulty. For if two artists were commanded to produce a form embodying their ideas of perfect beauty, and both exhibited figures equally shaped, upon types or models most different from all ever before seen in their country, and, at the same time, each perfectly resembling the other, I am sure such a fact would appear almost incredible except on the supposition that both had copied the same original. The Evangelists, too, must have copied the living Model which they represent; and accordance of the moral features which they give Him can only proceed from the accuracy with which they have respectively drawn them. But this only increases our mysterious wonder. For, assuredly, He was not as the rest of men Who could thus separate Himself in character from whatever was held most perfect and most admirable by all who surrounded Him, and by all who had taught Him; Who, while He set Himself far above all national ideas of moral perfection, yet borrowed nothing from Greek, or Indian, or Egyptian, or Roman; Who, while He thus had nothing in common with any known standard of character, any established law of perfection, should seem to everyone the type of his peculiarly beloved excellence. And truly, when we see how He can have been followed by the Greek, though a founder of none of his sects—revered by the Brahman, though preached unto him by men of the fishermen's caste-worshipped by the red men of Canada, though belonging to the hated pale race—we cannot but consider Him as destined to break down all distinction of color, and shape, and countenance, and habits; to form in Himself the type of unity to which are referable all the sons of Adam, and give us, in the possibility of this moral convergence, the strongest proof that the human species, however varied, is essentially one.

AUTUMN IN NEW JERSEY—1925

“Yes, God can do all things,” chanted my First Communion class. “Nothing is hard or impossible to Him.” Our curate had already thrown us once. He would not settle for catechism by rote. He had to assure himself that we had indeed attained the use of reason. Our age was insufficient evidence. Nor was it too tender to receive “adult” mental fare.

“God is everywhere,” we had chorused. “Is God in hell?”

He must have heard the gears spinning in our heads. In hell all suffer eternal torture and never see God. Who can make God suffer? Can He be where His privation is required? But He’s here and we never see Him. The gears never meshed; we had to be told: “God is in hell **in power**.” Without God’s support and will, hell could no more exist than earth and heaven, the damned could no more exist than the saved, torture and privation could no more exist than possession of the Beatific Vision.

Now he threw us again: “Can God make a square circle?”

“Yes, of course! God can do anything!”

Our curate could do more than ask silly questions; he could draw. He drew us a square and a circle. He defined them. He showed us that a square cannot be circular and that a circle cannot have four equal sides and four equal perimetric right angles—by definition. Since a square circle cannot exist, since it is a contradiction in terms and ideas, it has no relation whatever to the power of God. He cannot make a square circle any more than He can create another God— another being equal to Himself. He is the Supreme Being. No one can be His equal. He is the necessary, uncreated Being. Any being He creates necessarily depends on Him, is a contingent being, and cannot be or become His equal even though He could conceivably wish it so—by definition. These are not limits to His power; they prove its infinity. We cannot “restrict” it to absurdity.

This parish curate thus put more than a hundred born Catholics on the road to becoming thinking, reasoning, logical Catholics; I shall be grateful to him till I die. For he enabled me to draw the parallel:

The pope possesses supreme power in the Church. But supreme power cannot empower him to perform an absurdity. It is a manifest absurdity to replace Catholic traditions, especially traditional Mass and sacraments, with something new. A new tradition is as self-contradictory as a square circle. Papal power is also restricted to reason. Nothing unreasonable, illogical, or new can be Catholic.

Or else God has decided to drive all men mad. He has decided to reveal eternal religious truth to men, to require its acceptance on His authority, and then to change it. He experiments with us as Pavlov did with dogs. He may act as He pleases; He has Creator’s rights over all. But He cannot act in such a manner because, being perfect, He cannot change, because He is eternal Truth, because He cannot be subject to His own creations (of which time, even “modern” time, is one), because He can do nothing absurd, such as to draw square circles or reveal contradictory “truths.”

If we join Paul VI in his unending search for the truth that God has truthfully revealed and has assured us we already possess, we demonstrate little appreciation of God’s word. Then why should we prize that of Paul VI? When Paul teaches and legislates in direct or oblique opposition to former popes, how can he claim the same authority? the same infallibility? the same office? the same religion?

My First Communion catechism taught:

1. **God is a spirit, infinitely perfect.** Perfection necessarily predicates unchangeability, and excludes stages of development. Any difference is necessarily imperfection.
2. **Man is made to the image and likeness of God.**
3. **This likeness is chiefly in the soul**—which, the Church teaches, is created immediately and individually by God.

Paul VI and his modernists now order us to believe in modern man, the excuse for the postconciliar “Church,” who is different—possibly through evolution—from his last two millennia of ancestors. They lead us to yet another absurdity: a perfect, unchangeable God Who has changed His own image and likeness in an area not possibly invaded by any form of evolution—even were it possible in the human body.

When did God break the mold and begin to create modern man? It was necessarily since my own conception. So why must I be saddled with this postconciliar religion, which has been developed from the perfection of the old to suit a new creature in **whose** image and likeness?

ON THEORIES OF ORIGINS (Thomas E. Heckenkamp)

Darwin (The Origin of Species, Chapter 9) “explains” the fossil record’s failure to show transitions from one animal group to another. They should show if his theory is correct. Most fossil study had been confined to European and North American rock strata. Cuvier, Lyell, and many other geologists deemed these representative of past life. But Darwin necessarily held to belief in the imperfection of the geological record. Further world-wide search, he felt, would indicate transitions between species, links between such groups as reptiles and birds, and how land mammals had developed specialized forms which could invade the oceans. His theory, which the fossil record should support, predicated millions of extinct missing links.

Extensive search has failed Darwin. Of 48 Australian land mammal genera, 45% are known as fossils. Of 145 in Africa 49% are known as fossils. In North America 90% of the 71 genera of land mammals are represented. The fossil record is fairly complete on animals we know have lived, but entirely lacking in animal links whose existence evolution assumes. Bats appear fully developed without a trace of “ancestral” forms. Birds have perfect wings capable of flight. Limbs of the earliest known amphibia are no more fishlike than those of living amphibia. There is no hint how a reptile exteriorized its skin as a turtle. No animal can be traced by fossils through evolutionary stages. Life itself appears suddenly in many different forms in the earliest fossiliferous rocks. This “Cambrian explosion” posed a still unsolved problem for Darwin.

Since 1859 science has added numerous far greater objections to Darwin’s theory. With Redi’s and Spallanzani’s groundwork the idea that life could arise spontaneously was challenged. It was still accepted, however, that “simple” one-celled life formed spontaneously in the presence of the right nutrients. In 1864 Louis Pasteur convincingly disproved this, and the Law of Biogenesis was accepted: life comes only from pre-existing life. Vast expenditure of time and money has failed to create life in the laboratory, understandably—we have only begun to realize the vast complexity of a single cell. If man ever makes a living cell, will this show that life could have started by itself? No; it will merely emphasize that life and intelligence—in this case the lives and intelligences of many men, the very top of the evolutionary tree—must precede even a single living plant or animal.

Mathematical probability applied to living systems can demonstrate lack of time for natural selection even to have begun an evolutionary process, even if no mutations were harmful. (MUTATION: A random change in the DNA molecule’s chemical sequence. It is detrimental if not lethal in more than 99% of cases. DNA contains the information directing the seed or ovum into the plant or animal it eventually becomes.) Accepting the current guess that the earth is 3,000 million years old, it can be shown mathematically that there has not been time to assemble the bones of a human skeleton at random even once. From life’s first appearance not enough time has elapsed for the chance formation of a single specific protein twenty amino acids long. No biological proteins are this small; even the haemoglobin protein of your blood is over 500 amino acids long of a specific sequence. And of course this mindless chain would know when to stop.

The theory of evolution proposes that life arose by itself when chemicals were arranged into greater order by natural random processes. Life, once begun, became over eons of time increasingly complex and diversified until finally we have life as found today. But two laws of thermodynamics contradict this:

1) Things left to themselves never become more organized but always less organized. They deteriorate and simplify, no matter how much energy or how many building blocks are available. Intelligence is necessary for any reversal in the natural deterioration of order.

2) Matter and energy can be neither created nor destroyed. So they come from a Creator or they have always existed. But if matter always existed what organized it? What gave planets their orderly elliptical orbits? Why does energy still reach us from the sun? In a finite number of years it and all the other stars will burn out, and all orderly orbits in the universe will become disordered. But if the universe has existed from infinite time, would not the state of total disorder already have been reached? For that takes only a finite period, and we're still on the way.

When you see a watch you believe in a watchmaker. No one can convince you that the watch fell together by chance. When you see the grand design and order in the universe can you disbelieve in a Grand Designer, an Orderer? Any other explanation must prove at least two laws of science incorrect. Unreasonably, ignoring these laws completely, most biologists today accept the design without the Designer, the watch without the Watchmaker, the obvious order out of Darwinian chaos. All the glories of the universe, all the marvels of nature, add up to rolls of the dice by a non-existent gambler.

EVOLUTION, Modernist Mendicant, ELIMINATES the CREATOR.

It reduces all life, all intelligence, to a common denominator—some lifeless cell somehow chanced to reproduce itself into all known forms. Man is produced accidentally by an undemonstrable, unnatural “natural selection,” of which he has seen no instance in five thousand years. Had such a stupendous event occurred, it is inconceivable that no one would have recorded it.

Evolution, wonderful though its blind chance accomplishments, produces no soul, no moral code, no conscience, nothing to differentiate man from beast. Somehow confined to the moral order as distinct from other non-material fields (philosophy, music, literature), this is enough; it wipes away restraint and responsibility, freedom of will and its possible punitive consequences, and God Himself—while it postulates man's progress to (undefinable) deification. Where will he be, what will he do, when he arrives? Deity appears to have neither function nor existence.

But no one can doubt the process. Look around at the high state of civilization. Note the increase everywhere—in crime statistics (the result of improved compilation methods?), in health (as in our frequent epidemics of unidentifiable new influenzas, or in the unprecedented spread of venereal disease), in literacy (where more and more can read less and less), in good manners (from superior education), even in prices for necessities of life, so that wives must work away from ever smaller families to help support them. This promotes the independent evolution of women. Are they catching or outdistancing men?

Evolutionists evidently enjoy greater intelligence than the simple Christian believer. They cannot be gulled by Holy Scripture's fairy tale of creation. They **know!**

They also support ZPG, and emphasize quality over quantity. But mathematically they reduce the chance—less men, less chance—of further evolution, which has a “history” of dependence upon chance. Or will we progress simultaneously— Andamanese, Namibians, Hairy Ainus, and all?

Heredity plays a large part in men's development, both physical and mental. No one passes on what he lacks. Bright parents produce bright children. Who produces least? The university graduate. Who procreates most? The ignorant “savage” who has never heard of, or is too pig-headed to use, contraception. The result? On the evolutionists' own standards, the average mental level drops with each generation. At rock-bottom all will believe in evolution, but none will be able to spell it.

In all my life I have met only three men too stupid to realize that any intelligence could surpass their own. If they could not understand something it could not be understood. No amount of evidence could convince them otherwise. They were the acme of human intelligence, beyond which no man could progress. Evolution's logic is on their side—they outclass all previous generations. These three have arrived at Omega Point—they are as gods because they are perfect, or at least further perfection is unthinkable. When all men come to this state they will enjoy permanent peace through self-fulfilment and self-satisfaction. But they won't believe a word on authority. For what authority could know more than they?

This attitude prevails among stone-age peoples, who are consequently “happier” than we. They have less “hang-ups”; they live close to “nature.” Human nature? Grown children, they are called, or, when it suits, the deprived and/or oppressed. They have fallen behind in the scale of evolution, and we must help them along. But who helped **us** along? Who brought **us** from the stone age? We have developed from such origins? Why not these peoples?

The universe is running down—becoming less not more perfect. The sun, feeding on itself, must eventually burn out. The solar system slows down a few seconds each year. Plant and animal species become extinct, and nothing replaces them. Nature becomes increasingly unbalanced, as the ecologists endlessly complain. Why, in all this degeneration, is man the sole exception? Why is evolution upward? Why is not stone-age man furthest from primitive man? No one bequeathes what he lacks. Each generation can only lose, not gain, though some generations treat their patrimony with skill and care. Stone-age peoples have outstripped us in the scale of devolution.

Though evolution remains unproven theory, it appeals to proud man because he then owes nothing to a Creator. But it is against all historical evidence, and illogical to boot. It could not have happened.

Yet upon this impossibility are based modernism and the postconciliar changes in the Church, which accommodates evolved, evolving modern man—this inexorable, inevitable advancement over Aristotle, Cicero, Virgil, Tertullian, Augustine, Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Thomas More, Leonardo Da Vinci, Michelangelo, Kepler, Newton, Pascal, Cobbett, Bernini, Beethoven, Dante, Swift, Samuel Johnson, and Chesterton.

What can an evolutionist bequeath except scorn for his own generation?

C. S. LEWIS (MIRACLES, pp 126 sqq & 181):

“In science,” said the late Sir Arthur Eddington, “we sometimes have convictions which we cherish but cannot justify; we are influenced by some innate sense of the fitness of things.” This may sound a perilously subjective and aesthetic criterion; but can one doubt that it is a principal source of our belief in uniformity? A universe in which unprecedented and unpredictable events were at every moment flung into nature would not merely be inconvenient to us; it would be profoundly repugnant. We will not accept such a universe on any terms whatever. It is utterly detestable to us. It shocks our sense of the fitness of things. In advance of experience, in the teeth of many experiences, we are already enlisted on the side of uniformity. For of course science actually proceeds by concentrating not on the regularities of nature but upon her apparent irregularities. It is the apparent irregularity that prompts each new hypothesis. It does so because we refuse to acquiesce in irregularities; we never rest till we have formed and verified a hypothesis which enables us to say that they were not really irregularities at all. Nature as it comes to us looks at first like a mass of irregularities. The stove which lit alright yesterday won’t light today; the water which was wholesome last year is poisonous this year. The whole mass of seemingly irregular experience could never have been turned into scientific knowledge at all unless from the very start we had brought to it a faith in uniformity which almost no number of disappointments can shake.

Our repugnance to disorder is derived from Nature’s Creator and ours. The disorderly world which we cannot endure to believe in is the disorderly world He would not have endured to create.

Men became scientific because they expected Law in Nature, and they expected Law in Nature because they believed in a Legislator. In most modern scientists this belief has died; it will be interesting to see how long their confidence in uniformity survives it. Two significant developments have already appeared—the hypothesis of a lawless sub-nature, and the surrender of the claim that science is true. We may be living nearer than we suppose to the end of the scientific age.

..... Nothing is more definitely excluded by Old Nature than any return to a *status quo*. The pattern of Death and Rebirth never restores the previous individual organism. And similarly, on the inorganic level, we are told that Nature never restores order where disorder has once occurred. “Shuffling,” said Professor Eddington, “is one thing Nature never undoes.” Hence we live in a universe where organisms are always getting more disordered. These laws between them—irreversible death and irreversible entropy—cover almost the whole of what St. Paul calls the “vanity” of Nature: her futility, her ruinousness. And the film is never reversed. The movement from more order to less almost serves to determine the direction in which time is flowing. You could almost define the future as the period in which what is now living will be dead and in which what order still remains will be diminished.

[What could be more glaringly obvious than the universal breakdown of order? Only its near-complete disappearance from our most orderly Church!

To bring it back we must kill EVOLUTION.]

RADICAL INNOVATION plagues the Church since Vat II’s Convocation.

Its excuse, foundation, and sole philosophy is **Progress—Updating—Evolution**, that absurd theory dependent for its shadow existence on its usefulness to militant atheism. Its use to current ecclesiastical “authority” is emphasized in Paul VI’s words to theologians and scientists at a Symposium on Original Sin(!) July 11, 1966: “But even the theory of ‘Evolutionism’ favored today by many scientists and not a few theologians **owing to its probability**, will not seem acceptable to you where it is not decidedly in accord with the immediate creation of each and every human soul by God, and where it does not regard as decisively important for the fate of mankind the disobedience of Adam, universal protoparent.”

Paul again (Sept. 9, 1966: “..... wonderful and moving picture of our parishes of the past, those generated by the Tridentine reform, from the actions and teachings of St. Charles; those where personal and collective prayer, the children’s catechesis and that of adults, Christian customs, the united and community consciousness, the authority and spirit of sacrifice of the

shepherd were truly active in an exquisitely pious and popular manner. Times of the past? Yes, past, at least in great part; worthy, however, of honor and memory, not because we should resolve to make their external and particular forms live anew, **forms which the evolution of our society no longer allows**, but because we should endeavor to make the Christian community live anew in a new conscience and a new fullness, such as the parish.” (!?) “The Council preserves, confirms, ennobles the parochial formula, as a normal and primary expression of the care of souls. It is not a formula sufficient in itself in the pastoral plan proportioned to modern needs. Many other forms of religious aid and of apostolate are necessary to carry the word and grace of the Gospel to the hundreds of forms of life of men today.”

Paul’s letter to the International Congress on the Theology of Vatican II, Sept. 21, 1966: “..... the work of the ecumenical council did not end completely with the promulgation of the decrees because as the history of the council shows, such decrees constitute a start toward new goals rather than a point of arrival. It is still necessary that the renewing spirit and the breath of the council should penetrate the depths of the life of the Church; it is necessary that the vital germ deposited by the council in the soil of the Church reach full fruition. But this cannot be achieved unless the great riches of the doctrinal patrimony—**the gift of the council to the entire Church**—are first duly investigated, known, and possessed. everything that is taught by the Second Vatican Council is harmoniously joined with the preceding ecclesiastical teaching, of which it is no more than the continuation, explanation, and growth.”

Paul addressed the Workers of the World (Turin, 1960): “Will it not happen to modern man as slowly his scientific studies progress and laws and realities buried in the mute face of matter come to be discovered, that he will hear the marvelous voice of the spirit vibrating within it? Will this be the religion of tomorrow?”

He told the Apostolate of the Laity (Rome, 1957): “..... the world, especially today, is in a phase of profound and rapid evolution”

* * * * *

That the universe was formed by a fortuitous concourse of atoms, I will no more believe than that the accidental jumbling of the alphabet would fall into a most ingenious treatise of philosophy.

—Jonathan Swift.

LIBER ACCUSATIONIS IN PAULUM SEXTUM: “The immense harm done by Teilhardism is common knowledge today. And, though the star of the evolutionary Jesuit may have paled considerably, this is not because of any general realization of his errors but rather because present day opinion has far outstripped these. Not only do you not condemn him, but at the very moment when everyone expected from you some reaction to the worldwide campaign being waged on his behalf, you reacted, not with any clearcut comment, favorable or unfavorable, but by praising him in a subtle manner, We heard that on 24 Feb. 1966, in the course of a visit to the Pharmaceutical Laboratories, “The Holy Father then made a reference to Teilhard, who had given an explanation of the universe and who had seen in the sensory world evidence of an intelligent principle which could only be referred to as God.” Man was learning how to engage in “this vast dialogue with the universe and was sending up a hymn to God, creator and father of all.” These few extracts from your remarks reported in the press were enough to illustrate the affinity between the vague Deism of Teilhard and your own way of thinking. His pantheistic evolutionism provides an ideal setting for your own progressist Utopianism, incompatible necessarily with your Catholic Faith. — Georges de Nantes

Paul went miles out of his way to canonize an outstanding proponent of evolution whose dedication to this theory’s promotion induced him to manufacture evidence of two non-existent “ancestors,” Piltdown and Peking men. Paul emulates Teilhard in remaining “in the Church” for the sake of his message in preference to leaving like an **honest** heretic. Like Henry VIII, **he** must be right, and needs universal acclamation to prove it. God, he would appear to hold, cannot condemn **all** men. United we can outvote God; the totality of our intelligences can exceed our Creator’s; God exists to fulfil men. **Then how came the Flood?**

How are we to kill this nonsense when our “pope” spouts it? In what can we trust words, acts, or motives of one who will purvey absurdity to degrade our ancestors who kept the Faith **because** they kept it—who will use this absurdity to convince us that we must have a more advanced religion to suit our higher state of evolution?

All truth is God’s truth, said the Church; science and religion cannot contradict each other. So it failed to condemn direct contradiction of Scripture which

- 1) reduces man to a graduate beast without moral obligation,
- 2) eliminates respect for authority,
- 3) breaks down civilization, order, and religion.

TREMENDOUS FINISH TO A TREMENDOUS PAMPHLET

Wallace Johnson published an unanswerable fifty-eight pages in which he exploded base after base purporting to legitimize evolution, **The Case Against Evolution**. I paraphrase the finish, **Why We Must Fight the Theory of Evolution**:

Among the mightiest weapons in Lucifer’s arsenal is a myth, put forth seriously though preposterously as “science.” He trapped our first parents with pride. He traps modern men with an odd inversion of pride whereby they glory in the basest of bestial origins and boast of their “advancement.”

Acceptance of the theory of Evolution destroys Christianity. A process of mindless chance replaces God the Creator. Thus no absolute moral authority exists. Who will obey a non-existent?

No laws, no violations! No sin—especially no original sin. From what, then, did Christ redeem us? Christianity becomes a useless fraud.

The surest way to lose original sin is to get rid of original sinners [and their tempter as well; no God, no devil]. Adam and Eve become an allegory to cover the infinitely complicated miracle of blind chance, the simultaneous mutation of one human race from clans of beasts. This polygenism richly merited Pope Pius XII’s condemnation (*Humani Generis*).

Without original sin 1) Baptism has no meaning. 2) Redemption is unnecessary. 3) What is the Immaculate Conception? 4) Genesis is a fable which must yield to “science.”

5) When part of the Bible is untrue, what supports the remainder? All doctrine based on Scripture loses its foundation. Christianity declines with Evolution’s advance.

Teilhard de Chardin’s “theology” has re-cast Catholic doctrine to “fit” Evolution. The Church has placed against his doctrines 1) Pius XII’s *Humani Generis* (1950), 2) a *Monitum* of the Holy Office (1962) warning against Teilhard’s grave errors and their propagation, 3) Decree of the Holy Office (1957) forbidding his books in Catholic libraries and their sale in Catholic bookshops. These documents remain unretracted and unmodified.

Two Jesuits have written **The Theology of Evolution**, a book which supports and cites “evidence” for Evolution, turns original sin upside-down to suit Evolution, and devotes a chapter to “the evolutionary vision of Teilhard de Chardin.” It states that “Pius XII in *Humani Generis* could have made a mistake,” refers to “the censures of *Humani Generis* on polygenism,” and concludes: “we think that the question of polygenism, with all due respect to *Humani Generis*, may be treated as an open one.” But it argues against the Special Creation of the human soul—that would require a miracle, and miracles are unacceptable.

If Evolution is really true (a miracle in the face of astronomical odds) then the **Catholic Faith simply must be changed**. Therefore, **to defend the Faith we must demolish the Theory of Evolution**. And **we must demolish Evolution on its own chosen ground, scientific credibility**. If we can demolish Evolution the **Teilhardian church** falls with it.

And then the **Faith of our Fathers** is restored. (So far Mr. Johnson)

The Faith of our Fathers centred around the Mass and Sacraments of our Fathers. These, like the doctrine, are gone through application of the same theory of Evolution, the same weapon of the same Lucifer. It will not suffice to bring back the Faith without the Mass and Sacraments which nourished it. We may be forced to settle for the bare Faith, however, when Mass and Sacraments finally vanish through the machinations of the **Teilhardian Church**.

RELEVANT TERMS, DEFINITIONS, ETC.

Ecology—A science developed to demonstrate the end result, comparable with locking the barn door after the horse has been buried.

Metabiosis—Preparation of a friendly environment by preceding life forms.

Creation—The act or series of acts by which God made a perfect ecological system from nothing, apparently applying metabiosis. Man came last. All previous creation had prepared his way. The perfect God in His perfect action placed a perfect man in a perfectly suited environment.

Man—A creature composed of body and soul, made in the image and likeness of God. A major likeness is free will, by means of which man proceeded to rebel, preferring his own will to that of his Creator. The environment, loyal to its Creator, turned against man. Man fought it. He wiped out a plant here and an animal there. Into the abhorred vacuum sprang something more hostile—a weed or beast which the vanished species had kept in check, in God's marvelous metabiotic system. The lesson lost, men then wiped out the substitute danger, inevitably replaced by a worse. He had invented the law of diminishing returns. He was well on his way to converting his original paradise to desert.

Man's interference with his base and his perversion of his gifts led to further numbing of his appreciation of both, to the detriment of his health, strength, mental capacity, and longevity—a major factor. The longer the life, the greater the use that can be made of increasing stores of experimental knowledge, even in passing it on. The fewer the hands through which knowledge passes, the less chance for distortion. Writings inevitably replace first-hand knowledge, and have little effect on the illiterate or the magnificently literate with insufficient access to the records, or too lazy to consult them. Men enjoying a vigorous maturity of sixty or seventy years can have no concept of the effect, the store of knowledge and experience, the capacity, ability, and energy of men strong enough to last eight or nine centuries. If we are lucky we can ask our grandparents about events or customs of seventy or eighty years ago. But Noe had eighty-four years in which he could have associated with his seventh direct ancestor, Enos, who in turn had 695 years with his grandfather, Adam, who was taught by God. Men who lived to such ages could well have numbered their children in hundreds, and have seen as many as forty generations of their descendants.

Darwin—Originator of a theory proposed to replace creation and to relegate early man and his history to the categories of fable and hyperbole. The old boy left no written records.

But who knows what libraries the flood may have wiped out? We can identify no antediluvian writings. So Darwinists assume that early man was illiterate, which, against all odds, could be true. In a tribal environment communication is easy. Certainly there was little need for writing, hardly the only means of communication. Railroad switchmen communicate at considerable distances with each other and with their engine crews by hand and lamp signals. When man needs something—a tool, a skill, a shelter—he develops it. This is no more than application of his natural gifts, almost always built upon experience and civilization preserved for his generation by his ancestors. The very few lost or abandoned children who survive in the wild are invariably retarded by their environment. It takes years to civilize those caught. No wild man ever civilized himself. He requires example. "Primitive" peoples are those whose ancestors neglected, forgot, or were prevented from passing on higher standards. Yet some of these have kept long and accurate histories by oral tradition. Is it science to assume that records cannot be accurate unless written?

Evolution—Darwin’s discovery, a theory which replaces faith in the Bible with blind faith in Darwin, and requires a pre-history of millions and billions of years because all recorded history glaringly fails to exemplify or corroborate it, though such a stunning occurrence could hardly have escaped the widest coverage. Such a long established process would hardly have ceased abruptly because man began to write history. Truly the impossible takes a little longer.

Like begets like. Our great common ancestor was a man, a direct creation of God. We see men come from men every day. When have we seen marine microbes outdistance a carp, crawl out of the water, survive sun and wind long enough to propagate, and develop into a passing phase so unfit for survival that it has survived nowhere, but is capable of fathering such a complicated being as a man, or his little toe?

Have you ever paused to consider, when you have seen a detailed sketch of the current Missing Link, the consummate skill of an artist capable of reconstructing such a great hairy creature from such a slight foundation as a molar, a malar, and a partial metatarsal—probably from three different simian species?

CATHOLIC EDUCATION OFFICE HALLOWEEN RELEASE

to all teachers in Sydney’s 343 Catholic schools (all quotations from Sydney Morning Herald, Nov. 1, 1986)—this directive commissioned by Brother W. X. Simmons, Diocesan Director of Schools:

*Creationism should not be taught.

*Literal interpretation of the Bible is unacceptable.

*The concept of evolution of man and other primates is beyond serious dispute.

[Like begets like. If evolution—concept, theory, whatever—be beyond serious dispute, blood tests to determine paternity are useless. Possibly the CEO can explain original sin in the presence of evolution. Presumably Cain would know whence he came. When taxed with Abel’s murder he could have disclaimed moral responsibility in words that would have echoed and re-echoed down the ages: “What do you want from me? My grandfather was an ape!” Neither he nor any of us would owe anything to a Creator; we would simply have evolved through chance. From what would we have been redeemed? Why would we be baptized?]

“There has been some confusion about what to teach,” said Barry Price, Religious Education Adviser (CEO). “This position statement was written to ensure that the true position of the Church gets through to the children.”

[When did this nonsense become the position of the Church?]

Simmons: “Scientists do not accept creationism as science and the Catholic student who is taught creationism as if it were a science is forced into an impossible position.”

[Creation is a fact. Science is a series of hypotheses continually abandoned as facts or other theories fail to confirm them.]

Price: “If children are taught creationism as a science then sooner or later they are put in a dilemma which for many of them will result in rejecting their faith. If they reject science, they cannot fit into our modern science-based culture. essential to bring about a synthesis of faith and science and culture so our children will be able to take their faith into the third millennium with them.”

[Faith in what? When science has contradicted the Catholic faith it has never been able to demonstrate its own truth. What kind of faith in God can’t stand up against faith in some scientist, who is here today, and tomorrow damned by the entire scientific establishment?]

The directive: “We are not required as Christians to maintain that the earth was created in six calendar days, when everything which has been learned by the most careful and honest scientific analysis of the book of the works of God points to different conclusions.”

[What is this book of the works of God? Who can read it? People differ on the meaning of Scripture, which is God’s word. Why can they not honestly differ or err in the field of God’s other

creation? Nor are scientific researchers necessarily honest. They tend to discover evidence to corroborate what they have already concluded—like: the omnipotent Creator could not have created the world in six days. Why not? It's His time. He created it. How can **it** limit Him?]

Father Brian Lucas, an official spokesman: “The Catholic Church rejects creationism, a belief that the world was created in six days or some other very short time, as a misunderstanding of the Bible. The Church simply insists that the human spirit is uniquely created by God and that the whole world is God's creation.” [including the time in which it was created.]

Evolutionary theory opposes all nature. Anything left to itself will decline or decay, like religious education. The longer the time the greater the decline. An omnipotent Creator, Who creates out of nothing, cannot be restricted by human conceptions or misconceptions. We proceed by trial and error. But God knows all, including how to create that which he wishes to create. CEO implies, with the scientific community, that God is too stupid to get things right immediately, but requires endless time and monkeys to evolve men. If He has guided such an unnecessary, not to say impossible, process, what happens to natural selection? Has some one abrogated the laws of heredity? How is the concept of Deity consistent with limits? Whoever sets limits to His power, knowledge, ability or puts a stop-watch on His actions denies His divinity. So what is he doing in the Catholic education system?

Genesis i, 5: And He called the light Day, and the darkness Night. And there was evening and morning one day.

8: And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and morning were the second day.

13: And the evening and morning were the third day.

19: And the evening and morning were the fourth day.

23: And the evening and morning were the fifth day.

25: And God made the beasts of the earth according to their kinds, and cattle, and everything that creepeth on the earth after its kind. And God saw that it was good. [After its kind. Like begets like. It was good—complete, done—not in flux or evolution.]

27: And God created man to his own image. [Through a series of mindless creatures?]

31: And God saw all the things that He had made, and they were very good. And the evening and morning were the sixth day.

We are to interpret Scripture literally unless it is clearly intended (such as through parable or impossibility) otherwise. There may be a case for poetic phrase here, but none whatsoever for impossibility. Even if we dream up some reason not to believe God in His revelation to the human race (which had only His word for whatever happened before the sixth day) how can we be expected to believe Charles Darwin, who neither saw nor accomplished any of it?

Objection—THE WORLD CREATED IN SIX DAYS? RIDICULOUS! Even many who believe the Bible defend against this stupidity by admitting that the Bible cannot be taken literally in its account of creation—that God spoke to primitive man according to his limited understanding. Man could not comprehend the complexities of evolutionary processes and the immensity of time necessary.

Reply—If the Bible is not to be taken literally, what is wrong with the argument—at least as probable—that God, having created all in one instant, parceled out the account over six days to present the limited human intelligence with something it could handle. Instantaneous creation (the Big Bang?) also was certainly within His power. He could create in six days or six seconds. Indeed, He created time itself, by which He could measure, if or how He wished, how long creation took. But it is not in His power to deceive. So why quibble over what can be known not from history, observation, or application of non-applicable rules and measurements, but only from Authority? To circumscribe Omnipotence with laws or rules of His own making is the peak of illogicality.

The philologists tell us that the Hebrew **yom** is indeterminate, representing not only **day** but **eon**. Ptolemy's seventy Alexandrian Hebrew scholars, hired for outstanding competence in Hebrew and Greek, agreed on ημερα, not αιων, even furnishing it (as in Hebrew) morning (πρωι) and evening (εσπερα). When St. Jerome, extremely proficient in both languages, translated the Septuagint from

the philosophic Greek to the pragmatic Latin he used equivalent words, **dies, mane, vespere**. The learned Douai translators used **day, morning, evening**, again equivalent. Only since science discovered the “impossibility” of their literal meaning has anyone worried the question. (Fathers and Doctors of the Church could be found on either side, without rancor.) Man has not really evolved to the point where he can understand what his ancestors meant better than when under divine inspiration they recorded creation. Even supposing evolution possible in man’s body, his soul and intellect cannot come within its scope.

Evolution’s proponents have a wicked end in view, animal amorality for rational creatures—non-existence of human responsibility to man’s Creator. If I owe nothing to God, what must I owe my family, associates, or community? Who can trust me?

If morals can be based on majority opinion I need not try to be good; it may be easier to mould public opinion. If I can control immigration I can eventually break down the country’s moral and legal systems. After all, can we discriminate against our Buddhist, Moslem, Hindu, or voodoo citizens? But try moving to Saudi Arabia or Sudan and demanding your own legal or moral code. Or try practising a non-Islamic religion in public.

BOOKS

TEILHARD AND THE NEW RELIGION, Wolfgang Smith,
TAN Books & Publishers, Inc., Rockford, Illinois 61105

A real delight. Puncturing Teilhard de Chardin presents all the problems of shooting fish in a barrel. Demonstrating Pierre’s (unwed) paternity of the New Religion requires more skill, comprehension, and patience. Dr. Smith has performed both tasks competently, convincingly, thoroughly, and enjoyably. In our decadent, pedagogically perverted age it is not merely satisfying but almost surprising to discover such an outstandingly articulate intelligence, “from start to finish motivated by one paramount concern: to safeguard a living legacy which is incomparably more than a mere philosophical system or formal doctrine.” In Chapter I he shows several times that Teilhard has bound his entire “system” (a new religion) to evolution. Between times Dr. Smith quotes both the scientists themselves in his utter demolition of Darwin’s weird theory, and St. Augustine: “God, therefore, in His unchangeable eternity created simultaneously all things whence times were to flow,” including, of course, time itself.

Dr. Smith asks why all Teilhard’s assumptions, and dogmatic statements—unsupported, at times contradictory. He suggests that Teilhard’s real concern is precisely abolition of the traditional corporal-spiritual dualism. Seemingly, it hardly matters whether consciousness springs into existence as a direct result of some fortuitous conjunction of particles or pre-exists in some rudimentary form. Teilhard leans now to this side, now to that, but in either case denies the traditional dualism. Even where he straddles an issue, neither foot reaches firm ground. It seems that just about anything goes, with one notable exception: the traditional teaching—the one teaching which irreconcilably opposes the postulate of radical evolutionism.

Typically excellent is Chapter VIII, **The Idea of Progress**. “..... reason, too, has its limitations; it does not simply coincide with intellect, or with intelligence as such. it constitutes but one particular mode of knowing, a mode which moreover is secondary or derivative. Discursive thought represents after all an indirect way of knowing, a knowing ‘by reflection,’ Thought does not cover the entire ground of knowing the spiritual man in us has also his cognitive means. And as we learn from St. Paul, only by way of these higher and indeed god-like faculties shall we be able, *Deo volente*, to know ‘the things of the Spirit of God.’

“Now the great Scholastics understood this perfectly well. They did not idolize human rationality, nor were they ignorant of the fact that the spiritually integrated man can readily dispense with syllogisms. They knew, moreover, how to combine reason with spiritual contemplation; in their hands argument could serve as a catalyst of intellection in the true sense. But unfortunately this spiritual art has not been passed on to the bulk of their disciples; mainly the more external and contingent aspects of Scholasticism have been transmitted to posterity—

the mere instrument, the very perfection of this instrument contributed to the subsequent decline of spiritual vision; after all, the 'letter' does have a tendency to 'kill'

"..... no sooner had the great masters passed from the scene than signs of decadence and disintegration began to appear. No longer was reason regarded as the handmaid of a higher intellectual faculty, a power in us that needs to be awakened through grace and a certain spiritual art. And this was the fatal step: reason declared its own autonomy." And reason divorced from a large part of reality leads to the irrational—such as a God completely comprehensible to (*ergo* limited by) the human mind—Omniscience and Omnipotence subject to His own creation.

"Progress, then—the specifically modern concept of a future collective utopia—replaces the quest for God, and ultimately becomes confounded with that quest. eventually the veneration of Progress blossoms forth into a mysticism of sorts, a 'religion of the future' that claims to fulfill and supersede all the religions of the past. futurism and a cult of progress are inevitable once the world has become flattened out in the collective imagination and there has been an effective loss of verticality." If hope can aspire to nothing higher it must fasten on horizontal progress. JP2, asked whether he tended right or left, said: "My direction is forward"—further from our spiritual base, not such foolishness as "Upward."

"..... science inevitably begets pseudo-science and its own brand of sorcery our humanist and scientific gurus continue to proclaim the gospel of Progress. Only by now the idea of future progress has become solidly allied with a systematic devaluation of our pre-modern past. apostles of progress busy themselves, not only with the building up of a new order, but equally with the destruction of whatever yet remains of the old. The idea of progress has thus become distinctly subversive: revolutionary two main factors or 'arguments' lend credence to the dogma of progress: the miracles of technology; the Darwinist theory of evolution, perceived as a scientific fact.

"The technological argument is hard to refute in recent times it has disarmed and carried off even eminent theologians, suggests the feats of our contemporary technological prowess may indeed be 'signs and wonders, to seduce (if it were possible) even the elect.' (Mark xiii, 22) Darwinism, decked out as a scientific discovery based upon 'incontrovertible evidence.' Who, after all, can argue with facts, especially when no one has any idea what they are! Such a notion, once it has been drilled into our collective psyche—from grade school to post-graduate encounters—is hard to beat. And if it be true that we have evolved from primate stock, then it is clear on even the most pessimistic evaluation of our present status that there has indeed been progress. It is now only a small step to the conclusion that our more distant forebears—especially those with whose views we do not agree—had not yet altogether cast off their simian vestiges; and so we arrive at last, by seemingly scientific and sober considerations, at the credo of Progress in its full-blown format.

"Teilhard takes over all the humanist and scientific conceptions and adds a few touches of his own. His great gift is to synthesize and epitomize these notions, these contemporary tendencies, and bring what is most typical to a sharp point. he not only draws together, but magnifies and exalts; in fact, he deifies Most men admire science; but Teilhard goes into ecstasy. Most think that science is a good thing, or perhaps even an incomparable boon to humanity; but for Teilhard it is 'the source of Life.' Scientists refer on occasion to the joy of scientific discovery; but Teilhard exults in 'the divine taste of its fruit' (..... from a biblical point of view rather interesting) clear that this pervasive predilection for unrestrained eulogy when it comes to science is not just a literary mannerism. take Teilhard at his word (:)' Research has for long been considered by man an accessory, an eccentricity or a danger. The moment is approaching when we shall perceive that it is the highest of human functions.' He is absolutely serious: scientific research is not just sublime, or useful, or wonderful—it is precisely 'the highest of human functions.' if scientific research is the highest of human functions, then it is *ipso facto* the religious function par excellence. Science, then, in its full-blown form, is the true and ultimate religion, the quest which by right fulfills and replaces all that men have previously designated by that term. Teilhard himself, moreover, confirms this conclusion: 'It will absorb the spirit of war and shine with the light of

religions.’ Here we have it: Science is to be the world religion, the final religion of mankind which incorporates into itself all that was true in the great religions of the past while presumably discarding their errors and limitations.”

I could not resist these quotations. Their clarity is obvious. With their conclusions I most heartily agree. (Nor can I forget that good old atheist Pierre bore the Good Churchkeeping Seal of Approval of Paul VI.) But I could say the same of the entire book, a polished, many-faceted jewel from page 1 to page 245.

**COSMOS & TRANSCENDENCE,
Breaking Through the Barrier of Scientific Belief,
Wolfgang Smith, Sherwood Sugden & Co., Peru, Ill. 61354**

Unless you are a mathematician, physicist, or philosopher you may find Dr. Smith’s first chapter heavy going. But press on; it’s worth the struggle. He, at least, is thoroughly at home, and one tends to submit proofs extrapolated from one’s own expertise and environment. One applies one’s own skills. Everyone can appreciate his distinction between scientific knowledge (refers to things observable, affirms verifiable truth) and scientific belief (refers to entities not in truth observable, affirms what is unverifiable), the **Barrier** of his subtitle.

Chapter 3 returns the reader, but not the scientists, to sanity via Scripture and Tradition. “..... science, for all its accomplishments, must ever rest content with more or less fragmentary insights. The perfection of knowledge is simply beyond its ken for the reason that the supreme unity, whose reflections we discern in all the laws of Nature, is itself beyond every law: for that unity belongs, not to creation, but to God Himself.”

Doctor Smith indulges his sense of high comedy in a chapter analyzing Freud, before warning seriously against Sigmund’s involvement in control and the occult. Psychoanalysis, it develops, is a science—like all sciences, infallible—but, by design, cures nothing. To become a shrink, one must first himself be shrunken.

Science received its humanist orientation through its drastic limitation to human sources and resources. Its rationalism poisoned all, and many read into its individual hypotheses the evils by which they themselves were victimized, misused, and twisted. In the inconclusive debate between geocentricity and heliocentricity, each is neutral in origin, each can be warped equally to serve humanism. Copernicus hypothesized; Galileo warped. The climate contributed to the misuse.

“Come what may,” writes Dr. Smith, “pure science—science with a capital S—can do no wrong. It is astounding that in an age of unprecedented skepticism, when immemorial beliefs are being tossed aside like worn toys or blithely held up to public ridicule, one should encounter this virtually limitless faith in the unflinching beneficence of scientific research.”

HERETICAL SPOKESMAN

Edward Clancy, reputed bishop, spokesman for the Sydney Catholic Archdiocese, was quoted in the Sydney Morning Herald Tuesday 9 August 1977:

“It is possible that as an interim measure a uniate-style agreement might be reached in which the pope became presiding bishop of two Churches which retained essential independence but shared a common outlook in many areas.

“Such an agreement could operate while the two Churches worked towards the aim of complete unity. **During this period** beliefs held by Catholics would not be compulsory for Anglicans and vice versa.”

Paul VI or his successors—but never a **genuine pope**—may thus become presiding bishop over an heretical communion. The visible head of a religion necessarily belongs to that religion. It is impossible for a Catholic—therefore for a pope—to belong to the Church of England. The moment he belongs to the Church of England is the moment he ceases to be Catholic. One man simply cannot simultaneously hold contrary doctrines. Nor can such doctrines be compromised without

eliminating one or both Churches. An adherent of the “complete unity,” if achieved, will be necessarily at variance with one of these communions. He will probably belong to neither—certainly not to Catholicism. For the entire process is based on denial of the Communion of Saints, which requires unity in doctrine and practice with all ages of the Church.

Conversion is always personal. Conversion or compromise of a religion kills it. Ecumenism in the sense of Vatican II is only another pipe dream.

KID GLOVES FOR BISHOPS?

“We all want progress. But progress means getting nearer the place where you want to be. If you have taken a wrong turning, then to go forward gets you no nearer. If you are on the wrong road, progress means doing an about-turn and walking back to the right road; in that case the man who turns back soonest is the most progressive man. There is nothing progressive about being pig-headed and refusing to admit a mistake. We are on the wrong road. Going back is the quickest way on.” — C. S. Lewis, “Mere Christianity”

When I belatedly discovered what had been done to my Church I realized that to remain Catholic I must apply logic. I experienced a crisis, not of faith, but of authority: How far may I be pushed?

Christ founded His Catholic Church to preserve unchanged and *in toto* His doctrine, His revelation, His sacramental system, above all His perfect worship— His Sacrifice of Calvary. His Church cannot teach error in these dogmatic or moral fields. But individual popes have erred (though not *ex cathedra*) in just these matters, as have properly convoked councils, even “dogmatic” councils.

Crisis resolved: **I can be bound to nothing new.** If salvation was available to my grandfather and his grandfather it is available to me in exactly the same way. Nothing they had can be taken from me; no new requirement can be imposed. I must believe in and belong to the Communion of Saints, not believe or obey authorities that preach, suggest, command, or pretend to command contradictories.

But, I am told, I must accord due respect to my superiors, my bishops, my pope. My insults usually accompany my third or fourth presentation of refused truth. I insult these men that misuse their office to rob the faithful as a **tactic**. Nothing else makes an impression; **I must** shock. I did not start with this attitude—this **reaction**. No one ever hung on episcopal or clerical words more than I. No one, then, noted the changing shades of meaning, the loosening tempo of the soft accompaniment, more than I. I present nothing that Christ and His Church have not presented. Since these modernist priests and bishops refuse their method of presentation, let’s try another.

If bishops could sink my arguments they would long since have enjoyed their duty. Even the few who try to uphold innovation abruptly cease correspondence when their defense collapses. They fail because they fight themselves thirty years ago. Can I follow men too ignorant (in their own field) or cowardly to fill their offices?

None could foresee the results of their experiments? They had no right to grope—to back off Christ’s mandate to teach. **He** never said: “Learn from all nations and their false gods! Apologize to all because they have refused, reformed, or abandoned Me.” Now that they have seen the disastrous short-term results, only obstinacy in error, ridiculous pride, or absolute and culpable inertia can explain the bishops’ continued toleration. All the bishops at Vatican II knew that collegiality was refused any basis in tradition or Scripture by the Roman experts. All know they are individually responsible for their respective dioceses, where each ordinary, not a majority or unanimous vote of a programmed episcopal conference, is the teaching authority. They accepted and cannot escape this responsibility. If anyone leaves the Church over unnecessary changes the diocesan bishop who permitted these changes is responsible. He will not escape the same hell as his victims. Shall I respect him there, too?

We are all saved through the Catholic faith. We Catholics shall receive short shrift at our particular judgment for pleas of ignorance. How will our “educated” bishops fare? We—and they—are bound to know. Tertullian successfully argued nearly eighteen centuries ago: nothing new is

Catholic. “..... all baptisms, spiritual gifts, martyrdoms, were in vain until Marcion and Valentinus appeared at last!”

Yet priests who brook the modernists’ most arrant nonsense berate me for leading Catholics astray, for raising doubts, for criticizing the pope. Insofar as I lead Catholics, I lead them astray to what Catholics have everywhere and always believed and practiced. Doubt is created by change, not by adherence to beliefs and practices that Catholics have never doubted. Nor would I criticize popes who behave like popes. To accommodate Christ’s Church to this age—or any age— does not become Christ’s vicar. Did Christ accommodate His age? Did His Church spread and grow by offering incense to Caesar?

CONSERVATIVE BISHOPS?

Several Australians enjoyed such a reputation. They made the best of both worlds. They somehow kept their jobs and the respect of traditional Catholics. In April 1978 we tried to push one off the fence. This venerable character could spare no time in conversation, even on the telephone. We elicited no further reaction with a second letter, from which we quote:

A man who intends effectively to fight for the Faith must sever connection with organizations which control him by majority vote. Bishops’ Conferences use the communist-masonic democracy fiction to submit worship, doctrine, and morals to vote. Packing the electorate has gone forward twenty years here, and longer in Europe, where the vote is heavier.

Faith apprehends and encompasses God’s revealed truth—all of it—on God’s authority. If He has revealed the Catholic Religion and founded the Catholic Church we must accept it in its entirety. If the postconciliar “Church” is God’s, and imposes His truth and orders, logically we must accept **it** whole and entire (whenever—hopefully—it arrives at such a recognizable state). We may not pick and choose among its doctrines and practices any more than we could in our traditional Catholic Church. Like the Catholic Church, it must be rejected or accepted in its entirety.

We cannot take a position midway, for that has no logical, legal, or moral validity whatever, nor any definable limits, precedents, guidelines, or objectives. Just what are you defending? Against what? For how long? What will your successor do to your diocese, with your same “authority?” None but innovators receive promotion; there is no prospect of assignment of even a mild conservative. Your present position is that of a mere die-hard obstructionist. The postconciliar “Church” will rejoice when you die or retire. [He has done both.]

You have no position to defend—merely a lone, poorly supported, strategically useless outpost. Your only chance of victory lies in alliance with the entire Catholic Church of all times in all its traditions—Mass, sacraments, doctrine, unity, sanctity, Catholicity, Apostolicity, adherence to the Faith even to martyrdom.

I am sure you think you are holding the line. But what line? For whom? How long? Your type fight will die with you. No one will fight for a dead bishop but only for a live Church. Paul VI is killing it, not least by collegiality.

The same bishop heard also from a sympathizer in Queensland:

..... many Catholics associated with the (Catholic Research) Centre hold you in the highest regard. Many others who still attend the Conciliar Church in the mistaken belief that it is still Catholic have looked to you for leadership. They use your example, milord, as a justification of their failure to use their God-given reason.

..... (for) more than sixty years I was obliged to associate with Freemasons some became close friends. However, beneath the friendliest exterior often lurked an implacable hatred of the Catholic Church. What my children had to suffer simply because they were Catholic, is frightening in retrospect. we were able to remain steadfast because we had the True Mass, the Real Presence and our altars were intact. We were familiar with what a succession of holy Popes had warned about the evils of Freemasonry.

What are Catholics who have fought and suffered for their Faith to do when they see the Chair of Peter usurped by a thirty-third degree Mason and surrounded by Masonic cardinals and priests occupying positions of the highest influence in the Vatican? We know from the teachings of the Church that any Catholic that joined the Masonic Lodge was automatically excommunicated. How can a proven heretic validly rule over Catholics who have proved their loyalty? We know that the current hatred of the True Mass which is one of the features of the Conciliar Church is a sure sign of Masonic influence.

..... I appeal to you as a validly consecrated Catholic Bishop to use your exalted office to insist on the return to Catholics everywhere of the Mass which validly ordained priests are bound to celebrate.

Remember, milord, that we have been robbed of our greatest heritage by Masonic usurpers. Why Catholic lay people tolerated this outrage instead of fighting as their ancestors fought is due largely to the lack of real leadership from those in whom they trusted.

All can see the results triggered by this one-way correspondence. Conservative bishops may no longer be considered an endangered species; they're extinct!

ARGUMENT CORNER: We often hear that the Holy Spirit guides the conclave of cardinals in the election of a pope. Therefore, it is implied, and often insisted, that the pope is God's choice. Let us apply this reasoning to the Medici popes, Leo X and Clement VII.

Giovanni, second son of Lorenzo de' Medici, was destined for the Church from boyhood. He received the tonsure at age seven, "and thereafter Lorenzo applied his talents as businessman and statesman to the acquisition of rich benefices for his son. In 1483 when the boy was only eight, he was made abbot of Font Douce in France; in 1484 he collected the abbey of Passigano; in 1486 the legendary abbey of Monte Cassino. By a continual pestering of Innocent VIII, Lorenzo got his boy made cardinal at the age of fourteen, but even Innocent giped at the idea of a child exercising quite this type of power, and insisted he should wait at least three years before taking his place in the college of cardinals." — **The Bad Popes**, E. R. Chamberlin, Hamish Hamilton, London, 1969

"The twenty-five members of the Sacred College met in conclave on March 4, 1513. For once they were virtually unanimous as to the type of pontificate they desired—the exact opposite of that of Julius II. a peaceful, easy-going pontiff who would rule in a civilized manner, and die soon enough for some other member of the college to enjoy the tiara.

"After a week, the choice had narrowed down to Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici, immensely wealthy, a son of the ruling family of one of the major city-states, cultured and tolerant. But he had one great defect: he was just thirty-seven years old But, though young, the pudgy Giovanni de' Medici by no means enjoyed good health. For years he had been tormented by an open ulcer, and in order to allow him to attend the conclave, his physicians had been brought in with him. Whether by accident or design, they became increasingly troubled by his condition during the conclave and let it be known that there was a high probability that (he) would not long survive his dangerous and painful illness. With that assurance, the older members of the college at last came over to the side of the younger. On March 11, Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici was elected pope and took the name of Leo X." — *ibid.*

June 8, 1517 Leo summoned a consistory and investigated a plot to poison him, which Cardinal Petrucci had admitted. Leo extracted confessions from four more cardinals—"altogether a curious affair. Each of the accused men had had a grievance against Leo but probably every other member of the college could lay some such complaint against the pope. Taken singly or in their sum, the ostensible motives of the conspirators were not strong enough to impel a group of wealthy, powerful men to hazard their lives and liberty in such an inept attempt on Leo's life. And yet each had confessed—abjectly. The minutes of the 'trial' had been kept secret, and swiftly rumor outside the college supplied its own motives—it was a Medicean trick to eliminate, finally, Medicean enemies and fill the coffers of a pope ever desperately in want of money.

“Rumor appeared to receive startling confirmation a few weeks afterward when, on June 26, Leo made a massive creation of thirty-one cardinals. Each paid liberally for his hat But, more important, the college was now swamped with Medicean supporters. Leo had no more trouble with the Sacred College.” — *ibid.*

It elected his cousin six years later. “Good fortune, in the shape of an assassin’s knife, had changed Giulio’s life drastically while he was still a baby in arms, transferring him from a Florentine slum to the Medici palace. No one knew, or much cared, who his mother had been, except that she had presumably had been pretty enough to attract the passing attention of his father, young Giuliano de’ Medici, the handsome and popular brother of Lorenzo the Magnificent. On an April Sunday in 1478 he was hewn down in the Cathedral of Florence..... “In his passionate grief” Lorenzo learned of Giulio’s existence. His mother “made no difficulties and Lorenzo brought up the child as his own.” — *ibid.*

“Shortly after his election Leo had created his cousin Giulio a cardinal. It had been necessary to precede the creation with an act of perjury, for Giulio was illegitimate; to remove the canonical impediment a document was drawn up, stating that his parents were wedded. The new cardinal received the lucrative and important post of vice-chancellor.” — *ibid.*

The conclave that elected Giulio pope wrangled and politicked for seven weeks, October 1 to November 17, 1523, and finally had to be starved into agreement.

Leo X held the papacy when Luther revolted. He provided the fuse and failed to blanket the charge. Clement VII refused to call a council for fear it would censure or depose him. His temporization and cowardice contributed heavily to England’s loss to the Church.

Who will say that these two walking disasters were chosen candidates of the Holy Ghost? Because they were elected by cardinals in conclave? Whoever holds this opinion must admit that they lost whole countries to the Church for four and a half centuries. If this is the work of Divine Providence, why may not another pope or two be involved in a similar work of Divine Providence?

Clement VII’s illegitimacy made him canonically ineligible for the offices he filled. Perjury could not render him eligible.

Paul VI’s public heresy, before and since his election, has made him far less eligible to head a Church to which he cannot belong by reason of his public heresy. Even his present or future abjuration of these heresies cannot render him eligible at the time of his election.

But, it is argued, Catholic doctrine is unchangeable; therefore Paul VI and Vatican II have not taught new Catholic doctrine. Vatican II says in *Lumen Gentium* (51) that it proposes again the decrees of Second Nicaea, and Trent, regarding the Communion of Saints. So where it appears to disagree with Trent what it says must be read in a sense which agrees with Trent. Vatican II, therefore, cannot teach heresy because it said that it intended to adhere to orthodoxy. Similarly, no one was ever cheated in negotiations with Soviet Russia, because communists have all men’s welfare at heart.

How is it, then, that we find clearly heretical statements—as well as enormous heretical bias—which appear in every case over the words: “Each and every one of the things set forth in this declaration has won the consent of the Fathers of this most sacred Council. We too, by the apostolic authority conferred on us by Christ, join with the Venerable Fathers in approving, decreeing, and establishing these things in the Holy Spirit, and we direct that what has thus been enacted in synod be published to God’s glory?” This promulgation is then dated and signed by one who, standing in the place of Christ, never hesitates to commit Christ to error and call upon the Holy Ghost to guarantee it. Let us give credit where due; such bravery rivals Lucifer’s.

But Paul VI, the argument continues, cannot teach heresy *ex cathedra*. (Not being pope he cannot teach anything *ex cathedra*!) Since he has taught nothing *ex cathedra* he has not taught error. We must take all his ambiguous and heretical pronouncements in a Catholic sense. But these same pronouncements are taken in heretical senses by non-Catholics, who can then say our “Holy

Father” agrees with them against us. Furthermore, Paul VI has condoned heresies propounded by “Catholic” theologians by permitting them to continue as “Catholics” to preach these heresies. Catholic authority cannot condone or even tolerate heresy. Heresy kills souls. Catholic authority cannot preach heresy, even unofficially. Therefore, an authority which has done so cannot be Catholic.

“We have found,” says a sincere but insufficiently aware Catholic, “that the best way to beat the trendies is to line up Vatican II and Paul VI against them. Incidentally, the trendies hate Paul VI—which is where they agree with you” (me). One minute’s serious application of papal discipline would settle the trendies—already excommunicated according to Trent and *Lamentabili*. I am concerned for Catholics—for those who try to preserve their faith—not for trendies. If they hate Paul VI they display the rankest ingratitude to the man most responsible for the environment in which they flourish—the man who attempts to discipline only the most faithful of Catholics, the sincerest supporters of the papacy—which many of them wish were not so vacant.

Agreed, the body of Catholic doctrine remains objectively unaffected by Paul VI and Vatican II. But where is Catholic doctrine preached? Nay, where is it not suppressed and superseded by the innovations of Paul VI and Vatican II? What purports to be the visible Church, the inspired teacher of the world, can no longer be believed under oath. Who is responsible? Not only Paul VI but every Catholic who refuses to contradict his “ambiguities.”

If a man or a council should stray from the doctrine of Trent while claiming to agree with it, are they not promulgating an even greater falsehood by committing Trent to their falsehood? Do they not tell us that their own inventions, and false doctrines adopted from the Reformation, are traditional Catholic doctrine?

SCRUPLES, Fear of erring, doubt of one’s capacity (which is, after all, God’s gift), calculated to thwart, obstruct, abort positive judgment and action in the name of prudence. They unbalance judgment, overcome reason, prevent action to the point of phobia. What but scruples beguiles tens of millions of normally intelligent Catholics to acquiesce in the plainly un-Catholic *novus ordo* “mass” and the Protestant mess of pottage fermented via Vatican II? Beyond doubt, that innate dread we all harbour of disobedience to the proper authority of the Catholic Church; for such shrinking from a consequence assumes that the Church must necessarily reflect the truth—isn’t it of God? Isn’t this the way we felt, what we **assumed** as a practical truth? Yet we know from Church and Scripture that a great apostasy is to precede the Last Judgment. Several popes of this century have recorded their belief in its imminence. I worked hard to persuade a neighbor that they were probably correct. He agreed to every point I raised, but finished: “We’ve got to go along with the bishops, don’t we?” The apostasy flourishes on such scrupulous distrust of our own perception and reason in favor of the “safe” course.

On past performance, however, the reception of Holy Orders cannot guarantee orthodoxy. **The Catholic Encyclopedia** lists sixty major schisms and heresies originated by Catholics. Bishops and priests originated—or immediately adopted—and actively promoted fifty-eight of them. All seriously considered antipopes were bishops. Left to themselves the laity have seldom bothered.

Now, for the first time in many centuries, the “Church” places a premium on original thinking, as though doctrine and worship depended on human origins. Laymen are gulled into following brilliant modernists. But brilliance as a criterion of doctrinal orthodoxy cannot supplant memory, particularly of the traditional catechism, learned through traditional methods. Behind this catechism lay the authority of the diocesan bishop, who knew what doctrine to uphold on the authority of the Church—the same authority that had faced and condemned sixty major schisms and heresies precipitated by Catholics, 97% clerics, all self—acknowledged theologians.

“We’ve got to go along with the bishops?” Scruples we have; have the bishops?

BISHOPS IN ACTION

The Sydney Morning Herald, Nov. 23, 1977: “Australia’s Roman Catholic bishops have moved to clear up misunderstandings and uncertainty over the Church’s rulings on marriages between Catholics and people of other faiths. A statement issued yesterday makes it clear that the Catholic partner in mixed marriages no longer has to make an absolute promise that children of the marriage will be brought up Catholics.” The statement, made to clarify Paul’s document, “Mixed Marriages,” March 31, 1970, explains that in the past there had to be a guarantee that the Catholic would practise his own faith and that all children would be reared as Catholics. This guarantee had to be made secure by written promises by both partners. “The Catholic must still promise he will live his own faith. In relation to children, the Catholic no longer declares outright that the children will be Catholics, but rather that he will, according to his abilities, do all that he is able to do to give his children a Catholic baptism and upbringing. The non-Catholic now makes no promise at all before the priest, but is to be informed of the promise made by the Catholic.” The bishops say that although these changes are far-reaching, they do not alter the fundamental obligations of the Catholic partner in a marriage.

The bishops, then, expect this lone Catholic to fight the good fight without the support formerly given by the Church. He is left on his own to do “all he is able” to retain his children for a Church that seemingly doesn’t care how he fares, and no longer tries to smooth his way by involving the non-Catholic in the project. As many a Catholic married to a non-Catholic can testify, it was tough enough before. Many another has been saved the struggle by the honest refusal of a non-Catholic prospective spouse to sign such promises. The Church actively discouraged mixed marriages, and tolerated them only under strict rules protecting the faith of the offspring. Now, under instruction of Paul VI she withdraws all support for the absolute rights of the faith. Admittedly Paul’s postconciliar “Church” impedes Catholic instruction and rearing of children of two Catholics. Why should one who marries a non-Catholic receive preferential treatment?

Objection—You set your opinion over that of Monsignor Lefebvre? A trained theologian? You accuse him of heresy?

Reply—Only bishops and priests understand the Catholic Faith? Theologians cannot be heretics? Of the sixty formal heresies from Catholicism treated in **The Catholic Encyclopedia**, fifty-eight were originated or immediately embraced and propagated by priests and/or bishops, almost invariably theologians. Yes, we accuse Lefebvre of heresy. This is not opinion but application of tradition, doctrine, morals, and history. The Church has, as we have shown, condemned the introduction of the *novus ordo missae* or of anything of like nature or general class. No Catholic has any basis for demanding a further ruling. Re-examination characterizes the postconciliar “Church”, which in its incompetence will certainly never rule the *novus ordo missae*—or Anglican orders!—invalid.

Objection—The Church is hierarchical in structure. The laity owes reverence and obedience to priests and bishops. Why have you attacked Lefebvre and Fr Fox?

Reply—The hierarchical structure would oblige me to revere and obey a sleepy heretic in Asquith presbytery, a beknighted heretic at St. Mary’s Cathedral, and a vacant chair in Rome. No one has appointed, or can appoint, Father Fox my Parish Priest, or Lefebvre my Ordinary. I would owe them no obedience under any conditions. Reverence for their Orders has little to do with attacking their ideas. No one may keep silence in the presence of error, or hold back his best fight against it, especially out of considerations of reverence, obedience, or charity, which are owed first to God. When we leave error unopposed we violate: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy ...whole mind.” When we fail to oppose it to the best of our ability on every occasion we disobey: “and with thy whole strength.” Complete acceptance of God’s Revelation and its defense against all comers can only be called obedience to God. Should anyone call us fanatics, we could not care less.

Objection—Nearly all our bishops and priests disagree with you. Shall we not listen to the Lord’s anointed?

Reply—Let me recommend **The Catechism Explained** (Spirago-Clarke), so good that its table of

contents would constitute a better than average catechism. It devotes five pages to Holy Orders, including: “St. Francis of Sales said of priests: ‘I will close my eyes to their faults, and only see in them God’s representatives.’ How blameworthy are those who publish far and wide the misdeeds of a priest! ‘Are we,’ asks St. Augustine ‘to think slightly of Christ and the apostles, because there was a Judas among them? Who will show me any body of men upon earth who are without faults?’” But it finishes the subject with: “7. It is the duty of the faithful to pray God to send them good priests. Remember that a priest is the salvation or the perdition of his flock. In the Old Testament we read that when other scourges were of no avail to turn the people, hardened in sin, from their evil ways, God sent upon them the heaviest scourge of all, wicked and corrupt priests.” So it should evoke no astonishment that the materialistic generation of Jews that largely rejected their Messiah was blest with Annas and Caiphas. Can you see no parallel in Knox, Freeman, Gleeson, Rush, Goody, Young, Casaroli and Wojtyla?

THE INCREDIBLE SIZE OF THE ROMAN COLLAR

can best be shown by citing the men who hide behind it. The latest example comes to hand in **The Remnant**, whose editor manages to avoid real issues nearly as well as the compromisers to whom he grants space. Once (1973) he printed the inconsequential final paragraph of a long letter I wrote to the Sydney priests, but has never acknowledged mail from me or those who share my opinions. He even apologized to his readers for carrying an ad for Bill Strojic’s writings. He has studiously avoided mention of our book, **Paul VI’s Legacy: Catholicism?** At last he permits mention (Feb. 28, 1981) in his letters column, wherein Father Urban Snyder registers embarrassment at being quoted in our “irresponsible and harmful book” whose “Australian layman” author “had no competency to write on the subjects he chose. Books and articles of this kind do nothing but harm to the traditionalist cause and to souls.”

Laymen, of course, lack competence to write on the Catholic Faith, even though they confine themselves to the Church’s authoritative teaching, though to hope to be saved we must know it. If we know it we must be allowed to follow Christ’s mandate to teach it, especially since the clergy mostly quit. If we don’t know it our clergy and hierarchy have shown total secretiveness, inefficiency, or negligence, because no one can deny our lively interest and (literal sense) docility. If we are too stupid Christ obviously saddled His Apostles and nineteen centuries of their successors with an impossible task.

There are, unfortunately, few books of this kind; thus we felt bound in conscience to publish it. Perhaps Father Snyder has a better explanation of our present troubles. Most “traditionalist” literature comes from compromisers, crooked thinkers, gutless wonders, or outright traitors. **Una Voce**, for instance, has now decided to oppose its great hero, Lefebvre, we hear, because his position (shifty as it is) jeopardizes that disastrous organization’s hopes of securing concessions from JP2. Lefebvre seeks different concessions from the same public heretic. Both recognize him as pope. It follows that they tolerate, therefore support, his heresies, when their duty requires condemnation of his heresies and consequent refusal to treat him as pope.

Father Snyder, too, displays this inconsistency, though he compiles magnificent articles from the writings of others, as in the Feb. 15 **Remnant**. If our book causes harm let him show how, when, or where. Let him refute our words or demonstrate our deviation from the faith. Like Fr. Fox, who disagrees with **some** (unspecified) things in our book, he hides behind his collar from his duty to point out our errors. God’s enemies upon whom Father Snyder’s lightning will burst could not possibly include those who preside over the crucifixion and burial of the Mystical Christ.

In our lone phone conversation last year he called our intention to destroy the *novus ordo* impractical. He regards JP2 as pope. He left Econe for two reasons, which I gratuitously promised not to quote. I agree with both. The first reason I had already covered independently in **TWIN!** No. 7, page 11. The second grew logically out of the first. Neither Lefebvre’s heresy nor his willingness to treat with JP2 repelled Father Snyder. Like Father Fox, he agrees with Lefebvre on those points, but not, to my knowledge, in print. **This man is dangerous to your faith.**

Not only Episcopal Authority but Episcopal Sanity

In response to **Una Voce**'s clarion call, some of the East Lindfield congregation petitioned the area bishop for the return of the Tridentine Mass. He replied (21 October 1980):

Dear friends all, My heart is with you but my head is not. I must obey. Of course, I am sending your letter and the petitioners' signatures directly to the Holy Father ("*pro mensa sacra*,") so that only he may open the envelope sealed by my seal. In my petition to him, I request only that the former *ordo missae* be allowed to co exist with the *novus ordo missae*, so that the people may have a choice, [as now, the president's choice] but I must say that I do not anticipate any great, or any other, change. I repeat: my heart is with you, but my head is not. But I do not wish to enter into disputation or argumentation with you, my friends.

I must give you counsel (a) to say that you cannot "in conscience" attend a *novus ordo* mass is, to put it politely, a very misinformed statement. In fact, it is silly. Would you, if invited, have attended the Last Supper, when the Mass of the Catholic Church was instituted? Would you? Was it the true Mass? Yes! It was the very original, but it was *not* the Tridentine liturgy ...and so it went on *through the centuries, liturgy differing from liturgy*, but always the same *contents*: Offertory, and *sacred consecration* of the elements. [We have shown him proof that the *novus ordo* has neither.] Was the Mass *valid* through all those centuries or not? Of course it was! Trent tried to bring about *uniformity of liturgical celebration* but *even Trent allowed diversity*, as regards *liturgical celebration* of the Mass.

[Trent faced a problem new in the Church, wholesale heresy which pretended its new rites were Mass to accommodate the general populace's belief in the Mass and its efficacy. The Church guarantees the Mass; it necessarily specified what it guaranteed in both definition and content. So after more than six and a half years' exhaustive research since Trent's last session Pope St. Pius V guaranteed the oldest rite **in existence**, and permitted continued use of rites then at least two hundred years old. The Church guarantees no rite introduced after 1370, and has forbidden any newer rites which even if they contain no heresy obviously cannot be traditional—an essential requirement decreed by Vatican I in 1870. We have shown this bishop that the *novus ordo* contains specific Arianism and conforms also to Lutheran doctrine, in neither of which can a Catholic conscience concur.]

I repeat, my friends, it is silly to say that you cannot "in conscience" attend a *novus ordo* celebration of holy mass. Nostalgia—yes, the same as I have,—reason—no. (b) *Do not ever* say that the *novus ordo*, as you say "deviates from the norm of permanent reflection of the eternal law." My heart is still with you, but such a stated position is plain stupid. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the eternal law. Nothing! Do not use such silly statements to further your cause. Our people easily discern the fallacies of your position.

[Our people? Those who no longer attend church because of the changes? Or those who show up because they believe this illogical bishop? Or has he somewhere in reserve a group of theologians and liturgists capable of portraying consistency and tradition as fallacies? He won't argue; he will merely counsel absurdities: The Eternal Sacrifice has "**nothing** to do with eternal law!" Examine this carefully; it may be his reason for violating *Quo primum*, the law obviously needed now more than at any time since the Reformation necessitated ecclesiastical laws to spell out divine law.]

(c) "The threat to the universality of the Church." This is, absolutely, *contra factum*. The missionaries in Asia, China, Japan, like the great Fr. Ricci, pleaded again and again with Rome to put the liturgy of the Mass in the vernacular and adapt it to the culture of these peoples. Rome *failed* to respond.

[Rome responded—with a clear "**NO!**" It saw the impossibility of trying to adapt Catholicism to pagan cultures. The Church resisted adaptation to older cultures from the beginning, even to Judaism and its practices, which it might have been expected to respect and inherit. Vernacularization has proven an effective vehicle for destroying the Mass, notably in the sixteenth

century. Then as now it disguised mistranslation. When we are subjected to “mass” in Pidgin, for aborigines, even for scholars, universality and unity are the first casualties.]

We had to await Vatican II, and I am convinced that the putting of the liturgy of the mass into the vernacular is the best thing that Vatican II did. It has, more or less, saved a generation of youth. Of that I am sincerely convinced.

[And rather easily, considering the mountainous evidence to the contrary.]

(d) The “*Novus ordo*” of the mass, *taken in its entirety*, brings out very well the *sacrificial nature* of the mass. [If he insists, but what sacrifice? Fruits of the earth? Work of human hands?] In fact, given the intention of the priest which is always present and determinate, the *novus ordo* brings out far more determinately (sic) the mass as a faithful perpetuation (sic) and mystical renewal of the sacrifice of Calvary. The Tridentine formula was gravely at fault.

[His first counsel implied that the multiple new rite in all self-contradictory versions is equivalent to the Last Supper—though that is no definition of the Mass—and is necessarily valid (though Judaized in intent and embodying both Lutheran and Arian heresies) because of succession in turn to all the genuine liturgies that were “of course valid through all those centuries.” Now we find that the oldest rite that covered most of the Catholic world for most of those centuries, the Mass Trent guaranteed “so pure from every error,” was “gravely at fault!” Small wonder he won’t dispute or argue! He has jerked the rug from beneath his own feet. Perhaps realizing that he has placed himself squarely under Trent’s condemnation—Session XXII, Canon VI—he then cites] Cf. the Tridentine formula for the Offertory against which the council [He **must** mean Vatican II] *unanimously rebelled*.

[Perhaps so. He was there and we were not. So why no mention of **this** rebellion in council documents? Vatican II simply never dealt with this matter; it never ordered a new rite of Mass in the first place. The closest it came (Const. Sac. Lit.): “58. A new rite for concelebration is to be drawn up and inserted into the Pontifical and the Roman Missal.”—**existing books!**]

+Thomas Muldoon, Bishop

The signatories to that petition may insist that we treat this heretic with respect, not antagonize one whose heart is with us. He has antagonized all Catholics by withdrawing the true Mass from his jurisdiction. The petitioners should thank God that this man’s head is **not** with them. Who needs another head?

Logic and faith elude those who have deliberately abjured them to accept heresies, both in the new rite of “mass” and in the documents of Vatican II. **How** could all those bishops have been deceived? They deceived themselves; and it becomes easier daily.

Objection—But we are told that we may not attack a priest no matter what his crimes. He is Christ for us and Christ will judge him. How much more must this apply to Christ’s vicar, the pope!

Reply—We never attack priests for public crimes, though we could often carry accounts of their rapes, embezzlements, drunken driving, or elopements. We attack their erroneous preachments, their compromises, their heresies which render them un-Catholic. In this we follow the Church, which has traditionally condemned heretics without exception. Among these were priests like Arius, Nestorius, Ulrich Zwingli, John Knox, Martin Bucer, Thomas Cranmer, and Martin Luther.

Objection—Let us take the positive approach—strive for the return of the traditional Mass—rather than the negative—condemn the *novus ordo*.

Reply—Behold the slanted terminology of the public relations expert! Vatican II has sold the false religion with new insights, updating, and openness. These concepts would have misled fewer people had they been more accurately termed eccentricity, rejection of tradition, and vacancy. Even cattle sound better ruminating than chewing their cud. But what has positive over negative? Why are we told we act positively in striving to recover our Mass but negatively in condemning the idolatry which has displaced it? We shall never see our Mass in the churches built for it until we drive out the interloper. Even the idolater has the sense and consistency to see that. So we shall never secure a compromise—not that we could accept one if offered. The idolater says that he is

pope and we must accept the *novus ordo* on his authority. He pretends to grant us something by occasional permission of the idolatry in Latin.

The Way of the Transgressor is HARD

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol VIII, pp. 431-2: “JOHN XXII, Pope Jacques d’Euse), b. at Cahors in 1249; enthroned 5 Sept. 1316; d. at Avignon, 4 Dec. 1334.studied theology and law at Montpellier and Paris. He then taught both canon and civil law..... After the death of Clement V (20 April 1314) the Holy See was vacant for two years and three and a half months. In the last years of John’s pontificate dogmatic conflict about the Beatific Vision brought on by himself,Before his elevation to the Holy See, he had written a work on this question, in which he stated that the souls of the blessed departed do not see God until after the Last Judgment. After becoming pope, he advanced the same teaching in his sermons. many theologians even calling his view heretical. A great commotion was aroused at the University of Paris when the General of the Minorites and a Dominican tried to disseminate there the pope’s view. Pope John wrote to King Philip IV (Nov. 1333), and emphasized that, (since the Holy See had not decided the matter, theologians enjoyed perfect freedom). In Dec. 1333, the theologians at Paris, after consultation decided in favor of the doctrine that the souls of the blessed departed saw God immediately after their death or after their complete purification; they pointed out that the pope had given no decision but only advanced his personal opinion, and now petitioned the pope to confirm their decision. John appointed a commission at Avignon to study the writings of the Fathers, and to discuss further In a consistory held on 3 Jan. 1334, the pope explicitly declared that he had never meant to teach aught contrary to Holy Scripture or the rule of faith and in fact had not intended to give any decision whatever. (Finally) he withdrew his former opinion, and declared his belief that souls separated from their bodies enjoy in Heaven the Beatific Vision.” [A fine example of humility in the world’s highest office.]

For contrast, a letter from St. Vincent’s, Ashfield, 28/5/79: “Dear Hutton, Thanks for your letter given to me last Thursday night. It remains in its envelope unread, because my sermons are not part of a debating process evoking replies. Though I am not sure of this following, some signs indicate that you were not present to hear my sermon of 20th May, and therefore depended on excited and stirred up reporters of my alleged remarks. If this be true, it would have been wiser to check with me before any other action.”

[I heard the “alleged” sermon. Not trusting my control in verbal recriminations and arguments written on the wind, I committed my objections to paper for his leisurely assessment.]

“But in any case in my liturgical procedures and choice of sermon material at East Lindfield and elsewhere I make the decisions and am accountable to no layman—neither to you nor to any of your friends. Let none of you therefore usurp the functions of a liturgical dictator—policeman—*ensor non deputatus*.”

[Liturgical? We objected to the sermon.]

“I will continue, with God’s help, to preach what you people need to hear, not necessarily what you like. Amateur theologians do say some good things, but they have their limitations—from lack of full seminary training.”

[Where are his classmates? And where are mine that finished the seminary course? Who but this priest first called me a theologian? I claim only to remember what theologians taught me.]

“If therefore you come to East Lindfield again simply say your prayers and learn from the sermon how to love God better, to intensify the virtues and reject vices—as I told you by letter in 1975.”

[He won’t read my letter, but I must read his—even 22 typed foolscap pages duplicated and distributed to show all his “correction” of my **one** line.]

“Why not examine your conscience more, and leave Abp. Lefebvre (and other Tridentine clergy) alone? *Memor sis conditionis tuae.*’ Yrs in J.C. (sic), Fr. P. Fox, C.M.”

The alleged sermon of Sunday 20 May sounded more like a threat. It began with the reading in Latin, then in English, of a theological opinion of Cardinal Bellarmine: “Just as it is licit to attack a

pontiff who attacks the body, so is it licit to resist him who attacks souls, or who disturbs the civil order, or above all, who tries to destroy the Church. It is licit to resist him by not doing what he orders and by impeding the execution of his will. It is not licit, however, to judge him, to punish him, or to depose him; for such acts belong to a superior.”

From this inconsistent and paralyzing opinion Father Fox then extracted an arbitrary, untenable, inconsequent conclusion that he is obliged therefore to refuse Holy Communion to anyone who holds such opinions as mine, specifically who will not acknowledge the authority of “Pope” John Paul II. For such persons are in schism, and would be advised not to approach the communion rail, to save themselves embarrassment.

We must, sermonized Fr. Fox, allow JP2 a little time to come to orthodoxy, probably under Lefebvre’s tutelage. He cited the “parallel” case of Pope Pius IX, who had supposedly toyed with modernist ideas until rudely awakened by the assassination of his prime minister. (It has been suggested—jocosely, we may suppose—that a closer parallel could be easily obtained by shooting Casaroli.) The sermon ended with a third reading of St. Robert Bellarmine’s irrelevant opinion, during which I said: “I think I’ll send him what Innocent III and Paul IV said on the subject.” “He won’t read it,” said my neighbor.

To read it would be to act rationally, and perhaps to forestall public defense of a Catholic’s rights to his sacraments, his good name, and Mass without unnecessary and erroneous provocation. The priest is ordained not for himself but for the laity. The ship’s look-out is stationed not merely for his own protection, and it is permitted to awaken him. It is for the shepherd to raise the alarm and drive off the wolf, not to berate the flock for nervous behavior when it scents the wolf.

My “unread” letter to Fr. Fox (24 May): You may have noted my absence from the communion rail last Sunday morning. Since you had imposed new restrictions upon reception of the Holy Eucharist I could not approach without denying my Faith. For one who professes to avoid unnecessary trouble you display remarkable talent for its gratuitous manufacture.

Why must Catholics wait around for a pope to join them? Where is John Paul II meanwhile? **In heresy! In idolatry! In official support and enforcement of those crimes!** He backs celibacy? Some one should have informed last week’s clergy corroboree. Did not Paul VI condemn contraception? Did not Marcus Loane condemn abortion? Does not Billy Graham uphold righteousness generally? Must Catholics obey them?

Yet on the basis of a **theological opinion** in opposition to two papal decrees, which strips Catholics of defense against an interloper, you have taken it upon yourself to deny men of my honest and well-documented opinion the ineffable benefit of the Holy Eucharist.

In all your research have you never encountered *Ius Canonicum de Personis*, by I. Chelodi, 1942? “.....[quoted at length]..... The axiom ‘Doubtful pope, no pope’ expresses correct canonical doctrine, if positive and insoluble doubt remain about the legitimacy of an election.” (There are plentiful, even overpowering reasons to doubt the legitimacy of the last four elections.) “For he never acquired the power, since jurisdiction, of its own nature, requires fitting bases, but no one may hold himself to submit to an uncertain superior..... Judgment of the doubtfully elected is not judgment of a pope, therefore it can be made by the Church.”

In our last conversation you stated that no compromise is possible on the Mass—the *novus ordo* must be wiped out. You now insist that the authority which supports this *delendus* must be acknowledged and obeyed, at least in some matters. And you bravely combat us who seek your objective, suppression of the *novus ordo*, restoration of the true Mass, while you neglect to fight those who have saddled us with the *novus ordo* travesty. You select areas for obedience or disobedience without regard to logic or consistency.

The clergy and hierarchy are nearly unanimous these days in inconsistency, illogicality, heresy, and idolatry. Yet you presume upon your membership in this clergy to instruct us in the rights of the matter. But where has your authority gone? The “authority” which you insist upon upholding has

withdrawn its last vestige. And with this vanished authority you cite a discredited opinion of a theologian. Why do you not quote the far more relevant official decree of an **undoubted** pope, one of those who lent their authority to the Council of Trent? (quoted).....—Pope Paul IV, *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, 15 March 1559, when Bellarmine was not yet seventeen.

Not only has the present usurper been doubtfully—at the very least—elected; he has publicly embraced heresy before and since his election, even introducing into his *Redemptor Hominis* a quotation from the Arian Eucharistic Prayer IV. He is heretical, then, even on your requirements, blind and reluctant as they are in **his** regard, eager as they are to disqualify **me** from my Catholic right to the sacraments for pointing out **his** shortcomings, which should be equally evident to you. When you abrogate my privilege of evaluation you remove your own privilege of judging me.

You have gone out of your way to vilify my opinions with the word **schismatic**. You threatened to deny communion to those holding these opinions. You must have had some one in mind; no one threatens decapitation of green dragons with blue spots. You apparently think no one knows the Faith except clerics—that laymen who contradict clerics necessarily fall into schism. But we are saddled with the battle because you refrain. And we take it amiss that the pacifist impedes the fight. If you have any regard for truth you will read out the excerpts from the law and the papal decrees that I have quoted. You had your chance to keep as quiet here as you have too long in far more urgent matters. Sincerely

Fr. Fox will disapprove this action “before checking with him.” Had he read my letter he might have discovered that I **was** checking with him prior to action. He did not check with me, give me a chance to justify my position privately before attacking and defaming me publicly. For it is defamation to declare a man a schismatic, and arbitrarily for that reason to refuse him the sacraments, to place him under obligations that are not placed upon all Catholics, to restrict him to a **misapplication** of one **unsound** theological opinion as proof of his Catholicity.

In the face of the vulpine attitude two other courses suggest themselves. We may vulpinely sneak off and refuse to defend the Faith publicly. Or, during a sermon in which the Faith is compromised, we can defend publicly and immediately, as the layman Eusebius publicly opposed his patriarch, Nestorius. We shall not likely become bishops, as did Eusebius subsequently. But they’re not making bishops like they used to.

East Lindfield—16 Nov. 1980—Father Patrick Fox, C. M.

invited traditional Catholics at his Mass to a novena to be held in conjunction with *novus ordo* benediction of the blessed sacrament in a *novus ordo* chapel in which the *novus ordo missae* is celebrated, apparently to create an impression on the Vincentian denizens. He had found nothing wrong with the novena, but suggested leaving before benediction. He insinuated no reason but our probable problem of conscience.

What could cause our problem? Violation of Canon 1258, banning *communicatio in sacris* with non-Catholics? (Father Fox has said that the Vincentians remain a Catholic order as long as he, a Catholic, remains in it. Hannibal Bugnini, great masonic architect of the *novus ordo missae*, lived and died a Vincentian in good standing.) Were they Catholic during the novena but suddenly non-Catholic during benediction?

The bread used for benediction was “consecrated” at a *novus ordo missae*; so must we absent ourselves to signify disapproval of sacrilege? If, as Father Fox had said, the *novus ordo missae* is not *per se* invalid, it is *per se* a valid Mass which produces the Blessed Sacrament. So we avoid the blessing of Jesus Christ sacramentally present, whether or not through sacrilege. But the bread was present in the chapel wall-safe during the novena. So should we attend the novena, thus condoning the same sacrilege?

Or does the *novus ordo* fail to transubstantiate, and we should give divine honor, praise, and worship to a piece of bread? We could participate in novena prayers with Catholics(?) in the absence of the Blessed Sacrament—right?

Oak Hill chapel, Castle Hill, Easter Sunday 30 March 1975—Father Fox left six at the rail uncommunicated when **his** supply of hosts was exhausted, though the tabernacle held hosts “consecrated” at a *novus ordo missae*. Mrs. Coffey’s daughter vehemently but unsuccessfully demanded communion, whatever the source.

St. Patrick’s Seminary, Manly, 1973—Father Fox showed me the chapel. I stood like a tourist and beheld Father Fox kneel and pray. When he arose he explained that he customarily prays in churches and chapels with the intention of visiting the Blessed Sacrament at its nearest presence, though it be five hundred miles distant.

Marian Centre, Neutral Bay, NSW, Wednesday 17 January 1973—After Frits Albers’ lecture Father Fox stated that Vatican II had erred in matters of doctrine. Not having read the documents I could not accept that an ecumenical council of the Catholic Church could err. Father Fox proved it by citing authority as quoted and applied in **The Robber Church**, by Patrick Omlor, who proved the council in heresy. He thereby disposed of my difficulty; obviously a council in heresy cannot be a council of the Catholic Church. Even more obviously a man who signed and promulgated these heresies is necessarily a heretic, so, not being Catholic, he cannot be pope. Therefore his decrees in virtue of his papal authority can have **no** effect, **at least** from the date of his first public proclamation of previously condemned public heresies publicly voted and declared by Vatican II. Montini, however, had disqualified himself for election to the papacy by doctrinal and moral errors in his speeches, sermons, and published writings. Either way he had no legitimate ecclesiastical functions, papal or Catholic. He could not legitimately appoint cardinals, bishops, commissions, or altar boys. He could neither convoke nor continue a council. He could not change rules for papal elections. He could not require resignations for age or other reason. Not even a legitimate pope can innovate under cover of infallibility, the scope and purpose of which are the Deposit of Faith (in which innovation is obviously impossible) and its total preservation. So Paul’s sacramental “decrees” in “obedience” to heretical Vatican II were doubly illicit, invalid, and impossible. Least possible of all was his “Apostolic Constitution,” *Missale Romanum*, which decreed nothing while grievously infringing and violating divine law codified when necessary to protect the Mass against false, heretical, or new rites and approaches.

This law, necessary to the Church, of its nature unabrogable, St. Pius V’s *Quo Primum*, Father Fox has cited for years as his authority, against Paul VI and his successors, to celebrate the traditional Latin Mass. He now professes the *per se* validity of a service reeking with heresy, introduced to replace the Mass in violation of this same *Quo Primum*. He says in effect that *Quo Primum*, on which he bases his own right, can be changed, derogated, abrogated, superseded by a heretic who, moreover, somehow retains a position of command and authority over **him**.

He flouts and violates this “authority” every time he celebrates Mass except in complete privacy, every time he preaches a sermon, every time he administers a sacrament. He obeys this “authority” whenever he supports or imagines the *novus ordo*’s validity, whenever he delays Benediction fifteen minutes after Mass, whenever he fouls his Mass with optional Collect, Secret, and Postcommunion “for the pope” instead of “against the persecutors of the Church,” whenever he says “Pope” Paul VI or “Pope” John Paul II.

The *novus ordo missae* is either licit or not. If licit, it is licit on the authority of a public heretic mendaciously citing obedience to a publicly heretical council while he violates laws of God and His Church. (*Quo Primum*, Canon 733)

The *novus ordo missae* is either Catholic or not. If it is, Caiphaz, Arius, Luther, and Cranmer were Catholic all their lives, and all their followers since. Then Mass is no sacrifice; it offers human works because it is a human invention, because Jesus Christ is not God but an inconsistent teacher of self-contradictory “truth.”

The *novus ordo missae* is either valid *per se* or not. If valid, it is valid on the same heretic authority that declares it licit. If this is competent Catholic authority, then validity, which entails institution (obviously impossible) by Jesus Christ is guaranteed by the Church; the *novus ordo missae* is valid

every time through the Church's expressed (where?) intention, not merely on the few occasions when it meets Lefebvre's approval (Eucharistic Prayer I, Latin consecration, old priest with proper intention, no communion in the hand, no rock music, etc. Eucharistic Prayer I, after all, enjoys the same status and authority as E.P. II, III, IV, etc.). Where has the Church expressed an intention to do what? At **no** point in the *novus ordo missae* is unequivocally expressed or implied the necessarily traditional, necessarily expressed and incorporated intention of Christ and His Church at Mass. At several points this intention is replaced, contradicted, or deliberately excluded. Are public heretics the Church? Can they form or reform, define or redefine, the Church's intention? No, nor can the Church itself reform or redefine it, coming as it does from Revelation.

If we grant that the *novus ordo missae* is a licit, valid, Catholic Mass we must grant a possibility that it **can** be licitly imposed (to replace what all must agree is a licit, valid, Catholic Mass) by an authority steeped in condemned heresy. Therefore we must obey this heretical authority (if we can discover what it commands, and obedience will not lead us into sin, Protestantism, or Judaism) and assist at an idolatrous novelty, thus desecrating the Sabbath and offending God most grievously.

There can be only a Catholic Mass; even Mass celebrated by schismatics is Mass only through the Catholic Church (which forbids attendance) and its sacramental system. There is no Arian Mass; there is no non-sacrificial or Lutheran Mass; there is no Church of England Mass; there is no **new** Mass. Whoever grants that the *novus ordo missae* can be a Mass under any circumstances must grant Catholicity and authority to the same public heretics who suppressed the true Mass—thereby joining them in public heresy and condoning their criminal suppression. It follows, therefore, that if anyone attends the Mass, even the undoubtedly true Mass, of one of **these** heretics, he violates Canon 1258, which forbids *communicatio in sacris* with non-Catholics.

Canon 2316: A person who of his own accord and knowingly helps in any manner to propagate heresy, or who communicates in sacred rites (*in divinis*) with heretics in violation of the prohibition of Canon 1258, incurs suspicion of heresy.

Canon 2315: A person who is suspected of heresy, and who after admonition has not removed the cause for suspicion, he shall be suspended *a divinis*. If a person suspected of heresy has been punished with the penalties here stated, and does not amend within six months after their imposition, he shall be considered as a heretic and be liable to the penalties for heresy.

Canon 2314 (1): All apostates from the Christian faith and each and every heretic or schismatic incur the following penalties: (1) *ipso facto* excommunication; (2) if they have been admonished and do not repent, they shall be deprived of any benefice, dignity, pension, office, or other position which they may hold in the Church; they shall be declared infamous, and, if they are clerics, they shall after renewed admonition be deposed; (3) if they have joined a non-Catholic sect or have publicly adhered to it, they incur infamy *ipso facto*, and, if they are clerics and the admonition to repent has been fruitless, they shall be degraded. Canon 188, n. 4, provides, moreover, that the cleric who publicly abandons the Catholic Faith loses every ecclesiastical office *ipso facto* and without any declaration.

Lefebvre is a heretic. I shall have nothing to do with him or his priests. When I find a priest who rejoices publicly that Lefebvre agrees with **him** on the very points which most clearly demonstrate Lefebvre's heretical bias, I must apply the same logic against my wish to believe Father Fox Catholic, or to grant him a fool's pardon. This position cuts me off from Mass to a great extent, much as Father Fox' former position cut him off from his own father's funeral "mass."

Uncharitable? There is no obligation to like anyone. Some people just rub each other the wrong way. I must love my neighbor as myself, but not more than myself. When I err I appreciate having my error corrected. If I am fool enough not to heed private correction, public is next best.

Father Fox' position appears in the last stages of erosion. Even the halved Lourdes traditionalist pilgrimage figures ("twice as less") he ascribes, or approves the ascription, to us few "super-integrists," the Catholics who could not compromise with the *novus ordo* shrine authorities. Wonderful!—if true.

‘Faithful Catholics know **by sure instinct** that this (Tridentine) Mass is the work of Almighty God Himself,’—Father Fox, page 8, LMSA Newsletter Nov. 1980.

Where was this sure instinct—how did it operate—when this Mass was stolen? Why depend on instinct when proof exists from Scripture, tradition, history, theology, conciliar and papal testimony, divine and ecclesiastical law? What kind of argument is an instinct obviously lacking in most of the race? Are we faithful Catholics from this instinct, or have we this instinct from Catholicism? Is this the same sure instinct by which Father Fox declares the *novus ordo missae* not *per se* invalid? Are we not entitled to ask why our point is attempted so feebly?

Father Fox’ “instinct” will appeal to and flatter the nostalgia freak, the blind follower, the non-thinker—the man who may be led into *communicatio in sacris* with *novus ordo* heretics in *novus ordo* chapels and churches—scenes of regularly scheduled sacrilege and idolatry. What is Father Fox’ motive? To create an impression on heretics seems too trivial, and downright foolish after our Oak Hill experience. Can he not bear to see his “followers” free of the heretical authority which he permits to bind **him**, more Catholic than **he**, more willing to fight for their Faith, publicly, against its known enemies? We must all wait for the clergy to lead? We’ll wait longer again than we already have for Father Fox, possibly an eternity in hell. For we are as obliged to fight as Father Fox and Mgr. Lefebvre. Their glaring failure will not excuse ours.

It is not enough to have Mass, nor to have a visible pope-substitute. We cannot adulterate our Faith, one integrated whole prescribed for total acceptance, the Faith betrayed by LMSA official policy and the Fox version of ecumenism.

They who promulgate or adhere to condemned heresy are condemned heretics. This category embraces every bishop alive who has not publicly condemned Vatican II. They who adhere to condemned heretics condone and support condemned heresy. St. Athanasius never said: “I agree with Arius except where he is wrong.”

We patiently awaited circumstances which would force Lefebvre to declare himself. He has lined up with heresy. Father Fox maintained his silence for years, but has chosen to follow Lefebvre instead of Catholic truth. These men have shown that we cannot impute Catholic motives to silence. Silence in the face of heresy is in practice consent to heresy. The only Catholic course is public belligerence. **The war is now!** If we lose by default we shall not have another chance.

Since Father Fox refuses to read what I write, I asked a friend to propose these arguments. Father Fox stated his preference for St. Robert Bellarmine’s theological opinion over Pope Paul IV’s decree. (This nourished foolish hopes that he would appreciate our preference for St. Thomas Aquinas and the Council of Trent over Paul VI and his antipapal successors.) But defense? Our friend could discern none.

A week later, however, Sunday 7 December, Father Fox disclosed his reaction. Displayed on the table at East Lindfield Community Centre entrance were two photocopies in Father Fox’ inimitable calligraphy of Michael Davies’ definitive pronouncement in the Powers Lake **Maryfaithful** that we who cannot see four heretic usurpers of St. Peter’s Chair as genuine popes are necessarily in schism.

Father Fox despises logical arguments from born, raised, educated Catholic laymen who urge papal decrees and canon law. Who are we to argue with the clergy? But when he cannot refute our authorities his native humility takes over; he hides behind the leading theologian of our day, a layman in England, a convert who has never understood logic, consistency, or the points at issue, a man who publicly sees none of the heresies Father Fox once saw in Vatican II’s documents. For St. Michael Davies tells him, as he tells so many, what he wants to hear, so that he need not face or perform his Catholic duty to uphold the Faith against its most effective enemies, the last four “papal” heretics, Roncalli, Montini, Luciani, and Wojtyla.

Formerly Father Fox would quote Pope Leo XIII to the effect that the traditional Mass is the way in which God has shown that He wishes to be worshipped. Now he and Lefebvre come under the

same pope's dictum that the most dangerous heretic is the one nearest truth. Unfortunately, too many traditional Catholics see these two compromising heretics as Catholic martyrs. Too many remain in compromising groups (*Una Voce*, LMSA) that officially condone and support dual rites and doctrines, and contribute to collections that eventually enrich Lefebvre.

We see Fox and Lefebvre insisting on papal status—therefore infallibility—for men whose heretical pronouncements and promulgations they have themselves exposed, though hardly to the extent to which exposition is obligatory. Too many who consider themselves Catholic oversimplify acceptance of heretical doctrine and practice, especially worship, by misapplication or misunderstanding of papal infallibility. It seems beyond their comprehension that a public heretic, not being Catholic, cannot be pope, and cannot therefore be endowed with papal infallibility. Nor can they appreciate that infallibility is limited to specific areas, and cannot even there correct its Divine Source, Who determined for time and eternity what He sacrificed for what purpose for whose benefit. But these elementary considerations cannot have escaped either of our heroes, if only because we ourselves have often enough called the facts to their unwilling attention.

They have adopted toward all criticism the attitude of the official Roman post-conciliar apostasy: they refuse to acknowledge or reply, on the pretext that laymen have no right to criticize. We have the Catholic right and duty to condemn heresy whenever and wherever detected. We can be denied this right and duty only for inability to discern heresy because we were not taught Catholicism. This would postulate that our clergy and hierarchy have been woefully inefficient or frightfully remiss. What **have** they taught us? Error? Then why should we believe them now?

Before definition infallibility was taken for granted as necessary to true religion. Without it no one could state, for instance, what constitutes Holy Scripture. So Holy Scripture is not required to prove infallibility. Nevertheless it contains certain texts quoted in support. Among these is: "And the Lord said: Simon, Simon.... I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not...." (Luke xxii, 31-32). Those who cite this text conveniently ignore St. Peter's subsequent triple denial and seven acknowledged popes who have held or supported heresies while in office. They further ignore that if this text **is** to apply it must apply to genuine popes, not to public heretics. Since Christ prayed for Peter, it is argued, a pope cannot fail, **because His prayer is always efficacious**, despite man's free will, which even popes possess. For whom, then, did Christ pray while sacrificing, consecrating, and transubstantiating? For all men? Then **all men will be saved**, immediately or eventually. So why has the Church condemned **this** pernicious doctrine, apocatastasis? And why will Fox and Lefebvre traffic with the authority which promotes and enforces **this** condemned heresy? Because Wojtyla "says it in Polish?" (as Father Fox actually pleaded!)

In **The War Is Now!** #7, October 1979, we recorded that Sunday 20 May Father Fox had cited the authority of St. Robert Bellarmine to read us out of the Church. He quoted the saint: "Just as it is licit to attack a pontiff who attacks the body, so is it licit to resist him who attacks souls, or who disturbs the civil order, or above all, who tries to destroy the Church. It is licit to resist him by not doing what he orders and by impeding the execution of his will. It is not licit, however, to judge him, to punish him, or to depose him; for such acts belong to a superior." (*De Romano Pontifice* II, 29). Father Fox then restricted us to his **misapplication** of one irrelevant theological opinion to prove our Faith. He has since set these words against the doctrine of Popes Innocent III and Paul IV, expressed in papal sermon and decree.

But the next chapter (30) in St. Robert's book expounds his **relevant** opinion, which agrees with these popes and with us. Father Fox knows this chapter also. Here, as so often, he selects what he can torture into agreement with him, even when irrelevant, and buries what he can't refute. One need only recall his attitude when we lost the Oak Hill chapel. He could not celebrate Mass within a parish where he lacked the parish priest's permission "according to Canon Law." Though he could then have cited the law, had it existed, his difficulty evaporated the moment he saw three volumes of the law stacked beside the chairman at an LMSA meeting. He hadn't known we had access to the Code, just as subsequently he hoped that to us Bellarmine's book was closed. When you have read the following quotation therefrom, whether or not you agree, decide for yourself

how far you may trust Father Fox. Is this a man to follow? Can you bet your soul on his choice of quotations? St. Robert Bellarmine:

“... it is proven with arguments from authority and from reason that the manifest heretic is *ipso facto* deposed. The argument from authority is based on St. Paul (*Ep. ad Titum*, 3), who orders that the heretic be avoided after two warnings, that is, after showing himself to be manifestly obstinate—which means before any excommunication or judicial sentence. And this is what St. Jerome writes, adding that the other sinners are excluded from the Church by sentence of excommunication, but the heretics exile themselves and separate themselves on their own from the body of Christ. Now, a pope who remains pope cannot be avoided, for how could we be required to avoid our own head? How can we separate ourselves from a member united to us?

“This principle is most certain. The non-Christian cannot by any means be pope, as Cajetan himself admits. The reason for this is that he cannot be head of what he is not a member; now he who is not a Christian is not a member of the Church, and a manifest heretic is not a Christian, as is clearly taught by St. Cyprian (*lib 4, epist. 2*), St. Athanasius (*ser 2 contra Arian.*), St. Augustine (*lib de grat. Christ. cap 20*), St. Jerome (*cont. Lucifer.*) and others; therefore the manifest heretic cannot be pope.”

“We affirm that absolutely no heretic or schismatic has any power or right.” – St. Cyprian, who also teaches that heretics who return to the Church must be received as laymen, even though they have been bishops or priests, in the Church before their heresy. St. Optatus, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Jerome all teach that heretics and schismatics cannot have the keys of the kingdom of heaven, nor bind nor loose. All based their arguments on the nature of heresy, refusal to believe God.

Father Fox lives in a heretical community and supports heretics, especially antipopes. For this anomalous situation he pleads scrupulous obedience vowed to a Catholic community under genuine popes. By his erroneous—or malicious—selection and misapplication of St. Robert Bellarmine’s irrelevant opinion, and by his suppression of St. Robert’s writings on the point at issue—whether a heretic can be pope—he neither hesitates nor scruples to place his illustrious patron and authority in flagrant disobedience to the law of the Church codified by Pope Paul IV to protect the Church from imminent danger, before St. Robert turned seventeen. Both St. Robert and Father Fox knew this law, which St. Robert respected and neither disobeyed nor contradicted.

But Father Fox disobeys it constantly, habitually, and knowingly. He says it has been abrogated by the Code of Canon Law’s omission, and condemned by Pius XII in *Vacantis Apostolicae Sedis*, according to which no cardinal may be deprived of his papal electoral franchise by reason of excommunication, suspension, interdict, or other ecclesiastical penalty. But heresy is none of these. A heretic is neither covered nor privileged by this law. He is not a Catholic, not a cardinal, not a pope. No law can make him a Catholic. God Himself cannot make him a Catholic, a cardinal, or a pope while he remains a known, unrepentant heretic. A Catholic heretic is as much a contradiction in terms as a square circle. Of their nature neither can exist. Heresy of its nature removes one from the Church. It did so before Paul IV’s law supported this fact. The fact remains after the law is removed—if it is removed. Facts are facts—supported by law or not.

When Cranmer and Luther applied the principle *tolle missam tolle ecclesiam* no one held that their substitute liturgies were genuine, valid Catholic Masses. Indeed their declared intention proved this impossible. No one was required to await St. Pius V’s decree, *Quo Primum*, to assume the obvious fact of invalidity. Nor if *Quo Primum* is ever abrogated will Luther’s and Cranmer’s liturgies become either genuine or legal Masses. The fact is, and will never change, that these liturgies are not Mass. They and their ilk brought on the law to support the fact. Not the law but their nature invalidates them.

Now the law is constantly flouted by use of a rite with identical and additional defects of form, matter, and intention, a rite as deliberately intended to replace the Mass of all the Christian centuries, the Mass supported when necessary by law, the law that remains unabrogated but

disregarded by public heretics who claim to be popes, cardinals, bishops, and priests, all publicly in violation of their ordination oaths in **this** disregard among others.

Father Fox advanced: “If I can establish that the Vatican represents(?) the head-quarters of the Church, then the man who presides over the Vatican, namely Pope Paul VI, must be the legitimate successor of Peter from the mere fact that he occupies the Chair of Peter.”

[Anacletus II and several other antipopes presided over the Vatican. This argument would render the Avignon popes illegitimate.]

“When you read the various books dealing with the primacy of Peter, one of the points stressed as proof that Peter was the head of the Church is the fact that the majority of the faithful, or the universal Church recognized him as such.”

[We know Peter was Christ’s vicar because Jesus Christ appointed him. Naturally all the faithful of his time knew this. They could be the faithful only on condition that they recognized this. But their recognition did not make him pope—it merely testified that the fact was well-known because it was part of the faith preached by the Apostles. It is no part of that faith that an antipope or heretic is pope. The fact that he is recognized as pope by most Catholics proves only that most Catholics can be in error. Papal, collegial, now lay infallibility!]

“Some very important points, pertinent to this topic, are expressed by two learned Doctors of the Church. They were of the opinion” [Opinion binds no one!] “that the legitimacy of a Pontiff need not be questioned if the Catholics of the world accept him. Cardinal Billot” [Doctor?] “held that ‘.... the adhesion of the universal church’” [consisting of all the modernist apostates, or the traditional Catholics? True Catholics are necessarily traditional Catholics.] “‘will be always, in itself, an **infallible sign** of the legitimacy of a determined Pontiff, and therefore also of all the conditions required for legitimacy itself.... For the adhesion of the Church to a false Pontiff would be the same as its adhesion to a false rule of faith....” [Exactly! St. Paul’s predicted apostasy is clearly upon us. The adherents of the last four antipopes all accept Vatican II’s heretical statements, which Paul VI signed, and his successors pledged themselves to support.] “from the moment in which the Pope is accepted by the Church and united to her as the head to the body, it is **no longer(?) permitted to raise doubts about a possible vice of election** or a possible lack of any condition whatsoever necessary for legitimacy.” [Down with Sts. Bernard and Norbert!] “For the aforementioned adhesion of the Church heals the root of all fault in the election and **proves infallibly** the existence of all the required conditions....”

[Let us rejoice that this is an opinion. I could not bear to have such obvious asininity forced on me as defined dogma.]

“St. Alphonse de Liguori seems to substantiate the opinion, ‘It is of no importance that in past centuries some Pontiff was illegitimately elected or took possession of the Pontificate by fraud; **it is enough that he was accepted** afterwards by the whole Church as Pope, since by such an acceptance he would have become **true Pontiff.**’”

[He never asks whether they were heretics.]

“Canon law is quite specific on this point. The Church allows for error in the election of superiors so that the faithful majority are not deceived. ‘The Church supplies jurisdiction both for the external and the internal forum: (1) in common error; (2) in a positive and probable doubt whether of fact or law (Canon 209). Common error consists in the erroneous belief of all or nearly all the people of a place, parish, or community that a man has jurisdiction. The fact that the person knows that he has no jurisdiction, does not interfere with the validity of his acts if by common error he is believed to have jurisdiction.... in the case of common error, no matter how created, the Church supplies the jurisdiction for the benefit of the people.’—Woywod’s Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law.”

[But the common error in the case of the last four antipopes is not that they had or have jurisdiction, for public heretics can have none, and there is no doubt whatsoever of their public heresy or their

consequent lack of jurisdiction. The common error here is obstinate adherence to public heretics, which removes the adherents from the Catholic Church and plunges them into heresy, apostasy, and idolatry—for their benefit?!

“It would seem from this that a Pope or a bishop, if elected on questionable grounds, would regardless have all the authority designated by the Church” [which grants none to public heretics] “if the people believed he had it.

“It is a simple matter of deduction then to understand and accept the legitimacy of Pope Paul VI from the mere fact that **he is recognized** by the majority of the faithful, or the physical church structure.”

[The majority of the faithful, in fact all the faithful, adhere to the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church—and will have nothing to do with the postconciliar heretical structure or its antipopes. They did not recognize heretic Montini as pope; they do not accept heretic Wojtyla as pope.]

But all the feeble priests and collegial bishops accept these monsters, these destroyers of the faith. Why? Refusal of their clear and obvious duty to condemn public heresy and name its proponents! Cowardice! Failure to trust in God!

“Why are you fearful, O ye of little faith?”

John McGrath’s Tribulations

over “Religious Cavalier,” a foul, blasphemous exhibit displayed at the Art Gallery of New South Wales, were partially detailed on page 3, **Sydney Morning Herald**, January 13, 1981. He removed the offending clothing. but was persuaded to return it. No mention was made of his protest to the Gallery, nor of his unsuccessful attempts to elicit protests from every priest of his acquaintance. When he dragged the exhibit to St. Mary’s Cathedral the priest he had phoned would not come to the door. No support came from Fathers Fox or De Silva, who told John that what offended him would not necessarily offend all Catholics. John stated—correctly—that anyone not offended could not be Catholic.

Father De Silva disapproved John quitting his job at the Art Gallery when the management refused to withdraw the obscene exhibit. “What did you accomplish? How will you make a living?”

Like Lot leaving Sodom, John publicly disclaimed responsibility for gross insult to our faith and Our Lady. And he provoked a shining example of De Silva-Fox syndrome, the reason priests won’t leave heretical communities: “**How will we make a living?**”

ARGUMENT CORNER

Objection—Why devote space to persecuting saintly little Father Fox, who has brought us the true Mass for years? We need him more than we need you.

Reply—Why not? He obviously enjoys persecution, and never leaves his portable catacomb. For years we tried to make him face his duty publicly to condemn public heresy and its public supporters. At last he gripped his courage in both hands and condemned **us**. He publicly embraced the postconciliar apostates and preached their heresies: 1) the *novus ordo* can be a valid Mass; 2) public heretics are popes; 3) one must accord usurping heretics the honor due offices to which they have no right; 4) JP2 celebrates a valid *novus ordo* in Polish!

Since Father Fox heeded no private remonstrations I delate him publicly for heresy, and refute arguments he parrots to excuse his heretical position. These arguments are used around the world by such as Williamson from Econe. Father Fox travels to Wagga, to Albury, to Adelaide, to Ballarat, to Melbourne. Everywhere Catholics come to Mass because on the day he has a monopoly. He leads them by word and example into cowardice and unwarranted submission to four antipopes. Since this is now as public as I can make it, my duty in the matter is done, and I shall never mention Father Patrick Fox, C.M. in these pages again—nor attend his schismatic Mass.

ENGLAND'S UNFAITHFUL PRIMATE

How can you tell, his enemies ask, when Harold Wilson is speaking from expediency rather than principle? When you see his lips moving, they answer.

But Harold Wilson is no more skilled in political speech than His Eminence of Westminster, John Carmel Heenan. This proud prelate could, if times get really bad, find employment in the Meteorological Office, so skilled is he at determining which way the wind is blowing. He is thus the fit spokesman for the hierarchy of England and Wales.

Consider this specimen of his hypocrisy. What is a priest to say to one who wants to know the Church's teaching on contraception, he was asked.

"The priest has to say," answered Heenan, "'This is the teaching of the Vicar of Christ in the encyclical.' He can then say, 'For my part, personally, I do not agree.'"

Personally, Cardinal Heenan does not agree with much of the Church's teaching. He went over to Northern Ireland in 1962 to tell the eager bigots who rule there, and who hold that Rome is the seat of the Scarlet Woman, that "being a Christian is more important than being Catholic or Protestant." What was left of English Catholicism was enraged at this traitorous repudiation of the Faith for which hundreds of martyrs under Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth died. One priest wrote Heenan that "the plain, commonsense meaning" of his words was that "to be a Christian is something over and above being a Catholic—in other words the Branch Theory," that impertinent and ludicrous Anglican idea that the Church of Rome is but "a branch of the larger Church."

But of course Cardinal Heenan had long since in practice admitted that mad, loathsome theory. It had long been his joy to wine and dine Protestant "bishops" and make congenial noises at them, just as though they were the real thing, not fakes and frauds to a man.

(Several years ago Heenan under oath was asked in court: "You are probably the most intelligent man in England?" He answered: "Yes, I suppose you could say that." Not since Toad of Toad Hall has such self-inflation been seen in the sceptred isle. Is it surprising that such an egotist should shrink from being thought lace-curtain Irish, and long to be thought worthy to bend the elbow with Anglican snobocracy, all their usurpations and impertinences forgotten?)

He is the complete Ecumeniac. He collects rabbis with the same avidity with which he collects Anglican "bishops" (indeed he had a hand in the production of Vatican II's infamous Declaration on the Jews) and has kind words for the poor, misunderstood Sons of the Widow. He even tries his best to wow the Wogs (as the more beastly British call their million or so Asiatic and African immigrants). In September 1972 he took part in a London Hindu do, organized to give honor to Ganesh, a four-armed, elephant-headed god, and told the assembled idolaters that the one God of the Hindus was the same one God of the Christians. The miscalled Catholic Herald (September 22, 1972) published a photograph of Heenan in action, wearing a Hindu garland and standing before a grotesque idol of the elephant "god" that he so ludicrously and so blasphemously identifies with the one God of the Christians.

This is the man who (24 April 1975) acting as spokesman for the English and Welsh hierarchy declared that "the missal of Pope Paul VI has now replaced all other missals in the Roman Rite. This is a law of the Church and must be obeyed."

This man who treats Anglican bureaucrats as equals of Catholic bishops, who calls upon us to accept that the Scriptural and traditional anathemas of perfidious Jewry are somehow repealed, who declares that a four-armed, elephant-headed Hindu idol is the same God Christians worship, this man is to tell us that the Mass of the Apostles, the Mass of the centuries, the Mass of Trent, the One True Mass, is **forbidden** and **reprehended**?

Let us rather listen to a better Heenan. The same man who in his old age so far fallen from the Faith we are bidden to hold though an angel from heaven preach another wrote in 1951 a book entitled "The People's Priest." He spoke in it of "the stout defense of the Mass by the Catholics of the

sixteenth century” and observed that “their day is not altogether unlike our own. Although there was a great outward devotion to the Mass in the reign of Henry VIII, the majority of the bishops and priests forsook the Faith” (*De te fabula narratur*; of thee, John Carmel, the tale is told!).

“It is not impossible,” wrote the Heenan of 1951, “that Catholics in English-speaking lands will be called upon to defend their altars against God’s enemies. It is not difficult to imagine circumstances in which a priest will once more have to make the choice between his life and his Mass.”

The priest has not yet to make his choice between his life and his Mass. He is only asked, in this soft and unheroic age, to make his choice between his bishop and his Mass. It is not really a very difficult choice, is it?

Cardinal Heenan himself tells us in his autobiography, “Not the Whole Truth,” that “Unquestioning obedience can sometimes be a positive dereliction of duty” (p 272) so we can be sure he knows better.

LETTER TO AN ORDINARY **Most Rev E B Clancy, St. Mary’s Cathedral, Sydney 2000**

I noted in **The Weekend Australian**, May 3-4, 1986 your letter properly defending against a mindless, bureaucratic ruling which penalized moral convictions:

“I would point out, however, that what is at issue is more basic than religious belief. At issue is freedom of conscience, a freedom enjoyed also by those who profess no particular religious belief at all.”

How does this freedom of conscience affect the rights of the traditional Catholic (All true Catholics are necessarily traditional.) to his traditional Mass and sacraments, his traditional doctrine, and the support of his hierarchy and clergy?

Your freedom of conscience excuses all from the duty of forming a right conscience. In effect it makes each a law unto himself. This is precisely the “right” which authorizes the over-riding of moral right in the case upon which you commented. If two people without religious belief or moral training wish to cohabit, their consciences, free from religious influence, render their behavior normal and acceptable. This freedom is also to be respected as more basic than religious belief. The argument is thus reduced to a choice between equally free consciences, on your own argument.

Freedom of conscience includes a “right” to believe as one likes, in effect refusal to believe God and freedom to violate His Commandments. If by such freedom is understood the individual’s right to form on all questions such internal convictions as he may judge right, says **The Catholic Encyclopedia**, this ethical freedom also has its limits, since the spiritual life is subject to conscience and to the moral order of the universe—bound by ethical obligations which no man may disregard.

Pope Pius IX wrote (*Quanta Cura*): “..... this erroneous opinion, which could not be more fatal to the Catholic Church and to the salvation of souls and which Our predecessor Gregory XVI called madness, that ‘freedom of conscience and of worship is a right proper to every man.’ all and each of the disordered opinions and doctrines recalled in detail in this Letter, We reprove, proscribe, and condemn with Our Apostolic Authority and We will and ordain that all the sons of the Catholic Church hold them absolutely as reproved, proscribed, and condemned.”

Genuine freedom of conscience is properly freedom from interference with a properly formed conscience, which is invariably based on religious belief, sometimes at second hand. But yours, “enjoyed also by those who possess no religious belief at all,” looks suspiciously like freedom **from** conscience.

To a Catholic there cannot be an issue “more basic than religious belief.” His chief purpose in life, salvation, depends directly upon his beliefs. “He who believes not shall be condemned.” (Mark xvi, 16) Why would a Catholic bishop defend a modernist, freemasonic doctrine such as freedom of conscience? Or don’t you belong to the Communion of Saints, wherein all Catholics of all times

agree on beliefs? Who released you from your ordination oaths against modernism and to the doctrine of the Council of Trent?

In a way I am almost happy that you have spoken out over the years, though frankly I cannot understand your compulsion to prove publicly that you are not Catholic. Nor, being a victim of Paul VI's new rite of ordination, are you a bishop. How many Protestant churches and synagogues must that Roman Pole pray in before you come to your senses?

AND A **REPLY!** 10 June 1986, His Grace, Archbp. Clancy, has asked me to acknowledge your letter 26th May, 1986 and to advise you that he has noted your remarks.—(Rev) Paul Hilder

LETTERS

July 3, 1984

Milord, I've written again to the Australian bishops. I send you a copy. how hard it must be for them to admit they've erred, but they had few scruples in admitting that all their predecessors erred. Otherwise how correct them? No one would believe them, they think, if they reverted to the eternal religion. But who believes them now? Their performance in the face of our New South Wales homosexual rights legislation was even more pitiful than when abortion was legalized..... What will (their Judge) say to this generation of bishops that killed the missionary effort on the pretext that there is good in all religions?

Have you given any thought to the timing of the end of the world? "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world, for a testimony to all nations," (not necessarily for their conversion) "and then shall the consummation come." (Matt xxiv, 14) The Gospel **has** been preached to the whole world, and the official policy of Vatican II is to preach it no longer. (Here) the genuine Catholic missionary effort is confined to the laity, who make very little headway against the interference of the perjured clergy and apostate hierarchy.

BISHOP'S REPLY Aug 6, 1984

You have written at length, Aug. 11, 1981 & June 1, 1984. I am not a clever brain, so cannot digest it all. It seems to me, you spend way too much time in condemning the Hierarchy. Most will not read your long treatises. As I see it, the Catholic Church is very simple, & every person of good will can absorb the essential doctrines & live up to them. You delve way too deep into all kinds of problems, & in the murky waters, the real fish seem to disappear. The Spirit of God is not to be put into the darkness by fussing over history, tradition, and translations.

[I swear, he really is a bishop. I attended his consecration in 1948. He was to retire in 1987.] From my reply, 22 Nov. 1984:

I object to translations that are incorrect—deliberately. My theological points should hardly be obscure to any former student of theology. Granted, the Faith is simple enough for the simple to understand. But there is nothing simple about the modernist attack on orthodoxy. This heresy only pretends to simplicity, and must be controverted and condemned in the abstruse murk in which it hides.

Our entire religion is traditional—devoted to preserving tradition, the unchangeable deposit of faith. Not only can tradition not be overemphasized, but a religion without it is necessarily false.

"Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things? we speak what we know and we testify what we have seen" (John iii, 10-11). Jesus appears to mock Nicodemus. Take care that He mock you not. I would go to none of this trouble were I not convinced absolutely that the Church taught me correctly, and that it cannot correct itself—that Vatican II and its "popes" cannot, therefore, be Catholic. Inquiry into the facts cannot engender doubts concerning true religion, however many they may confirm concerning the postconciliar "Church." God gives no prizes for invincible ignorance to those He has designated to teach and spread His truth. Think hard! Think straight! Put your flock back on the road to heaven.

Do **not** resign, like all the shirkers! Resignation is another innovation, designed to separate the faithful from those who can remember the Church. As a policy it is a denial of respect for elders and appreciation of their accumulated knowledge and experience. I suppose some incompetent (native) with modern, substandard training is lined up for your job in three years or less? Some man acceptable to the modernists in Rome? Whether or not true (there), it is generally true around the mission world.

There can simply be no simple faith in Arianism, clearly embraced in the *novus ordo missae*. If your flock is condemned for its beliefs you will also stand condemned. You are responsible for their beliefs.

Everyone who can speak the truth, yet speaks it not, will be judged by God.
St. Justin Martyr

OFFICIAL

17 Nov 1987

N. 1981/87 Dear Mr. McGrath,

It seems that the “summation” you sent to me with your letter of 13 October 1987 lacks authority and credibility, and should be disregarded.

Yours sincerely, + (Abp) Franco Brambilla Apostolic Pro-Nuncio

Your Grace,

24/11/87

Mr. J. D. McGrath has forwarded your odd reaction to the 16-page “summation,” **The Great Apostasy**.

I recognized its unmistakable stamp of truth throughout. Truth has become a rare commodity in the Church. I should dearly love to discover where this article diverges from truth, especially dogmatic Catholic truth. And to discover in what respect it misquotes or misapplies the unimpeachable Authorities on which its arguments are based. Which of them are we to disbelieve, and on whose authority? Religion is your province, the reason for your office, supposedly your chief and official interest in life. But you summarily dismiss this serious argument, which contains not one word of a lie, not one weak or silly statement, not one divergence from the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church from its foundation till the accession of Angelo Roncalli and his anti-Catholic successors. Wherein have I misstated Catholic doctrine, law, practise, or theology? You have been granted the charity of this argument. Have you enough to prove me wrong?

How do you rationalize your acceptance of the Arian heresy in the Church’s official worship? What value has the sacrifice of a mere human, especially one who claimed to be divine? Would this not be the greatest hoax in history? What prevents you from publicly condemning this damning heresy and those who have foisted it upon us? What Catholic ever asked for a new rite of Mass? When will you undertake your obvious and manifest duty to profess the Catholic Faith against the Arianism clearly stated in the preface to “Eucharistic Prayer” Four? [Reply? No.]

From a Columban priest in Turrumurra, N.S.W. March 19, 1988

Dear Mr. McGrath, On my return from Medjugorje and the Holy Land, I saw your letter (**The Great Apostasy**) the Old Catholic Encyclopedia on La Salette and also the NEW CATH ENCYCL. Melanie ’s brochure was printed in 1879 with the approval of the Bishop of Lecce. The opinion of wise persons was that there is a distinction between the Melanie of 1846 and the visionary of 1879 whose mind was disturbed by apocalyptic books. Most of the defenders of the text of 1879 received censure from THEIR bishops..... As Solange Hertz says: The Church has not **condemned** (so it seems) the **actual words** of Melanie but it has condemned the interpretations and Solange Hertz says **and with very good reason.**”

Melanie was obedient to the Church. S. Hertz seems to give correct historical information about the Church’s attitude. So a distinction between S. Hertz and **The Great Apostasy**—Containing many serious **errors** Melanie does not **authorize** these conclusions. **Solution** 1) The Church accepts Fatima 2) The third **secret** may most likely be **the confusion** in the Church cf. **Soul Magazine** 3) Mary asked in 1925 that people should meditate on the Mysteries of the Rosary..... (The parts omitted are even sillier!)

The recipient forwarded the foregoing letter for my amazement and reply:

April 9, 1988

Dear Father J,

You wade through nearly fifteen pages of incontrovertible argument based solidly and solely on Scripture and traditional Catholic doctrine, to fasten on the “weak spot,” a private revelation never advanced as an argument but only to show that it and another uncontested private revelation demonstrate that the real argument violates no Church doctrine. You call into question the veracity of two witnesses selected, you appear to agree, by Our Lady, the Mother of God, to propagate her message—though we make no such claim.

The Church continued to allow an average of 30,000 pilgrims annually to the site of the supposed vision, which had received the local bishop’s approval as genuine. But it could and should have destroyed this cult immediately had the 1879 version disagreed materially with the accounts

delivered to Pius IX in 1851. If the Blessed Virgin appeared to you and communicated a message of importance to the entire world, and you were instructed to write this message to the pope, would you ever forget it? Would you not at least keep a copy? These visionaries were described, even as St. Bernadette, as ignorant. Part of the ‘proof’ in such cases is that both the subject matter and its phrasing were beyond their natural capacities. Rather telling, too, is the fact that the chief opposition to both 1846 and 1879 reports came from the equally offended clergies, even the “wise and prudent” who without the slightest evidence postulated a difference in the 1851 and 1879 versions. But if that reference to La Salette offends you, though it is quoted neither directly nor erroneously, but is summarized in agreement with Anne Catherine Emmerich’s revelations, throw them both out! The real argument depends not one syllable on either. They are introduced after the facts only as demonstrations that such possibilities as the real argument proves do not conflict with the Catholic Faith. You have overtaxed your logical powers in attacking a side issue which no one can argue seriously, and have left the central issue uncontroverted. Why?

You fail to identify these “many serious errors” If Melanie were still alive to “authorize these conclusions” who would be forced to ask her? She is supposed to have transmitted a message; application is left to others.

Of course “Melanie was obedient to the Church.” Of course S. Hertz reported accurately. The “distinction” between her writings and **The Great Apostasy** is that they cover distinct subjects.

Soul Magazine is connected with **The Blue Army**, which will believe anything connected with Fatima, its supposed third secret, and the rosary. They keep telling anyone who will stand still long enough that one day Our Lady will save the world through the rosary—that the rosary will be all that we have left.

But what value has the rosary in comparison with the Mass? Will the Mass have disappeared? If its absence be implied or admitted in the future, what keeps it beyond possibility now? Is this perhaps the unpublished secret? May not this be why it is unpublished?

Private revelation cannot bind those to whom it is not personally revealed. So John and his successors were not bound to publish the third secret of Fatima. But was not Sister Lucy so bound? If the “popes” believe that Our Lady appeared at Fatima, and the message is consonant with Catholic doctrine, and (as your photo-copied page from **Soul** records) the message is “more relevant now than in 1917,” why is the message not published? Why is Sister Lucy silenced? These popes can gauge public reaction better than Our Lady? But if the revelation is genuine—and accurate—these men were and are motivated by self-interest. They can’t allow a vision to state facts which we traditional Catholics publish, because even people who refuse reasoned proof will believe visions, even though four “popes” would possibly consider these “sensational.” To what else would it refer, if true and relevant, but the present crisis in the Church? Why else would Rome hide it?

But you solve our problem: meditation, docility, the **infallible** Church. We are mad if we grant infallibility to innovation or permit the latter in our ordinary means of or doctrinal requirements for salvation. We are here only once, and it behoves us to adhere to the proven methods—to remain with all our ancestors in the Communion of Saints—same doctrine, same sacraments, same Sacrifice. All changes in these areas create doubt—unnecessary doubt from unnecessary change. Every Catholic has an absolute right to stability in such matters..... We need none of these visions—true or phony. All salvation’s requirements are included in the Deposit of Faith, the Revelation complete with the death of St. John, the last Apostle. Haring after these so-called visions is nothing more than criticism of Christ for not providing a complete revelation. Everyone seeks an easier road to salvation, as though Christ had founded a secret society to hide our necessities

As the writer of **The Great Apostasy** emphasized, he covered only one facet of the postconciliar “Church” and its Renewal, because one divergence from true doctrine suffices to remove the offender from the Church. But I have dozens more.....

THE AUSSIE CLERICAL MIND NEVER CEASES TO AMAZE. A letter from the P.P., Doonside, N.S.W. in “A Journal of Religious Opinion”: “..... growing epidemic of ‘Novus Ordo bashing’ among some who ought to be more loyal to the official liturgy of the Roman Rite. present liturgical comedy of errors fault of those who abuse the Rite. pity that so much good will and energy is now pouring into returning (.....) to the Tridentine Rite rushing out of the nave main action into some obscure side chapel. pity if people see the return of the Tridentine Rite as the solution to our liturgical problems **the Novus Ordo is the traditional Mass** irritating to hear people claiming Traditional Mass is Tridentine Rite, as if Novus Ordo (users) are second class Catholics Church is greater than the Rite.”

The **JRO** will print nothing from me, not even paid ads for **Is The Pope Catholic?**, so I wrote Fr. O’Neill at home: “Most had no wish to leave the ‘Tridentine’ Mass; only natural they leave the knave who brings them the novelty which replaced it. redefinition of ‘traditional’—which you apply to an ecumenical service fraudulently imposed for a mere 20 years. And you dare recommend loyalty ‘to the official liturgy of the Roman Rite!’ Where was your own loyalty to the official traditional Tridentine true Mass? You *novus ordo* presidents give yourselves airs not second-class but apostates..... You deprive God of His due, the worship He Himself prescribed.”

He replied that he would not read my letter unless printed in the same public forum as his. He has not replied to my answer to his private letter.

..... “our” bishops some people call them. Yes, they **were** our bishops. But they have double vision, double spiritual vision. They can’t logically be termed **our** bishops; they deceive themselves, claiming they are “following the Church,” when in truth they are following, almost holus-bolus, a new un-Catholic system of belief and practice, and have almost entirely abandoned Catholic orthodox teaching as practiced throughout the centuries. But, as has been plain over the past ten years, they have one overall policy, from parish level to Rome: that no challenge, however just, or expedient, or urgent, shall be answered or recognized. For they know as well as we that ninety per cent of Catholics who so easily accepted the *novus ordo* did so because it made everything so much **easier** for them. The strict conscientious obligation to obey the age-old laws and constraints gave way overnight to a great looseness—oh yes, all they had to do was “follow the Church.” The vast structure of Catholic orthodoxy in morality and faith was at once and in general **disregarded** as though it never was. The laity millions were not only **directed** to apostasy but were **induced** to join it. “Hear the Church.” How easily the lukewarm majority succumbed—for they had the promise, hadn’t they, “who heareth you heareth Me.”

Surely many of those backsliders must have seen through that trickery? But were they ever referred to that specific test, so obviously apt and indicative, of by whom and by what means they are to **know** the false teachers of whom Christ warned us? Never have I read or heard of them any reference to that all-revealing test “By their fruits shall you know them.” Never have I heard of any attempt by *novus ordo* authority, or apologist, or spokesman, to justify their new teaching by **that** test. No; for the identification is clear and definite; a child can easily deduce who are “teachers”—those delegated by authority to instruct—and a child can recognize good from evil as easily as ripe from rotten. But all are tempted by the easy way out, “obedience to authority,” and suchlike specious trickery.

Sadly we recognize that, humanly speaking, the cards are stacked against us—we know that in the end the truth will out. But how long, O Lord, how long? Our role is to “hold fast to the teaching and traditions given to you.” And that demands fortitude—plus patience of high quality.—Tom Matthews

Several years ago a traditional periodical ran a very small advertisement for Dr. John H. De Tar’s **Cursillo—To Deceive the Elect**. A “conservative” local bishop phoned the editor and beat his ear off. “What’s wrong?” broke in the startled editor. “You couldn’t ask for finer treatment of this brainwash.”

“Don’t you realize,” asked the bishop, “that every bishop in the United States has attended a two-week *cursillo*?” Dr. De Tar describes the incredible effect of a week-end *cursillo*. Imagine what the mind-benders can accomplish in two full weeks! Especially with weak minds!

Uncharitable? What **is** a bishop? Doctor of Divinity, teacher of his diocese—**the** expert! What else but a weak mind could force him to submit to an innovation of the last few decades conducted by his inferiors? To teach **him** his religion? To make **him** a better Catholic? Surely one or two of these highly privileged and educated men could discern the weird stupidity of the whole idea. So we can deduce three further points. They underwent this lobotomy under orders. Whose orders would they accept? Why would not the same authority so order the rest of the world’s bishops? Small wonder we make no progress with them!

We have sampled our clergy. Why are they so wrong? They vary in their menu, but nearly all err in some fashion. Are they one in doctrine and practice with each other? Are they one with their pope? Is he therefore their necessary standard of unity? On the contrary, **he** agrees with **them**, all of them, on different days. For years we have heard this fairy tale that the bishops plot against the pope. They work behind his back. They sabotage his plans and edicts. So who supports them in office? Who supplies their jurisdiction(?)? Who programs their conferences? When one of them succeeds to the pontificate, does he wipe all vestiges of his own and others’ plots from his mind, if any? Will he sit there unable to cope with his own experience? A plot is necessary. The Church could not have wandered by chance into suicide. The rot is everywhere. The responsibility is at the top.

MILANO? BOLOGNA! (Alden Hatch’s biography of Paul VI)

“It is possible that of all the popes of modern times Pope Paul VI is the only one who desired the office.” (page 8)

“..... John inspired Montini to succeed him.” (page 9)

“When the Council first met in October, 1962, Montini was the only non-resident cardinal whom John invited to live in the Vatican, thereby having him at hand for unofficial, unpublicized, and intimate talks on the problems presented day by day. As these became more involved, and the probable duration of the Council lengthened indefinitely, Pope John became convinced that he would not live to see its end.

“Though a pope may not choose his successor, and any attempt to do so might boomerang, it was well known that John felt that the one person capable of fulfilling his plans and realizing his hopes for an open Church and a united Christendom was Montini.” (page 9)

“It is even said that John coached Montini in the matter of getting elected, urging him to take a not too strong attitude at the opening session of the Council and thereby committing himself to one side and alienating the other. At least it was noted by journalists that the brilliant and progressive Archbishop of Milan, who might have been expected to illuminate the Council by his thinking, took virtually no part in the debates. By remaining uncommitted, he made it possible for cardinals of all opinions to vote for him in good conscience.” (page 10)

“Pope John’s first great gesture, which he always attributed to the Holy Spirit, came on January 25, 1959, when at St. Paul’s Outside-the-Walls he announced to eighteen cardinals his intention of calling an Ecumenical Council. The cardinals sat in stunned silence made no move and spoke no word of approval.” (page 110)

“The Cardinal-Archbishop of Milan was the first member of the Sacred College publicly to hail the Pope’s move towards renewal of the Church. Montini exultantly greeted the Council that was to open windows to the world. Others might fear the draught, but he looked out at the fair prospect of ‘history opening with immense and centuries-old visions before our eyes.—’” (page 111)

Is there some meaning to these soul-stirring phrases, this grandiose orchestration of the music of the spheres? Some echo of Rosicrucian “knowledge” of the secret inner mysteries of history about

to be revealed to all the deceived, unsuspecting, uneducated Catholics? Some new truth to set us free? From our tyrannical Church?

“Montini’s enthusiasm for the Council stemmed from his ardent wish to bring the Church into harmony with the thinking of the modern world without losing any significant tradition.” (page 111)

A Solomon come to judgment, indeed! Montini **knows** how much of our tradition is significant—how much of the baby he can divide!

“..... the Holy Father then made it perfectly plain that he hoped Montini would be his successor to guide the Council towards the achievements they both anticipated for it..... the Holy Father seemed to have greater confidence in the Cardinal’s ability to bring the Council to a successful conclusion than in his own—**if Montini were elected pope.**

“That was the crux of the affair, the objective they must both work for. In order to achieve it the Pope almost certainly asked Montini not to thrust himself into any controversial position at the first session of the Council in order to place no obstacles in the difficult path to his election.” (pp. 118-119)

These two superior beings in their all-surpassing wisdom conspired to hide Montini’s liberal leanings so that he might complete the modernization of the one institution to which the spirit of the age—**every age**—is necessarily hostile. Traditionally the Church has brought the fruits of the divine, unchangeable revelation for which it is the appointed vehicle—not critic or modifier—to each age in turn. The All-Wise Creator fashioned and directed this message to His creatures whom He necessarily knows inside out. Men must accommodate to God’s message. To reverse the adaptation is absurd.

But not too absurd for Paul VI and his Council! They have raised man to their own megalomania—set his sights on progress, even infinite progress to heaven on earth through attainment of social equality and racial divinity. This new Tower of Babel has run afoul of the same curse that aborted the old: confusion—not merely of tongues but of mutually conflicting definitions and ideas as well. Our civilization, the product of Christianity, collapses before our eyes because we will not maintain Christianity’s traditions, but subscribe again to all the old errors. Only the civilization oriented to the next world can make this world fit to inhabit. The sooner man can restore such a regime, the better man will fare.

“Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His justice : and all these things shall be added unto you.” (Matthew vi, 33)

JOHN XXIII HAD MORE THAN ENOUGH BIOGRAPHIES

We quote “I Will Be Called John,” by Lawrence Elliott. Page 287: On the morning of Jan. 20 “Suddenly an inspiration sprang up within us as a flower that blooms in an unexpected springtime. Our soul was illuminated by a great idea A word solemn and binding rose to our lips. Our voice expressed it for the first time—a council!”

Elsewhere we hear of the shocked silence which greeted this inspiration. This reaction, among others, underlies Ursula Oxford’s charge of heresy against John; he acted rashly in not consulting others, as recommended by St. John of the Cross. But John XXIII simply lied; lies are seldom subjected to the saint’s judgment. Besides, John had another inspiration, a veritable pipeline to heaven as Jozef Mackiewicz details (**In the Shadow of the Cross**), when he was inspired to commence dealings with the communist government of Russia to secure Russian Orthodox observers at his previously inspired council. This inspiration led to abandonment of the entire Ukrainian rite on its native heath.

[Let us cite page 116, **Vatican II Revisited**, by Dom Alberic Stacpoole, OSB, on which John’s “intensely loyal personal secretary,” Archbp. Loris F. Capovilla records (part of his job) three occasions prior to divine inspiration on which John XXIII had raised the subject of a council. He

first mentioned it November 2, 1958, five days after his “election.” He returned to the subject November 21, and again on Christmas Eve. Then, in only another month, he stunned his curia.]

Pages 289-291: what earthly—or heavenly—purpose could a council now serve? [Divided responsibility?] Later, when some one put the question to John he strode to a window of his study and threw it open. “We expect the council to let some fresh air in here,” he said. [Removal of the atmosphere of centuries, the Church’s necessary climate for authority and credibility?] For him, typically, that was enough. He imposed no program, content to have **opened a way to let the spirit of inspiration enter**. But, as soon came clear, Vatican Council II was to be a forum free to reexamine almost every aspect of Catholic life. Modification of everything from the liturgy to the eating of fish on Friday became possible. And in a larger sense, the Church prepared to study itself in the context of a bewilderingly new universe, seeking to relate in a meaningful way to an industrial surge and urban growth and decay, to an explosion of scientific knowledge, to a **new morality** and the politics of a world that had come to a balance of terror

Was the union of all churches a possibility too? In the great spiritual renewal envisioned by Pope John, nothing was beyond hope. The Council was to be John’s means of breaking through the sealed walls of the curia [the legitimate administration of the Church]. It was to be the way in which he would involve the whole church in his aspirations, not only for his lifetime but for generations to come. John announced the formation of a Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and named as its head Cardinal Bea [Behaim?], who was adept and long active in maintaining contacts with non-Catholic Christians [but singularly inept at converting them]. it served as the link between the council and invited observers for other Christian communities.

This, too, was John’s own idea. Once again he was moving to free the church from the **stigma** of doctrinal absolutism John was asking the whole world [**about 80% non-Catholic**] to participate in this [Catholic?] council. he himself intervened to assure that observers would be given the best places.

Page 300: On Saturday, Oct. 13, Pope John spoke to the delegate-observers in the Consistorial Hall. He did not sit on his throne, but took one of the chairs arranged in a square,

This brotherly gesture was underscored when he said, “As for my own humble person, **I don’t like to claim special inspiration.**” [Whence the council?] Handed a list of 160 curia-approved candidates for the ten permanent commissions, the bishops refused to vote their approval. Demanding a voice in the all-important organization of the council’s administrative structure, they adjourned the meeting after only twenty minutes—and returned a few days later to elect men of their own choosing.....

Page 310: John, watching on closed-circuit TV (after his inaugural sermon, he did not return to the conciliar hall until the end of the first session.), noted the contention between the Italian traditionalists and the more progressive-minded churchmen from beyond the Alps but he did not intervene the Fathers moved on to high drama: the debate over the first schema, a proposal for liturgical reform few outside the clergy, and not all in it [nor indeed author Elliott] really understood the core significance of this issue. little more than an idea for dropping Latin in certain parts of the mass and permitting those parts in the language of the people. But most of the council fathers understood clearly that to deprive the curia of its historically held right to decide all liturgical matters was to open the door to decentralization

Page 302: After nearly a month of intense debate, the council approved certain liturgical reforms, among them the right of the bishops to decide whether parts of the mass could be said in the language of their own countries. But the most important thing was that the vote was 1922 to 11; it was an emphatic sign that change was possible.

The next schema, On the Sources of Revelation, plunged the council into crisis. It had been prepared by the theological (Page 303) Commission whose chairman was Cardinal Ottaviani and whose dominant members were like-minded, and it unequivocally reaffirmed one of the sharpest points of difference between Catholic and Protestant theology: How has God spoken to man?

Protestants recognize only one source of revelation, the Bible. But the Catholic Church holds that a certain body of religious truth, passed down by the Apostles and called Tradition is equally valid. Many of the council fathers believed that the Church's ancient definition of the nature of revelation **needlessly** stressed religious differences and also obstructed modern Biblical study. In the quest for Christian unity, they wanted a schema that would present Scripture and Tradition as parallel paths between the same places.

But Ottaviani was inflexible. His schema came down hard on the distinction between the beliefs of the separate faiths, and was even written in a terminology largely unfamiliar to non-Catholics. [Not only our doctrine but its phrasing must suit those who don't believe it!] Its supporters—Siri, Ruffini, and Cardinal James McIntyre of Los Angeles—defended the schema on grounds that it represented centuries of Catholic thought [an obviously silly argument]; and its challengers cautioned that its adoption would strike down any hope for Christian unity in this century. Pleaded Cardinal Bea: “Do not close the door to intellectual” [as distinct from Catholic?] “Europe and to the outstretched hands of friendship in the Old and New World.”

Pope John watched the unhappy proceedings and knew that the Protestant observers [who should never have been let in] were watching with particular interest, too. On Nov. 20, he saw the fathers vote 1368 to 822, in favor of a proposal to reject Ottaviani's schema—but the motion fell narrowly(!) short of the required two-thirds majority. And at this point, John intervened [at the expense of orthodoxy and council rules] to save **his** council. the alternative was continued wrangling as the schema was debated section by section, dulling, scarring, and, in the end, perhaps destroying the fine spirit of ecumenism [O horror!] in which the council had begun. After a night of anguish and prayer [Amen, brother!] he sent word to St. Peter's that because such a clear majority oppose the schema, he was withdrawing it despite the vote. A new commission would be **appointed** [not elected?] to redraft it.

What he did cannot be overestimated. No victory was won, but certain defeat was staved off. Vatican II had spoken out in the name of “holy liberty” as he had urged [It **had** spoken out and he had nullified its decision—to save the council—he had no responsibility to save the Church!]

The bishops had dealt a death blow to the creaky dictum, “Rome has spoken; the case is closed.” In its place, a certain optimism, an aspiration, a divine audacity was in the air, and would haunt the Vatican and inspirit the world.

Some windows, once open, can never be closed again [particularly if their frames and half the “sealed walls” in which they were set have been battered to bits].

* * * * *

Super-hero Roncalli, as we have quoted Alden Hatch, saved his council yet again by conspiring, again in violation of Church law, to secure Montini's succession. The “pilgrim pope” degraded the papacy even further. But to do the job right they needed the council, heavily loaded with co-operative prelates all too ready to take up the slack, to assume collegial status, to flout the rules which should have stifled the modernists. Had John adhered to the two-thirds majority rule the council would have taken up the prepared agenda or been dissolved.

Were you on trial for a capital offense you would not appreciate the judge's liberal ruling that a mere majority of the jury could convict. But you would surely have grounds for appeal; a hung jury can't hang.

Bishops who voted against Vatican II's documents cannot hide behind their voting record. They remain responsible for these documents, heresies and all, when promulgated. Any who disagree with conciliar canons and definitions either submit and administer these points as though they had voted for them or publish their disagreement and accept the consequent excommunication (viz. the Old Catholics in 1870). We have yet to discover a bishop who publicly condemns Vatican II and its heresies. Lefebvre wishes to interpret its unnecessary, heretical documents “according to the light of tradition and having incorporated within them those dogmatic formularies previously

worked out by the Church's Magisterium." So all participants without exception have in effect approved Vatican II's documents. Even Cardinal Mindszenty, absent, therefore disclaiming responsibility for the council's words and actions, approved change in the liturgy because "vernacular promotes nationalism."

All bishops were and are obliged before God and all the faithful to disclaim and condemn Vatican II openly, and to take the consequences, in obedience to Canon Law (1325), in accordance with their ordination oaths, in emulation of St. Athanasius. Never let the cowardly perjurers forget it.

POPES? INFALLIBLE? ANTIPOPES — E. A. W. Howson

[In February 1981 the author, having heard of me for the first time, submitted an article for publication. Though I had already covered his subject I published to exhibit a man half a world away who had come to identical conclusions.]

The great bulk of Catholic doctrine has never been defined under papal infallibility or conciliar anathema, because it has never been controversial within the Church. Definition is usually reserved for major disputes. Nevertheless, what has been taught as the Catholic faith from the beginning, the “ordinary Magisterium,” is clearly and necessarily infallible. Vatican Council (*Dei Filius*, III, 24 April 1870):

“All those matters must be believed with divine and Catholic faith that are contained in the word of God, whether in Scripture or in tradition, and that are proposed by the Church, either by a solemn decision or by the ordinary and universal Magisterium, to be believed as divinely revealed.”

The Church cannot require belief in the ordinary Magisterium if not free from error. Jesus Christ said (Mark xvi, 16): “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved : but he that believeth not shall be condemned.” He could not in justice require belief as essential for salvation without revealing with absolute certainty what must be believed. Therefore what the Church has always taught must be infallibly true. God is unchangeable. Therefore His Truth is eternal and immutable—from the beginning, yesterday, today, tomorrow, for all time to come, and when time has run its course. From this essential Revelation:

1) Jesus Christ came as promised to save us by His Sacrifice of Calvary. He established the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church to preserve His Revelation and to apply the means of salvation, unavailable outside the Church, as the Church has always held and taught. Obviously, if we could have saved ourselves Christ wasted His time, lied tremendously, and died that horrible death without reason.

But Paul VI ratified Vatican II’s Decree on Ecumenism, which contradicted the oft-defined doctrine thus: “For the spirit of Christ has not refrained from using (non-Catholic, therefore false, religions) as a means of salvation.”

2) Contraception violates the natural law and reason, and is mortally sinful. Pius XI (*Casti Connubii*, 31 Dec. 1930): “But no reason whatever, even the gravest, can make what is intrinsically against nature become conformable with nature and morally good. The conjugal act is of its very nature designed for the procreation of offspring: and therefore those who in performing it deliberately deprive it of its natural power and efficacy, act against nature and do something which is shameful and intrinsically immoral. We cannot wonder, then, if we find evidence in the Sacred Scriptures that the Divine Majesty detests this unspeakable crime with the deepest hatred and has sometimes punished it with death, as St. Augustine observes: ‘Sexual intercourse even with a lawful wife is unlawful and shameful if the conception of offspring is prevented. This is what Onan, the son of Juda, did; and on that account God put him to death.’”

But John XXIII set up a commission to re-examine this crime. Paul VI continued and enlarged this commission, though he said the law must be obeyed **until** the Holy See decided otherwise, leading many to anticipate change. He let the uncertainty hold sway four years before settling it without invoking papal infallibility, and suffered whole hierarchies to disagree publicly without remonstrance or punitive action.

Angelo Roncalli took the name John XXIII, last used (1410-15) by antipope Baldassare Cossa, possibly because, according to Pier Carpi (*Les Propeties de Jean XXIII*, 1976), under that name he joined the masonic Rosicrucians in Turkey (1935).

Charles Riandey, a masonic sovereign grand master, contributed a preface to “**Ecumenism as Seen by a Traditionalist Freemason**” (Paris 1969) by Yves Marsaudon, State Minister of the Supreme Council of France (Scottish Rite): “To the memory of Angelo Roncalli, priest, Archbishop of Messamaris, Apostolic Nuncio in Paris, Cardinal of the Roman Church, Patriarch of

Venice, Pope under the name of John XXIII, **who has deigned to give us his benediction, his understanding, and his protection.**”

A second preface: “To the Pope of the Poor. To the Pope of Peace.” [The first peace ever between Christians and freemasons!] “To the Father of all Christians, To the Friend of All Men, To his August Continuer, His Holiness Pope Paul VI.”

The book slams Pope Pius XII for withholding Montini’s red hat, thus making it “difficult for Montini to become Pope, but then came a man: his name was John, like the **precursor**,” who immediately created Montini his first cardinal.

As nuncio in France he backed the worker-priest debacle. He issued some four thousand false baptismal certificates to Jews. He pretended divine inspiration to convoke a council to change the unchangeable Church for reasons (updating, accommodation to the times, etc.) condemned by previous popes. He dealt with God’s avowed enemies, the atheist persecutors of His Church, and traded off the Ukrainians and Balts for the presence of Russian Orthodox prelates at his scandalous council. He destabilized the Mass. He packed the College of Cardinals to promote the election of his successor, Montini, who augustly continued his council and promulgated its heretical decrees.

Paul VI also replaced our infallibly guaranteed Mass and Sacraments with heretical services concocted by men who believe in neither Mass nor Sacraments. He tampered with Baptism (absolutely essential to salvation) leaving us at least doubt and probable lack of validity. He imposed a new sacrament of Order wherein “priests” receive no power to offer Mass or forgive sins (Jesus Christ specified these powers; is His Church greater that it may merely imply them?), and “bishops” no power to ordain. Even had other Sacraments been left intact, who will administer them?

Paul never tried to refute Abbe Georges de Nantes’ or Father Noel Barbara’s extensively documented charges of heresy, schism, scandal, and apostasy. He rather confirmed them by rejecting the cross and substituting the ephod (emblem of the Jewish high priest, the last of whom condemned Christ and procured His death sentence), publicly on at least these occasions: Rome, March 27, 1964 during the public Way of the Cross; Rome, Dec. 8, 1964 at La Place d’Espagne; Vatican 1966 during the visit of Dr. Ramsay, Protestant “Archbp.” of Canterbury; Vatican, Feb. 9, 1969, Sistine Chapel, reception of parish priests of Rome; Castelgondolfo, Summer 1970 (**Paris Match**, 29 Aug.). Should you be unhappy with the source of these photos, *Critica Cattolica* and 17 April 1966 *La Documentation Catholique*, you may see further photos in *L’Osservatore Romano*, English editions of April 12, 1973—page 8, Oct. 18, 1973—page 4, Nov. 1, 1973—page 6, Feb. 7, 1974—pp. 2 & 7, July 4, 1974—page 2, of Paul VI wearing the ephod at his official functions.

A list of his crimes against the Catholic religion would overflow a compendium of heresies, which he promoted or tolerated when he did not invent. (Honorius I was condemned as a heretic for not condemning one heresy, though he silenced it. A heretic, said Suarez and Bellarmine, is not a pope.) He further enlarged the College of Cardinals, rendering impossible the election of a Catholic.

Luciani showed his attitude in his choice of names, John Paul, after the great window-opener and the open heretic, destroyer of Mass, Sacraments, and unity. He had before election opposed Catholic doctrine on contraception. He promised to devote his ministry to the teachings of Vatican II, the basis of “rights” for contraception, abortion, pornography, and sodomy. “For years,” he said, “I have taught that only truth has rights. Now I have convinced myself we had been wrong.” In this he implies that all popes in history have erred, and who is to blame if not the Holy Ghost? Sept. 17, 1978 he held up a classic example of self-abnegation and devotion to duty, one Giosue Carducci, professor at Bologna University, founder of two masonic lodges at Bologna, author of a long, blasphemous “Hymn to Satan.”

Wojtyla, taking the same names, announced the main object of his “pontificate,” **continuation of the work and reform of Vatican II.**

The French newspaper **Le Soir**, 28 Oct. '78 reported: "In 1971, four years after becoming a cardinal, Archbp. Wojtyla made a visit to the synagogue at Cracow, during a Friday night Sabbath service; where he spoke in warm terms to the small Jewish congregation and inquired about its difficulties of worship." Christ's representative could not, of course, speak to those whose religion is essential rejection of Christ and denial of His divinity, except during their false worship at their synagogue, in violation of divine and canon law. Nor could his duty to attempt their conversion overcome his charitable interest in easing (why else?) difficulties in this worship.

Like Montini, who made him *papabile*, who gave his ring to lay freemason Ramsay to bless the Catholic crowd, who treated with Anglicans on their "orders," he repudiated the clear doctrine of the Catholic Church on Anglican orders since their invention as finally summed up in Leo XIII's *Apostolicae Curiae*; he sent his personal representative, Cardinal Willebrands (who would reinstate Luther), to the installation as Archbishop of Canterbury, successor of St. Augustine, of Dr. Runcie, a layman before and after.

In his encyclical *Redemptor Hominis*: Ecumenism "is an absolute necessity. It comes from the grace of our Lord, as it revealed itself by the word of the Holy Ghost which we heard during the council." "Contrary to all appearances (collegiality) has rendered the Church more united than ever." "It is this admiration for man which also **determines the place of Christ**, so to speak, **His right to be accepted** in the history of man and mankind." God could not exist without man? Or man determines Christ's rights?

These four men have obviously erred. Where is their necessary infallibility?

Obviously it cannot be used against past infallible doctrines or applied to new truths, new faiths, new morals. How true is a church which today approves acts which yesterday incurred its excommunication, infamy, and/or hellfire?

Christ promised divine guidance to St. Peter and his successors, not to heretics, apostates, usurpers, or antipopes. (**The Catholic Encyclopedia** lists more than thirty.) Nor did He promise the Holy See would never be vacant. **It is vacant NOW!**

Or else God is unjust in condemning to hell those who do not believe Him or obey Him yesterday, and today rewarding identical behavior with eternal beatitude.

PAUL VI HABITUALLY SPOKE IN SUCH LOFTY PHRASES

that his meaning cannot be determined. Many tend to view their non-comprehension as fault in themselves; they are simply too ignorant to plumb the depths of his spiritual insights. We recommend comparison of his obscure rhetoric with the clear logic of St. Thomas Aquinas or of St. Pius X, with the brevity and clarity of Denzinger's *Enchiridion*, with the pronouncements of the Council of Trent, with the Penny Catechism.

It requires talent to obscure the Catholic Faith, to confuse the man properly instructed in his religion, to convince him who learned early that "God made me to know Him, to love Him, and to serve Him in this world..." that despite Jesus Christ and His tremendous Revelation God is unknowable—that he has thus been saddled with an illogical, impossible task. Paul excelled at not only this talent, the common denominator of the modernists, but at the insertion of subliminal messages into apparently orthodox—or at least piously harmless—uplifting, ennobling sentiments. These insertions, this habitual mode of expression better suited to the Delphic oracles than to the papacy, this typical modernist underemphasis and obfuscation of clear doctrine, emerged often at Milan, where he demonstrated his suitability to succeed the self-admittedly inspired Roncalli in usurpation of the Holy See.

Montini's widely published sentiments hereinafter quoted appear also in **Pope Paul VI, *Dialogues***, translated and arranged by John G. Clancy, one of Montini's superabundant biographers. All this published official Montinian verbiage is found almost anywhere. We refer you to this book chiefly because 1) its translator is on Montini's side, approves these quotations, and would not put his idol in open heresy gratuitously, and 2) we have often said that all required to prove Montini's overt heresy before his election to the papacy is this excellent volume. Attend particularly to the dates.

"Too often in the past the cry of scandal has been raised when some zealous pastor has sought to explore a new and courageous path.

"Risk is an essential element in the pastoral art.

"If we do not want the pastoral art to be paralyzed at the moment of birth, we should, with a broad perspective, allow pastoral experimentation. We should assist it, and give it direction until such time as it will have proved or disproved its validity."—Eighth National Week of Pastoral *Aggiornamento*, Milan, September, 1958.

New, usually more authentic, becomes courageous. Much innovation is ancient, so the innovators assure us as they courageously resurrect it and palm it off as tradition, ignoring usually cogent reasons why it was discarded—if it ever existed. What is genuinely new is rebellious, and has no place in the Church. There is no risk in preaching the Gospel except to the preacher, but this is evidently not Montini's meaning; he wishes to introduce new methods. New methods have, since his election, metamorphosed catechetics into propagation of modernist heresy in "Catholic" schools. This theorist, who never spent a single day as parish priest, presumes to discourse on the pastoral "art", and to push for experimentation in a field which cannot improve on the Apostles, who presented the message and left the increase to God. How many souls must be lost before validity is disproved? To whom will proof be submitted? To the artist himself, who has proven his paternal bias and rebellious bent. Why must Catholics be subjected to experimentation for the implied benefit of lost lambs? It is as though the shepherd, to prevent straying while he sought the lost lamb, had slaughtered the flock. In the day of the pastoral artist defections have sky-rocketed and conversions ceased. Christ has shown over nineteen centuries that conversion stems from the simple presentation of His message, not from application of complicated, ephemeral, specialized, or sophisticated methods and arts. All the world knows this, especially those who told us what fools we were to fall for simplistic, crude methods. Even Montini knew it.

"The manner of Christian witness in our society and in conversation with particular sects and individuals can and should change. It should bring itself up to date, and more in line with the forms and languages of people today."—Epiphany, Milan, 1960.

“The problem of the contacts between the mission of the Church and the world is a problem that is always open. It is because the world, especially today, is in a phase of profound and rapid **evolution**, and because the application and announcing of the Christian good news admits of a variety of times and forms.”—Address to Apostolate of the Laity, Rome, 1957.

Pius XII said (*Humani generis*, 12 Aug. 1950, 11 & 12): Many, “grieved at this worldwide disagreement and misunderstanding, have been led astray by an indiscreet zeal for souls. They have an itch, nay, they have a burning desire, to break down all the barriers by which men of good will are now separated from one another; they embrace a policy of appeasement which would fain put on one side all the questions that divide us—not merely to the extent of uniting forces against the common menace of atheism, but actually so as to achieve a compromise of opinion, even where matters of doctrine are concerned. There have been thinkers before now who doubted whether the Church’s traditional system of apologetics was not a hindrance, rather than a help, in winning souls for Christ. And so it is with these moderns; they go so far, some of them, as to raise serious doubts about our theology and its whole method, as these now find favor in our schools, with the encouragement of ecclesiastical authority. The demand is not yet for the higher development of these, but for their wholesale reform; this, we are told, would make for a more effective spread of Christ’s kingdom all the world over, among men of whatever culture, of whatever religious opinions.

“If nothing more were suggested than some readjustment in the ecclesiastical sciences and their methods which would better adapt them to the needs and conditions of our time, there would be no cause for alarm. But the hotheaded supporters of appeasement are not content with that. They see obstacles to the restoration of brotherly unity everywhere, even in claims that are founded upon the very laws and principles which Christ gave us, even in the institutions He Himself founded! Yet what are these but the bulwarks which protect the faith in its entirety? Let those fall, and the world may indeed be united, but only in a common ruin.”

The quicker to achieve common ruin Montini unleashed the new nun: “The Church of God calls to religious women, because its need demands that they come closer to the pastoral life, to the priesthood, where the responsibility and mission of saving souls resides.

“Yet while you live, making of your rule, your discipline, and your constitutions a way of life, I see that your religious state, which is usually more conservative than that of men, is marked by a certain dynamism, a certain movement. There is among you an evolution, a development, a transformation. In which direction does it tend?

“You have given of yourselves in education, in the service of the sick, in schools, and in hospitals. And now the Church says: ‘There is more to be asked of you. You are capable of doing more. I want you closer. I will break up your ranks. I will separate you into little groups. I will scatter you among the Christian people, who have such need of seeing consecrated virgins in their midst. I will place you before the eyes of society, especially its youth, who have no other example of a life of virtue and of complete offering. I will put you close to my parishes. I will call you closer to my altars, I will involve you in all my activity for the salvation and sanctification of the world.’

“This is the modern vocation of the Sister—to become a collaborator in the pastoral action of the Church. You are called to save souls, and not only by caring for the sick or by educating children.

“You are called to become today co-workers in this supreme act of love, that of the priest—the charity of one willing to become a pastor of souls.” “The mission I point out will give you innumerable annoyances and worries because the apostolate, the service of souls, is sacrifice, not comfort. It will make you even poorer than before. It will make you capable of a poverty that will be lived, not merely professed. “It will place you in direct contact with modern humanity so starved by life, and so in need of being purified and saved. You have left the sinful world, only in order to come closer to it.....

“You must become qualified in all areas of your activity and intellectual formation, so that you will be able on every level, to influence, to educate, and to Christianize the world. Prepare yourselves;

and see to it that you carry through, even though it will disturb and upset your daily program, and will change some of your customs.” —Discourse to Sisters, Milan, Feb. 11, 1961.

St. Luke’s Gospel, X, 41-42: “Martha, Martha, thou art careful and art troubled about many things: But one thing is necessary. Mary hath chosen the best part, which shall not be taken away from her.”

“The dialogue is the necessary method of the apostolate It is not always the star of certitude that lights our path, but it should be enough to have seen it just once in order to continue on the way it indicates. We have a hunger for it, especially in some periods of our life, the younger years especially.” —Epiphany, 1960

“But it is not always given to us to experience this charism of truth, and this is especially true of that truth that derives its certainty not from intrinsic evidence but from authority, and from the **stupendous but delicate interplay of our spiritual and superior faculties, which we call the faith(!)**, a gift to our brothers and a light to society.”—Epiphany, 1961.

An uncertain apostle makes uncertain converts—if any. Who will convince this man of truth? What was he doing in the Church?

St. Pius X (*Pascendi dominici gregis*, 4): “It is one of the cleverest devices of the modernists to present their doctrines without order and systematic arrangement, in a scattered and disjointed manner, so as to make it appear as if their minds were in doubt or hesitation.”

Montini, the first prelate to welcome Roncalli’s inspired council, addressed his priests at Varese Feb. 6, 1963: “If we seek to define the Ecumenical Council, which apparently **had no reason for being except by way of convocation by John XXIII and at a moment when nobody expected it because there were no grave problems to resolve or opinions to conciliate**, it will be necessary to seek to understand where the Church wishes to go with this Council. What is its direct scope? To hold out a hand to those who are far from us? Yes, but this is a subordinate question. The Church would not extend the hand to those who are far from us if separation itself could not be defined.

“This is the point. The Church is seeking self-knowledge. But you will say to me: ‘Already for some twenty centuries it has done this.’ I say to you: ‘The knowledge that the Church has of itself is progressive.’ If indeed we are open to the invitation that the Lord makes to us in the Gospel — when, for example, He called on His questioners, His contemporaries, to beware of the signs that approached — it is necessary that we prepare ourselves to see the signs of the times.”

He wrote them March 10: “I ask again: what is the Ecumenical Council doing? The Church is seeking itself. With a great and moving effort, it is seeking to define itself, to understand what it truly is. The Church, after twenty centuries of presence in history and in the field of human activity, has come to a moment in which it seems submersed by the creativity, vivacity, and dimensions of modern history.

“The Church has felt the need of recollection. It has felt the need of reassembling itself, of fortifying itself, of purifying itself, of reforming itself and of taking up with great courage and with new energy its path through history.”

[Why must we assume that Montini himself knew what he was talking about?]

“Thus the Church intends through the Council to come in contact with the world. This is a great act of charity. The Church will not think only of itself: the Church will think of all humanity. To this end it will seek to be all things to all men: it will seek to be poor, simple, humble and lovable in its language and manner.

“The Church will seek to make itself understood. It will give to the men of today the opportunity to hear its voice and to itself the opportunity to speak to men with ease in the language of the times.”—Letter on the Council, Milan, Nov. 18, 1962.

[What delight to see such famous firsts! We return to his March 10 letter:]

“The Church wishes to weave a dialogue. This would not be difficult were it not for the radical and profound bewilderment found in the world concerning the notion of God, of Christ, and of the eternal life. The Church seeks to attain almost by itself the prophetic strength of saying to the world, of speaking to modern civilization and to future ages words that should be corrective and directive.

“What then is the Church doing? It seeks not only itself but the world. It seeks to come into new contact with a world that has appropriated to itself the principles of Christianity. The most beautiful—liberty, humanity, **the cult of man**, the respect for the human personality, the desire for peace, the desire for unity—are all Christian principles, which the world has made its own.”

“.....We **await** the manifestation of truth with respect, confidence, and prayer.”

In nineteen centuries truth had not been manifested? But now, in what had already been declared a non-dogmatic, pastoral council, truth at last will out! Elsewhere in the same Letter on the Council, Nov. 18, Montini wrote: “The Council is a Council of positive reforms, rather than of punitive ones; one of exhortation rather than of anathema.” [Not **the world** awaits the council’s explosive manifestation of truth by its modern methods—**We** await manifestation of (new and unmanifested, therefore suspect on its face) truth, perhaps as] Montini preached at Milan Epiphany, 1956:

“Man with respect to God lives in a continuous drama, that of being made for Him, of having need of Him and of being tormented by the quest for Him, and not being able ever adequately to find him. Man will always be aware of his own blindness as gradually God reveals Himself to him as knowable. He will always be more conscious of being able to love God than to know God, and of his duty of desiring Him more than of finding Him.”

[Am I too suspicious in discerning overtones and undertones of Freemasonry and its seeking ritual throughout that paragraph? Or in the next quotation which sets limits on God? Or does Montini refer to Lucifer, the limited masonic god?]

“The Shaper of the universe delights in His own work. God sees Himself reflected in His creatures. He admires their order, movement, beauty, and depth. He hears the canticle, which rises from the cosmos created by Him. He **measures the force of His own power and of His own freedom**.

“This could be for us, too, an overwhelming meditation: to consider almost with the mind of God the very essence of things. Before it” [almost with the mind of God?] “we remain confounded. Perhaps this confrontation will be the wellspring of the religious summons to the man of tomorrow which the scientific world of yesterday has lost.”—The Christian & Temporal Well-Being, Lenten Pastoral, Milan, 1963.

“The Church will seek to illuminate, by the light of its social doctrine, the way that men of good will take, even in the civil and political sphere. This doctrine—and this should be stressed—rests upon the principle of the perfectibility of mankind and therefore on the idea of progress.”—Religion and Labor, Address to the Workers of the World, Turin, 1960.

“Can there be for each of us in this life an epiphany, a manifestation of God in proportion to our capacity? And looking at the contemporary world this other question immediately comes to mind: Can our age also have its own epiphany, which would correspond to its talents and its capacity?”—Epiphany, 1958, Milan.

[What has capacity to do with Christ’s revelation to all? And what is the point, in the very celebration of Epiphany, of suggesting new epiphanies—new revelations for our age? What other age merited such absurd privilege? Change wildly as some of them did, they all had the sense to keep the original revelation from the Divine Hand. Only the Montinian era deems itself sophisticated enough to reject that for something better, newer, and more authentic.] From the same talk:

“Revelation, I insist, does not of itself oblige. What it announces is not verified by intrinsic evidence.”

[It obliges to the extent that on its acceptance depends our salvation. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.” (Mark XVI, 16) Nor is it “of itself.” It came from Divine Authority.]

“The order to which Christianity tends is not static but an order in continual evolution toward a higher form; it is equilibrium in motion.” —Easter, 1958.

“I am determined to place those estranged from us in the forefront of my activity and my prayer. If there is a voice that can reach you, those of you who have left the Church, the first will be one that asks pardon of you. Yes, I of you. When I see the one who has fallen away, there is much remorse. Why is this brother estranged from me? Because he has not been sufficiently loved.” — Christians are the Soul of the World, Discourse to Milanese Catholic Action, Oct. 15, 1961.

[Such heroic charity to deniers of Christ and His Revelation would ring truer without his Pastoral Letter, **Liturgical Formation**, Milan, 1958, when *Quo primum* **undeniably** ruled, and such sentiments contravened the law.]

“Christian prayer is a theme as vast as the sea. But the principal form and the one most useful for us is the prayer of the Christian people, considered as a living community and gathered to pay God the tribute of public worship.

“The outward form of our religion must express the inner reality. Our spiritual life must be deepened with new inwardness and new conversation with God. Our religious sense, awakened by the wealth of supernatural truths which our faith possesses, must find its own language, one that is lucid and sincere, strong and authentic, full of truth and of poetry, that we may enter into communication with the ever-present God.

“The liturgy stands today as a central problem of pastoral life.”

Now? Certainly. In 1958 a damnable lie!

“Liturgical prayer must give the Church deeper and more genuine knowledge of itself. It must make the Church more lovable and make it easier to attract souls to the happiness of a new life with God.”

Back to Pius XII: “They see obstacles to the restoration of brotherly unity everywhere, even in the institutions He Himself founded!” Enough sense; Montini:

“There are **still** those who consider the liturgical renewal an optional matter, or one of the numerous devotional currents to which a person may give himself or not as he chooses.....

“Renewal must consist in giving life, that is, understanding, participation and beauty, to liturgical worship. This is what the Church proposes to us. We must seek to understand and **revitalize** the **authentic elements** that make up liturgical worship; the **divine element first**, and then the instructive and aesthetic elements, with which approved tradition has clothed it.”

[Fine words for change. Montini could pretend he intended to inject nothing more than a new enthusiasm through proper instruction. Not only is such pretense incredible in context, his subsequent actions (especially Bugnini’s promotion and appointment) have betrayed his evil intent.]

“Participation,” he says despite universal experience, “demands understanding. It is a fundamental principle that rites should be understood. This does not prevent their having a content rich in mystery, or having portions that only the priests are to recite. But the understanding of the rite is a rule that flows from the rite itself.”

[Here Montini separates the Mass from the rite and the men from the boys. The boys cannot understand as well as the men, so they are to be presented something simpler, better suited to their childish brains. He never suggests that when simplicity and understanding prevail mystery vanishes. The Mass is in itself a mystery ranking with the Holy Trinity and Incarnation; the best brain ever created could never fathom it. What is this craze for understanding but human, nay,

diabolical pride gone amok? Perhaps we should set up an IQ test at the Church door and direct each man in his current state of awareness to a selection of rites which will accommodate him on a given day. Suppose he has overwhelming problems at home, and is partially or totally distracted. What if he has a headache or a hangover? He may even be approaching senility. Naturally in each case he will strive his best to understand it, but he has always known it was beyond him. It is no solution to this deliberately contrived, non-existent problem to remove its innocent cause and substitute a form of worship to fit human understanding. As well cut the power supply to those who can't construct a generator. Human understanding is not the purpose of our worship; to satisfy such a purpose removes and destroys

divine worship, as well as huge segments of disgusted worshippers. All knew why they assisted at Mass, and understood what took place. Parsing each sentence, not only distracting, was simply unnecessary.]

Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, 115: “A great number of the faithful are incapable of using the Roman Missal even in a vernacular translation; nor are all equal to a proper understanding of the rites and formulas of the liturgy. People differ so widely in character, temperament and intelligence that it is impossible for them all to be affected in the same way by the same communal prayers, hymns and sacred actions. Besides, spiritual needs and dispositions are not the same in all, nor do these remain unchanged in the same individual at different times. Are we therefore to say that all these Christians are unable to take part in the Eucharistic Sacrifice or enjoy its benefits? Of course they can, and in ways which many find easier: for example by devoutly meditating on the mysteries of Jesus Christ, or by performing other religious exercises and saying other prayers which, though different in form from the liturgical prayers, are by their nature in keeping with them.”

“The variety of its forms, the dramatic unfolding of its rites, the elevated style of its language” [as contrasted with his own high-flown usage], “the continual use of sign and symbol, the theological depth of the words and the mysteries fulfilled—all seem to conspire to impede the understanding of the liturgy.”

[What saves Montini from yet another outright lie? One word, **seem**, which he destroys immediately.]

“**This is true** for modern man, especially accustomed as he is to reducing everything to a complete intelligibility and to believing that he understands a truth when he knows how to impart it representationally in a geometrical figure or in a memorable phrase.

“We must show the faithful how to understand the Church’s prayer, lest we see them turn away from it, feeling themselves excluded from its inner spiritual mysteries. The culture of their secular lives has accustomed them to understanding and knowing all about everything in their environment and field of interest. We must, therefore, change the difficulty presented by the liturgical rite into a help for understanding the meaning of Catholic worship, a meaning that is hidden but impressive, inexhaustible, and living, too.”

[Is there some universal secular culture to which all Catholics belong? How many understand the “sciences” of economics, politics, or ecology?]

“Care must always be taken to preserve in worship the true proportions of dogma. Souls must be given the sense of Christ, Who is the focus of our spiritual life, and religion must be a tribute of praise and of love to God, rather than a set of devotional practices that are arbitrary or utilitarian.”

After the lip-service pejority rides again. **Arbitrary** means **prescribed** or **set**, so that everyone can determine what is happening and its relevancy or import, both of which are **appropriate** and **useful** to know. Montini certainly clarified his meaning after his election when the council he continued brought the schema on sacred liturgy “to a happy conclusion..... It is the first invitation to the world to break forth in happy and truthful prayer and to feel the life-giving force that comes from joining us in the song of divine praise and of human hope, through Christ our Lord and in the Holy Spirit.”—Address, Closing Second Session, Rome, Dec. 4, 1963.

[So much for the Mass of nineteen centuries.] From the same address:

“If now we wish to simplify our liturgical rites, if we wish to render them more intelligible to the people and accommodated to the language they speak, we certainly do not intend by this to lessen the importance of prayer, or to give it less prominence than other forms of the sacred ministry or pastoral activity, or to reduce its expressive force and artistic charm.

“On the contrary, we desire to make the liturgy more pure, more authentic, more in agreement with the source of truth and grace, more likely to be **transformed into a spiritual heritage** of the people.”

[What, pray, was he replacing? Unwittingly?]

“These are the light-giving ideas, the strength-giving ideas of modern life: respect for the **human person** as the **source** of civil law; the cult of liberty as the source of development of every feasible and honest human activity and as the unsurpassable criterion of responsible morality; the duty of promoting continuous progress in the conditions and in the forms of human living; the ideal of social and international peace.”—The Moral Sense, Pastoral Letter, Milan, 1961.

[Is the source of civil law the human person or respect for the human person? Either way this statement, though padded with an equivocal (in the sense that its clear approbation is so expressed that it could be interpreted as merely reportorial) introduction denies that all law draws its authority from God and its legitimacy from proper respect for God and His laws. And whence the duty of promoting continuous progress? Mt. Sinai?]

“Another phenomenon, which is vastly important in our day and which generates a powerful, reforming dynamism on our ways is democracy. It has been discussed and elaborated as a system that recognizes in people the original subject of sovereignty, and that re-enters into the Christian concept of authority as coming from God. This maintains that when people form a society they possess authority through the natural law, which has God for its author.”—Ibidem.

[Again, implied approval without a clear statement. But why should democracy arise? It was condemned by every pope of the last two centuries as an unworkable form of government based on the vicious cycle that authority springs from all those subject to itself—the masonic egalitarian plague of discontent that destroys stable government throughout the world.]

St. Pius X, **Our Apostolic Mandate**, August 25, 1910: “..... the famous trilogy: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity! A theory opposed to Catholic truth, warping the essential and fundamental notions which regulate social relations in every human society. By separating fraternity from Christian charity democracy, far from being a progress, would mean a disastrous setback for civilization.”

But Paul VI, safely elected, sermonized at Frascati Cathedral Sept. 1, 1963:

“In the period following the French Revolution there were some vital ideas abroad which, by coincidence were numbered among the great principles of the Revolution. The leaders of the Revolution had, in reality, done nothing more than appropriate some basic Christian concepts: fraternity, liberty, equality, progress, and the desire to raise the lower classes.”

“It is utterly untrue, and mere empty talk, to say that all citizens have equal rights.” —Pius XI, *Divini Redemptoris*.

“That ideal equality, about which they entertain pleasant dreams, would be, in reality, the leveling down of all to a like condition of misery and degradation.” —Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum*.

“Democracy is fatally doomed to develop into tyranny”—Plato, Republic.

Cardinal Pie noted that the first attempt at universal suffrage (Christian era) procured the release of Barabbas and the condemnation of Christ.

In 1931, before the rise of Hitler, when all spouted Liberty, Equality, Fraternity in the halcyon wake of the war to make the world safe for democracy and to destroy three great European empires, Hilaire Belloc, the greatest historian of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, wrote (Essays of a Catholic Layman in England):

“There never was a time since Christendom began when the mass of men had less to do with the way in which they were governed.”

The day before John XXIII died Montini’s Pentecost sermon at Milan deified him in a series of beatitudes. “Blessed is the Pope who made us see again that the authority of the Church is not an ambition to dominate, not an aloofness from the community of the faithful, not a remote and custom-ridden paternalism.” [It had, of course, been democratized, liberated, equalized, and

fraternized. Everyone had his say—except the poor fool who was satisfied with Jesus Christ's original message.]

Early in Montini's Milanese exile he indicated his Judaistic orientation to the future and impatience with the past. "The law of God ties us to itself," he said (Easter, 1956), "**not to the past**, and it **obligates** us to **new ventures** which we would wish were even better than those of the past."

"To make (traditions) vital to preserve their effectiveness, **it may be necessary** to prune them of what is transitory and worn, of any stupendous realities of religion." — Sermon for Holy Week, Saturday, 1959.

[Impatience? For novelties and "improvements." Tradition is to be drawn and quartered. "It is for us to say" **He** will rewrite history. **He** will tell us that what

we always knew from the Apostles is subject to Johnny-come-lately's approval and interpretation. He will select what traditions are to be retained in what form. (Consistory, May 24, 1976.)

Further confirmation of this nonsense, also reported in *L'Osservatore Romano* (Dec. 9, 1976), was published in his letter of 11 October 1976 to Lefebvre: "It is up to the Pope and to Councils to exercise judgment in order to discern in the traditions of the Church that which cannot be renounced without infidelity to the Lord and to the Holy Spirit—the deposit of faith—and that which, on the contrary, can and must be adapted to facilitate the prayer and the mission of the Church throughout a **variety of times** and places, in order better to translate the divine message into the language of **today** and better to communicate it, without an unwarrantable surrender of principles." [The Mass instituted by Jesus Christ, it would seem, is outside the deposit of faith.]

In this same letter Montini admitted his own responsibility for both the *novus ordo*, in clear, grievous violation of Canon 1261, §1, Code of Canon Law, and suppression of the true Mass. "We have sanctioned this reform by our authority, requiring that it be adopted by all Catholics must explicitly recognize the legitimacy of the reformed liturgy, notably of the *Ordo Missae*, and our right to require its adoption by the entirety of the Christian people." [When he applied his "authority" escapes us. Should anyone insist on his vague promulgation of the *novus ordo*, usually cited as the authority, please refer him to **Connally vs. General Constitution Co.** (1925) in which the United States Supreme Court ruled: "A statute which either forbids or requires the doing of an act in terms so vague that men of common intelligence must necessarily guess at its meaning and differ as to its application, violates the first essential of due process of law."]

When you have struggled to educate yourself to comprehend Montini's noble sentiments, pious platitudes, supercilious presumptions of mental and doctrinal superiority, and earnest pursuit of revelation into the future, when you have risen to an eminence where you can appreciate the depth of this homespun theologian's wisdom and grasp of essential Catholicism, pause for just a moment. Look behind you to that firm ground of the Faith that supported you and your forefathers. Take the safe, sane course: climb down! Forget that high dive into a damp handkerchief.

Why beat a dead horse? Montini certainly proved his own public heresy in promulgating Vatican II's documents. When he signed these he separated himself wholly from the Catholic Church, and could no longer lead, legislate for, or make appointments in, the Church. His "cardinals" are not cardinals; his privileges and permissions, his removal of tradition, all his official words and actions, lack authority and jurisdiction and **must** be disregarded. He had no power to kill Friday abstinence, to regulate the liturgy, to modify rites or papal election rules.

But we must deal with the "divine pope" syndrome which unjustifiably and gratuitously grants a pope *carte blanche*, and commands blind obedience and supine acquiescence in anything his little heart desires; he cannot be removed from office, even by his own publicly heretical actions—how could a pope be a heretic?

But even this maniac syndrome cannot overcome proof of Montini's ineligibility in the first place. Having never been pope he could not legitimately have re-convoked Vatican II, illogically granting that heresy-generating, reprobate council, convoked to tie the Church to the modern world, legitimacy during John XXIII's own usurpation and perversion of the papacy.

Footnote—Canon 1261 (1), CIC: Ordinaries of places must be watchful that the provisions of the sacred canons regarding divine worship be sedulously observed, and especially that, in divine worship whether public or private or in the daily life of the faithful, no superstitious practice be introduced, and that nothing be admitted which is foreign to the faith, or out of harmony with ecclesiastical tradition, or has the appearance of base profit seeking.

PAUL VI ON FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE

(July 9, 1969): "Recent Church teachings foster more freedom of conscience than has been practiced in the past."

“More freedom shall be in the Church; fewer laws.”
“Absolutism will be abolished. Authority moderated.”

Without absolutes, what morality can exist? We must grant that Paul sabotaged every absolute he encountered. He even left birth control to the individual conscience, though conveying the long-delayed impression that he condemned it. In February 1969 he had laid a bit of groundwork:

“Conscience is the ‘intuition’ we have of the goodness or the evil of our actions.”
“Acting according to conscience is not only a good thing but a real obligation.”
“No one is to be prevented from acting according to his conscience.”

Regrettably, the Queensland police interfered with the conscientious actions of a migrant awaiting JP2’s passing with a supply of petrol bombs. As the young man was led away he smiled and addressed the TV camera: “They’re not making assassins like they used to, mate.”

Nor are the schools making consciences as when values were absolute. Consciences become more elastic, easier to live with, as morals loosen and the prospect of hell fades. Even civil law becomes useless and unenforceable when the chief hazard is getting caught. The postconciliar Church has broadened the function of conscience to the point where any course of action whatsoever can be justified, except to follow the law and tradition of the Catholic Church.

“From the knowledge of the law comes conscience; the consciousness, that is, whether an act is permitted or prohibited by the law.” (**The Catechism Explained**, Spirago-Clarke)

A deliberately erroneous conscience cannot justify the errors into which it leads.

FLAVIUS CLAUDIUS JULIANUS

Roman Emperor 361-363 A.D., born at Constantinople (331 or 332), nephew of Constantine. At Constantine's death (337) only two very young members of his brother's family survived the army's method of insuring the succession of Constantine's sons. Constantius raised his cousin in his own Arianism, into which Julianus was baptized "at an early age."

According to pagan historian Ammianus Marcellinus, when Julianus succeeded Constantius he convened the leaders of all the dissenting sects (Arians, Macedonians, Novatians, Eustathians, Aerians, and schisms resulting from an unruly episcopal election at Antioch). "He expressed his wish that, their dissensions being appeased, each without any hindrance might fearlessly follow the religion he preferred." An imperial edict recalled all bishops of whatever persuasion exiled under Constantius and restored their confiscated sees. "Julian did this the more resolutely because, as long license increased their dissensions, he thought he should never have to fear the unanimity of the common people..... Julian found by experience that no wild beasts are so hostile to men as Christian sects in general are to one another."

Julian, alive only through the protection of Marcus, Bishop of Arethusa (terribly tortured in Julian's reign), professed Christianity, however insincerely, all his life till he thought himself safe. "His first pagan manifestation was cleverly calculated. The day when the body of Emperor Constantius was brought to Constantinople, after the funeral services in the Church of the Holy Apostles, Julian approached the remains, touched the coffin with his hand, then, ordering suitable honours to be paid to the deceased in the name of the tutelary gods of the city, he himself inaugurated the worship of the gods." (Libanius, Orations, 10) In this way, on the occasion of the funeral of a Christian Emperor, were celebrated the first official pagan sacrifices. Julian reestablished paganism under such circumstances that a protest by the Christians could hardly have been made. Says Libanius: 'Upon rising in the morning, his first care was to enter into communion with the gods by means of the victims. By blood he greeted the rising of the god; and with blood he led the god back again at the time of its setting; when the god had disappeared, he immolated to the genii of the night.' (He) not only sought the gratification of his mystical instincts; but through them he tried to efface the indelible character of his baptism. It appears that he made use of special rites and formulas of execration composed for that purpose. Especially by blood he sought 'to wash away the water of his baptism.' (St. Gregory Nazianzen)

"By an equally hateful outrage Julian took from the religion of his childhood to use in restoring paganism certain formulas and ceremonies, a hierarchical organization, and a method of propaganda. An imperial decree ordered that the temples be reopened and that everywhere the sacrifices be resumed. But the interior of the temples was at once arranged according to the model offered by the Christian

churches. As in the *presbyterium* of the latter, there were kneeling-benches and stalls for priests, who must there recite the offices at various hours of the day. We have a rescript directing the prefect of Egypt to create a sort of conservatory of sacred music at Alexandria. Out of the pagan priest, who was simply the performer of a traditional ceremony, Julian wanted to make a preacher, an apostle, a missionary. He planned a series of dogmatic, moral, and apologetical instructions, for the purpose of explaining the doctrines of pagan Hellenism and having them practiced. The whole pagan clergy was organized into a hierarchical system with three grades. The priests of each single locality were placed under the jurisdiction of a municipal pontiff, a sort of archpriest, who was subject to the pontiff of his province. At the head of the whole hierarchy was the *pontifex maximus*—the emperor himself.”

Julian “pretended to admire the Jews, not as the nation chosen to preserve the idea of one only God and the hope of a Messiah, but as a valiant race watched over, he said, by one of the many gods ruling the universe. We may well suppose he valued some of his best allies against Christianity.” He asked their principal leaders: “Why should you not also offer sacrifices to your god for the safety of the Empire?” They were not allowed, they said, to sacrifice elsewhere than in Jerusalem, in the Temple, then in ruins. The Emperor replied: “Let this not be a hindrance; I will rebuild it.”

Frequent earthquakes and cave-ins soon hindered the work. A falling colonnade crushed a crew of excavators. But construction went ahead until “fearful balls of fire continually erupted close to the foundations, burning workmen and rendering the spot altogether inaccessible. The very elements repelling the attempt, it was abandoned.”

Julian had gone to war with the Persians, and never returned. But in less than two years he had made a name for himself: THE APOSTATE.

[All quotations (minimally edited) from **History of the Catholic Church**, Mourret—Thompson, Vol II]

Sixteen centuries later Giovanni Battista Montini, known as Paul VI, attained the Roman Pontificate. He, too, was called *pontifex maximus*. Though he had several times solemnly professed Christianity, he replaced Christian worship with idolatry, into which he incorporated for good measure both Judaism and Arianism. Not content like Julian with setting up a rival organization on the same pattern, to lead us into modernism, he hijacked the existing hierarchy—leaving virtually defenseless the great mass of Catholics trained to let their bishops speak for them. Paul VI and his council, like Julian, rehabilitated all the misfits and heretics, granted them the “right” to their false rites and doctrines, and “conceded” them active participation in God’s salvific plan as “channels of grace.” Like Julian too, they tried to correct history in absolving and supporting the unconverted Jews, in restoring their nation and their priesthood. Not only did Paul almost habitually wear the ephod of Caiaphas in public, he gulled almost the entire Catholic clergy into returning in

worship to the insufficient Jewish sacrifices which Jesus Christ had superseded. Julian never came close! Paul accomplished far more, all at the expense of Catholics, their Church, and their chance for salvation. Why has his superior talent not achieved equal recognition? **PAUL THE APOSTATE!**

Paul VI was a public heretic before his election,

thus ineligible. Heresy is proven beyond doubt in **Pope Paul VI: Dialogues**, a book arranged approvingly by John G. Clancy from Paul's own public statements. His two successors were public heretics before their fraudulent elections. Published "sympathetic" material demonstrates and proves their heresy also. We cite **The Year of the Three Popes**, by Peter Hebblethwaite, ex-S.J. Albino Luciani at Vatican II "was rather isolated, though he made contacts with Belgian theologians (reported Cardinal Suenens) and with the Germans, whose language he knew best. For him the Council was a matter of 'conversion and going back to school.' It gave him an unrivalled opportunity to renew his theological thinking. His greatest difficulty with the Council was caused by its declaration on **Religious Freedom**. He had been taught by Cardinal Ottaviani in the Belluno seminary that 'error had no rights' and that, consequently, the toleration of Protestants was impossible where Catholics were in a majority." [When you want our doctrine phrased pejoratively, go to Hebblethwaite. Not "toleration of damning Protestant doctrine, unwarranted Protestant privilege, or scandalous public Protestant worship"—merely "toleration of Protestants!"] "This illiberal doctrine—traceable to Pio Nono and his **Syllabus of Errors**" [retention of which carries anathema] "—evidently cut at the root of ecumenism. It was challenged at the Council especially by American bishops and their *peritus*, John Courtney Murray. Luciani pondered the matter and changed his mind. He said later: 'I studied the question in depth, and reached the conclusion that we had been wholly wrong.'

"..... what to call the ceremony by which he officially became pope. Since he refused to be 'crowned,' there could be no question of 'coronation'..... 'Enthronement' was briefly toyed with, but he did not want that either. The tiara, the ostrich plumes, even the *sedia gestatoria*—all were to be relegated to the Vatican lumber room. But in all this Pope John Paul was not simply giving another demonstration of his 'humility.' He was rather making a point about the Petrine office itself. All the titles that theologians had criticized as unscriptural or even pagan—Vicar of Christ, Supreme Pontiff, Head of the Church—were abandoned in favor of pope, bishop of Rome, supreme pastor. What happened, therefore, at 6 p.m....3 Sept. was simply 'the inauguration of his ministry as supreme pastor'."

"Karol Wojtyla was only 43 when he was appointed Archbp. of Krakow in 1964. there had been two sessions of Vatican II, and Wojtyla had been present at both He had spoken in the aula on 7 Nov. 1962 on the liturgy, and on 21 Nov. 1962 on the sources of revelation. Bishop-theologians are rarer than one might think, and his contributions were listened to with interest. On 23 Sept. 1963 he urged that the Church should be seen as 'People of God' before there was any treatment of the hierarchy, on grounds that the whole should come before the part. The implications of this for the theology of the laity were considerable; and this speech (intervention) showed that Wojtyla was on the side of those who favored a more biblical and less clerical approach to the Church. Those who misguidedly supposed that all Polish theology was a defense of sturdy peasant piety or that all Polish bishops were as traditionalist as Cardinal Wysinski were pleasantly surprised.

"In later interventions at the Council Wojtyla made use of his experience under a communist regime to enrich the debates. There was one dangerous moment when the very existence of the declaration of religious liberty was threatened by attacks from conservatives who thought that it conceded too much to 'error,' and Wojtyla pointed out that the draft document contained both a concession and a claim. The Church could only claim religious liberty in the face of a hostile government if it were prepared to concede it where it was strong. For that reason, the declaration would be a great help to the Catholics of Eastern Europe in their struggles with their governments." [This declaration set forth at least two condemned heresies. It granted the "right" to choose among

divinely revealed truths. It terminated Revelation with the Crucifixion. And consider how it has helped Catholics everywhere!]

“His first-hand experience of atheism was also appreciated. He rejected an out-and-out condemnation,” [The fool hath said in his heart: There is no God.—Ps. xiii, 1] “since that would make subsequent dialogue impossible. He preferred the ‘heuristic’ approach which tried to find common ground with unbelievers. One had to begin where the people were, in the thick of human experience,” [atheism?] “and move on from there. A ‘pastoral’ treatment of atheism—or rather of atheists, since atheism as such did not exist—would have to adopt this method. He concluded: ‘It is not the role of the Church to lecture unbelievers.’” [No?] ““We are involved in a search along with our fellow men.... Let us avoid moralizing or the suggestion that we have a monopoly of the truth. One of the major defects of this draft is that in it the Church appears merely as an authoritarian institution’ (21 Oct. 1963)

“Archbp. Wojtyla was a member of the Mixed Commission which had to deal with ‘Schema 13,’ an early version of what eventually became **The Church in the World of Today**.” [This “pastoral constitution” contained, among other errors, the obvious heresy voiced above by Wojtyla: “Christians are joined with the rest of men in the **search** for truth.” What did Christ give us?]

Wojtyla preached a pre-election series of Lenten sermons in Rome, published under the apt title, **Sign of Contradiction**, copyright 1977 (Italian) and 1978 (English). Chapter III, **God of the Covenant**, begins with approving quotation from Eucharistic Prayer IV, the innovation with the Arian Preface. Further remarks in the same chapter betray his modernist outlook. “Already in the first chapter of Genesis and the first biblical description of creation—which in the light of literary

criticism would appear to have been written later than the second [Backward Moses wrote right to left?] in the same book—.... The description we find in the second chapter, the older one, seems to be closer to the modern trend toward biological evolutionism, that of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin for instance. It should be borne in mind that careful study of that first covenant—and, at the same time, of the first portrayal of the God of the covenant—is central to all reflection on the Church-world relationship. As was the case during the Second Vatican Council, which brought the Constitution on the Church to completion by adding to it the Constitution on the Church in the World of Today. That was no accident.” [Nor could its heresies have been accidental in the face of defined doctrine.]

“Rather it was a logical consequence of the work of the Council, which wanted to delineate precisely the relationship between the Church and the world of today. To do that it was necessary to go right back to the fundamental reality of creation—of the world and of man—and to the first covenant, which is the foundation for the definitive covenant offered by God to humanity in Jesus Christ. The Church is, precisely, a sign of that covenant. [If so, have the Jews not broken it?]

“At much the same time the Holy Father issued his first encyclical, which set out to deepen awareness of the Church and which is the basis of all dialogue with the world of today. It is a dialogue of salvation, and its beginnings have to be sought in the covenant, that is to say, in that fundamental first dialogue between God and man. It seems to me that nowadays we are sorely in need of a correct understanding of that first dialogue and that first covenant. Why? Perhaps because humanity as a whole is uncovering and clarifying with ever greater thoroughness the origins of man’s existence on earth. And perhaps, too, because today we are on the threshold of a new eschatology. And eschatology can be fully understood only when it goes right back to the beginnings, to the most fundamental problems within which lie, implicit but hidden, the outlines of the ultimate truths, eschatological truths. Something like an embryo, containing all that will in time make up the full-grown person.” [Back to the Old Testament? Not far enough! Toss in Evolution!]

From Chapter XI, **The Bridegroom is with You**: “He took the bread, broke it and gave it to them saying: ‘This is my body, offered in sacrifice for you’ (I Cor. xi, 24). And then: ‘This is the cup of my blood for the new and everlasting covenant, shed for you and for all men ...’ (cf. Luke 22, 20).” [He will not attempt the lie that in Aramaic, wondrously, **many** equals **all**. He passes over Sts. Matthew and Mark, who both wrote **for many** (St. Mark in Greek), and imputes **for all men** to St. Luke, who never went beyond **for you**.]

REDEMPTOR HOMINIS—JP2 has spoken to the world.

Is the Church in chaos? Is the Mass suppressed? Are Christ’s sacraments replaced? Is His command to preach the Gospel to every creature buried in the new ecumenism? Is the Church’s hold on its own people slackening? Are morals and authority collapsing? Is total war drawing visibly nearer?

All these considerations pale into insignificance before the great financial gap between rich and poor. This is urgent! This is new! Unless each gets his share of this world’s goods no one can be justified. This is the purpose of religion: to see that all are equal in all respects. And all respect is due the wallet. Almost equally important is the terrible crime of forcing unwanted tanks and bombers on the emerging nations. Their statesmen beg us for food, and we make them buy munitions instead—at gun point, probably.

Because by exceeding our income, living on credit, pawning the next generation, we can shelter ourselves and eat regularly we become responsible that in India there is such respect for life itself that human life is cheap. 128,000,000,000 rats live well on the grain that could feed people. The peasant is honored when the sacred cow eats his crop. Then in his hunger he can watch the tiger devour the cow. He cannot even use the cow manure for fertilizer—he burns it with his dead or tiles his roof with it to breed flies he can’t kill either. But he is paid a few bags of sugar to submit to sterilization. *La dolce vita!* He and the starving Indonesian can devote enormous acreage to

tobacco. Southeast Asia can raise opium poppies in lieu of bananas. Until we overcome all economic difference we cannot be saved. JP2 has spoken. And doubly!

While human rights appear as a major excuse for his veritable diarrhea of verbosity, his overpowering theme is canonization of Vatican II, John XXIII, and Paul VI, through whom, he says here, JP2 is linked with tradition. This “link” he emphasizes page after page in glorification, in citation, in footnotes. The great bulk of these last denote fragmental Scriptural sources, but he refers once to St. Thomas Aquinas and twice to his own “social” utterances. Not to neglect suggestion of his infallibility he borrows phrases from Vatican I four times, and cites Vatican II, often in multiple, in thirty-one footnotes. His footnotes refer once to Pius XI, three times to Pius XII, twice to John XXIII, and thirteen times to Paul VI. But no other pope or council in history receives the slightest mention or recognition in the text. Only Leo XIII receives even a passing notice in a Pius XII footnote, which covers also the 1971 Synod of Bishops. St. Justin and St. Clement of Alexandria share a footnote with two Vatican II documents. Footnote 52 ties a quotation to Eucharistic Prayer IV, which flagrantly reintroduces Arius, this time to “official” worship. Nevertheless we find traditional priests and people hoping for better conditions from this superb actor, who gave the game away at Puebla:

“In these last ten years, how much progress has humanity made, with humanity and at its service, how much progress the Church has made.”

“Therefore, brothers, drink at these authentic fountains (*Gaudium et Spes*, Paul VI’s address to the UN, 4 Oct. 1965, *Populorum Progressio*, 23 and 24, *Mater et Magistra*, 1.06). Speak with the language of the Council, of John XXIII, of Paul VI: it is the language of the experience, of the suffering, of the hope of modern humanity.” [It is as though the multitude had stopped glorifying God at the Pharisees’ importunation (Luke xix, 39) and instead of the stones crying out the ass had brayed.]

LET’S GET THIS SHOW ON THE ROAD!

Some four centuries ago a lustful king stole from our Holy Catholic Church the scene of St. Thomas a Becket’s martyrdom, the cradle of English Christianity, the shrine of medieval pilgrimage, the Cathedral of Canterbury. Now another pilgrim in white yarmilke and bullet-proof vest condones and compounds the historic felony. He strolls to the accompaniment of great applause on the arm of Cranmer’s successor, and on worldwide television kneels and worships at Cranmer’s table surmounted by Victimless crosses. He joins publicly in Protestant prayer in deliberate violation of divine law. Heretic pretender to the papacy, he rises to accept the greater accolade, “our brother,” from heretical pretenders to the priesthood.

He came reluctantly; he feared to offend the Argentines. But come he did and offended **all** Catholics, not least the recusants and martyrs of the Reformation.

But he owes us nothing—he has not been Catholic **at least** since signing Vatican II’s heresies. He paraded proof of his apostasy at Canterbury. But, of course, this is toleration, broadmindedness, and ecumenism rather than the rankest treachery.

MARRIAGE, ANYONE?

Canon 1013 (1) The primary end of marriage is the procreation and education of children; the secondary end, mutual support and the relief of concupiscence.

Comment (Marriage Legislation in the New Code of Canon Law, Ayrinhac & Lydon, Benziger 1943): The procreation and education of children form the primary aim of marriage, which was instituted by the Creator for the propagation of the human race. But mutual support and the appeasement of the passions are ends also, though secondary and subordinate. positive exclusion or even mere ignorance of the primary end would render the marriage null. As long, however, as the primary end is not excluded, marriage contracted for one of the secondary ends, or even for any reasonable motive, is both valid and licit.

Vatican II, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, 50. opposes Canon Law, Divine Law, and the entire tradition of the Church: “While not making the other purposes of Matrimony of less account” than the primary purpose. So the door opens to every possible abuse, including homosexual “marriages.”

The Council thus attacked and degraded marriage, breaking down the natural base for civilization, weakening the family, the responsible social unit, the first safeguard for not only its members but the world at large. Surely, one would think, this basic institution had suffered sufficient damage.

At his general audience, Rome, Wednesday 8 October 1980, His Vacancy, the Polared Kamerad, attacked marriage’s secondary purpose, fulfilment of the instinctive desire which contributes so largely to the primary purpose, the instinctive desire given us for the propagation of the race—the instinctive desire confined to and controlled by its legitimate exercise in marriage. JP2 quoted, 12 October Sydney Sun-Herald:

“Adultery in your heart is committed not only when you look with concupiscence at a woman who is not your wife but also if you look in the same manner at your wife. The husband must not use his wife, her femininity, to fulfil his instinctive desire. Concupiscence diminishes the richness of the perennial attraction of persons for interpersonal communion. Through such a reduction, the other person becomes the mere object for satisfying a sexual need and touches the dignity of the person.”

The Catholic Encyclopedia defines adultery: “carnal connexion between a married person and one unmarried, or between a married person and the spouse of another. St. Alphonsus Liguori, with most theologians, declares that even between lawful man and wife adultery is committed when their intercourse takes the form of sodomy.”

Except for this terrible crime, then, adultery is committed only outside marriage— by definition. (Incidentally, we should be slightly interested in JP2’s definition of perennial attraction for interpersonal communion.) So we have foisted upon us yet another absurdity. And all the little spokesmen hasten to tell us what the “pope” really means—support for women’s rights, striking at the purely physical use of sex (by men only?) in marriage, etc. But JP2 has time in his regular Wednesday mouthings to say what he means. Like his model, Paul VI, he never says anything idly, without purpose—malice aforethought.

Apart from his general purpose of general confusion we suspect specific reasons for this absurdity:

1. to stir up trouble between man and wife,
2. to provide another version of “mental cruelty” for separation and civil divorce,
3. to cause children to wonder about their legitimacy,
4. further to lower the esteem granted “papal” pronouncements,
5. to cause all to ignore marriage laws and doctrine emanating from such a source,
6. to cause all to ignore **all** law and doctrine from such a silly source.

It might be expected that his mouth, full of tarmac, would have little or no room for his feet. In neutral Switzerland perhaps expectations are also neutralized. Whatever the Freudian reason, JP2 on the fourth day of his six-day visit told the fifteen bishops and abbots of Switzerland: “One of your constant concerns is with the values of the family. These are sorely tried when the love that exists between a young man and woman, or between a married couple, is lived egotistically, in view only of immediate and selfish pleasure, in the absence of a definitive commitment to the person of one’s partner and to the children born of this union.”

All these years we thought marriage was just such a commitment. But what has happened to his own *Gaudium et Spes*, in which Vatican II said: “..... while not making the other purposes of matrimony of less account, the true practice of conjugal love?”

Has he gotten religion? Which? Shakerism? What is this puritanical scorn for enjoyment of God’s gifts to married couples? Is it aimed at destruction of marriage? Or is it the new psychological method of contraception? Why bring **this** up, when the Church has real problems—like the rest of the deliberate disruption?

‘For there is no joy in Mudville; ‘Mighty Wojty has struck out!’—again.

SYDNEY MORNING HERALD (12 Sept 87) quoted the ‘Pope,’ that homosexuals ‘are not outcasts like all the people who suffer, they are inside the Church they are in the heart of the Church.’

Formerly we entered the Church through Baptism. Now the gate swings open through flood, fire, famine, earthquake, or sodomy. Let us rebuild Sodom and Gomorrha to establish a new expiatory religious order of propitiation through suffering. Let us offer to God the perversions of His law we suffer, secure in the knowledge that sufferers are not only inside the Church but yea, verily, in its great heart. If we contract AIDS let us rejoice; that insures our unity with the Church. And when hell opens its jaws so that we may suffer eternally, how much more shall we rejoice to have merited eternal membership in the Catholic Church!

Though JP2 denigrates Christian Marriage, he mercifully opens an alternate road to sanctity.

THE BRISBANE SUNDAY SUN features regularly a column entitled ‘Selected observations of Pope John Paul II.’ A friend photocopied a late April, 1986 sample, and passes it around to prove JP2’s public heresy. The article:

In my first encyclical, I referred to the Second Vatican Council’s Declaration on non-Christian Religions which is filled with esteem for the great spiritual values expressed in religion.

The Church’s approach to other religions is one of genuine respect; with them she seeks mutual collaboration.

This respect is twofold: respect for man in his quest for answers to the deepest questions of his life, and respect for the action of the spirit in man.

All people, believers and non-believers, must unite in the task of bettering this world.

Dialogue between members of different religions increases and deepens mutual respect and paves the way for relationships that are crucial in solving the problems of human suffering.

The fruit of dialogue is union between people and union of people with God, who is the source and revealer of all truth and whose spirit guides men in freedom only when they meet one another in all honesty and love. Defending common ideals as followers of different religions, we should join in promoting and defending common ideals in the spheres of religious liberty, human brotherhood, education, culture, social welfare, and civic order.

The Christian faith meets in the world with various religions that take their inspiration from other teachers and traditions outside the stream of revelation.

If to believe in a Christian way means to respond to God’s revelation of Himself, contained fully in Jesus Christ, this faith nevertheless does not escape, especially in the modern world, a knowing relationship with non-Christian religions.

Each one of them expresses in some way ‘what human beings have in common and what promotes fellowship among them.’

Dialogue between members of different religions deepens mutual respect. The Church does not avoid this relationship, but rather desires it and seeks it.

Among the non-Christian religions, the religion of Mohammed deserves special attention by reason of its monotheistic character and its link with the faith of Abraham, whom St. Paul described as the ‘father of our Christian faith’ (Cf. Rm 4:16). [An incorrect quotation.]

But there is more: the followers of Mohammed even honor Jesus: though they do not acknowledge Jesus as God, they revere Him as a prophet.

They also honor Mary, his Virgin Mother; at times they call on her, too, with devotion.

After the Second Vatican Council, there was established a pertinent secretariat for relations with non-Christian religions.

Paul VI saw in these relations one of the ways for the “dialogue of salvation,” which the Church must carry on with everyone in today’s world. All of us are called to pray and work that the network of these relations may be strengthened and enlarged, stirring up to an ever greater degree the will for mutual knowledge, the quest for the fullness of truth in charity and peace. (END)

“Seek ye first, therefore, the kingdom of God and His justice; and all these things shall be added unto you.” (Matthew vi, 33)

Jesus was evidently wrong. JP2 leads us in a quest for fullness of truth in mutual knowledge with “religions” false by definition. Mohammed’s followers follow his doctrine that followers of Jesus Christ are infidels, to be forcibly converted, since force is their best argument. Those who die in battle with us infidels go straight to paradise. They honor Jesus but they believe Him not, and shall be condemned. Remember those immortal words: “Go dialogue with all nations?”

Paynim (Webster) — pagandom; also a pagan; an infidel, especially a Mohammedan. (Archaic)

Sources of Renewal (Karol Wojtyla, published 1972 in Krakow, revised, republished 1979—after author’s “election” to papacy—Vatican City) page 17: “Vatican II, while preserving its pastoral character and mindful of the purpose for which it was called, profoundly developed the doctrine of faith and thus provided a basis for its enrichment.”—a fine example of which appears on page 129: “But the plan of salvation also includes those who acknowledge the Creator, in the first place amongst whom are the Moslems: these profess to hold the faith of Abraham, and together with us they adore the one, merciful God, mankind’s judge on the last day. (*Lumen Gentium* 16)

“The expression ‘together with us’ should be noted here. It seems not only to denote the fact that we are all monotheists, but also to imply that we have something in common where Revelation is concerned.”

We must conclude from this that Catholics and Moslems worship the same God. Can the Moslems believe this? Do they not refer to us as infidels? Can we believe this? Do Moslems not reject the Holy Trinity? Can they then believe in the Incarnation? How is it that their religion rewards them with Paradise if killed killing Christians? Was not Christianity spread throughout the known world when Mohamet rejected its well known doctrine and spread his own religion “revealed” to him by Allah? How could our God have revealed so different doctrine to Mohamet? Can the “god” who made Mohamet his Prophet be the same Blessed Trinity that revealed our religion? Have we a lying God? Or a lying “pope?”

No one except the Sheffield Shield cricket and the Americas Cup races has ever spent so much time before the Australian television camera as John Paul II on his 1986 visit. Especially uninteresting were his mandatory ground-kissing and his locally prepared speeches in rather poor accents to demonstrate his linguistic prowess. He kissed nearly everyone he could reach, including some girls at the Sydney youth rally whom he beckoned onto the platform, then took two of their hands and swayed to the rock music. (November 25, 1986) A day earlier the whole country watched him preside at the *novus ordo missae* at Canberra. During his **narrative of institution**, he said “for you and for **all**”; at Sydney’s Randwick racetrack (November 26) he reverted to male chauvinism: “for you and for **all men**.” Neither time did he use EP1 (the “Roman canon”). Nearly everyone who approached for “communion” received it in the hand, without the slightest sign of “papal” hesitation or displeasure.

At Melbourne (November 28) he presided at an Ecumenical service in which roughly a dozen Christian sects were represented by their local heads. (Canon 1258?) This useless, formless montage slapped together for the occasion recalled Prof. Emil Ludvik’s question concerning the *novus ordo missae*: “Is it a valid ecumenical service?”

Among many objections to this visitation is the use of charisma. This posturing clown will succeed in converting Australia through the force of his personality? When Jesus Christ sent out his

Apostles they were not famed, skilled Roman orators, but barely literate fishermen from the least corner of the Empire. He thereby showed that the power is in His message, not in the messenger.

Not that anyone tried to preach His message. At Canberra John Paul II congratulated the government on having religious freedom, that masonic weapon so effective against the Catholic Church everywhere in recent centuries. He even declared for aboriginal land rights, as though he had never heard of sacred sites. Perhaps that would make no difference; he has already apologized to converted tribes around the world for stealing from them their cruel, heathen heritages.

JP2 celebrated a new version of the Malabar Rite “mass” in February at Kottayam. This Malabar *novus ordo* seems to have split the Malabar Church evenly.

The Calcutta Herald (Aug. 15, 1986) carried an article by K. J. John, from which we edit and quote:

“Cardinal Parekattil made no secret of his conviction that the Indian Church needs an Indian liturgy and forms of worship in tune with the process of inculturation set afoot in different parts of the world, particularly Africa. He has always regarded the Indianization of the Church as imperative for its full acceptance by Indians in general and to dispel their suspicion that the spread of Christianity turns Indians against the country’s culture and independence. Parekattil has played no small part in the vernacularization of the Syrian liturgy effected in 1962. In Kerala some opposed indigenization; they wanted ‘restoration of Syrian liturgy to its pristine purity’ [before changes allegedly made by the Portuguese missionaries]. The pre-Portuguese Syriac liturgy was regarded by some bishops and scholars as authentic, its origin attributed to St. Thomas the Apostle.

“Cardinal Parekattil in his autobiography had stated that the Apostle did not establish any Syrian liturgy in Kerala. In the absence of authentic information to the contrary, he would believe that the Apostle taught his converts to pray in the Hindu way with necessary changes.”

(Poor old St. Thomas! Not knowing how to pray, he consulted the Hindus. They showed him how to celebrate Mass!)

“The restoration brought many oddities. Friday abstinence applies here and not there. One priest celebrates facing the people, another faces the tabernacle. The bishops of the region could not agree. When JP2 came to Kottayam February 8, it was loudly stated that the Papal Mass was the inauguration of the restored liturgy —a statement soon challenged. A text of the missal entitled ‘*Revised Liturgy of the Syro-Malabar Rite*’ has reached practically all priests in some dioceses, while in others it is known to be withheld. In off-the-record talks priests express themselves strongly for or against the new liturgy, and attribute startling statements to bishops.

“The New Leader carried a report that the priests of Kothamangalam had sent a petition to Cardinal Lourduwamy to shelve the introduction of the revised liturgy. They ask for more study and consultation before any revision. Mr. Joseph Pulikunnel, the learned editor of **The Hosana** of Palai, has published a thought-provoking pamphlet in which he lists eleven ‘grave theological errors’ in the official text of the new liturgy.”

[What will you bet that he is told the Latin version is what counts?]

JP2 continues in the twisted paths of his three immediate predecessors to preach and worship heretically. Yet we continue to encounter priests educated in the Catholic faith who insist that all four were genuine popes, that they have (had) a right to innovate rites for Mass and sacraments, that these demonstrably heretical rites are valid because these four introduced and continue these rites, the while these priests declaim against heresy taught in “Catholic” schools. These four monsters, we are to suppose, will destroy the Catholic faith but not the Catholic worship!

THE CODE OF CANON LAW In English Translation

Introduction (first paragraph): ‘A journey [masonic term], literally a generation long, has just drawn to a conclusion, as exactly twenty-four years have passed since the unforgettable Pope John XXIII announced the reform of the Code, together with the proclamation of the Council.’ Thus said

Pope John Paul II on 3 February 1983, in the Hall of Benedictions over the portico of the Vatican Basilica, on the occasion of the solemn presentation of the new Code of Canon Law. On that occasion the Holy Father also repeated the phrase from St. Augustine, *'Tolle, lege'*: he wished the Code to be read by as wide an audience as possible. To this end, for the first time permission has been given for the Code to be translated into the vernacular, subject to the approval of the appropriate Episcopal Conferences, and subject in particular to the clear understanding that the only official and binding version of the Code is in the Latin text. [This **journey**, projected and begun in violation of all our laws, has transported what appears as the Catholic Church from orthodoxy to heresy, schism, and apostasy. John Paul II, asked whether he leaned right or left, replied: "My direction is forward!" *Non movet petra!*]

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION

To Our Venerable Brothers the Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons and to the other members of the People of God **John Paul Bishop** Servant of the Servants of God For an Everlasting Memorial [like the 1917 code]

Over the course of time, the Catholic Church has been wont to revise and renew the laws of its sacred discipline so that, maintaining always fidelity to the Divine Founder these laws may be truly in accord with the salvific mission entrusted to the Church. With this sole aim in view, we today, 25 January 1983, bring to fulfillment the anticipation of the whole Catholic world [breathlessly awaiting liberation], and decree publication of the revised Code of Canon Law. In doing so, our thoughts turn back to this same date in 1959, when our predecessor, John XXIII of happy memory, first publicly announced his personal decision to reform the current body of canonical laws which had been promulgated on the Feast of Pentecost 1917.

This decision to renew the Code was taken with two others, of which that Pontiff spoke on the same day: they concerned his desire to hold a synod of the diocese of Rome and to convoke an Ecumenical Council. Even if the former does not have much bearing on the reform of the Code, the latter on the other hand, namely the Council, is of the greatest importance for our theme and is closely linked with its substance.

If one asks why John XXIII had clearly perceived the need to reform the current Code, perhaps the answer is found in the 1917 Code itself. [A pregnant—but unextended—statement!] There is however another reason, the principal one, namely that the reform of the Code of Canon Law was seen to be directly sought and requested by the Council itself [**not yet convoked**], which had particularly concentrated its attention upon the Church.

As is quite clear, when the first announcement of the revision of the Code was made, the Council was something totally in the future. Moreover, the acts of its teaching authority, and particularly its teaching on the Church, were to be developed over the years 1962-65. Nevertheless, one cannot fail to see that John XXIII's insight was most accurate, and his proposal must rightly be acknowledged as one which looked well ahead to the good of the Church. [Additional proof of his invalidating intent to impose essential change on the eternal Church.]

Therefore the new Code which appears today necessarily required the prior work of the Council and, although it was announced together with that ecumenical gathering, it follows it in the order of time, since the tasks needed for its preparation could not begin until the Council had ended [when it was clearly necessary to accommodate the existing Code to innovations forbidden by the Code].

Turning our thoughts today to the beginning of that long journey [masonic word], that is to 25 January 1959 and to John XXIII himself, the originator of the review of the Code, we must acknowledge that this Code drew its origin from one and the same intention, namely the renewal of christian life. All the work of the Council drew its norms and its shape principally from that same intention. [Despite the "renewal's" demonstrated disastrous effects, this code with identical origin and intention is now imposed anyway.]

If we now turn our attention to the nature of the labours which preceded the promulgation of the Code and to the manner in which they were performed, especially during the Pontificates of Paul VI, John Paul I and then up to this present day it is vital to make quite clear that these labours were brought to their conclusion in an eminently collegial spirit. This not only relates to the external composition of the work, but it affects also the very substance of the laws which have been drawn up.

This mark of collegiality by which the process of this Code's origin was prominently characterized, is entirely in harmony with the teaching authority and the nature [Pastoral?] of the Second Vatican Council. The Code therefore, not only because of its content but because of its origin, demonstrates the spirit of this Council in whose documents the Church, the universal sacrament of salvation (cf Const. *Lumen Gentium*, n. 9, 48), is presented as the People of God, and its hierarchical Constitution is shown as founded on the College of Bishops together with its Head.

For this reason therefore, the Bishops and Episcopal Conferences were invited to associate themselves with the work of preparing the new Code, so that through a task of such length, in as collegial a manner as possible, little by little the juridical formulae would come to maturity and would then serve the whole Church. During the whole period of this task, experts also took part, people endowed with particular academic standing in the areas of theology, history and especially canon law, drawn from all parts of the world. [Two paragraphs of gratitude omitted]

In promulgating this Code today, therefore, we are fully conscious that this act stems from our pontifical authority itself, and so assumes a primatial nature. Yet we are no less aware that in its content this Code reflects the collegial solicitude of all our brothers in the episcopate. Indeed, by a certain analogy with the Council itself, the Code must be viewed as the fruit of collegial cooperation, which derives from the combined energies of experienced people and institutions throughout the whole Church.

[A long demonstrated tactic of the entire renewal—let's involve everyone!]

A second question arises: what is the Code? For an accurate answer to this question, it is necessary to remind ourselves of that distant heritage of law contained in the books of the Old and New Testaments. It is from this, as from its first source, that the whole juridical and legislative tradition of the Church derives. [He leaves his rhetorical question unanswered. The New Code is a deliberate replacement of the whole juridical and legislative tradition of the Church.]

For Christ the Lord in no way abolished the bountiful heritage of the law and prophets which grew little by little from the history and experience of the People of God in the Old Testament. Rather he fulfilled it (cf Matt.5,17), so that it could, in a new and more sublime way, lead to the heritage of the New Testament. Accordingly, although St. Paul in expounding the mystery of salvation teaches that salvation is not obtained through the works of the law but through faith (cf Rom.3,28; Gal.2,16), nonetheless he does not exclude the binding force of the Decalogue (cf Rom.13,8-10; Gal.5,13-25; 6,2), nor does he deny the importance of discipline in the Church (cf 1 Cor.5 and 6). Thus the writings of the New Testament allow us to perceive more clearly the great importance of this discipline and to understand better the bonds which link it ever more closely with the salvific character of the Gospel message.

[What an odd paragraph! He sticks us with Leviticus while he liberates us from that antiquated 1917 Code. Why drag in St. Paul? To foist an erroneous implied (Lutheran) definition of "works of the law"—the Old Testament sacrifices—as the Commandments of God—greater than that trifling discipline in the Church. But this new Code in relaxing matters as ancient as Friday abstinence links us ever more closely with our Apostolic Church?]

Granted this(!), it is sufficiently clear that the purpose of the Code is not in any way to replace faith, grace, charisms and above all charity in the life of the Church or of Christ's faithful. On the contrary, the Code rather looks towards the achievement of order in the ecclesial society, such that while attributing a primacy to love, grace and the charisms, it facilitates at the same time an orderly

development [previously lacking?] in the life both of the ecclesial society and of the individual persons who belong to it.

As the Church's fundamental legislative document, and because it is based on the legislative and juridical heritage of revelation and tradition [unlike that old 1917 Code?], the Code must be regarded as the essential instrument for the preservation of right order [which may have preceded the code], both in individual and social life and in the Church's zeal [all for innovation, right?]. Therefore, over and above the fundamental elements of the hierarchical and organic structure of the Church established by the Divine Founder, based on apostolic or other no less ancient(?) tradition, and besides the principal norms which concern the threefold office entrusted to the Church, it is necessary for the Code to define also certain rules and norms of action.

The instrument, such as the Code is, fully accords with the nature of the Church, particularly as presented in the authentic teaching of the Second Vatican Council seen as a whole, and especially in its ecclesial doctrine. In fact, in a certain sense [such a definite legal phrase!], this new Code can be viewed as a great effort to translate the conciliar ecclesiological teaching into canonical terms. If it is impossible perfectly to transpose the image of the Church described by conciliar doctrine into canonical language [the "great effort" a failure?], nevertheless the Code must always be related to that image as to its primary pattern, whose outlines, given its nature, the Code must express as far as possible. [What an admission is this (and the next) paragraph!]

Hence flow certain fundamental principles by which the whole of the new Code is governed, within the limits of its proper subject and of its expression, which must reflect that subject. Indeed it is possible to assert that from this derives that characteristic whereby the Code is regarded as a complement to the authentic teaching proposed by the Second Vatican Council and particularly to its Dogmatic and Pastoral Constitutions.

From this it follows that the fundamental basis of the "newness" which, while never straying from the Church's legislative tradition, is found in the Second Vatican Council and especially in its ecclesiological teaching, generates also the mark of "newness" in the new Code.

Foremost among the elements which express the true and authentic image of the Church are: the teaching whereby the Church is presented as the People of God (cf Const. *Lumen Gentium*, n. 2) and its hierarchical authority as service (ibid. n. 3); the further teaching which portrays the Church as a communion and then spells out the mutual relationships which must intervene between the particular and the universal Church, and between collegiality and primacy; likewise, the teaching by which all members of the People of God share, each in their (*sic*) own measure, in the threefold priestly, prophetic and kingly office of Christ, with which teaching is associated also that which looks to the duties and rights of Christ's faithful and specifically the laity; and lastly the assiduity which the Church must devote to ecumenism.

[How much more clearly could he spell out complete reorientation of the Church?]

If, therefore, the Second Vatican Council drew old and new from the treasury of tradition [old novelty and new tradition?], and if its newness is contained in these and other elements, it is abundantly clear that the Code receives into itself the same mark of fidelity in newness and newness in fidelity, and that its specific content and corresponding form of expression is in conformity with this aim.

[Double talk! Paradox! The "plausible" facade for the damnable lie!]

The new Code of Canon Law is published precisely at a time when the Bishops of the whole Church are not only asking for its promulgation but indeed are insistently and vehemently demanding it. [They need help—and some shadow of justification.]

And in fact a Code of Canon Law is absolutely necessary for the Church. Since the Church is established in the form of a social and visible unit, it needs rules, so that its hierarchical and organic structure may be visible; that its exercise of the functions divinely entrusted to it, particularly of sacred power and of the administration of the sacraments, is properly ordered; that the mutual

relationships of Christ's faithful are reconciled in justice based on charity, with rights of each safeguarded and defined; and lastly, that the common initiatives which are undertaken so that christian life may be ever more perfectly carried out, are supported, strengthened and promoted by canonical laws.

[Implication: Until imposition of this new Code the Church had operated lawlessly.]

Finally, canonical laws [except the laws in force during this new collection's concoction] by their very nature demand observance. For this reason the greatest care has been taken that during the long preparation of the Code there should be an accurate expression of the norms and that they should depend upon a sound juridical, canonical and theological foundation. [Another defect in the 1917 Code?]

In view of all this, it is very much to be hoped that the new canonical legislation will be an effective instrument by the help of which the Church will be able to perfect itself in the spirit of the Second Vatican Council, and show itself ever more equal to carry out its salvific role in the world.

[Some are more equal than others. We skip four paragraphs of wishful imposition.]

Given at Rome, in the Vatican, on the 25th day of January 1983, in the fifth year of our Pontificate.

JOHN PAUL II

The Second Vatican Council, its members, its decrees and declarations, and their immediate and ultimate imposition on the Catholic Church all blatantly violated not merely Divine Law and reason, but even the 1917 Code of Canon Law in force, specifically, among others, Canons 2, 4, 5, 6(6), 22, 23, 27, 70, 71, 76, 129, 188(4), 336, 682, 733, 803, 817, 845, 849, 977, 985, 1002, 1172, 1258, 1261, 1275, 1302, 1317, 1320, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1372, 1381, 1397, 1406, 2200, 2314 §1, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2320, 2325, 2364, and 2403. Subsequent decriminalization can have no effect on prescribed penalties, especially when the decriminalization itself ignored or violated the laws. Legalization of crimes cannot change their intrinsic evil nature. These particular crimes support or constitute heresy, schism, and apostasy.

Let us compare the 1917 and 1983 codes in treating heresy schism, and apostasy.

Canon 2314, §1: All apostates from the Christian faith and each and every heretic or schismatic incur the following penalties:

- (1) *ipso facto* excommunication;
- (2) if they have been admonished and do not repent, they shall be deprived of any benefice, dignity, pension, office or other position which they may hold in the Church; they shall be declared infamous, and, if they are clerics, they shall after renewed admonition be deposed;
- (3) if they have joined a non-Catholic sect or have publicly adhered to it, they shall incur infamy *ipso facto*, and, if they are clerics and the admonition to repent has been fruitless, they shall be degraded. Canon 188, n. 4, provides, moreover, that the cleric who publicly abandons the Catholic faith loses every ecclesiastical office *ipso facto* and without any declaration.

New Code 1364: §1 An apostate from the faith, a heretic or schismatic incurs a *latae sententiae* excommunication, without prejudice to the provision of canon 194, §1, n. 2; a cleric, moreover, may be punished with the penalties mentioned in canon 1336, §1, nn. 1, 2 and 3 (which reads: Expiatory penalties can affect the offender either forever or for a determinate or an intermediate period. Apart from others which the law may perhaps establish, these penalties are as follows:

- 1° a prohibition against residence, or an order to reside, in a certain place or territory;
- 2° deprivation of power, office, function, right, privilege, faculty, favour, title or insignia, even of a merely honorary nature;
- 3° a prohibition on the exercise of those things enumerated in n. 2, or a prohibition on their exercise inside or outside a certain place; such a prohibition is never under pain of nullity;
- 4° a penal transfer to another office;
- 5° dismissal from the clerical state.

2 Only those expiatory penalties may be *latae sententiae* which are enumerated in 1, n. 3.).

New Code 194, §1 the following are removed from ecclesiastical office by virtue of the law itself:

1° one who has lost the clerical state;

2° one who has publicly defected from the catholic faith or from communion with the Church;

3° a cleric who has attempted marriage, even a civil one.

§2 The removal mentioned in nn. 2 and 3 can be insisted upon only if it is established by a declaration of the competent authority (which may conceivably vary according to the status or location of the offender).

“Without any declaration,” says the 1917 Code. **“Only if it is established by a declaration of the competent authority,”** reads the new. Even were this new Code legitimate, its promulgators have lost all office in the Church under the Code in force at the time(s) of their offenses. But one must give them credit for detecting what works against themselves and plugging the hole in their “authority.” To them this one change was worth two dozen years of misapplied assiduity.

FAITH IS NECESSARY. (*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol V, p. 759: XII): “He that believeth and is baptized,” said Christ, “shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned” (Mark xvi, 16); and St. Paul sums up this solemn declaration: “without faith it is impossible to please God” (Heb., xi, 6). The absolute necessity of faith is evident from the following considerations: God is our beginning and our end and has supreme dominion over us; we owe Him, consequently, due service which we express by the term **religion**. Now true religion is the true worship of the true God. But it is not for man to fashion a worship according to his own ideals; none but God can declare to us in what true worship consists, and this declaration constitutes the body of revealed truths, whether natural or supernatural. To these, if we would attain the end for which we came into the world, we are bound to give the assent of faith. It is clear, moreover, that no one can profess indifference in a matter of such vital importance. During the Reformation period no such indifference was professed by those who quitted the fold; for them it was not a question of faith or unfaith, so much as of the medium by which the true faith was to be known and put into practice. The attitude of many now outside the Church is now one of absolute indifference; faith is regarded as an emotion, as a peculiarly subjective disposition which is regulated by no known psychological laws. indifferentism in all its phases was condemned by Pius IX in the Syllabus “*Quanta cura*”: in Prop XV, “Any man is free to embrace and profess whatever form of religion his reason approves of”; XVI, “Men can find the way of salvation and can attain to eternal salvation in any form of religious worship”; XVII, “We can at least have good hopes of the eternal salvation of all those who have never been in the true Church of Christ”; XVIII, “Protestantism is only another form of the same true Christian religion, and men can be as pleasing to God in it as in the Catholic Church.”

XIII. THE OBJECTIVE UNITY AND IMMUTABILITY OF FAITH.

Christ’s prayer for the unity of His Church, the highest form of unity conceivable, “that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee” (John xvii, 21), has been brought into effect by the unifying force of a bond of faith such as that we have analysed. All Christians have been taught to be “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, one God and Father of all” (Eph. iv, 3-6). The objective unity of the Catholic Church becomes readily intelligible when we reflect upon the nature of the bond of union which faith offers us. For our faith comes to us from the one unchanging Church, “the pillar and ground of truth,” and our assent to it comes as a light in our minds and a motive power in our wills from the one unchanging God Who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Hence, for all who possess it, this faith constitutes an absolute and unchanging bond of union. The teachings of this faith develop, of course, with the needs of the ages, but the faith itself remains unchanged. Modern views are entirely destructive of such unity of belief because their root principle is the supremacy of the individual judgment. (end)

In addition to this article’s demonstration of the postconciliar “Church’s” absurdity, its several quotations destroy arguments that Vatican II’s Declaration on Religious Freedom in advocating a

human right to disbelieve God is not heretical on grounds that it does not contradict revelation. This foolishness is then extended to absolve John Paul II, the Declaration's major architect, of heresy. To declare that man has free will is perfectly orthodox. To advocate its legal support in sin or error is another matter entirely. If a pope's education was liberal he may hold error in good faith, and promulgate it as Catholic doctrine in his ignorance? What has happened to Papal Infallibility—Divine protection from error? Major defects in freemasonry are “religious freedom” and indifferentism.

Jesus Christ established (Divine Law) that “He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned” (Mark xvi, 16). Wojtyla's and Vatican II's Declaration on Religious Freedom gratuitously established a human right that flatly contradicts this Divine Law. But even should we fail to appreciate the nature of this crime—whether heresy or mere error—can we ignore the Declaration's paragraph eleven, which terminates Revelation with Christ's death on the cross? If the Revelation was complete on Calvary where would any priest acquire the power (conferred after the Resurrection) to absolve? Or the mandate to preach the Faith? Paragraph eleven contradicts Christ Himself at the Last Supper: “I have yet many things to say to you but you cannot bear them now.” (John xvi, 12) It removes from His revelation His Resurrection, His explanation of His fulfilment of the prophecies, St. Thomas' skepticism and its dissipation, **Feed My sheep**—used to establish St. Peter's papacy—, His Ascension, and the descent of the Holy Ghost. Denial of these doctrines and their Scriptural base—inherent in the Declaration's bald statement—constitutes classic heresy which no one can reduce to error—especially inadvertent error. Everyone, Catholic or not, who has ever read the Gospels knows better. Wojtyla certainly and blatantly lied here. Why should any other lie strain his conscience?

How differentiate condemnations for error from condemnations for heresy?

HERESY (*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. VII, 257): “It cannot be pleaded in attenuation of the guilt of heresy that heretics do not deny the faith which to them appears necessary to salvation, but only such articles as they consider not to belong to the original deposit. two of the most evident truths of the *depositum fidei* are the unity of the Church and the institution of a teaching authority to maintain that unity. That unity exists in the Catholic Church, and is preserved by the function of her teaching body: these are two facts which anyone can verify for himself. In the constitution of the Church there is no room for private judgment sorting essentials from non-essentials: any such selection disturbs the unity, and challenges the divine authority of the Church; it strikes at the very source of faith. The guilt of heresy is measured not so much by its subject-matter as by its formal principle, which is the same in all heresies: revolt against a Divinely constituted authority.”

If one is excommunicated for holding a condemned proposition it matters little whether the proposition is erroneous or heretical. Either way the man outside the Church cannot be its head. How is it that a man supposedly guided by the Holy Ghost falls so often into “theological error?” From liberal schooling he may hold errors quite naturally, but that cannot make him orthodox by intent or by any stretch of imagination. One who holds heretical doctrines is a heretic. Why must we accept him for his good intentions, especially if undemonstrable from his words or actions? But, we hear, JP2 is not a heretic, even though he has publicly committed some theological errors.

Theological error? Of method or of content? Is a pope not obliged to teach truth? Has he no means to discover truth? Was he raised a Catholic? How many heresies have not been theological errors? How has the Church always regarded error?

ERROR (*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. V, page 525): one way or another the product of ignorance. Besides the lack of information it implies, it adds the positive element of a mental judgment, by which something false is held to be true, or something true avouched to be false. The subject matter is either the law itself (one is astray in affirming or denying the existence of a law, or the inclusion of some individual case under its operation) or a fact, or circumstance of fact (one labors under an equal misapprehension, but with regard to a fact or aspect of a fact).

When an agent deliberately omits means calculated to dispel his error, or purposely fosters it, it is called affected error. not so styled to indicate that it is simulated, but rather to point out that the erroneous tenet has been studiously aimed at. When the error is the offspring of sheer unrelieved negligence, it is termed crass. [minimally edited]

INADMISSIBILITY OF THEORETICAL DOGMATIC TOLERATION

(Vol XIV, pp. 765-6): Such toleration implies indifference towards truth and, in principle, a countenancing of error; hence it is clear that intolerance towards error as such is among the self-evident duties of every man who recognizes ethical obligations. Inasmuch as this dogmatic intolerance is a prominent characteristic of the Catholic Church, and is stigmatized by the modern spirit as obstinacy and even as intolerable arrogance, its objective justification must now be established. We will begin with the incontestable claim of truth to universal recognition and exclusive legitimacy. Just as the knowableness of truth is the fundamental presupposition of every investigator, so also are its final attainment and possession his goal. Error itself, as the opposite of truth is intelligible only when there is an unchangeable norm of cognition by which the thinking mind is ruled.

Nowhere is dogmatic intolerance so necessary a rule of life as in the domain of religious belief, since for each individual his eternal salvation is at stake. Just as there can be no alternative multiplication tables, so there can be but a single true religion, which, by the very fact of its existence, protests against all other religions as false. But the love of truth requires each man to stand forth as the incorruptible advocate of truth and of truth alone. While abstract truth, both profane and religious, asserts itself victoriously through its impersonal evidence against all opposition, its human advocate, involved in personal contest with adversaries of flesh and blood like himself, must have recourse to words and writing. Hence the sharp, yet almost impersonal clash between opposing views of life, each of which is thoroughly convinced that it alone is right. But the very devotion to truth which supports these convictions determines the kind of polemics which each believes himself called on to conduct. He whose sole concern is for truth itself, will never besmirch his escutcheon by lying or calumny and will refrain from all personal invective. Conscious that the truth for which he fights or in good faith believes he fights is, by reason of its innate nobility, incompatible with any blemish or stain, he will never claim license to abuse. He may, however, by a fair counter-stroke parry an unjust, malicious, and insulting attack, since his adversary has no right to employ invective, to falsify history, to practise sordid proselytism, etc., and may, therefore, be driven without pity from his false position. These principles apply universally and for all men

If, therefore, the Catholic Church also claims the right of dogmatic intolerance with regard to her teaching, it is unjust to reproach her for exercising this right. With the imperturbable conviction that she was founded by the God-man Jesus Christ as the "pillar and ground of truth" (I Tim., iii, 15) and endowed with full power to teach, to rule, and to sanctify, she regards dogmatic intolerance not alone as her incontestable right, but also as a sacred duty. If Christian truth like every other truth is incapable of double dealing, it must be as intolerant as the multiplication table or geometry. The Church, therefore, demands, in virtue of her Divine commission to teach, the unconditional acceptance of all the truths of salvation which she preaches and proposes for belief, proclaiming to the world with her Divine Founder the stern warning: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved : but he that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mark xvi, 16). If, by conceding a convenient right of opinion or a falsely understood freedom of faith, she were to leave everyone at liberty to accept or reject her dogmas, her constitution, and her sacraments, as the existing differences of religions compel the modern state to do, she would not only fail in her Divine mission, but she would end her own life in voluntary suicide. As the true God can tolerate no strange gods, the true Church of Christ can tolerate no strange Churches beside herself, or, what amounts to the same, she can recognize none as theoretically justified. And it is just in this exclusiveness that lies her unique strength, the stirring power of her propaganda, the unflinching vigor of her progress. A strictly logical consequence of this fundamental idea is the ecclesiastical dogma that outside the Church there is no salvation. Scarcely any article of faith gives such offense occasions so many misunderstandings

..... owing to its supposed hardness and uncharitableness. Yet this proposition is necessarily and indissolubly connected with the principle of the exclusive legitimacy of truth and with the ethical commandment of love for truth. Since Christ Himself did not leave men free to choose whether they would belong to the Church or not, it is clear that the idea of the Christian Church includes as an essential element its necessity for salvation. In her doctrine the Church must maintain that intolerance which the Divine Founder Himself proclaimed: "And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican" (Matt., xviii, 17). This explains the intense aversion which the Church has displayed to heresy, the diametrical opposite to revealed truth (cf. I Tim., i, 19; II Tim., ii, 25; Tit., iii, 10 sq.; II Thess. ii, 11). Döllinger writes: "The Apostles knew no tolerance, no leniency towards heresies. Paul inflicted formal excommunication on Hymenaeus and Alexander. And such an expulsion from the Church was always to be inflicted. The Apostles considered false doctrine as destructive as a wicked example. With weighty emphasis Paul declares (Gal., i, 8): '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.' Even the gentle John forbids the community to offer hospitality to heretics coming to it, or even to salute them" (*Christentum und Kirche*, Ratisbon, 1860, pp. 236 sq.) [minimally edited].

Now, if John Paul II were really pope, how would a stream of "non-heretical" theological errors affect his credibility? Is a pope less bound to truth than the rest of men? May he speculate irresponsibly in public and destroy the faith of those unable to discern when he is in outright heresy or mere "theological error?" Is a theological error any less a lie than a bare-faced heresy? Is not all error opposed to truth? If John Paul II were to preach that there were eleven inches in a foot, some would agree—there are **at least** eleven inches in a foot, and anyway many people have short feet. John Paul II, the "papal" heretic, has declared his intention, the implementation of Vatican II, the replacement and destruction of our means of salvation. What kind of theologian palliates this malice, excuses this obvious heretical practice, with a spurious euphemism (theological error) for heresy? This shifty redefinition is characteristic of the modernist heresy. When a modernist has lost on the terms of an argument he quickly redefines the terms. A slaving wolf at the sheepfold gate becomes a slightly misguided watchdog.

Can John Paul II not know the Nicene Creed which, presumably, he uses every Sunday? He was not using the creed before the eighth century. He deliberately omitted a major tenet of the Catholic Faith in the official presence of the Greek Orthodox who rejected us over just this tenet. From any Catholic such omission in such circumstances would constitute denial and contradiction of our Faith, rendering us heretics and apostates. From the man occupying the papal office—standard, preserver, teacher of the Faith—it constitutes proof that he cannot be pope. John Paul II was under no compulsion to recite the creed. It is obvious that he did so only for the purpose of omitting *filioque*, an essential part of the creed since the doctrine was defined. Why should heresy not be imputed and charged to a man who had so publicly at Canterbury violated Canon 1258, to which violation is attached suspicion of heresy by the canon itself?

The Nicene Creed containing *Filioque* has been recited at Sunday Mass for centuries, an official profession of faith to admit, as it were, celebrant and congregation to continue into the Church's official worship. It is known to all; few would omit **any** word even accidentally. All know that to deny one doctrine, however insignificant, is to destroy the basis for all doctrine—to disbelieve God.

A general complaint against the *novus ordo* is its dilution of Catholic doctrine to promote false ecumenism, to sugar-coat the bitter pill for those who have refused the Mass. The precedent has been set. Who can believe other than that a chief conspirator and major supporter of the Renewal has followed this precedent? He obviously accommodated the schismatic Greeks to garner them in by suppressing the very matter over which schism arose—by backing off and in effect denying a major Catholic dogma. If he uses *Filioque* at his "mass" he demonstrates beyond doubt his evil intent, his duplicity, his hypocrisy, his heresy in its deliberate omission where it counts most—in the presence of those who officially deny it.

One Easter Sunday about fifty years ago an auxiliary bishop in the New York archdiocese said to a small group of priests: "I don't believe I've ever heard a good Easter sermon." He should have waited till this year, when John Paul II, featured in the Easter "**Parade**," an America-wide Sunday newspaper insert, in four pages of interview contrived completely to ignore Jesus Christ and His Resurrection—without which, then is our faith vain.

What, then, was the "papal" message on this our greatest feast? Did it quote our first pope? (**Acts iii, 13**. The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified His Son, Jesus, whom you indeed delivered up and denied before the face of Pilate, when he judged He should be released.) Or our first Gospel? (**Matthew xxviii, 11-15**. Now when they were departed, behold some of the guards came into the city, and told the chief priests all the things that had been done. And they being assembled together with the ancients, having taken counsel, gave a great sum of money to the soldiers; Saying: Say you, that his disciples came by night and stole him away, while we were asleep. And if the governor shall hear of this, we will persuade him, and secure you. So they, taking the money, did as they were taught. And this word was spread abroad among the Jews even unto this day.)

Neither! The message justified the Jewish invasion of Palestine after "2000 years" of dispersal. Next he may promote a Catholic recovery of Britain, whereby our cathedrals, shrines, and monasteries revert to our occupation. When will he reclaim the Hagia Sophia and the rest of Constantinople, not to mention Corinth, Alexandria, Ephesus, Hippo, Galatia, and Antioch? What have mythical Jewish rights to do with us or JP2 or Easter? He appears obsessed with present-day Jewish problems. Has he not maintained and continued the incredible silence, dating from the death of Pius XII, on the horrible plight of the Catholics of Eastern Europe? Rather he gave comfort to the persecutors, the rulers of Russia, just as though he knew no more about them than Father Dennis Fahey, who listed communist leaders and officials by the hundreds, and included their real names and tribal origin. Coming from that region, Wojtyla knew less than Bruce Lockhart, British Consul in Moscow during all stages of the communist revolution. Bruce knew all the Bolsheviks; he professed to admire them greatly. His autobiography mentions a certain Kucharsky, unique in that he was the only **Russian** communist that Lockhart had ever met—the rest, mass murderers beyond compare except for the Chinese communists, and the worst persecutors of Christianity in history, were all Jews.

John Paul II told us this Easter that "The attitude of the Church toward the people of God's Old Testament—the Jews—can only be that they are our elder brothers in the faith"—the faith that they refused before Pilate and in the face of certainty immediately after its greatest proof. We recall the first recorded elder brother, Abel's.

The interview continued: with citations from *Nostra Aetate*, arguably the Second Vatican Council's insanest declaration, which absolved many New Testament Jews and all our contemporary Jews of blame for Christ's crucifixion, presumably because they were not there. Were we all in Eden that we should inherit original sin?

After obligatory references to the Holocaust (for which all Germans and skeptics since are presumed liable) our peerless leader trusts "that with the approach of the year 2000, Jerusalem will become the city of peace for the entire world and that all the people will be able to meet there, in particular the believers in the religions that find their birthright in the faith of Abraham."

Galatians iii, 6-9. As it was written, : Abraham believed God, and it was reputed to him unto justice. Know ye, therefore, that they who are of faith, are the children of Abraham. And the scripture, foreseeing that God justifieth the Gentiles by faith, told Abraham before: In thee shall all nations be blessed. Therefore, they who are of faith, shall be blessed with the faithful Abraham. 29. And if you be Christ's; then you are the seed of Abraham, heirs according to the promise.

Luke iii, 8. Bring forth, therefore, fruits worthy of penance, and do not begin to say: We have Abraham for our father. For I say to you that God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham. (— Matt. iii, 9)

John viii, 37-59. I know that you are the children of Abraham : but you seek to kill Me, because My word hath no place in you. I speak that which I have seen with My Father : and you do the things that you have seen with your father.

They answered, and said to Him: Abraham is our father.

Jesus saith to them: If you be the children of Abraham, do the works of Abraham. But now you seek to kill Me, a man who have spoken the truth to you, which I have heard from God. This Abraham did not. You do the works of your father.

They said then to Him: We are not born of fornication : we have one Father, God.

Jesus therefore said to them: If God were your father, verily you would love Me. For I proceeded and came from God : for I came not of Myself but He sent Me. Why do you not know My speech? Because you cannot hear My word. You are of *your* father, the devil, and the desires of your father you will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and he abode not in the truth : because truth is not in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own : for he is a liar, and the father thereof. But if I say the truth, you believe Me not. Which of you shall convince Me of sin? If I say the truth to you, why do you not believe Me? He that is of God, heareth the words of God. Therefore, you hear them not, because you are not of God.

The Jews, therefore, answered, and said to Him: Do we not say well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil?

Jesus answered: I have not a devil : but I honour My Father and you have dishonoured Me. But I seek not My own glory : there is one that seeketh and judgeth. Amen, amen, I say to you, if any man keep My word, he shall not see death for ever.

The Jews, therefore, said, Now we know that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead, and the prophets : and thou sayest, If any man keep My word, he shall not taste death for ever. Art thou greater than our father, Abraham, who is dead? and the prophets are dead. Whom dost thou make thyself?

Jesus answered: If I glorify Myself, My glory is nothing. : it is My Father that glorifieth Me, whom you say that He is your God. And you have not known Him, but I know Him : And if I should say that I know Him not, I should be like to you, a liar. But I know Him and keep His word. Abraham, your father, rejoiced that he might see My day : he saw it and was glad.

The Jews then said to Him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham?

Amen, amen, I say to you, before Abraham was made, I am.

Then they took up stones to cast at Him : but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple.

Matthew viii, 11-12. And I say unto you, that many shall come from the East, and the West, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven : But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into the exterior darkness : there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

John i, 11. He came unto His own, and His own received Him not.

In view of the foregoing “theological opinions,” how is John Paul II not a public heretic?

The theological opinion that a pope turned public heretic is automatically deposed, embodied in Canon Law, is not in the slightest doubt. Canons 188 n.4 and 2314. §1 necessarily apply. All quibbling concerns definitions of **public** and **heretic**.

Vatican II never ordered a new rite for Mass, though Paul VI cited such an order in promulgating his heretical new rite. Why is not John Paul II who perpetuates this new monstrosity and continues to implement Vatican II as publicly a lying heretic?

It is argued that a pope is not subject to Canon Law, therefore not to Canon 188. So John Paul II is pope? The argument depends upon his being pope so that he can be above the law. John Paul II was certainly a public heretic, *ergo* ineligible, before election. Papal privileges accrue only to genuine popes.

A pope must profess the Catholic Faith. A pope is subject to divine law, natural or positive. He is therefore subject to canons which express such doctrine and law, obviously including Canon 188, n.4, which states undeniable fact: a heretic is not a Catholic; a Catholic is not a heretic—by

definition. To laws (ecclesiastical but not divine) for which his office is the authority he is not subject, but he should observe them if only for the sake of example until he finds it necessary to abrogate, obrogate, or modify them; he should also bear in mind that unnecessary change weakens law, custom, and credibility.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, vol VII, p 261, published the substance of Canon 188, §4 eight years before the Code was promulgated: “Heretical clerics and all who receive, defend, or favor them are *ipso facto* deprived of their benefices, offices, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The pope himself, if notoriously guilty of heresy, would cease to be pope because he would cease to be a member of the Church.” Volume XI, page 457 spells out the consequence: “Of course, the election of a heretic, schismatic, or female would be null and void.”

Clearly, therefore, Canon 188, §4 embodies a doctrine already received, an essential feature of the divinely instituted Church, as defined by Pope Innocent III in 1215, in the Fourth Lateran Council (Denz. 430): “There is one universal Church of believers, outside which no one at all is saved.” A publicly unbelieving pope, a pope that is a public heretic, would be incompatible with the nature of this Church of believers. Adolphe Tanquerey, the eminent theologian, writes:

“All theologians teach that notorious heretics, i.e., those who by public profession adhere to a heterodox sect or refuse the infallible teaching authority of the Church, are excluded from the body of the Church, even if their heresy is merely material.— Are **occult** heretics also excluded, who depart from the Catholic faith only by an internal act, or who manifest their heresy in external acts but not by public profession? The more common opinion holds that occult heretics are still in the bosom of the Church because they retain an external connection with the social body through profession of Faith and obedience to legitimate Pastors.—All agree that **infants** validly baptized among heretics are truly and perfectly members of the Church until they become notorious heretics by public adherence to heresy. Of schismatics, whether notorious or occult, about the same may be said as of heretics. The same of apostates.”—*Brevior Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae*

INFALLIBILITY

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol II, page 131b: “At this moment of renewed energy in the Church, Austria possessed bishops who would have excited the envy of little Cappadocia at the time of the three great Cappadocians. Among these Austrian bishops were: Cardinal Schwarzenberg (d. 1885) and Cardinal Rauscher (d. 1875; life by Wolfsgruber); Francis Joseph Rudegier, Bishop of Linz (d. 1879; life by Meindl); Vincenz Gasser, Prince-Bishop of Brixen (d. 1879; life by Zobl); Joseph Fessler, Bishop of St. Poelten (d. 1872; life by Erdinger); John B. Zwerger, Prince-Bishop of Seckau (d. 1893; life by Oer).”

Volume VI, page 51: “**Fessler**, Josef, Bishop of St. Poelten in Austria and secretary of the Vatican Council; ordained priest in 1837 professor of ecclesiastical history and canon law in the theological school at Brixen, 1841-52.” (He published two books, one in 1848, the other, two volumes on the Fathers of the Church, 1850-51.) “From 1856 to 1861 professor of Canon law in the University of Vienna, after making special studies for six months at Rome consecrated as assistant bishop to the Bishop of Brixen, Dr. Gasser, on 31 March, 1862, and became his vicar-general for Vorarlberg in 1869 Pope Pius IX proposed Bishop Fessler to the Congregation for the direction of the coming Vatican Council. It was certainly wise to choose a prelate whose vast and intimate acquaintance with the Fathers and with ecclesiastical history was equalled only by his thorough knowledge of canon law. He seems to have given universal satisfaction by his work as secretary after the council he replied in a masterly brochure to the attack on the council by Dr. Schulte, professor of canon law and German law at Prague (The True and False Infallibility of the Popes....)”

The Ecumenical Councils, by Francis Dvornik, Hawthorn 1961: “Mgr V. Gasser, Bishop of Brixen, one of the first theologians of the Council, in his report to the General Congregation on July 11th, offered proposals as to how the canon (on infallibility) should be interpreted. Mgr Gasser made it clear that theological questions concerning truths not belonging to the deposit of faith, but safeguarding it, were not affected by the definition: ‘In those things in which it is theologically

certain, though not yet certain by faith, that the Church is infallible, by this decree of the Council the pope's infallibility similarly is not defined to be believed of faith.'

"Another authority, the conciliar secretary, Bishop J. Fessler, stressed very clearly that the Vatican definition of the pope's infallibility should not be extended, but interpreted in the strictest legal sense. he limited the dogmatic definition of the Vatican only to the words following the formula *Definimus*—we define. All which precedes must be regarded as a very important introduction to the definition, but it is not part of the dogma he specified clearly that the subject-matter of the definition must be only the doctrine of faith and morals. Moreover, the 'pope must express his intention to declare this particular doctrine on faith and morals to be an integral part of the truth necessary for salvation revealed by God, he must publish it, and so give a formal definition in the matter' Thus 'the, pope has the gift of infallibility only as supreme teacher of truth, 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 still in other respects extend.' And in such a definition, 'only that portion of it is to be looked upon and accepted as an *ex cathedra* utterance which is expressly designated as "the Definition"; and nothing whatever is to be so regarded which is only mentioned as accessory matter.' Schulte pretended that the Council wished to extend papal infallibility to social and political matters as well. Fessler, however, declare authoritatively: 'The pope cannot according to his own will and fancy extend his infallible definition to matter relating to the *jus publicum*, to which divine revelation does not extend.' 'Fessler's treatise was approved by Pius IX who ordered it to be translated into Italian. because of their functions, they (Gasser and Fessler) were in position to know the minds of the great majority of the (Council) Fathers.

"Bishop Ullathorne set forth in his pastoral letter to the Council the same ideas as Bishop Fessler. Important in this respect also is the pastoral letter of the Swiss bishops. They limited papal infallibility in the following way:

"'It in no way depends upon the caprice of the pope or upon his good pleasure to make this or that doctrine the object of a dogmatic definition. He is bound by and limited to the divine revelation, and to the truths which that revelation contains; he is bound and limited by the divine law and by the constitution of the Church; lastly he is bound and limited by that doctrine, divinely revealed, which affirms that alongside the ecclesiastical hierarchy there is the power of temporal magistrates, invested in their own domain with a full sovereignty and to whom we owe in conscience obedience and respect in all things morally permitted, and which belong to the domain of civil society.' Pius IX congratulated the Swiss bishops on their clear explanation of the limits of the infallibility.

"..... Bishop Gasser declared as unacceptable the view that infallibility resided primarily in the pope from whom it is communicated to the Church. This relationship between the infallibility of the Church and that of the pope was very plainly stated by a prominent English theologian, the Dominican Fr. Vincent McNabb. In his treatise, **Infallibility** (London, 2nd ed., 1927), he says (on page 52): 'It should be noted that infallibility is primarily given for the Church, and in some sense resides primarily in the Church. Neither the pope nor General Councils are ends in themselves: they look towards the Church. So may it be said in a very true sense that the gift of infallibility resides primarily in the Church rather than in the popes or General Councils. Though popes and General Councils may be looked upon as the proximate principles or organs of the Church's infallibility, yet it is true to say that in a certain sense infallibility resides primarily not so much in popes or General Councils as in the Church. When, then, it is recognized that Faith demands objective infallibility, and that conciliar and papal infallibility, though not subordinate to the infallibility of the Church, are yet referred on to it, matters are seen in their true light.'

"But even when the pope alone should proclaim a doctrine *ex cathedra* he can do so only after having examined the mind of the Church in this matter. After declaring that 'infallibility is a divine assistance enabling the teaching Church to declare or expound the deposit of faith possessed by her,' Fr. McNabb compares such a declaration of the pope, the head of the Teaching Church, with a judge sitting in the judgment seat. Before making his declaration *ex cathedra* on the case in

process, the judge is bound to hear all the witnesses. His judgment is binding only after he has examined all the witnesses. 'In the same way, the *ex cathedra* judgment of the pope (or Council) needs the **mind** of the Church as its necessary preliminary material It would be false to say that the official *ex cathedra* judgment of the judge needs the consent of the witnesses to make it binding. The evidence of the witnesses gives the necessary **material** for the official judgment, but does not give the necessary **sanction**.'"

Objection—The Vatican II popes are legitimate; they exercise functions of infallibility, as when they canonize saints. If they were not popes they could not exercise their infallibility.

Reply—Papal infallibility is confined to its field and purpose, preservation of the entire, unchangeable Deposit of Faith, Christ's Revelation. Whether John Ogilvie, for instance, is declared a man of heroic sanctity makes no difference whatsoever to that Revelation. Declaring such a man a saint seems fairly safe—he died for the Faith—but it is not an *ex cathedra* statement on faith or morals, and is therefore, whether true or not, not an exercise of papal infallibility. In canonizing, a pope declares complete the process and investigation, which depend on either a large existing cult or at least two first-class certified miracles. (Nowadays only one miracle is required; miracles are counterfeited regularly at charismatic covens.) But even were this papal prerogative covered by papal infallibility, it does not follow that a false pope or usurper would acquire infallibility by performing the ceremony. Nor could he be induced to refrain from such duties because he knew he was not really pope; he would be eager to exercise any and all functions that would promote or continue his deception. Even faultless "proper" performance of an infallible function could not confer infallibility upon a non-pope. If a doctrine is true it does not depend on the infallibility of its promulgator for its truth. Jesus Christ was truly God before the Nicene or Athanasian Creeds.

Objection—JP2 has erred often in his many speeches. But the crime of heresy requires pertinacity. In the flood of discourses a pope can express grave theological errors and even real heresies without falling into the **crime** of heresy which cuts one off from the Church. In such a grave matter, only a general council settles the question.

Reply—Because you won't face facts and settle the question for yourself. If he errs so much that even those who defend his occupation of St. Peter's See are embarrassed, why can't he stem the ceaseless verbal flow to keep within his mental capacity or his competence in the Faith he is obliged to teach? **Can** a man raised and educated through the seminary in the Catholic Church continue so consistently to spout heresies without knowing or realizing their heretical nature? Has he no Denzinger? No huge Vatican library? No living theologians? No respect for the office which his loose tongue lowers daily in all eyes? No time to check his sources? Does he not deliberately deceive in typical modernist fashion by exciting sympathy for his incompetent approach, as though he had no system? And which of these episcopal heretics or Dutch theologians will reprove JP2 or call a council to correct him? Such an appeal from a pope to a council is expressly forbidden by Pope Pius II's *Exsecrabilis*, which annuls any council convoked to make drastic change (such as updating) in the Church. The Church never appeals to the future to condemn heresy—always to the *depositum fidei*, all on the **past** record, necessarily. Without pertinacity in error, convincingly shown by his adherence to, and commitment to continued implementation of, Vatican II and its at least twelve clearly stated, previously condemned heresies, JP2 could never have been elected.

Objection—To admit however sadly that JP2 is the pope is not a heresy.

Reply—Perhaps not. But the admission commits a Catholic to heretical acts and doctrines manifestly and undeniably JP2's, and to the absurdity that, despite canon law and of definition itself of "Catholic" and "heretic," a heretic heads the Catholic Church to which he cannot belong. On the record, JP2 continues illegal, impossible suppression of the traditional Mass, undeniably true worship of God, in favor of a monstrous, heresy-laden, mocking service of idolatry whose traditions are Arian, Protestant, and Jewish. What Catholic suppresses Christ's Eternal Sacrifice? (Even were it "permitted" it would still be suppressed on each and every occasion on which a properly ordained priest used the *novus ordo* in its place.) What man or angel has such authority? Whoever usurps it perjures himself beyond belief. This may explain why Paul VI got away with it and JP2 continues to do so; no one will believe such criminal audacity, such utter, practical hatred

of God, God's true worship, and God's true worshippers. The infiltrators have destroyed our ordinary means of grace, supplanting them with idolatry to destroy the souls of unsuspecting forced participants. Clearly, however broad minded, tolerant, or "forgiving" JP2 may sound, he does the work of Satan. To acknowledge his papal status or authority is to condone heresy and idolatry and to support the same Satan, his works, his pomps which we renounced at Baptism before its exorcism was removed, probably for lack of exorcists. Whether that condonation and support constitute heresy I leave to your disinterested determination. But don't expect me to risk my soul by such an absurd admission.

CUM EX APOSTOLATUS OFFICIO—Paul IV, 15 March 1559

Let them be driven out of Christ's fold who despise to be disciples of truth, and let not the teaching of error continue.

The Roman Pontiff can be contradicted if he be found wandering from the faith, and because where danger is more greatly extended, there it must be more fully and assiduously questioned, lest false prophets lamentably ensnare the souls of the simple, and draw innumerable peoples committed to their care with themselves into perdition and into the ruin of damnation.

By Apostolic authority we approve and renew each and all sentences of excommunication, suspension, interdict, and privation, and any other sentences, censures, and penalties by any Roman Pontiffs our Predecessors or by sacred Councils accepted by God's Church, or decrees of the Holy Fathers, and statutes, or holy Canons, and Constitutions, and Apostolic Ordinances against heretics and schismatics, howsoever made known and promulgated, and that they must constantly be observed, and if there be, perchance, those not in vigorous observance they must be replaced.

.... this our constitution to prevail in perpetuity, in hate of so great a crime, than which nothing in God's Church can be greater or more pernicious, of the fullness of Apostolic power we enact, determine, decree, and define that the aforesaid sentences, censures, and penalties remaining in their strength and efficacy, and fixing their effect, each and all bishops, archbishops, patriarchs, primates, cardinals, legates, counts, barons, marquesses, dukes, kings, and emperors, who thus far, as shown, are discovered, or confess, or may have been convicted of having deviated, or fallen into heresy, or incurred schism, provoked, or committed (these), and in future will deviate, or fall into heresy, or incur schism, or provoke or commit (these), and will be found to have deviated.... (etc)since more inexcusable in this than the rest, let them be punished beyond sentences, censures, and penalties aforesaid, let them be also by the crime itself and apart from any application of law or fact, utterly, totally, perpetually deprived of their orders, and cathedrals even metropolitan, patriarchal, and primatial churches, and of the honor of the cardinalate, and of the office of whatever legateship, likewise of active and passive voice and of every authority, and of monasteries, benefices, and ecclesiastical offices secular and regular of whatever orders obtained from whatever concessions and Apostolic dispensations unto title, charge, and administration, or any other manner, in which they may have any right Moreover let those who may have presumed knowingly to protect, defend, favor, or believe or teach the doctrines of those so discovered, or confessed, or convicted automatically incur sentence of excommunication, and let them be made infamous, and let them not be admitted in voice, person, writings, representative, or any agent to public or private offices, or deliberation, or Synod, or general or provincial council, or conclave of cardinals, or any congregation of the faithful, or election of anyone, or the presentation of testimony, **nor can they be so admitted** [First the law, then the fact]. Should it happen that a bishop (.... archbp., patriarch, or primate), cardinal, or legate, or even the Roman Pontiff had deviated from the Catholic Faith or had fallen into some heresy **before** his nomination as bishop, cardinal, or pope, the following dispositions are compulsory: The promotion or election, even if the cardinals have consented to this of common accord, are null and void. They cannot acquire validity by the fact of the subject's entry into function or by the fact of consecration or subsequent exercise of authority, nor—in the case of a pope—by the fact of enthronement, of the act of veneration or of subsequent general obedience, whatever be the duration of this situation—nor can they be considered as partially legitimate. Nor can they confer upon such persons promoted to the dignity

of bishop, archbp., or primate, or called to the dignity of cardinal, or to occupy the See of Peter, any power to command either in the spiritual or the temporal domain. On the contrary, all their words, actions, and dispositions and their consequences have not the least juridical effect and confer no slightest right upon anyone. [End of excerpts]

This law, enacted early in the Protestant revolt, confirmed the obvious traditional doctrine, uncontested for centuries, of revelation and reason, the logical conclusion from Mark XVI, 16, "...he that believeth not shall be condemned." Yet we hear that this law, necessary to the Church's survival when enacted, bearing the marks of positive divine law, is replaced by the 1917 Code of Canon Law, was condemned by Pius XII (Why?—if it had already been replaced?), or has no effect because it was never applied. Is there no law against murder in a monastery because no murder has taken place to cause the law's application? Can facts be denied because no law makes them criminal? Is it not indisputable fact that a heretic is not a Catholic? Is it not absurd that one who contradicts Jesus Christ and refuses His mandate to preach His entire doctrine to every creature can be His vicar?

The 1917 Code of Canon Laws was introduced to organize and simplify the laws, not to change them. The same purpose remained after its introduction as before: the good of the Church and its members.

Objection—You have quoted *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio* against our recent popes. This was superseded by St. Pius X, the 1917 Code of Canon Law, and Pius XII who condemned it.

Reply—Did he, now? Why bother to condemn a law superseded forty years earlier? It was the law of the Church nearly three and a half centuries, legislated against clear and present danger, in effect at the time of Cardinal Bellarmine's oft-quoted opinion—which is thus shown erroneous and/or inapplicable, and which he himself corrected later in the same book. To validate your objection you must do away as well with Canon 188 and Canon Law *de Personis*.

The 1917 Code of Canon Law has eliminated several former safeguards without appreciable reason. Let us not forget Rampolla's contribution to its codification. Notoriously missing are the Toledan Councils' laws against Jews. Antisemitism is criminal, unless practiced by Jews against Arabs. After all, says our enlightened age, Christ and His Apostles were Jewish.

No comparison is possible between Jews who accepted Christ and those who rejected Him down the centuries, especially those who hid in the Church to preserve property or to bore from within. One of these, Pierleone, secured a thumping majority of the Cardinal-electors. In a mere eight years (1130-38) he nearly destroyed the Church. Only Paul VI has accomplished greater destruction. Why is he not tarred with the same brush? Why is he not also condemned as antipope? Because an anti-Church cannot condemn its founding fathers?

Objection—Canon 188 superseded *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*.

Reply—But never invalidated its provisions. The "superseded" law was official Church law for 370 years, since its necessity to protect Christendom's unity with explicit codification in the face of mass schism and heresy. (A logical conclusion from Mark xvi, 16 ["He that believeth not shall be condemned"], it is of the nature of things in a Catholic civilization.) In like circumstances the same natural law applies, whether codified, in effect, or "superseded." Canon 6 (6): "All other disciplinary laws of the old law which were in force until now, and which are neither explicitly nor implicitly contained in the Code, have lost all force of law **with the exception** of laws contained in the approved liturgical books and laws **derived from the natural and positive divine law.**" The Code itself legislated nothing new; it summed up existing law. **Canon 23:** "In doubt whether the former law has been revoked, the repeal of the law is not to be presumed, but the more recent laws are to be, as far as possible, **reconciled with the former laws** so that one may **supplement and not contradict** the other." Canons 188(4) and 2314 §1, therefore, are to be read in concordance with *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, which they abbreviate—not supersede.

Objection—Since the Church no longer applies the law to civil rulers it picks and chooses by applying it to Church officials. This selectivity smacks of heresy.

Reply—Choice here is a matter of judgment on the part of the Prosecutor. In all legal systems prosecutions with little prospect of success seldom go to court. This in no way binds the prosecutor's hands when he **can** win. There is simply no excuse to continue a heretic in ecclesiastical office because it is impractical to remove one from civil office.

Objection—*Cum ex Apostolatus Officio* is a dead letter because it was never applied.

Reply—Laws are not merely punitive; they also mark out limits for men of good will. If no driver is caught drunk then probably the drunken driving laws are effective though not applied.

What law was applied in St. Pius V's excommunication of Queen Elizabeth, and his freeing her subjects from all obligations to her sovereignty? St. Pius V made use either of this law or of the divine law upon which it is based, as expressed by St. Jerome: "It is intolerable that heretics rule over Catholics." Either way he was clearly in accord with the mind of the Church.

Objection—Canon 188 applies to clerics, not bishops. Canon 2227 reads: "Cardinals are not subject to the penal law, unless they are explicitly mentioned, nor are bishops subject to penalties of suspension and interdict *latae sententiae*."

Reply—Canon 188 concerns **all** offices in the Church. Canon 118: "Only clerics can obtain the power of either orders or ecclesiastical jurisdiction...." Canon 107: "The clergy are distinct from the laity...." Canon 108: "Those who have been assigned to the Divine ministry at least by the first tonsure, are called clerics. they form a sacred hierarchy in which some are subordinate to others...."

Now that Canon Law's definition of a cleric is established, let us turn to Canon 2255: "The censures are as follows: (1) excommunication, (2) interdict, (3) suspension. An excommunication is always a censure; interdict and suspension can be either censures or vindicative penalties, but in case of doubt they are presumed to be censures." This includes one more censure than Canon 2227 exempts: excommunication, which can hit anyone in any office, as in Canon 2314, §1, (1).

Objection—Even 2314 provides for admonitions, even renewed.

Reply—To cover paperwork after *ipso facto* excommunication and loss of all churchly office.

Objection—I find your approach too legalistic. I prefer some evidence of compassion, love, and human feeling.

Reply—Then you may seriously consider joining the Salvation Army, or, unless you're a woman, that benevolent fraternity, the Freemasons. But Christ's first commandment (Mark xii, 30 & Matthew xxii, 37) enjoins love of God. His test: "If you love Me, keep My commandments." (John xiv, 15) His last exhortation (Matthew xxviii, 19, 20): "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."

Baruch iv, 1: "This is the book of the commandments of God, and the law, that is forever: all they that keep it, shall come to life: but they that have forsaken it, to death."

Jesus Christ (Mark xvi, 16): "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned."

Divine Commandments are laws with penalties. In applying laws to our present difficulties we apply the Church's traditions, known attitudes, and evident facts. Gravity, for instance, is a fact, recognized as such long before it became a "law." Australian law determines who is an Australian citizen. Divine law determines who belongs to God's Church. How anyone feels about law has little effect on its force or obligation. Laws argue and convince far more than compassion, love, and human feeling. Cajolery and public relations substitute insufficiently for clarification of truth (necessary to salvation) that has become somewhat obfuscated since Vatican II and its "popes" assumed competence to correct it.

View from Eternity or Who's Dead?

Customs change. Attitudes contribute. No longer is weeping universal at funerals. The cortege travels not to the cemetery but to the taxidermist, the crematorium, or the freezer-locker. Men are no longer frozen with horror but with hope. The erstwhile cry is absorbed into cryonics.

In anticipation of death a man may consign his corpse to a storage firm that for a huge fee will quick-freeze him *in cadaverous toto* against the day when medical science stumbles upon a cure for what ailed him. He is then to be thawed out and the remedy will be administered. Then his troubles will begin, probably with chilblains. These routed, he tries to contact his remotest descendants, to see about accommodation or a share in his estate.

So he'll need a job. Imagine his interview with the personnel officer at Broken Hollow (the Hill will be long gone).

"You're a what?"

"An open cut miner. I drive a bulldozer and operate a dragline."

"What do you know about laser beams?"

"I was always a quick learner."

"Let me see your references. You've submitted no birth certificate."

"The record bureau burned down three hundred years ago. I have this resurrection certificate."

"Go haunt a house!"

Off he'll go, head bowed low. With luck he may catch on as a guide in some museum. Perhaps he'll discover the fate of many of his frozen fellowship. He may learn that not all those cryonic corporations have outlasted the pertinent research. Bankruptcy or power strikes will have brought on sudden premature thaws.

Nor let us forget the color problem. Color is a fact of life—or, as in the redness of my hair, of history. Some are blond, some brunette. But what thought have we devoted to color as a fact of death? Can a Melanesian identify with himself when blue with the cold? Can a Buddhist return to his own consciousness from the throes of metempsychosis? May he not prefer being a tiger, an elephant, a python, or a songbird?

Only last winter a Swedish migrant walked into a cryonic establishment in Nome, Alaska with his rigid brother under his arm.

"I have come to leave Erik until you can cure what killed him."

"That's why we're here," smiled the mortician. "What killed him?"

"He froze to death!"

Objection—The story about the Buddhist Eskimo freezing to death at Broken Hill and being reincarnated as a songbird is a bit far-fetched. Next you'll be saying that the Pope ain't Catholic.

Reply—Where would you get an idea like that? Popes are necessarily Catholic or they could not have been eligible for their office. We have had four ineligible non-Catholics occupying the vacancy left by Pius XII. Many insist that without a pope the Church cannot exist. History disproves this. The Church cannot exist without Christ's doctrine—all of it, not merely a few bows to orthodoxy to maintain credibility while preaching the new doctrine of human supremacy. We are all to glory in collective progress to superhumanity and racial divinity, and ignore the escalating loss of individual human freedom and responsibility. "Not everyone that saith to Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doth the will of My Father, he shall enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Matthew vii, 21) So it seems unlikely that all who cry: "JP2, JP2!" will fare better. Each man will face judgment alone. JP2 will not plead his cause, share his judgment, or go to hell in his place. It is good to have a pope, a standard to measure our Catholicity. But we are still bound to the eternal standard when there is no pope. We remain responsible before God, and we cannot plead that some one has misled us because we thought he had the power to mislead us—to vary the standard.

Go ye not out!

The day began, like any other in Mt. Hallucination, with a torrential downpour. The hundred-odd locals could be distinguished from the visiting throngs by their webbed hands and feet. Last month little Aqueous McWaters was born with gills. Father Parr would baptize him only conditionally, so much had poured over him en route to St. Swithun's.

Why would anyone live here, Jock Schmutzgraeber asked himself. His hired four-wheel-drive

sloshed to a tentative stop at the presbytery gate, and he waded to the front door. The balding, white-fringed priest welcomed him into the drip-foyer and handed him the first towel off the rack
“You’ve attracted a good deal of attention here, Father,” said Jock, shedding his raingear and toweling off.

“Not I,” said the gloom-clothed old man. “This was so peaceful. Drowning is said to be the easiest death. Half the trouble is you newshawks. Why must you publicize lunacy?”

“We can’t publicize what isn’t here.” He followed the priest into his office and seized a chair. “So you don’t put much stock in these amazing events?”

“I’ve known that whacky woman for forty years, and all that time she’s had water on the brain. Must I take her seriously now that she communes with heaven, or cloud-cuckoo-land?”

“Can’t you stop it?”

“Heaven knows I’ve tried. But little Lauretta Logie floated over my head to our charismatic cuckoo of a bishop.”

“Aha!” Jock reached for his notebook. “A quotable quote!”

“No fear! Do you know what he’d do to me?”

“Send you off to the retired priests’ home?”

“Right! And who could live with that bunch of useless fools?”

“Useless?”

“Why didn’t they stay in their parishes? We’re rather short of replacements.”

“But what do priests do these days? And don’t the poor old fellows deserve the reward of their labors?”

“The priest’s reward is heaven. Nothing else can pay him if he does his job. If he doesn’t he certainly need not retire.”

“Retired you’d lose no more hair over this whacky woman.”

“I know my duty. All wet or not, the town’s still entitled to the unwashed truth. If no one preaches it the Church is no longer Apostolic.”

“But why should **your** parishioners enjoy special privileges?”

“Because they’re mine—**my** responsibility. The new-fangled retirement scheme was not put on us for our benefit, but to remove all memory of the old doctrine and practice from the parish scene—to untrammel modernism, innovation, and dilution and destruction of our religion.”

“Why, then, do so many priests retire?”

“As you said, their job is gone, and the excuse given for its abolition is that there are not enough priests. Their time is filled with new duties, committees, conferences, senates, daily homilies. Their real duties are conferred on brothers and nuns, on parish councils, on acolytes, hospital visitors, and social workers. They are made unwelcome—frustrated at every turn—estranged from their Faith and tradition by their every function. They are conditioned to obedience, and accustomed to the protection and patronage of their bishops, most of whom have gone as loony as my own. There is always the chance that the old priest may cry ‘enough’ and rebel. So he is offered ‘retirement’ which confines him, removes whatever audience, leverage, or financial independence he may have had, and usually muzzles him. Then if he rebels, who cares?”

“So why don’t you rebel?”

“I try to hold on to what I can. My people, probably alone in the diocese, still attend Mass and receive the sacraments. I get by because the bishop is a trifle afraid of me. I was ordained before he started school. But if I go too far he’ll call in the white coat brigade to retire me to the funny farm. That will destroy my credibility, even if it does **not** drive me out of my mind.”

“Those are the hazards of the job.”

“Possibly, but they’re brand new hazards in a brand new Church. You news hounds can help if you report the plain facts.”

“You should appreciate more than anyone that no one **wants** facts. My job is to sell newspapers so we can charge enough for our ads. If I publish your facts I may wind up in the next padded cell.”

“At least you can report obvious facts that your editor sent you to investigate.”

“What facts?”

“Not all our townfolk are fish. Many of them coin money out of this notoriety—renting rooms, catering meals, selling souvenirs. It is in their interest to keep the visions viable. Lauretta helps

considerably. She schedules apparitions a year or more in advance, always including school holidays and major area events. Advance bookings pass belief nearly as much as the visions themselves and their messages for our times.”

“What do you want? Declarations for dodoes and dinosaurs? New times, new interests.”

“What’s new about morbid concern with the future? Whatever we need to know can be determined by natural means. I’ll give you three-to-one it rains tomorrow, and forty-to-one it rains next week. Whatever Laretta’s messages, true or false, we never needed them for here or hereafter, or we should have had them from Jesus Christ. Haring after these so-called visions is nothing more than criticism of Christ for not providing a complete revelation. Everyone seeks an easier road to salvation, as though Christ had founded a secret society to hide our necessities from us.”

From **A Companion to the Summa**, by Father Walter Farrell, O.P.

Perhaps nowhere in all his works does the humanity of St. Thomas appear more clearly than in his defense of the universal sway of reason, a sovereignty that he argues must extend itself even to the play of men. Here in this tract on modesty St. Thomas gives his philosophy of fun. He has compressed it into three articles; an extremely brief treatment that is yet a noble human document, worthy of the tribute of familiarity from any age.

It seemed obvious to the greatest scholar of the most scholarly century that fun is necessary to human life. When a man has pushed a wheel-barrow all day, his body is tired. If he is to do the same thing the next day, he must do something about the bodily fatigue; he must give his body some rest. Exactly the same thing is true of the soul. Even though there are no such things as spiritual wheel-barrow, there is a weariness of soul that is exactly proportionate to the intensity of a man’s mental efforts. It is true that speculative work causes a greater soul-weariness than does practical thinking; but the latter, precisely as thinking, has the same, though a lesser, wearying effect. In other words, man’s mental powers, like his physical powers, are definitely limited. When a man reaches, or goes beyond, those limits, he becomes tired—tired both mentally and physically, for in the labors of the soul the body must also work. If he expects to continue that mental work, he must give his soul a rest; and the rest of the soul is called play or fun, that is, words or action in which we seek nothing but physical or animal pleasures.

It is a very human thing, when we are loaded down with work and we see another stepping out liltily for a good time, to feel very virtuous in our condemnation of such frivolous waste of time. There are so many serious things in life, so much to be done that it is childish and silly to fritter away precious time on amusement. To combat that notion St. Thomas records the story of St. John the Evangelist. Just such a serious-minded person caught St. John one day playing a game with his disciples. The saint was roundly rebuked for activities so unworthy of an apostle. Instead of arguing the point (people as serious as this will argue forever), St. John picked up a bow, handed it to his reformer, and asked him to shoot an arrow at a target. The man did. St. John asked him to shoot again and again. Finally he asked what would happen if arrows were shot indefinitely from that bow.

His critic, in some irritation at so obvious a question, answered that of course it would break. St. John said that exactly the same thing would happen to a man; unless he gives his soul a rest, he too will break.

The whole idea of amusement is really an application of the orator’s technique to individual life. Cicero gave the counsel, entirely approved by Thomas later, that when an orator talks overlong, when he notices his audience getting restive, he should say something novel or, in keeping with the circumstances, something ridiculous. In other words, the orator must give his audience a let-down, a rest, a break from the mental effort of following his argument. Amusement gives a man a let-down, an interruption of the mental effort of thinking.

The very purpose of fun, then, indicates its need for regulation. Fun should clearly interrupt the labors of the soul, but not upset rational balance, not induce hysteria or stupor; it is meant for a rest. It cannot turn about obscenity or crime without defeating its own ends; these things do not give

quiet but torment to the soul. The general term human activity is a description of man's play as well as his work; even in his play there must be the human note of fittingness to persons, places, and time. We are right in our judgment of the man who relaxes by shouting operatic scales at three o'clock in the morning. He is not only lacking in a sense of humor, he is beyond question lacking in the virtue which regulates fun, the virtue of *eutrapelia*; for surely such relaxation is not rational.

It is to be well noticed that the whole purpose of play is to rest the soul. It presupposes work and looks forward to more work. In the absence of that mental activity which makes play necessary, amusement becomes a terrible bore, as distasteful as a steady diet of spinach or six months in bed. Even too much of it in one dose destroys the sparkling relish of it. Of course the retired business man promptly lies down and dies; he has nothing to do but rest. While rest is fine as a recuperation from work or a preparation for work, rest for the sake of rest is really a killing thing.

The wit whose humor is discourteous, scandalous, or obscene is clearly not practicing virtue, any more than the man whose relaxation consists in murder or theft. Obviously amusement is not always virtuous. These things cannot be excused on any grounds, let alone on the flimsy grounds of fatigue. In fact, the possibilities of sin in play are considerably varied. Thus, for instance, fun can become such a fever in a man as to destroy all else, inducing a man to sacrifice his family, his work, even his God for such trifles as a horse race, a golf or a poker game. Then it is a vicious thing with none of reason's beauty about it.

In a less ugly but more undignified manner, we can sin in play by a disregard of reason in the circumstances of our amusement. The things that are done may be just clean fun, and highly amusing; but somehow we do not expect a President to sneak into a dark alley at night to shoot dice, or a portly matron to skip rope by the hour in front of the parochial school.

For most of us, the work of the virtue of *eutrapelia* is to restrain fun from getting out of bounds rather than to coax us into taking some relaxation. In other words, a man is much more liable to sin by excessive play than by lack of all recreation. After all, a little fun goes a long way. Recreation is a seasoning of human life; a little touch of it is sometimes exactly what is needed to give a tang to a flat day. But we cannot live on recreation any more than we can on seasoning; and too much fun can spoil a human life as completely as too much seasoning spoils a meal.

Yet fun is so necessary to human life that the total lack of it is unreasonable and vicious. The wet blanket at a party is a burden to himself and to others; he takes no pleasure himself and cramps the pleasure of others. In fact (and the phrase is that of St. Thomas), the man who never says anything ridiculous and is a nuisance to those who are joking is vicious. He is not to be complimented for his serious frame of mind but to be condemned for his lack of reason.

The modern bitterness against God has more than one explanation. There is, for example, the zealous preference of men for the idols materialism has set up; and this is no more than the logical climax of the gradual development of philosophy these past few centuries. A more recent source of this bitterness, recent only in its extension and the sweeping devastation of its denials, might be dated from the despair of the World War (#1). It is engaged primarily with the problem of evil and bitterly rejects God because of the evil it finds. Actually it is a strange mixture of insults to God, insults to men, and absurd flatteries of humanity; like the incoherent ravings of a man gone mad.

There is first of all a violent rejection of a God Who would usher into the world men loaded down with the weight of sin and yet demand that they measure up to heights of virtue. This, they say, is a cruel, bitter, mocking divinity without the elemental justice of a crooked politician; a monster who made the world for the torture of men. Then, coming down a step further and taking the picture of God drawn by the destroyers and betrayers of human freedom as an authentic photograph, they vent their mad wrath on a straw god who never existed; on a god who creates men for hell, who pushes them into sin and awaits gleefully with a whip in his hand to punish the evil he himself has caused; on a god who could have prevented all this evil and did not. After having insulted God and insulted men by denying them the fundamental control of their actions, they leap to absurd heights in supposing the puny intellect of the creature they have so insulted is

capable of taking in by one glance the sweeping plans of infinite wisdom. They meet hunger and thirst, pain, accident, death, and injustice and demand to know why they cannot understand these things happening in a universe ruled by a good God. Why should not the creature who cannot master one human science grasp all the intricate workings of infinite wisdom ruling a universe from His eternal throne?

Perhaps they are a little mad. At least they are a distinct disappointment to the race that bore them; for surely we, with our great gift of intellect, should be able to appreciate the patent evidence of divine perfection which sin parades before the world. The very possibility of triumph and defeat, of virtue and vice, of success and failure, of heaven and hell is both a tribute to man and a generous sharing of divinity's power with humanity. Only a master sure of his power, supreme in his greatness, would dare to give so much independent power to his subjects; only a being infinite in his goodness would invite such a hopelessly inferior subject as man to share his own divine life; only a mind infinitely wise and a heart infinitely generous could have put into the hands of man the tools which would make that brilliant participation of divinity's life the product of man's own efforts. He could have made man merely an animal, a plant, a chemical. He could have put man on a spiritual dole and freed him of responsibility and self-respect; He could have tossed him the scraps from the tables of heaven as to a beggar who had no claim. But the astonishing thing He did was to treat man as man.

It is not well, in talking of sin, to forget Bethlehem and Nazareth, and the long, weary, discouraging years that led up to the climax of Calvary. Or the picture of the slave nourished on the body and blood of his Master, the strong flow of grace, the wide horizons opened by faith and hope. We blind ourselves if we refuse to see the manifest evidence of divine love as well as of divine justice, if we refuse to see that God has treated us not merely as men, but as friends.

The nature of sin itself shows the thoughtfulness of God. He gave us the privacy our nature demands; an inner sanctuary that no force, no devil, no man can violate. He Himself refuses to challenge the inviolability of that sanctuary. That soul is our own; its actions can be forced by no one else. They are ours; they must be ours if we are to be held accountable for them, for only by proceeding under our control to our goals are they human actions. The same is true of our sins, for they too are human actions.

Even the abuse of our mastery of our actions furnishes overwhelming evidence of the beneficent ingenuity and merciful justice of God. Time and again our sins are turned to good; we are snatched from the hardness of pride through the humiliation of other sins, brought to our knees by the awful face of sin and the kind face of God. Again and again suffering and misfortune serve as steps to bring us closer to divine heights. Even the raging activity of Satan himself is made the material by which the sanctity of the friends of God is fashioned. And when, after years of patient search for sheep that insisted on losing themselves, after silent years of unbearable insult, divine mercy sees the quest for love is hopeless, the very damnation of the sinner is made to serve the double purpose of warning, helping others and fulfilling divine justice.

Why should we have to face these awful possibilities? Why must we play the game of life and run the risk of defeat? These are the questions of the man afraid to live, afraid to be human, the questions of a coward. These are the questions of those who would sacrifice freedom for fear of making a mistake, give up intellect for fear of ignorance, give up action for fear of failure, give up heaven for fear of hell, give up life for fear of living. We cannot have any one of these without possibility of the other; our dignity as men is precisely that we can have, if we will, the most perfect of all, the triumph of life, a share in the life of God.

He came to the Jews in fulfilment of divine promises, in the name of God's strong love of the race—great enough to be terribly severe. By their malice, the leaders of this chosen people impeded the salvation of the whole race; they rejected Christ's doctrine which alone held out hope of salvation; their vices corrupted the life of the people. This was not the time for a lover of the people and a teacher of truth to tread gently lest he hurt the feelings of the great among men. Of

course Christ roared against them, sparing them nothing; yet in His violence was the full vigor of divine love, embracing the leaders perhaps more strongly than their followers.

To curry favor at the expense of truth may serve the disastrous ends of cowardice or selfishness; it can do no good to men or truth, for there is no price at which either can be sold. It helps no cause to sacrifice men in favor of power, for men and God are the sources of power. But Christ's cause suffered nothing in upholding truth at all costs, in placing men before all else. The people of His time, as those of every age, knew well the corruption of their leaders. Had Christ venally won the wholehearted support of these corrupt leaders, He would probably have lost the few hearts that clung to Him as the sparse fruit of three years sowing; He would certainly have lost the millions that have since come to Him.

Christ, called to account, could say with complete truth: I have spoken nothing in secret. He had not come to hide divine truth but to manifest it (even though Paul VI kept looking to the future for its completion) without equivocation or ambiguity.

* * * * *

.....the house of His Father defiled by a mob of filthy hucksters with the Pharisees and Levites standing by. To uproot this evil commerce from the house of God would have taken years of patient teaching and preaching. It would have called for the remaking of men's souls—souls toughened by vice, and grown cold from years of neglect. But the house of God had to be cleansed at once. Hence the physical violence which Christ used on the startled multitude. The echoes of that tumult will never die, nor did Christ intend that they should. He taught us an important lesson: anger, uncontrolled and unjustified, is an offense against God; but righteous anger is a lash in our hand to be used in the service of God.

Joan of Arc, seeing prostitutes mingling with her soldiers, broke her sword across the shoulders of one of the women. In so doing she emulated Christ cleansing the Temple. Anyone may be confronted with a situation which, although less dramatic, also justifies self-assertion or real anger. In the life of every individual, occasions arise in which we are obliged to defend our honor, administer a well-deserved reproof, nip calumny in the bud, or exercise violence in some manner, physical or verbal. But many Catholics are hesitant to use forceful language, or otherwise assert themselves vigorously. They are laboring under the misconception that perpetual mildness is the handmaid of piety and fail to distinguish between controlled anger and unbridled passion.

Anger, like joy, grief, desire, aversion, and so on, is an emotion, and as such is intended to be ruled by reason. Control is the measure of a man's humanity. The less control he has, the closer he comes to bestiality. Anger and other passions must obey, not govern. — Leo C. Sterck, *For All to Live By*

Objection: Jesus Christ told the Jews to obey the scribes and Pharisees because they sat in the chair of Moses. So we must obey the pope because he sits in the Chair of Peter.

Reply: Not parallel cases. Almost the whole of St. Matthew's 23rd chapter lists genuine judgments against the scribes and Pharisees, for lack of compassion, for self-esteem, vanity, and pride, for greed, blindness, and hypocrisy, for injustice, iniquity, and murder. But there is no suggestion that they expounded the laws of Solon or the Code of Hammurabi, no charge of heresy, apostasy, usurpation, or idolatry. They were orthodox Jews, reliable expounders of objective Mosaic law. They held their positions licitly, and everyone knew they adhered to proper doctrine and law, much as they tortured it to their own advantage. My Rheims-Douai-Challoner Bible prefaces the chapter with: "Christ admonishes the people to follow the good doctrine, not the bad example of the scribes and Pharisees....."

Archbp. Alban Goodier (**The Public Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ**): "The Scribes and Pharisees they could not love, yet they must obey them. At times, when the burthen pressed on them with special violence, when it seemed that the pain was theirs while their masters sat above them at their ease, the thought would arise that they should not bow down before these ecclesiastical tyrants Nevertheless He would have them respect lawful authority, however corrupt, however cruel,

however hard He had always respected their authority as **guardians** of the Law, as the **legal representatives** of Moses.”—**not** as **heretical usurpers, destroyers** of the Law.

Dom Bernard Orchard (A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture): “When the scribes and Pharisees faithfully expound the Law it is on the teaching chair of Moses that they sit. Accordingly they must be obeyed. But this obedience should not lead to imitation because they are hypocrites at heart. The letter of the Law they observe, not without ingenuity, but not its spirit;....”

But our antipopes, from John XXIII on, have broken the laws and eventually rewritten them to legitimize their aggravated fracture. If they sit in Peter’s Chair it is clearly through usurpation. If we observe and do what these open apostates enjoin, or even grant their right so to act, we join them in apostasy, wresting Scripture to our own damnation. We owe them nothing but denunciation of their crimes and heresies. We must observe and obey the legitimate commands of those who sit eligibly and legally in the Chair of Peter, genuine popes, the last of whom died in 1958.

Christ conferred wide powers (Matthew xvi, 19) upon Catholics, not upon public heretics. “We affirm that absolutely no heretic or schismatic has any power or right.”—St. Cyprian. Sts. Optatus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome all teach that heretics and schismatics cannot have the keys of the kingdom of heaven, nor bind nor loose. All based their arguments on the nature of heresy, refusal to believe God.

What is bound by genuine popes is bound in heaven, i.e., in eternity. It is not subject to change five or five hundred years later even by Catholics—certainly not by heretics. Challoner says:

“**Loose on earth.** The loosing the bands of temporal punishments due to sin is called an indulgence, the power of which is here granted.” The Haydock Bible’s footnotes continue: “Although Peter and his successors are mortal, they are nevertheless endowed with heavenly power, says St. Chrysostom, nor is the sentence of life and death passed by Peter to be attempted to be reversed, but what he declares is to be considered a Divine answer from heaven, and what he decrees, a decree of God Himself.... The power of binding is exercised, 1st, by refusing to absolve; 2nd, by enjoining penance for sins forgiven; 3rd, by excommunication, suspension, or interdict; 4th, by making rules and laws for the government of the Church; 5th, by determining what is of faith by the judgments and definitions of the Church.”

The papacy was established as our infallible authority and standard of belief. No genuine pope may err, even by accident or in good faith, in teaching the whole Church faith or morals, both complete in the unchangeable Revelation.

Orchard comments: “The Apostolic body, with Peter, is given wide powers which include that of formal excommunication or reconciliation.”

These powers were conferred for their responsible exercise for the protection of the faith and its adherents. Where, in all the welter of living and recent heretics, have the usurpers exercised these powers necessary for preservation of the purity of faith? Why not? Catholic powers of excommunication, if possessed by heretic usurpers, would apply first to the usurpers themselves—were they not automatically excommunicated by Canon Law. It is utterly inconceivable and absurd that unrepentant public heretics, deviating from the eternal standard of Christian belief, can fill the office Christ instituted to guarantee and teach it. Appreciation of the **fact** that the Holy See is vacant (as often in the past) since the death of Pius XII is basic to comprehension of the sorry state in which the Catholic Church finds itself. It is no argument that we must have a pope or anarchy. Not only does this not agree with history, but obviously we **have** anarchy.

THE PRIESTS OF CAMPOS AT BAY (*SI SI NO NO*, Oct. 15, 1982, Father M. Crowdy’s translation) again demonstrates the futility of complaint to the heretics in the vacant Holy See. Not merely we laymen, but priests, and even diocesan ordinaries receive no reply from supposedly competent authority in areas where competent authority must be exercised. But what can they expect when they write such foolishness as: “St. Pius V and Paul VI are both popes and their rites, both pontifical, remain in force in the Church.”?

Beyond that, much of their trouble grew from Bishop Antonio de Castro Mayer's retirement—his submission to an innovation intended with malice aforethought to remove the last vestiges of traditional religion and morality. What could he do? Publish the facts! He stood his ground? Now he's gone, replaced by a modernist innovator. He is far worse off than if he had been thrown out for attacking the heresy on its own ground.

AN EQUATORIAL NORTH POLE?

A serious concept? Yet often we hear uncritically of “our Judaeo-Christian civilization.” Our civilization—what's left—is a product of Catholicism. While acknowledging our debt to all those children of Abraham, who preserved true religion in its prophetic stage, we have never called our Church anything but Christian or Catholic. Who ever heard of the Judaeo-Catholic Church? “Judaeo” refers to those who rejected Christ.

Post-Christian Jews are anti-Christian—against our civilization in its roots. Somehow they have bemused us all, working on our sense of fair play and toleration. All minority “rights” cost and restrict the majority. Error's “rights” limit God's truth. Perversion has no rights over normalcy—nor disease over health, treachery over fidelity, innovation over tradition.

When Jesus Christ commissioned His Apostles He commanded them to preach the Gospel, the Good **News**, not the Old Testament. St. Matthew wrote his Gospel to convince the Jews, by demonstrating and documenting Christ's fulfillment of their own prophecies. Most refused to believe their own eyes, choosing rather to follow the Temple mob who had gone to extreme lengths to prove Christ's Resurrection to themselves.

The great bulk of Christian converts through the ages had little interest in the superseded Old Testament. The message concerns salvation, not vigil. The true Christian rejoices in possession of the means of salvation. Only those look forward to new and more authentic revelations who disbelieve the Gospel message, of which part is that the message has been fully revealed, that we look not to further revelation, not to another messiah. “Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.” (John vi, 69)

Only those dissatisfied with the roast query the cook. They who lack faith search the Old Testament. Catholics see it as preparation and longing, irrelevant after fulfillment. Prefiguration and typology won't save us.

The Reformers returned to the Old Testament in heretical dissatisfaction with the Gospel. They threw in with the Jews, who insisted that they still await their true messiah, who will give them the world.

Paul VI and his council looked ever forward to newer more authentic messages and interpretations. These last continue the great tradition of dissent, dissatisfaction, disbelief which pietistically crammed Christian Tradition's vacuum with pre-Christian Scriptures, embracing especially their longing for the **future** Redeemer with His finally complete revelation. This attitude and faith in Jesus Christ mutually exclude each other.

Objection—Why keep knocking Vatican II? Let's get on with current abuses and newer methods. We've tried all the approaches and the enemy still occupies the seats of power.

Reply—Because JP2 can point to Vatican II as his warrant. Unless we destroy it we can't unseat him. The Church never quit attacking Cranmer and Luther. Though dead and gone, they had left their mark. Their errors continued to require refutation because they still had a following. But Vatican II and its new religion stopped the fight, even rationalizing their rebellious, self-seeking conduct. Catholicism characteristically attacks religious error, for the benefit of both its own and the errors' adherents. Why **not** assault the council that joined the Reformers—that set the stage for the postconciliar “Church” to join Cranmer's sect and to join both in eliminating the Mass? Vatican II is the single most important target. It must be condemned *in toto* and in its roots before the usurpers can be excluded from the seats of power. It is additionally the usurpers' most vulnerable spot—utterly indefensible on dogmatic and moral grounds. Let us not fight a delaying action,

pointing out some of its dire fruits, selecting areas of combat. Wipe the whole damned thing! All its innovations are wrong; whatever truths it expounded had already been better expounded. And in considering private revelations let no one forget that good old “Pope” John XXIII claimed direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost in convoking a council in violation of all tradition and law, expressly to make drastic change in the Church—to open the windows; to breach the walls.

SALMAN RUSHDIE

wrote **The Satanic Verses**, which “blasphemes Islam,” according to Iran’s head of government, the Ayatollah Khomeini, who therefore hung a few million dollars on Rush(to)die’s head. I can’t work up much sympathy. Rushdie had surely realized how the Moslem world would react; he may have counted on its reaction to increase book sales.

What amazes is the general condemnation of the clearly predictable Moslem reaction. By now the world should have perceived that Islam involves strong feelings. Its founder borrowed, simplified, and desupernaturalized ideas from Christianity and Judaism, grafted them onto local pagan practises, and forced all those heathen Arabs into conformity. This worked so well that they ceaselessly forced it on others, mostly Christians, throughout North Africa and the Near East, even penetrating Europe as far as Tours and Vienna, and, when eventually driven out, left behind pockets like Bosnia and Albania.

These people, governed as they deserve, set us an example in zeal. They will die in droves for their pitiful “religious” heritage. They will brook no insults, real or fancied, to their prophet or his somewhat divided followers. They reject the cultured view that art, literature, and music, ends in themselves, are exempt from normal judgment and must be allowed maximum latitude. [91° N] They have the nerve to object when their mistaken creed is demeaned.

But how do we, in possession of all religious truth for two millennia, react when **it** is demeaned, insulted, or **removed**? Are we grateful enough to our Founder to wipe out the criminals, the venal and blasphemous playwrights and musicians(?), the thieving modernists, the postconciliar clergy and hierarchy, the antipopes? Will we even boycott any of these?

We have lived too long with multi-culture and have forgotten our own culture’s Christian nature and origin. Not for worlds would we show zeal over anything that matters. “Because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will begin to vomit thee out of my mouth.” (Apocalypse iii 16)

HERESY, SCHISM, & APOSTASY

ineligibly, illicitly, irrationally occupy the papal throne. Therefore that throne is vacant. But such as Hamish Fraser ascribe to those who can recognize plain facts some ulterior purpose, even aspiration to the vacant throne, the while they make an ass of Canon Law, ascribing the Code itself absurdity, in that it must harbor heresy and apostasy when its entire purpose is entire preservation of truth and God’s Holy Church, which He commanded to proclaim and propagate the entirely preserved truth. Their apparent logic: “We can’t depose a pope; he is infallible and we must obey him in matters of faith and morals!” Is worship not morals?—not our highest moral act and obligation?—not the subject and object of the First and Third Commandments? But Davies, Fraser, Lefebvre, and their ilk would reduce it to mere discipline—**then flout it**.

They can interpret the condemned heresies that Montini and Vatican II signed and promulgated “in the light of the Council of Trent.” They refuse to see that “popes” who publicly err in faith and morals cannot be infallible in those matters, that lacking an essential property of the papacy they cannot fill the office, and that in permitting these antipopes to continue to hold the teaching office after promulgating condemned heresies they themselves record their own acceptance of the promulgated condemned heresies and *ipso facto* exclude **themselves** from the Catholic Church.

ISABELLA OF SPAIN, William Thomas Walsh—edited excerpt:

Spain ultimately suffered decline. The causes were not those widely accepted. The Church cannot be held responsible, for Spain reached her greatest material prosperity precisely at the period when the Church exercised the most complete influence over the life of the people. Nor the inquisition, for Spain was at the height of her glory when the inquisition was most active. Nor, as maliciously alleged, a plague of syphilis. It has been rather generally believed that the disease originally appeared in Europe during the First Italian War; that some of Columbus' sailors had carried it from the New World to the camps of Italy. The belief that it was unknown in Europe before 1492 is contradicted by the fact that the Italian physician Guglielmo Salicetti, who kept careful case histories in the 13th century, recognized the symptoms and related them to their true cause; there are evidences that the plague existed in ancient Persia and Egypt. There are no historical records pointing to anything like an epidemic in either Italy or Spain during the closing years of the fifteenth century.

Spain failed to improve transportation, largely due to habitual dependence upon mules. After Isabel's death this Moorish custom gradually returned; hence wagons were little used, and there was but slight need for good roads. Spain suffered also from deforestation, which Isabel sought to prevent, but her successors permitted. The country paid, too, for extravagance, weakness, and reckless ambition of later kings. But on the whole it appears that Christopher Columbus, by one of the ironies of history, unintentionally dealt Spain one of its deadliest blows.

Within a century Spain's population was reduced by half through emigration to the New World, where the most ardent and adventurous of her chivalry scattered to fall under Indian arrows or disease, or to settle and perpetuate the civilization of Greece and Rome in the American wilderness. Migration fever was so intense that in a single generation after Columbus some of the cities of the peninsula were actually depopulated, and the Venetian ambassador, Andrea Navagiero, who traveled through Spain in 1525, recorded that in Seville scarcely any men were left. The gold that ultimately came by shipload from the mines of Peru and Mexico hardly compensated for so great a loss in manpower. In many ways it proved a curse to the nation that Isabel had just instructed in peaceful toil and frugality. Prices rose with the circulation of money, and the new demand for foreign products crippled some Spanish industries and eventually ruined others. A new class of wealthy parvenus, to whom titles were given with foolish prodigality, perpetuated a mischievous tradition that toil was dishonorable.

One more cause has been completely ignored by all our historians. "There can be no doubt," says the Jewish Encyclopedia, "that the decline of Spanish commerce in the seventeenth century was due in large measure to the activities of the Marranos of Holland, Italy, and England. who diverted trade from Spain to those countries When Spain was at war with any of these countries, Jewish intermediation was utilized to obtain knowledge of Spanish naval activity." (Vol XI, p 501) It appears from the same source that the Spanish *Conversos* who settled in London acquired within a century an almost complete monopoly of English trade with the Levant, the Indies, Brazil, and especially with the Netherlands, Spain, and Portugal. "They formed an important link in the network of trade spread especially throughout the Spanish and Portuguese world by the Marranos or secret Jews. Their position enabled them to give Cromwell important information on the plans of Charles Stuart in Holland and of the Spaniards in the New World. Outwardly they passed as Spaniards and Catholics; but they held prayer meetings at Cree Church Lane, and became known to the government as Jews by faith." (Vol V, p 168)

"Cromwell was by no means unacquainted with the resources and wide activities of the rich Sephardi Jews of the Continent. The Spanish and Portuguese trade was in their hands; the Levant trade also to a considerable extent. Jews had helped to found the Hamburg Bank, and were closely connected with the Dutch East and West India Companies. As bullion merchants, also, Jews were prominent, and, in addition, many of them owned fleets of merchantmen. The second reason for Cromwell's favour was the great assistance these crypto-Jews of London and their agents on the Continent were to the government of the Commonwealth. And, when employing them on secret service, he was well aware of their true faith." (Albert M. Hyamson, History of the Jews in England, p 176) Carvajal, a secret Jew, who went to England as Portuguese Ambassador, was

enormously wealthy, and placed a whole army of continental agents and spies at Cromwell's disposal.

The share of Jews in promoting the Protestant Revolt is pointed out by Rabbi Lewis Browne in **Stranger than Fiction**, p. 248 sqq. Luther, he observes, studied Hebrew with Reuchlin, pupil of Jewish scholars in Italy, and the Jews, "by their very presence in Europe had helped to bring the heresy into being. But once it was born, they let it severely alone." Browne is right, too, in discerning that Liberalism is of Jewish origin. "It was little wonder that the enemies of social progress, the monarchists and the Churchmen, came to speak of the whole liberal movement as nothing but a Jewish plot." (p 305) Liberalism, he adds, "was the Protestant Reformation in the world of politics Incidentally, however, it brought complete release at last to the Jew." The Jewish Encyclopedia recalls that Luther was said to be "a Jew at heart," and that he remarked on one occasion, "If I were a Jew I would rather be a hog than a Christian." Adler (A History of the Jews in London) recalls that Henry VIII summoned a Jewish scholar from Rome and another from Venice, to advise him that his marriage to Catherine of Aragon was unlawful. Abrahams (**Jewish Life in the Middle Ages**) points out that the Reformation "drew its life-blood from a rational Hebraism"; and says elsewhere that "on the whole, heresy was a reversion to Old Testament and even Jewish ideals."

There is a suggestion here of an unexplored chapter of history, in which the wandering Jew, defeated in his attempt to destroy the Catholic Church and build a New Jerusalem on its ruins in medieval Spain, is seen playing a large part in bringing low the greatest Catholic nation in Europe at the moment of its final triumph, and transferring the dominion of the seas and of world politics to the anti-Catholic power of modern England. It would be interesting to know to what extent they instigated or encouraged the Dutch revolt which Philip II attempted to suppress by the Inquisition. That they had something to do with these matters is highly probable, for they supported Calvinism and other anti-Catholic movements just as they had the primitive heresies and the Mohammedanism of the Middle Ages. They paid off the score of the Spanish inquisition at the strategic moment when Spain, despite her phenomenal recuperative powers, had at last exhausted herself like a good mother in the stupendous effort to colonize and civilize vast sections of the western hemisphere.

So far Walsh, who seems not to have realized that the score was not paid off. General Franco still carried the can for Ferdinand and Isabella. Walsh could hardly have missed the fact that a large factor in Spain's ruin was the chain of revolts organized by Freemasonry, Judaism's creature, throughout Latin America.

From William Thomas Walsh, **ISABELLA OF SPAIN:**

What cannot be questioned, however, is that *Conversos* and their kin everywhere controlled business, government, taxation, all that was valuable, just as their ancestors had as Jews. as *Conversos*, the Jews were now capable of doing greater injury to Christianity through their influence upon the Old Christians with whom they mingled.

Even the Catholic Church in Spain was being directed and exploited to an astonishing extent by Jews when Isabel became queen. As "Christians" they could now become priests, if otherwise eligible. A Jewish "convert" anxious to show his loyalty to his new religion would dedicate one of his sons to the Church. And in the Church the Jews excelled just as they did in other fields; they mounted the hierarchy so rapidly that in Isabel's reign an impressive number of the bishops were of Jewish descent. Every church, every chapter, every monastery had influential Jewish connections; and in some dioceses Jews collected the ecclesiastical revenues.

To attribute all the corruption in the Church to them was of course unfair. Clerical discipline had broken down in other countries where the Jews were few; the Church had had to lower the standard of her priesthood after the Black Death; and the seventy-five years of the popes at Avignon as prisoners of the French kings, had paralyzed the whole structure. But in Spain there was an additional cause of laxity and immorality, of cynicism and hypocrisy, in the presence of so

many priests who did not believe the doctrines they taught. It is not difficult to understand the indignation of Catholics against priests who made a mockery of the sacraments they pretended to administer. "No man could tell how many priests there were like Andres Gomalz, parish priest of San Martin de Talavera, who, on his trial at Toledo in 1486, confessed that for fourteen years he had been secretly a Jew, that he had no 'intention' when he celebrated Mass, nor had he granted absolution to the penitents who confessed to him."—Dr. Henry C. Lea, **The Inquisition of Spain**. [Walsh, note to his Foreword: Dr. Lea is so violently prejudiced that his conclusions are untrustworthy and his methods sometimes reprehensible, but he is an indefatigable hunter of facts and documents. useful, provided the student takes the trouble to verify his references. Vermeersch justly says of Lea's **History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages**, "This book imposes upon many persons by its confused mass of apparent erudition, but it is as deficient in synthesis as in impartiality and accuracy." I have found the same to be true of **The Inquisition of Spain**. In Lea, therefore, we enjoy the corroboration of a hostile witness.]

And others like Fray Garcia de Tapate, prior of the Jeronymite monastery of Toledo, who, when he elevated the Host at Mass, used to say, "Get up, little Peter, and let the people look at you," instead of the words of consecration; and who always turned his back on his penitents while he pretended to give them absolution.

The ministerial intention of the minister bears on sacramental validity only

when prescribed matter and form are used. Without these the best will in the world cannot produce the sacrament. With these, will not a contrary intention destroy validity? Or will intention find more practical methods, as exemplified by Andres Gomalz and Garcia de Tapate? If an apostate confessor were to substitute for *deinde ego te absolvo* the words *deinde nego te absolvere*, who would notice while saying his Act of Contrition? But would the absolution not be negated? Invalidating a Mass would be even easier, as in the *novus ordo* narrative of institution. If the "celebrant" silently followed traditional rubrics, who would catch him?

A bishop could deliberately invalidate an ordination form by omitting a syllable under cover of a cough, belch, hiccough, or even "dry throat." Suspicion could be aroused only in a Latinist with acute hearing who had attended enough of the bishop's ordinations to notice a pattern, unless deliberately varied. Thus the words which Pius XII called essential to validity in the long Preface which he defined as the sacramental form [*Da, quaesumus, omnipotens Pater, in hunc famulum tuum (hos famulos tuos) Presbyterii dignitatem, innova in visceribus ejus (eorum) Spiritum sanctitas, ut acceptum a te, Deus, secundi meriti munus obtinea(n)t, censuramque morum exemplo suae conversationis insinue(n)t.*] could be completely perverted by substitution of *sputum* (spit) for *Spiritum*, *obsignat* (seal or mortgage) or *abstineat* (keep away) for *obtaineat* (obtain), omission of *in* from *insinuet*, and/or its additional variation to *sinat* (changing **make known** into **bend, excavate, or permit, omit**). In a prayer of such length an occasional dry throat affecting one or more unaccented syllables toward the end might almost be expected. Would a secret Freemason not know of such recorded practises of secret Jews? Would he not follow suit?

Might not a secret Jew argue that he would at least promote his own conscientious beliefs inculcated by his parents? Behind what comparable excuse could an apostate Freemason cleric hide? Perversion in childhood by French secularized education, or these days by Australian "Catholic" education, which prevented belief in his seminary courses? What higher loyalties could move him to such malicious practises? We cannot discount them altogether; would he not have already killed his conscience and denied his God by joining the Freemasons? Was freemasonry not established, **as all clerics must know**, in opposition to Christianity?

They now offer peace, who themselves have not peace. They promise to bring back and recall the lapsed into the Church, who have themselves receded from the Church. God is one, and Christ is one, and the Church one, and the chair one, founded by the voice of the Lord upon a rock. Another altar cannot be set up, nor a new priesthood made, besides the one altar and one priesthood. Whosoever gathereth elsewhere, scattereth. It is adulterous, it is impious, it is sacrilegious, whatsoever by human madness is instituted so as to violate a divine arrangement. Far from the

contagion of such men depart, and by flight **shun** their words **as a cancer** and a pestilence, the Lord forewarning, and saying, “They are blind, leaders of the blind. But if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the pit.” (Matt. xv, 14). — St. Cyprian, Ep. 40, *ad Plebem de quinque presbyt.* p. 120, 121

But G. B. Montini and A. Bugnini imposed T. Cranmer’s new altar and an Old Testament new sacrifice, and our blind clergy accepted them to the near-exclusion of the divine arrangement which obliged them and us and all our forefathers. Simultaneously GBM & AB, of *Converso* and masonic backgrounds, imposed a new powerless Priesthood to lead us blindly into witless idolatry.

Objection—Most priests I know are suspect on one ground or another. I have approached retired priests who celebrate the true Mass but won’t let anyone in.

Reply—A priest may and should celebrate Mass so that Catholics may use the ordinary means of salvation and fulfil their obligations. A retired priest’s refusal fails in charity and incompliance with the law and intent of the Catholic Church. This man, retired with malice aforethought by an antipope because he may remember and pass on Catholic doctrine, “obeys” an incompetent “order” of the same apostate antipope (and his antipapal successors) intended to replace the Mass with idolatry. This retired priest is almost certainly a heretic and (except in imminent danger of death) should be asked for absolutely **nothing**. Let this keep no one from pointing out to such a priest his oaths and duties.

A TALE OF TWO PROPHETS

Paul VI always looked ahead to the Deposit of Faith. In his **Creed of the People of God** he voiced insane gratitude for Judaism and Islam: “that very many **believers** can testify with us before men to the unity of God, even though they know not the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity.” In what purports to be a catalogue (though non-infallible) of Catholic doctrine, Paul lent support to two howling heresies, both founded on hostility to Christ, His Divinity, His doctrine, His followers, and His vicar. His support of heresies constitutes additional proof that he was himself unmistakably a heretic. The support is incontestable. We need show only that Judaism and Islam are heresies. Since neither agrees on all points with Catholic doctrine, both are heresies by definition.

Post-Christian Judaism is the original heresy—the obdurate refusal to fulfil its self-acknowledged purpose—the denial *in toto* of the Revelation of Christ, galvanized into active persecution of Jews who accepted it. The Church’s first Council dealt with those who tried to subject Christians to Jewish laws.

Hilaire Belloc (**Survivals and New Arrivals**, 1929) treated Islam in aspects that apply almost equally to Paul’s postconciliar “Church.”

“How did Islam arise?

“It was not, as our popular historical text-books would have it, a ‘new religion.’ It was a direct derivative from the Catholic Church essentially, in its origins, a heresy: like Arianism or Albigensianism.

“When the man who produced it was young, the whole of the world which he knew (the only civilized world with which he and his people had come in contact) was Catholic. It was still the Christian Roman Empire, stretching from the English Channel to the borders of his own desert.

“The Arabs of whom he came and among whom he lived were Pagan; but such higher religious influence as could touch them, and as they came in contact with through commerce and trading, was Catholic—with a certain admixture of Jewish communities.

“.....Mohamet.....took over the principal doctrines of the Catholic Church—one personal God, Creator of all things; the immortality of the soul; an eternity of misery or blessedness—and no small part of Christian morals as well. All that was the atmosphere of the only civilization which had influence on him or his. But at the same time he attempted an extreme **simplification**.

“Many another heresiarch has done this, throwing overboard such and such too profound doctrines, and appealing to the less intelligent by getting rid of mysteries through a crude denial of them. But Mohamet simplified much more than did, say, Pelagius or even Arius. He turned Our Lord into a mere prophet,; Our Lady (whom he greatly revered, and whom his followers still revere), he turned into no more than the mother of so great a prophet; he cut out the Eucharist altogether, and what was most difficult to follow in the matter of the Resurrection. He abolished all idea of the priesthood: most important of all, he declared for social equality among all those who should be ‘true believers’ after his fashion.

“With the energy of his personality behind that highly simplified, burning enthusiasm, he first inflamed his own few desert folk, and they in turn proceeded to impose their new enthusiasm very rapidly over vast areas of what had been until then a Catholic civilization; and their chief allies in this sweeping revolution were politically the doctrine of **equality**, and spiritually the doctrine of **simplicity**. Everybody troubled by the mysteries of Catholicism tended to join them; so did every slave or debtor who was oppressed by the complexity of a higher civilization.

“..... this very powerful, distorted simplification of Catholic doctrine may be of high effect in the near future upon Christendom;

“..... Our world finds itself moving towards nothingness. All the old goals have disappeared. Civil liberty has not done what was asked of it, it has not even been achieved. Its concomitant, so-called ‘democracy,’ has not done what was asked of it, it has not given men dignity or security. Both these great ideals of the nineteenth century are ending in mere plutocracy and in our subjection to a few quite unworthy controllers of all our lives; the monopolists of material, of currency, information, and transport; the tyranny of trust-masters in production, banking, journals, and communications.

“The lay philosophies have gone..... They fulfilled no ultimate function; they solved no problem, they brought no peace. Their power has departed.

“Intellectual Europe today is again aware of the one consistent philosophy upon this earth which explains our little passage through the daylight; which gives a purpose to things and presents not a mere hotchpotch of stories and unfounded assertions, but a whole chain and body of cause and effect in the moral world. There is, as yet, no rival in this respect to the Catholic Church. There is now no full alternative system left.

“It has become more and more clear in the last generation, and with particular acceleration since the latest and immense catastrophe of the Great War, that the Faith preserves whatever, outside the Faith, is crumbling: marriage, the family, property, authority, honour to parents, right reason, even the arts. This is a political fact—not a theory. It is a fact as large and as certain as is a neighbouring mountain in a landscape.

“If the influence of the Church declines, civilization will decline with it and all the effects of tradition. It is a commonplace with educated men that the Catholic Church made our civilization, but it is not equally a commonplace—as it ought to be—that on her continued power depends the continuance of our civilization. Our civilization is as much a product of the Catholic Church as the vine is the product of a particular climate. Take the vine to another climate and it will die.

“It is error to mistake this product of the Catholic Church, Civilization, for her true end and nature. Her nature is that of an infallible divine voice. Her end is beatitude elsewhere for us all: who here are exiles. But my point is that all men should closely watch the fortunes of the Faith, both those who accept it and those who reject it, because that fortune is bound up with all those lesser things which even those who reject the Church regard as essential to right living, from the lesser arts and amenities to the main institutions of European society.

“Upon the right conduct of the presentation of the Faith in the next long lifetime surely depends the future of the world. Either we shall see the gradual permeation of mankind by the only body of truth to which the mind leaps in unison, rendering all as secure as it can be among a fallen race; or

our civilization will sink to a completely alien body, knowing even less of the Faith than do the distraught town millions of today. I cannot believe that the Human Reason will completely lose its power. Now the Faith is based upon Reason, and everywhere outside the Faith the decline of Reason is apparent.

“But if I be asked what sign we may look for to show that the advance of the Faith is at hand, I would answer by a word the modern world has forgotten: Persecution. When that shall once more be at work it will be morning.”

Only Tradition and its adherents are now persecuted.

Hilaire Belloc: Essays of a Catholic Layman in England (1931) Excerpts:

Now, an ingrained habit of the defensive is a prime condition of defeat. There is no such thing as a defensive battle or a defensive campaign, save in the sense that one may begin on the defensive, but only with the fixed object of turning to the offensive at the right moment. It was not the learning, still less the logic, of our enemies which gave them such strength; it was the defensive mood into which Catholic apologists allowed themselves to be manouvered.

Details must be dealt with; exposure of our opponents' ignorance on details is valuable to obtain. But allowing ourselves to be pinned to details involves a loss of power and is not the way to conduct a struggle. Through entanglement in detail we suffer the further weakness of allowing much to go by default. We are so much occupied with special points that false statement on others escapes attention and is let pass. A mass of such runs through all attacks in detail. If the habit of the defensive involves us in all this weakness, the lesson is that the counteroffensive should now be our policy. We have every reason for undertaking it.

The instruments with which to act are ready to our hands. But we shall use them without effect unless we act upon certain directives, unless we are inspired by certain rules, firstly, a spirit of hostility—that spirit of the offensive without which a counterattack fails. We must look with suspicion upon every statement—still more upon the main tendencies which we instinctively feel opposed to Catholic truth, even where they do not overtly attack that truth. We must not begin by accepting the bulk of the official stuff and then see where we can pick holes in it. We must rather set out with a general suspicion of the whole cargo. We must treat the matter as we would treat the statement of a man often discovered in falsehood or unpardonable ignorance. We must look equally narrowly for that master weapon, suppression of truth.

I may be told that those whose repeated falsehoods we expose, and whose warped presentation it is our business to render ridiculous, act more often than not in good faith. Possibly true, but off the point—as to remind troops that the enemy, individually, are good husbands and fathers. We have a campaign to win—a decisive result to achieve, and with the foe's good faith we are not concerned. We have two weapons only, but invincible—we possess the truth, we use our reason. Our opponents support falsehood, however consciously. Having a false theology they do not reason clearly. We must use these weapons unsparingly, without troubling ourselves over the good or bad faith of those against whom we use them. The struggle is arduous, and unless we use our full strength we shall not succeed.

[Please bear in mind that Belloc wrote this—and a lot more edited out—on history and its justification of Catholics in British eyes. How much more must his assessment apply to the survival of Catholicism itself! For, though historical illiterates refer to “Good Queen Bess” or “Bloody Mary”, our souls are not in the balance. We struggle now to preserve our ordinary means of salvation, besides which our reputation shrinks into insignificance.]

It is in the nature of things that the advance of the Catholic Church, now as at all other times, must be effected, ultimately, by individual conversions; so was the Church originally founded, so did it recover its loss in the sixteenth century, and, indeed, conversion can never be anything but individual by definition; to call it anything else **in its essence** would be a contradiction in terms. The process of individual conversions will be the constant and inevitable process of Catholicism

wherever it has sufficient vitality to advance at all. There is not, in any new method, room for slackening here; the appeal to the individual, the revelation of reality to the individual, remains the cell and unit of effort. If that were not present no mass effect could develop. But I say that “supplementary to it” must be a new conception of the way in which we should set to work. To undermine the crude false philosophy opposed to us, to loosen its hold on the masses by ridicule of its ignorance, exposure of its errors, satire of its pompous self-assurance and isolation, is a task open to any man. The method is easily available. But it involves very unpleasant consequences to the agent. We need agents, none the less. Without them we shall do nothing. we need Tertullians. We must be militant. Our society has become a mob. The mob loves a scrap, and it is right. We must attack the enemy we must analyze and expose his hidden false postulates, so that individuals who hold those postulates shall be brought to shame.... We must expose the confusion of thought in the opposing camp; its ignorance of the world and of the past, its absurd idols. And in doing so we must face, not only ideas—which is easy—but men, the defenders of those ideas—which is difficult. We must wound and destroy.....

Remember that the reaction of men against what they dislike is exactly proportion—ed to its activity. Now, activity is the condition of success. When Lord Salisbury said “First find out what particularly annoys your enemy and then do it as often as ever you can,” he proposed a sound rule of combat. That is the spirit in which victories are achieved. Nor is it blameworthy. On the contrary, it is glorious. It is indeed blameworthy to attack with the mere object of irritation; it is also futile and vulgar; but to challenge active hate as the proper means to a good end—excellent!

..... it is not enough to expose particular misconceptions which have arisen from some ignorance of detail in the matter of Faith; if the man is an enemy of the Faith, then let his whole body of work be battered. Let him be fallen upon. Let it be argued from his bad judgment in particular affairs that his judgment in the main affair is also bad. If there is a lack of good faith in his method let that be proved, not only by examples pertinent to religion, but also by examples which have nothing to do with the main quarrel in themselves, but which pertain to the general thesis that enemies of the chief truth are enemies of all truth.... As for those who maintain that militancy is barren, I will reply with the precisely contrary truth, that conflict is the mother of all things. The most powerful ally one can have is fashion, and fashion is set when a battle is won. But a battle is not won without wounds.....

Fashion is a tawdry ally—but we must not despise it. Fashion governs with peculiar power in times such as ours when intelligence is failing. And fashion is set by the energetic few.....

Catholic culture is still undecided between a reaction towards its great origins in religion and a popular drift still further away from these—which drift, if it becomes the main stream, will carry our civilization into the abyss. For upon the maintenance and increase of the Church the life of our civilization depends. There are apparent in all art, literature, and morals many forerunners of collapse. Whether we shall avoid it or succumb, none can tell.—so far Belloc.

Now, half a century later, civilization has all but disappeared. And so has the Catholic Church. Coincidence? Belloc recommended an attitude of belligerence toward Catholicism’s enemies, who may or may not have been in good faith, who inherited their prejudice against us. How much more mightily should we lash out against our apostate clergy and hierarchy who were raised in the Faith, who have broken their oaths, turned their backs on Christ and His saving doctrine, and purpose to lead us all into hell with them! Can a man educated in the Faith be imputed good faith when he contradicts the Faith? What claim has he to respect, gentle treatment, or consideration of his feelings? Not one whit more than the devil, with whom he is openly in league!

The Reformers openly left the Church, as all could see. The Renewal, having “corrected” the Church, fraudulently invokes that Church’s infallibility in support of its own erroneous “corrections.” We gain points with neither God nor man by pretending that we deal with rational men in good faith. Canon law protects Catholics, not heretics. Respect for office covers its holder, not its usurper.

BILLY GRAHAM PROVES A POINT

Should the head of a Catholic archdiocese take cognizance of a Protestant fundamentalist crusade, one would expect his low-key reminder that the crusade had nothing for Catholics. But in implicit admission of his own inadequacy, Sir James Freeman took it for granted that his flock would attend Billy Graham's Randwick trot in herds. In a circular letter to his parish priests he drew attention to Graham's course for training counselors from various denominations for the benefit of their own members attending. He indicated the source of "Catholic" counselors—Paulians, charismatics, and cursillists—and even authorized payment to Graham's organization of the course fee (ten dollars) from parish funds. Let one of our subscribers comment:

"..... the war we should all be waging with those who are trying to destroy the true Mass and the true Church of Christ. We are soldiers of Christ by virtue of the Sacrament of Confirmation. It is the duty of soldiers to come to grips with the enemy. Attack is the best defense and there should be no talk of retreat. There should be no weakening in our offensive against the heretics who have white-anted our Church structures. Our apostate bishops should never be allowed to forget the oath they have taken against Modernism, especially when they openly aid and abet our traditional enemies. Members of the laity not yet strong enough to take a more active part in defense of their faith should at least refuse to have any part of Cranmer's *novus ordo*. They should boycott it completely until the bishops return to the faith they have betrayed." — H. Pulsford, Brisbane

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol XIII, p 66, RITES

(Adrian Fortescue, Ph.D., S.T.D.):

The Western medieval rites are in no case (except the Ambrosian and Mozarabic Rites) really independent of Rome. They are merely the Roman Rite with local additions and modifications, most of which are to its disadvantage. They are late, exuberant, and inferior variants, whose ornate additions and long interpolated tropes, sequences, and farcing destroy the dignified simplicity of the old liturgy. In 1570 the revisers appointed by the Council of Trent restored with scrupulous care and, even in the light of later studies, brilliant success the pure Roman Missal, which Pius V ordered should alone be used wherever the Roman Rite is followed. It was a return to an older and purer form. The medieval rites have no doubt a certain archaeological interest; but where the Roman Rite is used it is best to use it in its pure form. This too only means a return to the principle that rite should follow patriarchate. The reform was made very prudently, Pius V allowing any rite that could prove an existence of two centuries to remain, thus saving any local use that had a certain antiquity. Some dioceses (e.g. Lyons) and religious orders (Dominicans, Carthusians, Carmelites) therefore keep their special uses, and the independent Ambrosian and Mozarabic Rites, whose loss would have been a real misfortune, still remain.

Rome then by no means imposed uniformity of rite. Catholics are united in faith and discipline, but in their manner of performing the sacred functions there is room for variety based on essential unity, as there was in the first centuries. There are cases (e.g. the Georgian Church) where union with Rome has saved the ancient use, while the schismatics have been forced to abandon it by the centralizing policy of the authorities (in this case Russia). The ruthless destruction of ancient rites in favor of uniformity has been the work not of Rome but of the schismatical patriarchs of Constantinople. Since the thirteenth century Constantinople in its attempt to make itself the one centre of the Orthodox Church has driven out the far more venerable and ancient Liturgies of Antioch and Alexandria and has compelled all the Orthodox to use its own late derived rite. The Greek Liturgy of St. Mark has ceased to exist; that of St. James has been revived for one or two days in the year at Zakynthos and Jerusalem only. The Orthodox all the world over must follow the Rite of Constantinople. In this unjustifiable centralization we have a defiance of the old principle, since Antioch, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Cyprus in no way belong to the Byzantine Patriarchate. Those who accuse the papacy of sacrificing everything for the sake of uniformity mistake the real offender, the ecumenical patriarch. [Now succeeded by the ecumaniacal "Church"].

THE LITURGY

[From a 1902 catechism "revised in accordance with the Code of 1918."]

The **liturgy** is the collection of rites and ceremonies by means of which the Church expresses and manifests the religion by which she is united to God. A **ceremony** is a liturgic act; a **rite** is a way of performing this act. The terms are often used interchangeably. The laws that govern the exercise of the liturgy are called **rubrics**. The Church attaches great importance to their observance, because they maintain uniformity of divine worship, preserve Catholic dogma, and manifest the unity of the faith, hope, and charity which hold all the faithful together as members of one family.

“The liturgy is the principal instrument of Christian tradition. It is at once very pleasing to God, very useful to the Church, very instructive and very consoling for the faithful” (Bossuet).

It pleases God because it is pure, universal, and perpetual praise. It is useful to the Church because it is a rule of faith, a theological topic, a bond of unity, and the official depository of Catholic dogma. It instructs the faithful by reminding them every year of the principal dogmas of religion and the principal precepts of a Christian life. It consoles the faithful by unceasingly reminding them of the perfections of their Father in heaven, and of their divine adoption and immortal destiny.

Liturgy, like religion, goes back to the origin of mankind. The principal liturgical acts, under the patriarchal regime, consisted particularly of the offering of sacrifice, the dedication of places in which the Lord had manifested His presence, and the raising of altars. The priceless and determinate character of these different practices leads us to believe that God Himself specially revealed them.

Under the Mosaic law it took a determinate form which it retained to the coming of the Redeemer. God chose a priesthood, and gave directions to Moses concerning every detail of the sacrifices, the feasts, and the ceremonies.

The Mosaic liturgy was perfected by Jesus Christ. After fulfilling all the prescriptions of the old law, He established, on the eve of His death, the eucharistic sacrifice, the centre of the new liturgy; and He invested His Apostles with the necessary powers for carrying on His work to the end of time.

The principal liturgies go back to the time of the Apostles, who determined the fundamental points. The prescriptions of the liturgy were preserved during the first ages of the Church by Tradition.

The principal Western liturgies are: 1. The **Roman** liturgy, going back to the time of St. Peter; 2. The **Ambrosian** liturgy, still followed in the Church of Milan; 3. The **Mozarabic** liturgy, observed in Spain from the seventh century to the end of the eleventh, when it was replaced by the Roman liturgy; 4. The **Gallican** liturgy, followed in Gaul to the time of Pepin and Charlemagne.

In the West the Roman liturgy should be followed, except in case of a special concession granted by the Pope. In virtue of such a concession several religious orders have preserved particular liturgies, these being two hundred years old at the time when St. Pius V published his bull ordering a return to Roman unity.

The most expressive form of liturgical language is the chant, in use in a very remote antiquity. St. Ambrose and St. Gregory the Great contributed most to its perfection. The Gregorian chant is simple, easily executed, truly popular; serious, adding to the expression of the words, never obscuring or distorting them; full of sweetness, unction, and majesty.

Who have been opposed to liturgical chant? The enemies of the Church’s doctrine: Arians, Protestants, and Gallicans.

Paul VI approved a new rite for ordaining deacons, priests and bishops

June 18, 1968. It was necessary, he said, to add, delete, or change certain things, either to restore texts to their earlier integrity, to make the expressions clearer, or to describe the sacramental effects better. “... it appeared appropriate to take from ancient sources the consecratory prayer which is found in the document called the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus of Rome, written at the beginning of the third century, and which is still used in large part in the ordination rites of the Coptic and West Syrian liturgies.”

And take he did! From the Malabar rite the *novus ordination* copies the boldface type words from the following scattered phrases:

Send **on this** Thy servant

—to appoint priests, to ordain deacons, to dedicate altars and churches, to bless houses, **to make effective appointments**, to heal, to judge, to save, to deliver, **to loose** and bind, to invest and divest, as well as to excommunicate.

Grant him power to **solve** difficult problems and **all bonds** of iniquity.

God the Father, **Son, and Holy Spirit**, we praise and thank Thee **now, at all times, forever. Amen.**

And now from the faithful copy:

Now pour out upon **this** chosen one

May he assign the duties of the flock according to your will and **loose every bond** by the power you gave the apostles.

Through **him** glory and power and honor are yours, with the **Holy Spirit** in the Church, **now and forever. Amen.**

The “source” rite appears intended to consecrate a bishop. The *novus ordo* charade, which approximates it in barely a dozen words, would, with its strange references to Aaron and the just people of Abraham, more aptly install a rabbi.

LITURGY (paraphrase), C. S. Lewis

Every service is a structure of acts and words through which we receive a sacrament, or repent, or supplicate, or adore. It enables us to do so best when, through long familiarity, we need not think about it. When you must count the steps you are not dancing but learning to dance. A good shoe is one you don't notice. Good reading becomes possible in the absence of conscious thought about eyes, light, print, or spelling. The perfect church service would be the one of which we were almost unaware; our attention would have been on God.

Every novelty prevents this. It fixes attention on the service itself. Thinking about worship differs radically from worshipping. “'Tis mad idolatry that makes the service greater than the god.”

Still worse, novelty may fix attention on not even the service but the celebrant. Try as one may to exclude it, the question “What on earth is he up to now?” will intrude. It lays one's devotion waste. Fondly we recall the man who said: “I wish they'd remember that the charge to Peter was Feed my sheep, not Try experiments on my rats, or even Teach my performing dogs new tricks.”

My whole position boils down to a plea for permanence and uniformity. I can make do with almost any kind of (Anglican) service whatever, if only it will stay put. But if each form is snatched away just when I begin to feel at home in it, then I can never make any progress in the art of worship. I have no chance to acquire the trained habit.

Concerning the words the question is rather different. A vernacular liturgy must change; otherwise it will finally be vernacular only in name. No living language can be timeless. As well ask for a motionless river.

It would have been best, if possible, that necessary change should have occurred gradually and imperceptibly: one obsolete word replaced in a century—like the gradual change of spelling in successive editions of Shakespeare.

C. S. Lewis (**The Airplane, the Wireless, & the Contraceptive**) wrote that “Man's conquest of Nature,” where not spurious, is conquest of Man. In peacetime, in a civilized community, anyone who can pay may use his three examples. But he does not thereby exercise individual power over Nature. He is not strong because he can afford to be carried. These powers can be withheld—by merchants, legal controls, or producers. Airplanes can be used to bomb and strafe. Wireless (and television) spread lies as well as truth. Contraception affects all future men, many of whom will never exist. “By contraception used as a means of selective breeding, they are, without their

concurring voice, made to be what one generation, for its own reasons, may choose to prefer.... Man's power over Nature turns out to be a power exercised by some men over other men with Nature as its instrument."

He refers not to particular corruptions or abuses but to the essence of "Man's power over Nature." Public control of raw materials, factories, or scientific research? Except in a world state this would mean power of nation over nation. "Even within the world state or the nation it will mean (in principle) the power of majorities over minorities, and (in the concrete) of a government over the people. And all long-term exercises of power, especially in breeding, must mean the power of earlier" over later generations.....

"Each generation exercises power over its successors: and each, insofar as it modifies the environment bequeathed to it and rebels against tradition, resists and limits the power of its predecessors. This modifies the picture....sometimes painted of a progressive emancipation from tradition and a progressive control of natural processes resulting in a continual increase of human power.If any one age really attains the power to make its descendants what it pleases, all men ...after it are patients of that power weaker not stronger: for though we may have put wonderful machines in their hands we have preordained how they are to use them. And if, as is almost certain, the age which had thus attained maximum power over posterity were also the age most emancipated from tradition, it would be engaged in reducing the power of its predecessors almost as drastically as that of its successors. Quite apart from this, the later a generation comes—the nearer it lives to that date at which the species becomes extinct—the less power it will have in the forward direction, because its subjects will be so few. There is therefore no question of a power vested in the race as a whole steadily growing as long as the race survives. The last men, far from being the heirs of power, will be of all men most subject to the dead hand of the great planners and conditioners and will themselves exercise least power upon the future. The real picture is that of one dominant age which resists all previous ages most successfully and dominates all subsequent ages most irresistibly, and thus is the real master of the human species. But even within this master generation (itself an infinitesimal minority of the species) the power will be exercised by a minority smaller still. Man's conquest of Nature, if the dreams of some scientific planners are realized, means the rule of a few hundreds of men over billions upon billions of men. There neither is nor can be any simple increase of power on Man's side. Each new power won **by** man is a power **over** man as well. Each advance leaves him weaker as well as stronger. In every victory, besides being the general who triumphs, he is also the prisoner who follows the triumphal car."

THESIS XIX: A. The Passion is Offered in the Mass. (p. 102)

The words of Cyril are in keeping with those of Ps. Sophronius, where he says that the very Blood which the lance caused to flow from the pierced side of Christ is daily offered in sacrifice by the priest for the people: "Let us now speak of the Body that is offered in sacrifice by the priests. Our Lord Jesus is daily offered in sacrifice for the life and salvation of the world, as crucified on Calvary, so at the sacred offering (*prothesi*) by the priest; with a lance, too, lest we forget that **His pure side was pierced with a lance in the Sacred Passion** when straightway there issued **Blood and water** for the incorruptibility and restoration of the world: **The priest offers for the people this same Blood and water in sacrifice**" (*Commentarius liturgicus*, 8 P.G. 87 ter; 3988-3989). Therefore Ps. Sophronius says that the Blood of the wounds is offered.

Nicholas Cabasilas discusses at length the question: How is our everyday offering of a true sacrifice reconciled with the apostolic teaching that Christ was sacrificed once and once only? He meets the apparent contradiction by assigning to Christ the formal condition of victim continuing from the Passion up to the present time. He says: "This sacrifice is not the image and figure of a sacrifice, it is a real sacrifice; it is not the bread that is offered in sacrifice, it is the very Body of Christ. And, moreover, the sacrifice of the Lamb is one; it is enacted once only." He explain(s): "As this sacrifice is carried out, not by the Lamb being slain, here and now, but by the bread being changed into the Lamb already slain, clearly there is a change, but quite as clearly there is no immolation here and now; and thus that which is changed (the bread) is many, and it is changed

repeatedly; yet there is nothing in this to prevent that into which it is changed being in each case one and the same: **Indeed, just as there is one Body so there is one slaying of the Body**” (*Liturgiae Expositio*, c. 32 P.G. 150, 440-441). He had already written in the same sense, referring to the time in the Liturgy after the consecration had been accomplished: “The whole sacrificial action is finished and consummated, the gifts have been consecrated, the sacrifice completed, the great Victim slain for the world is lying on the altar that most sacred Body of the Lord which suffered all those things, abuse, contumely, scourging: the Body which was crucified, which was slain. the very Blood which gushed from the slain Body” (ibid., c. 27, col 426)

(p. 117) From Spain, Cano, *De locis theologis*, 1, 12, c. 12) gives us the unsullied teaching of antiquity: “Let us grant to our adversaries what they bring forth in argument (what we also believe pertains to the perfect immolation of an animal), that if Christ is truly sacrificed, He must be destroyed, **He must be killed**. But although the Body of Christ in the Eucharist is living, and the Blood is in the Body, we do not offer the Body because it is living, and the Blood because it is in the Body, but we offer the Body **because it was slain**, the Blood **because it was shed on the Cross**. For although that offering made by Christ in the past and the visible slaying is over, it is still so acceptable to God, so everlasting in its power, that it is just as effective in the sight of the Father today as it was on the day when the Blood gushed from the pierced side: **Hence we offer now, and truly offer with Christ, the same Victim of the Cross**.... In very truth this sacramental image and exemplar in no way prevents **our offering here and now (*modo*) that same Blood of the Cross, just as if it were now shed in our presence.**”

THESIS XXVI: THE CHURCH AS OFFERER

....the consecration and the offering are not two actions, but one, because the consecration is truly oblativae, and the offering truly consecrative, so much so that, should anyone wish to consecrate, and absolutely refuse to offer sacrifice, he would effect nothing (1), having no intention of doing what the Church does and what was instituted by Christ (2). Hence it would seem to follow that as the priest does not consecrate as deputy of the Church so neither does he offer as deputy of the Church and so the Church does not offer through the priest. To this objection we answer that, although the consecration and the offering are one action of the priest, nevertheless they are in concept two actions (Suarez, disp. 76, sect. 3, n 7), for, if God had so willed, He could have instituted the consecration as non-oblativae, and the offering as non-consecrative. Hence it is that this one action may be spoken of in two ways, corresponding to its twofold aspect or relation, both as to its origination and its results: by the consecration God changes the bread into the Body of Christ, by the offering men (the Church) present the Body of Christ to God as Victim (3). And thus the priest consecrates in the name and in the power of the omnipotent God; yet he makes the offering in his own name and in the name of all the faithful. He consecrates as the minister of God, but he offers as the deputy of the Church, as William of Paris says: “The cause of the whole Church is pleaded in the Mass, namely, before God the Father, by the priest as her deputy” (*De Sacram. Euchar.*, c. 2, t. 1, p. 435). Thus we see how it is that the Church truly offers through the priest, as William of Paris says in another place: “The priest at the altar acts as minister and agent of the affairs of another, that is to say, of the affairs of the Church herself; he also assumes the person and the voice or words of the Church: **But it is the one in whose name the business** (of the Mass) **is carried out that really transacts the business** (*ille autem agit negotium, cujus nomine agitur*)” (*De Sacram. Ordinis*, c. 5, t. 1, p. 538) footnotes:

(1) Such a mental attitude, as Suarez remarks (ibidem), might be found in the case of priests tainted with the Lutheran heresy which says that our Lord is present in the sacrament, while it denies the sacrificial action of the Church.

(2) Suarez implicitly admits this principle when he says: “The consecration and the offering of the sacrifice are so necessarily linked together by the institution of Christ that, if one be given, it is impossible for the minister by his will or intention to take away the other” (ibidem). The Salmanticenses state it explicitly and rightly, too, following De Lugo (disp. 19, n. 103): “Should he refuse to act according to the intention of the Church, but wish to stop at the sole consecration of the matter, in no way acting sacrificially or offering sacrifice, in that event, thus as

he refuses to act sacrificially or to offer sacrifice, so, too, he would not consecrate; for the consecration of this sacrament is essentially the sacrificial action or the offering of the sacrifice; hence one who simply does not wish to offer sacrifice is convicted of not wishing to consecrate: hence he effects neither of the two” (disp. 13, dub. 2, parag. 2, n. 28). The Theatine; Raphael a Versa a sanserino (*De Eucharistiae sacramento et sacrificio*, q. 11, sect. 1, Bologna, 1642, pp. 229-230) writes in the same sense. Cf., too, our remarks below (XXXIII & XXXV)

..... For the baptismal character is a participation in the sacerdotal power wherewith Christ dedicated Himself as a Victim to God; and each one of the faithful, united to Christ in the Church, has at least the habitual desire of being conformed to Christ in offering to God the unique Victim of our salvation; outside of whose adoration of God no fount of propitiation flows for us.

THESIS XXVI (continued) pp. 237-238: The intervention of the whole Church can be proved in another way. Invisible sacrifice in general is shown or indicated by visible sacrifice, hence by the Victim of the Body of Christ is designated the invisible offering of the members of Christ on earth, that is, of the Church militant (to whom it belongs still actually to offer the sacrifice). For just as the whole Church body is the true **reality** of which the sacrament of the Eucharist is the external **symbol** or **sign**, so the offering or the dedication to God of the same body of the Church is the true reality of which the sacrifice of the Eucharist is the external **symbol**. But only the whole Church is competent to offer the whole Church to God. Hence there will not be a true and sincere sacrifice, unless the Church offers and dedicates herself, her whole self, in it. Every sacrificial activity, therefore, must be in the name of and on behalf of the whole Church. (*1) St. Augustine teaches this truth in many passages (see XIX), to which we add here a passage from a letter *Ad Paulinum* (Ep. 149, c 16), where he explains the word προσευχας?(prayers) of the Apostle (I Tim., ii, 1) as referring to the Canon of the Mass: This word has a proper and special reference to the prayer which we make in pursuance of our vow (προσευχην). Everything that is offered to God, **particularly the offering of the holy Mass**, is vowed or dedicated to God. **In this sacrament that greatest dedication of ours is proclaimed, in which we dedicate ourselves to remain in Christ, that is (utique) within the structure (compagne) of the Body of Christ.** The sacrament or symbol of this underlying reality is that **we, though many, are one bread, one body.**

Footnote *1 A priest, therefore, who deliberately excludes the intention of offering on behalf of the Church, does not validly consecrate, for he thereby implicitly excludes the intention of offering sacrifice, and without the intention of offering sacrifice there is no consecration, as we have already said.

(p. 239) Scotus, having excluded from the Mass any repeated offering on the part of our Lord, very rightly added: “So then it is clear that as the offering of the Eucharist is not acceptable by reason of the good will of Christ immediately offering it, it is acceptable by reason of the good will of the whole Church, the merit of which is finite.” Thus, therefore, every Mass, as it is offered on the part of the Church is actively propitiatory *ex opere operato*, its fruit, however, having a due proportion to the habitual devotion of the Catholic Church at the moment of offering.

THESIS XXX, p. 294—For while God judges what is internal to man, man judges by what is external. The Church being composed of men can only take cognizance of what is shown externally, leaving the rest which is hidden from her to divine judgment. (1) Hence if one makes a public profession of heresy, or adheres to a schismatical sect, he must necessarily be reputed to be outside internal communion with the faithful, and so to lack external communion with the Church.

THESIS XXXIII, p. 338-339 footnote—..... there is no exact parity between the sacraments (baptism, for instance) and the sacrifice. Baptism can be conferred by a person who never was or never will be in the Church; in baptism it is Christ, not the Church, Who acts through the person baptizing. Not so in the sacrifice. The reason for the distinction is that in the sacrament as such it is not man who acts toward God, but God Who, through His ministers, acts toward man, imparting a certain sanctification to him; this action, as an action of God, will be always holy, and if the necessary conditions are present, always effective. But in the sacrifice as such it is not God Who acts towards man, but man who acts towards God: he offers something to God. And in order that

this action of his may be acceptable to God, it must come from a man who is himself acceptable to God: all the more because, as we have said, in the Mass there is no oblation action elicited here and now by Christ, but only from us mortal men. We must then find an acceptable offerer among ourselves. The fact that our sacrifice is also a sacrament does not militate against this disparity. Because (logically) the sacrament of the Eucharist presupposes the sacrifice and not conversely. For the Body and Blood of Christ is in the sacrament only insofar as it is the Victim of the sacrifice which we are to partake of by way of banquet in communion. Moreover, the transubstantiation is caused by the rite of consecration, and it is formally in the rite of consecration that our sacrificial action consists. Of itself, therefore, and necessarily in the case of the Eucharist, the concept of sacrifice comes before the concept of sacrament.

THE LAST SUPPER & CALVARY

.... Christ our Lord, on the night of the Last Supper, by consecrating the bread into His Body delivered up to death for us, and the wine into His Blood shed for many unto the remission of sins, visibly, ritually, liturgically offered up to God His Death and Passion, whereby He was to be immolated at the hands of the Jews, a Victim for the ransom of the world. Thus, in that sacred mystery of our faith which is the redemption of mankind by the sacrifice of the body and blood of our Savior, I distinguish a twofold immolation. [**Immolation** is throughout this paper taken in its strictly technical sense, as distinct from **oblation**: both **oblation** and **immolation** being constituent parts of the sacrifice, which is therefore inadequately distinct from either.] One perfectly real, even bloody; another, previous to that, in the Supper, not real, but representative—symbolical—sacramental—mystical (all these words in the present case express but one thought), not bloody, but unbloody..... the unbloody immolation, which represented the bloody one to come, was the act by which Christ pledged himself to death in the sight of His Father and of men: thus making over to God the Lamb to be slain, and by the very fact offering, in the ritual sense of the word, not internally only, but outwardly, not a mere purpose or promise to give, but the actual giving and delivering up of the gift, not in mere figure, but most really and formally, the Victim that was henceforth sacred to God, and as such due to its ultimate fate.Christ offered as High Priest according to the order and likeness of Melchisedech, and yet in that very same capacity offered nothing but the sacrifice of redemption, the sacrifice of His Passion and Death; but He offered it in the Eucharist of the Supper night. There was a sacrifice at the Last Supper, but it was the sacrifice of redemption; and there was a sacrifice on the Cross, but it was the self-same sacrifice, continued and completed. The Supper and the Cross made up one complete sacrifice, properly so called, not invisible but visible, not metaphorical like the death of martyrs either under the Old or New Covenant, but in the strictest sense of the word, even as the sacrifices of the Law, which it came to abolish. We have then first a Priest and His sacerdotal action, a liturgy, a sacred rite; we have at the same time a Victim, offered by the Priest in that liturgical rite which He performs; and next we have the slaying of the Victim, the true and real immolation, which, as to its physical element, is the work not of the Priest, but of the executioners: although it is freely accepted and gone through by that Victim, Who happens to be the Priest, never ceasing for a moment to ratify and carry out in a visible and tangible manner the obligation which He has incurred by His solemn oblation, thus subscribing to that sacramental donation of His own self and of His own life by every drop of His own Blood unto death. After which God takes unto Himself the Gift, removing it from its former earthly sphere to the realm of heavenly light and bliss, of that glory which transfers it into the proper condition and state of a thing divine, of a thing assumed by God, owned by Him and resting in His Hand as the firstfruits of creation, and in His bosom as a Lamb, dear for His own sake and endeared by His cruel Passion. For our Melchisedech has entered the heavens with His firstfruits changed into the Flesh and Blood of the Lamb, but of the Lamb glorified, of the Lamb that was slain and liveth, of the Lamb once dedicated to God and accepted by God forever, and for evermore remaining what His sacrifice has made Him, the **Lamb of God**. Thus were the mysteries of the unleavened bread, of the paschal lamb, and of the sheaf of firstfruits to be brought before Jehovah “the next day after the Sabbath,” those three blended into one in that one sacrifice of the Lord, which, as we are told by the earliest Fathers, ran from the Supper night and its Eucharistic feast to the morrow that dawned on the empty Sepulchre.

So much, as regards the sacrifice of our Lord. Now, to turn to the sacrifice of the Church, Holy Mass Christ, after He had performed His work as a Priest, said to His disciples: **Do ye this in memory of Me.** What He did, we do; we do as a memorial what He did as a prefiguration of His own Passion. Our sacrifice presupposes then the Death of the Lord as a thing of the past. We offer the Death and Passion too; that is, the Victim of the Passion and Death, even as He did; but with a difference: He offered it to be immolated; we offer it as immolated of old. We offer the Eternal Victim of the Cross, once made and forever enduring: *Hostia illa perpetua est*, as St. Thomas says (4 Sent. 12, *in lit.*). We offer it by the same rite that Christ used before us, by the rite of consecration, which in our hands as in His constitutes a mystical—sacramental—symbolic—representative immolation, wherein lies the real and actual, the visible, audible, tangible oblation of what is represented, namely the immolation of Calvary. And thus is verified the definition given by St. Peter Canisius in that Catechism of his which was the bulwark of the Faith in all countries that defended themselves successfully against heresy: “The sacrifice of the Mass rightly understood is both a representation, at once holy and living, and an offering, unbloody yet actual—of what?—of the Passion of the Lord and of the bloody sacrifice—which was offered for us on the Cross.” The Mass is a sacrifice and a true sacrifice, insofar as, by means of a symbolic immolation, it is a true and actual oblation of a true Victim, although it contains no real immolation of Christ actually performed by us, but only a symbolic one, coupled with that state of Victim, perennial and celestial, due to the one real and bloody immolation undergone by Christ in days gone by. The Mass is a sacrifice, because it is our oblation of the Victim once immolated, even as the Supper was the oblation of the Victim to be immolated.

There is then a difference in point of time, as between an anticipation and a commemoration of the death. From this first difference a few more may be seen to follow.

Above all there is this one: In the course of Christ’s own sacrifice, as above described, there was to be found a real immolation; in the course of ours there is none to take place. Wherefore our sacrifice is called unbloody. Something then in Christ’s sacrifice is not renewed in ours; and something is actually renewed. As St. Thomas remarks in his very first utterance on the matter (*loc. cit.*), there are in the sacrifice of the Lord two things to be distinguished carefully: that which was done to Him by the Jews, and that which He did. The part of the Jews was the “slaying”: which was a crime, and need not be repeated (God forbid!). His part was the “offering” or “sacrificing,” which was performed in such guise that we might repeat it. And this is the sense, he concludes, in which we may be said to immolate Christ in our daily Mass. Real repetition of the slaying is excluded. But apart from that, the rest remains, implying a symbolic renewal of the slaying and a real repetition of the offering (or sacrificing). Thus there is this part of the sacrifice of the Lord, which we reproduce as it was done by Him: the offering, in the shape of a mystic immolation; and that is our sacrificing: an entirely unbloody one.

Closely linked with this difference comes another. The Mass—that is, our Eucharistic consecration—is, as soon as it is effected, a complete sacrifice, because it has not to wait for its complement in the shape of an immolation to come. The Supper was not a sacrifice completed on the spot, because it was an offering in view of something not yet fulfilled. The fulfilment would make it complete.

Again, the oneness of the Supper with the Cross, in the nature of sacrifice, is a numerical oneness pure and simple; that is, these two did not make two sacrifices, distinct and complete, but only one. The Mass is distinct numerically from Christ’s own sacrifice, in a way; not indeed on the part of the thing offered, which is the same, not only materially but even formally, that is not only the same Christ or the same Body, but in the same state of Victim, of a perfected Victim, into which His own sacrifice has brought His Humanity as the gift passed into God’s Hands. Nor again is the Mass numerically distinct on the part of the High Priest, Who now offers through us what He offered then once for all in His own Person. But it is distinct numerically on the part of the officiating priest, who on behalf of the Church is actually offering here, whereas neither himself nor the Church had any share in the active offering of the Supper. In other words, on the part of the passive sacrifice, there is absolute unity between the Mass and the Cross; on the part of the active sacrifice,

there is the subordination of a participated ministry to the original, principal and sovereign ministrations of the High Priest, ever operative through ours.

.... who holds that the Mass is an offering of the Passion is bound logically to hold the same of the Supper; because the Mass is our doing of what Christ did. If we offer His Passion, He must have done the same (allowances being made as above for the difference between past and future). Again, and for the same reason, anyone holding that the Supper was an offering of the Passion must hold the same of the Mass. And thus it comes that all testimonies bearing directly on the Supper also bear indirectly on the Mass; and, *vice versa*, all testimonies emphasizing in the Mass an offering of the Passion enlighten us as to the Supper. So that if St. Thomas, for instance, teaches us that the Mass is an oblation of Christ bruised in His Passion, he must also be taken to imply that the Supper was an oblation of Christ to be bruised in His Passion. —Maurice de la Taille, S.J.

Redemption, which might have been wrought otherwise, was accomplished by way of sacrifice. This of faith: Jesus is a true priest, Who offered a true sacrifice. But where shall we find in the work of the Redemption the elements of a true sacrifice? [The Passion sufficiently accounts for the immolation.] But the Passion was the work of the executioners, and not of Jesus: it cannot therefore, by itself alone constitute the ritual oblation, which is properly the external and sensible action of the priest. Where shall we find this oblation which is absolutely indispensable if the death of Jesus is to be a sacrifice properly so called, and not a sacrifice in the broad sense, a purely metaphorical sacrifice, such as martyrdom? From the Garden to the Cross this oblation appears nowhere, in spite of the efforts of some to locate it in this or that stage of the bloody drama—efforts which, moreover, do not bear analysis. The problem would indeed be insoluble, if, before Calvary and the Mount of Olives, there had not occurred the [Supper].

At the Supper Jesus Christ, taking the bread, blessed it, etc., and in like manner the chalice, saying: **“Eat, this is My Body, which shall be delivered [to death] for you: drink, this is My Blood which is poured out for you and for many unto the remission of sins.”** What does it mean? Only this, that Christ, having put Himself SYMBOLICALLY in the state of Victim, pledges to God for us that Death with whose sacramental signs He clothes Himself. His MYSTIC immolation binds Him to the effective and painful immolation on Calvary. Through the figure of His Passion He hands Himself over and dedicates Himself to the Passion itself. He devotes Himself to the expiatory death; before God He constitutes Himself debtor for our salvation. He is no longer His own: henceforth the grave claims Him as its prey. This is why, beginning their computation here, oriental interpreters of this text tell us that three days and three nights shall pass unbroken over the sepulchre of Christ before His Resurrection.

The Supper follows that paschal repast of the azymes and the cup of which Jesus Christ had said when taking it: “I will not drink of it again till its full realization in the Kingdom of God.” And yet after having thus spoken, He once more partakes of the azymes that have been consecrated and of the cup that has been blessed. What does it signify if not that there and then the Pasch is realized, and with it is accomplished the inauguration of the Kingdom of God? But who does not know that the realization of the Pasch is the sacrifice of the Passion, and that the Kingdom of God opens its era with the Redemption? At this very moment, therefore, the sacrifice of the Passion is going on; Redemption has already begun. Behold here, the Lamb of God, the Lamb Whose Blood at this very instant delivers from the death and slavery of sin; behold Christ’s sacrifice; behold, already here at the Supper, the sacrifice of Calvary: The Supper Room faces the Cross and consigns to it the Divine Lamb.

The Supper ushers in the New Covenant which abolishes the ancient one. It does not announce it; it brings it about: “This is the New Testament.” How so? Is not the New Covenant the consequence of the sacrifice of Redemption? If so, then once more the sacrifice of Redemption is already being carried out. This is the New Testament in the Blood of Christ, the price of our sins, offered to God and to be paid on the Cross.

The Supper is the sacrifice of the High Priest according to the order and rite of Melchisedech: Priest, Who, as we read in the **Epistle to the Hebrews**, offered but once the sacrifice of

Redemption, the sacrifice of His Passion, by which He entered into the holies, into the state of glory, when He came forth from His earthly humiliations and tribulations; Priest, Who accomplished His august oblation by the power of the Most High (“by an eternal spirit,” Heb. ix, 14): by the same power which all liturgies since then invoke or have invoked [this book was published in 1923] for the carrying out of the eucharistic rite through which the bread is changed into the Body, and the wine into the Blood. For the sacrifice of our Redemption was offered under the appearance of the gifts of Melchisedech.

Lastly, the Supper fulfils the promise of that bread which was to be the very flesh of Christ, given to God in ransom for the life of the world. (*Jn. vi, 52*). This is truly the flesh which is “given” (*Lk. xxii, 19*), given in the form of bread, given for the salvation of men (*PRO vobis; Lk. ibid.*), given to God as a sacrifice of expiation.

In the light of all this we are not surprised that the Supper had to be included within the compass of the Passion nor that the sacerdotal prayer of our Savior should lean upon the Supper and reach out upon the Passion, joining together these two main supports of the sacrifice that unite to form the arch of our salvation. This, too, gives the whole import of that mysterious expression with which Christ stresses His liturgical intent: “For them do I sanctify Myself [by the sacrifice] that they also [by sharing in My sacrifice] may be sanctified [no longer in figure only, but] in truth.” (*Jn. xvii, 19*). It also explains why it is that Christ, so free of His movements and determinations till the Supper, and till then master of His life, of which He disposes as He wills, once the Supper is at an end, should fall to the ground and, prostrate as a suppliant, pray that the chalice might pass from Him, “if it be possible”: and the chalice does not pass away. For this is no longer possible. Escape is no longer allowed Him, for He offered Himself: and no one can take back, without sacrilege against God, what he has once consecrated to Him. The chalice of the Supper should not have been consecrated, if afterwards the chalice of the Passion was to be eliminated: and Christ dies, obedient, not to a special command of His Father, but to that law that demands that justice be respected, and consequently that obligations contracted with God be fulfilled. Now the obligation to let Himself be put to death had been contracted freely by Christ in the eucharistic oblation of His Blood.—**The Mystery of Faith and Human Opinion Contrasted and Defined**, Maurice de la Taille

That final paragraph should place in perspective those priests who in their tens of thousands have deserted the priesthood. Jesus Christ apparently takes priesthood seriously. But that is not my purpose in quoting one of the most eminent theologians of our century. Aside from the edification to be drawn from his minimally edited words, I thought to favor all with another potent argument to support the fact that the Church offers not bread and wine but Christ’s Body and Blood at the Tridentine Mass Offertory. For if you examine the words of our traditional Offertory you find the same expiatory intention underscored by De la Taille, an intention wholly disproportionate to offerings of mere bread and wine, or of any other natural or human offerings or efforts. The argument that the priest offers only bread and wine because it is not yet consecrated certainly falls flat in the presence of Christ’s offering of His death, which took place the following day, even were the purpose of the Mass such feeble offerings as have been reintroduced from pre-Christian times into the “corrective” *novus ordo missae*.

Naturally bread and wine are only bread and wine until consecrated. But **they** are not offered in the Mass Offertory, which offers “this spotless Victim for my countless sins, offenses, and negligences, and for all here; but also for all faithful Christians living and dead, that for me and them it may avail for salvation unto life eternal.” This is clearly beyond the effect of an offering of mere bread. Whatever lies on the paten, what is here offered is the true Victim, alone capable of satisfying for all sins, offenses, negligences of all faithful Christians. Call it anticipation, or God’s independence of time or sequence.

“We offer Thee, O Lord, the Chalice of Salvation for our and the whole world’s salvation.” If a cup of wine could accomplish this we could all be saved at the nearest pub, tavern, saloon, or bottle shop.

After the *Lavabo* comes the prayer which “sums up the idea of the offertory” (**The Catholic Encyclopedia** Vol XI, p 219a): “Receive, O Holy Trinity, this offering, which we make to Thee in remembrance of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ that It may avail us unto salvation....”

Again, just **before** the Consecration: “....this offering of our bounden duty” (including at Easter and Pentecost: “which we offer Thee for these also granting them remission of all their sins”) “.... grant that we be rescued from eternal damnation and counted in the flock of Thy elect.” The offering **still** has not been consecrated but the intent is stated. How is this different whether ten seconds or ten minutes before the actual transubstantiation?

Moreover, in the Ukrainian Mass (according to the rite of St. John Chrysostom who wrote: “He” [Christ] “says: This is My Body. This word changes the offering,”) **after** the Consecration: “.... we offer Thee this reasonable and bloodless sacrifice, we call upon Thee and we beseech and pray Thee, send down Thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts here present. Make this bread + the precious Body of Thy Christ. And that which is in this chalice + the precious Blood of Thy Christ. Changing them + by Thy Holy Spirit: that they may lead” As Adrian Fortescue said, the rite continues to pray for the already accomplished effect. We pray for the transubstantiation that has just taken place. What possible reason, then, not to offer the Victim of Calvary, though represented still by unconsecrated bread and wine?

The Catholic Encyclopedia Vol V p 502-3: “.... the Epiklesis (postconsecratory invocation) for the Holy Eucharist is only one of many such forms. In other sacraments and blessings similar prayers were used, to ask God to send His Holy Spirit to sanctify the matter. In all these cases (including that of the Holy Eucharist) the idea of invoking the Holy Ghost to sanctify is a natural one derived from Scripture (Joel ii, 32; Acts ii, 21; cf Rom. x, 13; I Cor. i, 2). That in the Liturgy the Invocation should occur after the words of institution is only one more case of many which show that the people were not much concerned about the exact instant at which all the essence of the sacrament was complete. They looked upon the whole Consecration-prayer as one simple thing The succession of time in sacramental prayers involves nothing but a dramatic representation of what presumably takes place in one instant.”

The *novus ordo*, on the other hand, offers the bread and wine literally, as in the Old Testament Passover rite, one of the insufficient sacrifices which Christ came to replace with His own efficacious Sacrifice. Those who put this “correction” in the *novus ordo* certainly knew its source, and took advantage of the loose phrasing of many nuns.

The two foregoing excerpts come from Maurice de la Taille’s third book in his series, **The Mystery Of Faith**. The first two probe deeply into his subject, and adduce plentiful testimony from a tremendous array of Fathers and Doctors of the Church and from Sacred Scripture itself. The third book skeletonizes but does not change the results of all his research and its application. It would be hard to find a work based more heavily upon tradition. Yet we find Archbp. Denis Hurley of Durban, the subject of a biographical pamphlet in a series, **Men Who Make The Council**, crediting De la Taille’s works with promoting *aggiornamento*. Hurley recalls: “De la Taille showed us that there was only one immolation—Calvary. The Last Supper was the offering preparatory to that immolation on Calvary and all masses since then look back to it. This kept our minds concentrated on the Eucharist, gave us a wider perspective and brought us out of the realm of mathematical analysis to the broader consideration about sacramental life. Theologians have gone beyond de la Taille, but he showed us how one event of immolation—Calvary—could be caught up, and come to life again, in all subsequent offerings of the mass. This was a mental preparation for the modern liturgical movement.”

Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many (Heb. ix, 28). Let us give credit for the *aggiornamento* where credit seems due, to St. Paul. Nearly all heresies are truth wrested from its meaning.

When Hurley reads books which impress him deeply he experiences what he calls an “illumination. I find that they say things I feel I should have been thinking all along. They express in a burst of illumination what my mind must have been waiting for.” [Nature abhors a vacuum?]

Maritain was another of the great “illuminations” of his life. Hurley admits (says the pamphleteer, Desmond Fisher) that he is not a very well-read man, and so he does not know if the ideas Maritain expressed were original or whether others had expressed them before. Pity he couldn’t so evaluate De la Taille!

Another “illumination”: “I found the treatment of the laity one of the most enthralling topics of the Council. I had been reading Teilhard de Chardin and I was fired by the way he integrated the doctrine of the Mystical Body with the evolution of the universe.” But Hurley had been a modernist long before he read this condemned writer.

“The Constitutions on the Liturgy and on the Church have set in motion a tremendous reform,” (Hurley) says. “In less than twenty years, the external appearances of the Church will be enormously changed. We have eliminated once and for all, at least in our time, the abstract idea of the Church floating in the clouds above the world, all-perfect and all-holy.

“We have recovered the idea that the Church is a people with faults and sins but with the spirit dwelling within itself, and that priests and bishops are drawn from that people with all their faults and sins.

“The decree on ecumenism is also explosive. If these are all that is achieved, plus seminary reform, I would be happy.

“The **theology we have formulated** is inherently pastoral. Pope John would have been delighted by the way his Council has turned out.”

Objection—Father De la Taille affirms that an exterior, liturgical action, separate from the canon, expressing the propitiatory oblation of the Victim, is necessary *ad validitatem*. How do you reconcile this with *De defectibus* III, 4, which prescribes replacement for a defective host to be offered, at least mentally. This passage seems to imply that an exterior oblation is not necessary to validity.

Reply—*De defectibus* III, 4 requires no reconciliation with De la Taille. Rather it corroborates his position. Mass does not depend on one piece of bread. Bread is not offered. The Offertory (or oblation) offers the Sacrifice of Calvary, not bread (or wine) in itself, as I hope I have proved in **Paul VI’s Legacy: Catholicism?**, pp. 55-61 (pp. 53-60, **Is the Pope Catholic?**). This intention has been made public in the rite; it is therefore unnecessary to repeat the Offertory to apply it to a fresh piece of bread, for it is not a fresh sacrifice. Neither the defective bread nor its replacement is sacrificed, but only the **real** Sacrifice which it represents. Therefore, so far as necessary (the regulations play it safe), the celebrant may transfer the Church’s intention to the replacement bread in his mind at least. Were he to go through the Offertory again he would surely bemuse the congregation, if any, not to mention the poor acolyte. Only the pre-Christian notion of sacrifice of natural victims (as in the *novus ordo*) could imagine here a conflict between *De defectibus* and De la Taille or Nicholas Gihl, as quoted in my books.

TRADITIONAL WORSHIP

According to Adrian Fortescue (**The Mass, A Study of the Roman Liturgy**): “The whole consecration-prayer is one thing, of which the effect is the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. During this prayer we ask continually for that grace; although the prayer takes time to say and God grants what we ask at one instant, not necessarily the last instant of the prayer. So in all rites constantly people still ask for what, presumably, they have already received. Our baptism and ordination ceremonies furnish obvious parallel examples. The *Epiklesis* is surely also to be explained in this way. We may consider these later demands for a blessing on the *oblata* as dramatic postponements, since the celebrant cannot express everything in one instant. It is still righter to conceive the Canon as one prayer. Consecration is the answer to that one prayer. It takes

place no doubt at the words of institution, but it is the effect of the whole prayer. There is no sequence of time with God. He changes the bread and wine ‘*intuitu totius orationis.*’”

State Library of New South Wales, No. 09.DQ870.8

Patrologia cursus completus, Vol. 217, MIGNE, Jacques Paul. I requested the book at 1:55 p.m., 6 April 1981. It records the Mass as celebrated in Rome during the Pontificate (1198-1216) of Innocent III, the recorder, more than twenty years before the birth of St. Thomas Aquinas, three and a half centuries before the opening session of the Council of Trent. The recorded Proper is *verbatim* the Votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament found in the Roman Missal suppressed by the postconciliar Renewal. The Ordinary varies twice from the same Missal used worldwide for most of my own lifetime.

Variation one is merely a variant spelling, *commistio* for *commixtio*, in the prayer immediately preceding the *Agnus Dei*. Variation two is the omission in the last prayer before the *Domine, non sum dignus* of one word, *prosit*. The next word, *mihi*, is in the dative case as befits the object of *prodesse*, the omission of which in its third person, singular, present, subjunctive form is erroneous and accidental. We can safely attribute this difference to either copyist or typesetter and to the proof-reader. Even without this verb the sense of the prayer is fairly close—“May it benefit me” (*Prosit mihi*) or “for my benefit” (*mihi*).

Neither variation occurs in the Canon of the Mass, thus shown unchanged at least eight and a half centuries. Why, then, do modernists persist in the lie that St. Pius V invented a new rite for Mass in 1570? Because (1) they presume on the reputation for truth earned by former generations of good priests and bishops and expect unquestioning belief; (2) they desperately need a “precedent” for Paul VI’s criminal introduction of his Arian rite of idolatry.

Abbot Fernand Cabrol (The Catholic Encyclopedia XV, 710):

Christian worship is at once interior and exterior, public and private. It should be interior, otherwise it would be mere comedy, a purely pharisaical worship such as Christ condemned when He told His disciples that they should worship in spirit and in truth. But it should not be purely interior for man is not a pure spirit, but composed of body and soul, and he should adore God not only in his soul but in his body. This is the justification of all external manifestations of worship—genuflexion, prostration, kneeling, standing, the sign of the cross, the lifting-up or imposition of hands. Furthermore, on the same principle it will be readily understood that, in rendering homage to God, man may have recourse to animate or inanimate creatures (sacrifice of animals, incense, lights, flowers, etc.). Neither is it difficult to prove that, since man is a social being, his worship should be public and in common with others. Worship in private, or even individual worship in public, is not sufficient. Society as such should also render to God the honour due to Him. Furthermore, it is natural that men who believe in the same God and experience towards Him the same sentiments of adoration, gratitude, and love should assemble to praise and thank Him.

But even if this principle of a natural right did not exist to prove the necessity and legitimacy of a social worship, the fact that Christ founded a Church, that is, a society of men professing the same faith, obeying the same laws, united with one another by the closest bonds, implies the existence of the same worship. This religious society founded by Christ should have one and the same worship—one Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all (Eph., iv, 5-6). This baptism represents the entire worship, which should be one, addressed to the same God by the same Christ. Hence Christian worship is the worship of the Church, the expression of the same faith, and exercised under the **supervision** of the ecclesiastical authority. Thus understood, worship depends on the virtue of religion and is the manifestation of that virtue. Finally, theologians usually connect worship also with the virtue of justice; for worship is not an optional act of the creature; God is entitled to the worship of intelligent creatures as a matter of justice.

William L. Sullivan, C.S.P., S.T.L., Professor, Scripture and **Moral** Theology, St. Thomas College, Wash., D.C. In (**The Catholic Encyclopedia**, I, 151-2):

Adoration, in the strict sense, an act of religion offered to God in acknowledgment of His supreme perfection and dominion, and of the creature's dependence upon Him; The rational creature, looking up to God, whom reason and revelation show to be infinitely perfect, cannot in right and justice maintain an attitude of indifference. That perfection which is infinite in itself, and the source and fulfilment of all the good that we possess or shall possess, we must worship, acknowledging its immensity, and submitting to its supremacy. This worship called forth by God, and given exclusively to Him as God, is designated by the Greek name (latinized, *latría*) for which the best translation that our language affords is the word **Adoration**. Adoration differs from other acts of worship, such as supplication, confession of sin, etc., inasmuch as it formally consists in self-abasement before the infinite, and in devout recognition of His transcendent excellence. The revealed precept to adore God was spoken to Moses upon Sinai and reaffirmed in the words of Christ: "The Lord thy God thou shalt adore, and Him only shalt thou serve" (Matt. iv, 10).

The primary and fundamental element in adoration is an interior act of mind and will; the mind perceiving that God's perfection is infinite, the will bidding us to extol and worship this perfection. Without some measure of this interior adoration in spirit and in truth it is evident that any outward show of divine worship would be mere pantomime and falsehood. But equally evident is it that the adoration felt within will seek outward expression. Human nature demands physical utterance of some sort for its spiritual and emotional moods; and it is to this instinct for self-expression that our whole apparatus of speech and gesture is due. To suppress this instinct in religion would be as unreasonable as to repress it in any other province of our experience. Moreover it would do religion grievous harm to check its tendency to outward manifestation, since the external expression reacts upon the interior sentiment, quickening, strengthening, and sustaining it. As St. Thomas teaches, it is connatural for us to pass from the physical signs to the spiritual basis upon which they rest (Summa II-II, Q. xlvi, art. 2). It is to be expected, then, that men should have agreed upon certain conventional actions as expressing adoration of the Supreme Being. Of these actions, one has pre-eminently and exclusively signified adoration, and that is sacrifice.

Joseph F. Delany, S.T.D., New York, (The Catholic Encyclopedia, XII, 748):

RELIGION, Virtue of.—Of the three proposed derivations of the word religion, that suggested by Lactantius and endorsed by St. Augustine seems perhaps to accord better with the idea than the others. He says it comes from *religare*, to bind. Thus it would mean the bond uniting man to God. The notion of it commonly accepted among theologians is that found in St. Thomas' *Summa Theologica*, II-II, Q. lxxxi a virtue whose purpose is to render God the worship due to Him as the source of all being and the principle of all government of things. There can be no doubt that it is a distinct virtue, not merely a phase of another. It is differentiated from others by its object, which is to offer to Almighty God the homage demanded by His entirely singular excellence. In a loose construction it may be considered a general virtue insofar as it prescribes the acts of other virtues or requires them for the performance of its own functions. It is not a theological virtue, because its immediate object is not God, but rather the reverence to be paid to Him. Its practice is indeed often associated with the virtues of faith and charity. Still the concordant judgment of theologians puts it among the moral virtues, as a part of the cardinal virtue Justice, since by it we give God what is due to Him. St. Thomas ranks it first among the moral virtues. A religious attitude towards God is essentially the product of our recognition, not only of His sovereign majesty, but also of our absolute dependence on Him. Thus He is not merely "the Great Stranger;" our behavior towards whom must be invested with awe and admiration; He is besides our Creator and Master and, in virtue of our supernatural filiation in the present order of things, our Father. Hence we are bound to cherish habitually towards Him sentiments of adoration, praise, thanksgiving, loyalty, and love. Such a demeanor of soul is inexorably required by the very law of our being. We must not, however, rest satisfied because perchance our interior bearing is fairly in conformity with this standard. We are not simply spirits. Our composite nature needs to express itself by outward acts in which the body as well as the soul shall have a part—this is not only to spur on our inner feelings, but also because God owns us body and soul, and it is right that both should show their fealty to Him. This is the justification of external religion. Of course God does not need our worship,

whether interior or exterior, and it is puerile to impugn it on that score. We cannot by our homage add anything to His glory, unless it be the extrinsic increment of the theologians of which account need not be taken here. It is not because it is strictly speaking of use to Him that we render it, but because He is infinitely worthy of it, and because it is of tremendous value to ourselves. The chief acts of this virtue are adoration, prayer, sacrifice, oblation, vows; the sins against it are neglect of prayer, blasphemy, tempting God, sacrilege, perjury, simony, idolatry, and superstition.

Nicholas Gehr's **The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass** (pp. 30 & 96-7)

Insofar as sacrifice has a symbolical meaning and is a constituent part of public worship, it must positively be instituted by a legitimate authority. The sacrificial service of the Old Law was regulated and ordained by God Himself in its most minute details; in the New Law the essential elements and features of worship proceed directly from Jesus Christ—hence, first of them all, sacrifice, which constitutes the fundamental and central act of divine service. Neither to the Synagogue nor to the Church did God impart the right or the power to institute sacrifices: in His infinite mercy He Himself condescended to prescribe the sacrifices by which He would be honored and propitiated. No mere man, but our Divine Savior alone could institute so sublime and so excellent a Sacrifice as we possess in the Holy Mass.

Certain circumstances under which the Eucharist was celebrated and instituted by the Lord serve to develop still further its sacrificial character, and to confirm the proofs already drawn from the words of institution.

a) Our Savior named His blood, contained and shed in the chalice, **the blood of the New Testament** (Matt. 26, 28). The word testament has here a twofold meaning; namely, covenant and legacy. — Christ is the Mediator of a better covenant, which is established on better promises (Heb. 8, 6), and that covenant is the new covenant of grace.

This covenant was formed mainly at the Last Supper and at the same time sealed with Christ's Eucharistic Blood in the chalice; it then obtained by the shedding of the Blood of Christ its valid and complete confirmation. Thus Christ's Blood was equally as well in the chalice as on the Cross the Blood of the Covenant, that is, the Blood in which the new Covenant of Grace was established. Therefore, the Blood of Christ must not only not have first been sacrificed on the Cross, but previously offered in the chalice as sacrificial blood. This is required by the contrast here evidently made between the establishment of the old and new covenants; for the words of our Savior: "This is My blood, the blood of the new covenant," contain a distinct allusion to the words: "This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you" (Exod. 24, 8), the words spoken by Moses after the establishment of the covenant of the Old Law, when he sprinkled the people with blood. At the foot of Mt. Sinai, God formed a solemn covenant with the chosen people Israel. The Lord gave His laws and promises; the people promised obedience to the instructions and regulations contained in the book of the covenant, and then they were sprinkled with "the blood of the covenant." This blood of the Old Law was sacrificial blood; for it was consecrated by the offering of holocausts. — The covenant into which God, through Moses, entered with the Israelites, was only a figure of the new and better covenant which God, through Jesus Christ, formed with mankind. But in order to be the counterpart and completion of the old covenant, the new covenant had likewise to be established by a sacrifice and to be sealed with sacrificial blood. Hence it follows that the Eucharistic Blood, which flowed in the chalice for the sealing of the new covenant, was the sacrificial Blood of Jesus Christ shed for the glory of God. This celebration of the Eucharist established by our Lord became, consequently, a true and real sacrifice. — The better covenant, whose author and surety (Heb. 7, 22) Jesus Christ became, is not merely an alliance between God and the regenerated, but, moreover, a legacy. That which Christ bequeathed to us at the Last Supper is nothing else than His sacrificial Body and His sacrificial Blood, the Eucharistic Sacrifice together with all the goods and graces of redemption included therein.

We quote these two paragraphs from Nicholas Gehr to support the obvious—(1) that Paul VI could not institute a new order of Mass; (2) that his "preparation of the gifts" is proper to the Old Law, the

sacrifices of which Jesus Christ fulfilled and replaced. The following quotation (pp. 129-30) will expound the reason for Canon 817 of the 1918 Code of Canon Law.

The distinct consecration of the elements of bread and wine, the separate representation of the Body and Blood of Christ under the two species, that is, the mystical shedding of blood, is, in virtue of the institution by Christ, absolutely necessary, not merely for the lawful, but also for the valid celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. If culpably or inculpably, but one substance is consecrated the Sacrifice is not accomplished, because an essential characteristic and requisite, namely, the twofold consecration, is wanting. Hence it is of divine ordination, that both elements—bread and wine—must always be consecrated, in order that the Eucharistic Sacrifice may take place. Our Lord instituted the unbloody Sacrifice of the Altar in this manner, because He willed that by its very nature it should be a visible representation of the Sacrifice of the Cross, which was accomplished by a violent shedding of blood unto death.

From Augustin's **A Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law** (1920):

To consecrate **outside the Mass** would not only be a sacrilege, but probably also an attempt at invalid consecration. The priest would certainly not perform that action in the person of Christ, nor according to the intention of the Church, which is restricted to the celebration of the Mass.

Paul VI's *novus ordo missae* is by definition and institution **not Mass**.

Objection—We need the Mass first, and the rest will follow.

Reply—We **had** the Mass in 1958, and what followed? The Greek orthodox supposedly have the Mass, but who can assist?

Your solution is Lefebvre, who has foisted *novus ordo* “priests” on traditionalists for no other possible motives than occasioned idolatry or more collections. His motives and intentions in ordaining(?) religious illiterates—who cannot determine what constitutes heresy these days—consequently attract at least suspicion—probably sufficient to invalidate his orders even were they otherwise unquestioned.

We are obliged to keep the Faith. Assistance at Mass is a far lesser obligation, dispensed for any number of reasons, certainly for its unavailability under Catholic auspices. Neither Lefebvre, nor Schmidberger, nor any member of their society, which recognizes JP2 as pope, thereby condoning his long list of public heresies, can be Catholic. Not only their ordinations but all their masses and sacraments are illicit in their roots, even could they be valid. Their fruits are of the nature of Luther's—progressive splintering.

ARGUMENT CORNER

Objection—I agree that the new rite of “mass” contains “manifest errors against the faith,” etc., as brought out in the Ottaviani Intervention. But one must draw a distinction between the new rite's philosophy and its sacramental validity. The new rite contains the elements of a valid sacrament despite all its manifest errors. I cannot in conscience believe otherwise while the official text does not depart from a certainly valid form.

Reply—Official text? You probably mean the seldom used Latin version, which its constructors defined as not a Mass, and to the **formal** part of which they refer only in Protestant terminology as the **narrative of institution**. Would you say that Transubstantiation takes place when the priest reads such a narrative in the presence of the proper matter during Mass during three Holy Week Gospels? Or during the Epistle on Holy Thursday or Corpus Christi? No intention, you will say. Can you know the priest's intention? The intention, though not precluded in the rite, is not directed to mere accounts or histories. The new rite, however, precludes the proper intention, which is in any case precluded by exclusion of the **Action** in favor of the new rite's **narrative of institution**. No priest's intention can overcome the rite's contrary intention. His intention is, moreover, extremely suspect by reason of his use of the new rite in the first place.

Why must sacramental validity be granted or imputed a rite never seen before which replaces Catholic truth with condemned heresy? You could not find the Arian heresy more clearly expressed than in Eucharistic Prayer IV's Preface. But EP IV, according to your argument (it uses the same “form”) is just as capable of producing the Body and Blood of Christ as the other EPs.

Suppose the rite offered, not fruits of earth and work of human hands, but, what Christ and His Church offer, the Sacrifice of Calvary—of a Divine Person of infinite value. Suppose, impossibly, that the “form” took effect in EP IV, which denies this Person’s divinity. Have we then on the table the infinitely valuable Divine Christ or a mere man—a human sacrifice—of no value whatsoever? Is it not even less—the useless corpse of the greatest liar and impostor of all time—the man who conned nineteen centuries into believing he is God? And supposing anyone can believe his “consecration,” when he is elevated and adored **is this not idolatry?**

What must be said of the man who put **this** upon us? Can you pretend to believe him Catholic? Can you insist on his papal prerogative or authority? Can you postulate that even these could cover such a crime? Is not obedience to condemned heresy in action in itself condonation of, support of, and participation in heresy?

Objection—You cannot pronounce upon the validity of the *novus ordo missae*. The Church must pronounce.

Reply—Appeals to the future violate the revelatory orientation of Catholicism. All moral and doctrinal decisions necessarily base themselves on the past—on revelation and its traditional application and interpretation. Divine worship necessarily comes under both doctrine and morals, and must satisfy both requirements for validity. God may not be forced into self-contradiction. When Arius introduced his heresy (318) was it permissible to hold it before the Council of Nicaea (325) condemned it? Can you expect the crew that fraudulently introduced or culpably accepted the new sacrilege to condemn it? This new rite is a greater departure than Cranmer’s service, which no Catholic accepts as a valid Mass.

Objection—But **this** was introduced by a pope.

Reply—And **that** was introduced by a Catholic archbishop at a time when his action violated no specific law of the Church. But Paul VI violated *Quo Primum*—divine law codified when necessary—and his own ordination oaths in introducing condemned heresy into our worship. He wished on us a rite which by definition is not Mass. All priests are forbidden by canon law to attempt consecration outside Mass. Nearly all vernacular formulas run head on into *De defectibus V Formae* which declares all change grievously sinful and excludes consecration itself with change of meaning even in a proper rite. How many more condemnations are needed? Or do you hold that forbidding and condemning do not constitute a pronouncement?

Objection—But even the Ottaviani Intervention does not call the rite invalid.

Reply—The new rite clearly showed its anti-Catholic intentions, which should have sufficed to prevent its introduction. Ottaviani erred in not spelling it all the way out—in pretending that Paul VI was Catholic. He had every right to believe his Intervention should carry greater weight—the weight of his years in the Holy Office—than the liturgy of a man once removed for liturgical heresy, particularly since he showed that the new rite subverts all three principal parts of the **Mass**.

How can a priest have the intention to consecrate—to do for the Church what the Church intends—in a rite which publicly opposes the Church’s intentions? By using the rite in any form he publicly joins in its public opposition. This is self-evident. But you won’t admit that water runs downhill without a papal or conciliar ruling. Why insist on validity for heretical innovation? Why give away the front trenches to fight rear-guard actions? The burden of proof rests very heavily on the innovator. The *novus ordo* is innovation beyond compare. Any “proof” of its validity would necessarily ride a solid column of hot air. It is no argument that a pope imposed it. **The papacy’s purpose is preservation, not innovation.** A pope can neither teach us new truths nor oblige us to new rites. Should a pope introduce condemned heresy, as Arianism in the *novus ordo missae*, he proves that he is a condemned heretic—by definition and by canon law not pope. The new rite—any new rite—must overcome the time barrier. Obviously Christ and His Apostles did not give us the *novus ordo missae*. If it is essential to salvation where are all our Catholic predecessors?

Vatican I, the infallible council that defined infallibility, proclaimed (*Dei Filius*, Canons II, 2): “If anyone should say that it is impossible or inexpedient for man to be taught by divine revelation concerning God and the worship to be rendered to Him, let him be anathema.” The Church has

therefore defined that it is possible and expedient for divine revelation to teach on divine worship. Proper divine worship, then, must have existed before the death of the last Apostle, after which nothing could have been added to revelation.

So a new rite, defined as not a Mass, containing condemned heresy, perverting Christ's own most solemn consecratory prayer both verbally and formally, contradicting Christ's and His Church's sacrificial intention, is introduced fraudulently, as an experiment, in flagrant violation of the law made to protect our Holy Mass, in deliberate fracture of two most solemn oaths required of every priest at ordination and every bishop at consecration, nineteen centuries too late for revelation. Who needs further condemnation? No validity is possible. No one may accord it validity or any other Catholic status without supporting specific condemned heresies. An Arian is not a Catholic. Yet Lefebvre will not only not say that the *novus ordo missae* is invalid *per se*, he cannot tolerate (Nov. 8, 1979) in his society any who affirm that the *novus ordo missae* is *per se* invalid—anyone, that is, who holds the Catholic view that it is necessarily invalid under all conditions—that it is not Mass, was never intended as Mass, and was deliberately and successfully foisted upon us to replace our Mass. We lack—not a superfluous ruling of invalidity—an authoritative (how?) declaration of validity.

Objection—I don't believe one can expect the new rite to die out. To fight fanatically against parity of rites can lead only to despair. The majority of the faithful are tired of the fight, now clearly unwinnable. Those who will not accept the old rite alongside the new will find themselves with no Mass to attend.

Reply—Then, at last, we'll be in the majority. Not we fanatics but you and your "majority of the faithful" have despaired. You are ready to accept a compromise, not even offered, which will render you non-Catholic. You appear to speak for those few priests who now celebrate the traditional Mass. You imply that they also will compromise—desert the Faith. If you are correct then we must indeed do without our Mass; keeping the Faith comes first. We are not obliged to win—victory is God's—but to fight. The only people not tired after a genuine fight are the spectators.

AMERICANS FOR PUBLIC MORALITY EXONERATE HONORIUS.

They quote St. Robert Bellarmine, then leap to a *non sequitur* par excellence: "Case against Pope Paul VI Collapses." Why not: "Arius may not have been a heretic; therefore Luther was Catholic?" But APM tries nobly to bridge the gap:

"Many modern-day heretics pose as traditionalists, with the sole motive of drawing Catholics away from the traditional Catholic Church. Their scheme to accomplish this deception consists in attacking the Church's very foundation, the Vicar of Christ, by laying upon Pope Paul VI the solitary blame for the official enactment of that compendium of heresy and sacrilegious innovation, the *Novus ordo Missae*."

Has APM some notion that Paul VI never promulgated the *Novus ordo*? Or that having done so he remains unaware of episcopal conferences which make it "mandatory?" Or that he has no control over these conferences' agenda? Vatican II's Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office in the Church, 38, 4):

"Decisions of the episcopal conference, provided they have been made lawfully and by choice of at least two-thirds of the prelates who have a deliberative vote in the conference, **and have been reviewed by the Apostolic See**, are to have juridically binding force in those cases and in those only which are prescribed by common law **or determined by special mandate of the Apostolic See**, given spontaneously or in response to a petition from the conference itself."

The *novus ordo missae* could never have been imposed without at least Paul's culpable acquiescence. It is imposed everywhere, so the question of local option or responsibility never arises. The blame falls clearly, inevitably on the universal convergence of ecclesiastical authority—on Paul VI. A proven public heretic, before and since election, usurps the See of Peter. A heretic is neither Catholic nor pope. He has, therefore, no infallibility, nor power to ratify or confirm

councils— even orthodox councils. Those who attack Paul VI cannot be accused of attacking the foundation (or any part) of the Church, or a Vicar of Christ.

No real pope ever tried to institute a new mass. That is just too *DAMNED* vicarious.

DR. CYRIL B. ANDRADE (Bangalore, India):

“There is, of course, a big hue and cry and a fair amount of concerted action against the pagan (Hindu) prachas that have been introduced into the liturgy; but talk of the abominations of the *novus ordo* and no one is even interested. I just cannot get these anti-Hinduists to understand that the paganizing of the liturgy would not have even been attempted had Paul VI not tampered with the true Mass.”

India exemplifies early results of Paul’s tampering. Far worse is in the wind. Once a law is broken with impunity it loses all effect. When Belgian Congo gained independence Katanga logically considered itself separately independent. The Kinshasa government viewed things differently, and war followed. But Katanga based its claim on disappearance of Belgian rule. It had owed allegiance to Brussels, never to Kinshasa.

Once *Quo primum* had been violated to permit Protestant, Jewish, and Arian intrusions in the “mass,” there was no logical reason to reject Moslem, Hindu, Shinto, or any other false intrusions. You can’t demolish a mighty stone dike and expect a fishnet to contain the tide.

WILL THE REAL ENEMY PLEASE RISE?

The innovators never shock or surprise me. I take it as a cardinal principle that they intend nothing less than total destruction of the Catholic Church. What astounds me is the performance of such staunch traditionalists as *Una Voce* and the Latin Mass Society (England). The latter’s newsletter carries the message of Chairman Alfred Marnau and of *Una Voce* President Eric de Saventhem: their goal is establishment of parity for the Mass of the ages with the *novus ordo*, which—valid or not—embodies the chief heresies of the Protestant Revolt and of Judaism.

These men will settle for a Church of dichotomy, of heretical and sacrilegious worship **on par with true, divinely instituted worship**, of innovations of Vatican II held equally with the tradition they replace, of bluffed “orders” of Paul VI carrying greater force than the laws of the Church. They postulate an impossible Church and to it they pledge their loyalty. They will condone destruction of their Church if they may have a “high church” enclave of their own.

No Catholic can tolerate schism, nor its equivalent innovations, within the visible structure of his Church. Nor can he accept authority which tolerates these splits, these innovations, these destructions of his traditions, these errors. For what authority can impose error?

Where is the essential difference in *Una Voce*’s attitude and that of Sydney’s archdiocesan spokesman when he countenances and accepts a “pope” who is head of another religion along with Catholicism, when he accommodates Anglican consciences at the expense of Catholic consciences?

The Latin Mass Society Annual General Meeting

Saturday, 27 June 1981, was reported in **LMS News Bulletin** No. 49, August 1981. From the Chairman’s address:

“..... we are not dissenters. Dissenters wish to change things for better or for worse. We do not wish to change anything—we want what was great and beautiful and holy to stay as it was, unchanged..... It was not we who called in a repair squad, there was nothing needing repair. They entered unasked; repaired nothing; ruined what was perfect leaving a mess behind. But, they did remember to send us the bill, this demolition squad disguised as repair men, for never feeling at home in the house of our Church again. What makes us so special is a sneaking but persistent feeling, a certainty that where we stand, the Church is unchanged. Where we kneel at Mass the Church has not changed. What we received and what we intend to pass on; what we carry in our

hearts and souls; what we shall defend by word and deed is the Church unchanged.” [Brave words! Who could object?] “More priests are coming forward; some young, some highly placed, ready to say Mass for us. Not only on weekdays; but also on feast days and Sundays. And, if more and more priests are ready to stand at the foot of the altar and acknowledge in murmured Latin that he will ‘go unto the altar of God’ and plead that his cause be distinguished from ‘those not holy,’ how can we fail? What is happening now cannot last. We cannot fail in our quest because” [we ignore the *non-sequitur* for the import’s sake] “no human institution, let alone a divine one, can survive if it cuts itself off from its ancient life-giving source; if it poisons that source—the source that has channeled the blood through the veins of generations for centuries; blood that has kept the brain functioning and the heart beating The moral collapse caused by changes and revolutions; the insecurity of men and their social institutions; the abdication of religion—all this creates a vacuum which has to be filled. Multinational power centres governed by nameless men have moved in in a deadly struggle for the possession of this globe. They are beginning to show their hand by terror, blackmail, assassination; by manipulating the word and thus destroying communication other than under their control. That is where the devil has us by the throat. The question we can no longer afford to suppress is this: to what extent was or is the Church exposed to these satanic forces—to terror, blackmail, assassination, falsification of words? How much of what the Church has already surrendered was due to such pressures? To what extent are they applied from without? And to what extent from within? The answer may explode in our faces any day. It was a loss of nerve, a folly sponsored by tyranny, to cut us off from our ancient sources. A people’s altar? An altar without God? A house of the People of God? A godless altar! Easter people? Pentecostals? Christmas games!!” [A champion of the Church! A fearless font of forthright logic!] “The final and decisive question remains to be asked. Will the pope reverse the trend? Will and can he recover what has been surrendered and, thereby, give a lead to the bishops?” [If he can’t or won’t, how is he Catholic? If not Catholic how is he pope? He made no secret of his adherence to innovation—indeed his own contribution to Vatican II advanced it. While we await his reversal of the trend he continues to further the trend. Who else gives a lead to the bishops? Every bishop when confronted with his dereliction of duty reduces his reply to absurdity: shall he follow a few laymen or the pope?] “If not, then only divine intervention” [the unanswerable excuse for doing nothing!] “can ultimately save the Church from self-destruction.” [The destruction of the Church goes forward under enemy direction; the destroyers are not Catholic, however much they seem or claim to be. Suicide does not become the Mystical Body of Christ. Destruction? Obvious! Self? No, an enemy hath done this.]

The chairman introduced Father Bryan Houghton from the South of France, the Guest Speaker. He placed his Guest Spoke in Father Anthony Boylan’s wheel, proving that Boylan is a liturgical wheel. Then he turned serious: “Dr. Boylan is, of course, quite right when he says that an emergency situation exists.” [Neither Boylan nor Houghton appears to appreciate that it was planned.] “His proposed cure reads like a fantasy because he has misdiagnosed the causes. One cause is clearly the failure of the new liturgy. Since he is unwilling to admit it, he is obliged to fall back on blaming the clergy for failing to implement it. This is a gross slander. The new liturgy has been put into effect in every diocese and almost every parish with the utmost loyalty. sixteen years since a Latin Mass has been widely heard and over eleven since the New Ordo in the vernacular was imposed on England. This represents the total school life of practically every child in the country. also three generations of students in our great Public Schools and Convents. It is this latter fact that is so revealing. Here are bright children, boarding in an enclosed community at a particularly impressionable age; taught by priests and religious at least as intelligent and forward-looking as Dr. Boylan and even more experienced in the formation of youth. And what is the result? A religious fervor and enthusiasm hitherto unknown? No. Unprecedented lapsation and general boredom with religion. If the new liturgy fails after three generations of students at Downside, Ampleforth, Ascot, and the like, where is it likely to succeed?”

Dr. Boylan’s solution, that of liturgical commissions worldwide according to Father Houghton, cannot bring **peace**. Father Houghton, however, has the solution—not the old religion, for that, though necessarily correct, will not suit those who have been saturated with the new; not the new

religion, for Father Houghton and the Latin Mass Society will not accept it; we shall have neither our horse nor the ass which we are told is our new horse. We shall parade gloriously on our mule, the sterile, hybrid offspring of the marriage of horse and jackass. We shall compromise what belongs to Christ. **For peace! Pax Christi?**

Houghton: “..... conditions prior to any settlement validity of the election and authority of the reigning pope must be acknowledged. How can the pope possibly bring about peace if his authority to do so is not recognized?” [By resigning?] “..... the decrees of Vatican II must be accepted as they stand.” [They cannot stand—they lie.] “..... Old Rite as it stood at the death of John XXIII would do.” [*Quo primum* had already been breached. Why not 1570?] “..... The Old and New Rite should be equally licit.” [What could be more licit than Judaism, Lutheranism, and Arianism?] “However, in order that there should be available a form of Mass common to all priests a hybrid Mass should replace *Prex I* in the New a) The New Rite, in the vernacular with the priest in stole facing the people, for the Ministry of the Word—with the bidding prayers before the Creed; b) from the *Credo* onwards, the Old Rite in Latin with the priest in chasuble and his back to the people. c) This hybrid Mass should be considered as belonging to either rite. By its use a Traditionalist could satisfy any obligation to say the New Mass or a Progressive to say the Old.” [He fails to distinguish properly ordained priests from men swindled by the new rite of ordination. Has he a hybrid rite for that? Retroactive?] “..... I have never said the New Mass. I resigned my parish rather than be under an obligation to do so. I have no intention of saying it under existing circumstances.” [Why not? Is something dreadfully wrong with it?] “..... Nevertheless, I would say it tomorrow with what devotion I could muster if I knew it would contribute to giving back the old Mass to my ex-parishioners.” [They could still have the old Mass had he not resigned and decamped. He might even have traveled—provided the true Mass where needed. Retirement suits men who want **peace**.]

And how did the fearless champion chairman react? Did he ask what pressures had generated this abject surrender? Did he throw back Houghton’s own words: “His proposed cure reads like a fantasy because he has misdiagnosed the causes?” He thanked Father Houghton for a speech “about which we shall have to think very deeply. Truth, realism, and precision—these we have had from our speaker and we are grateful to him for sharing with us his view of the future.” The words that best describe these two men’s behavior—creeping, crawling— have a synonym of Latin derivation: serpent.

Could Houghton’s views have surprised the Latin Mass Society? Had none of its members read “The Issue of Downham Market,” his pamphlet which deemed the *novus ordo missae* licit—brought in by legitimate authority—and then adverted to the status of the Bishop of Northampton’s order to celebrate according to the new missal in his diocese. “I neglect Episcopal Conferences,” Houghton wrote, “as they lack legal status.”

Right! But Episcopal Conferences were established by the same Rome-based incompetent, heretical authority that promulgated the new missal. He must, to be logical, consistent, or possibly correct, either accept or reject both innovations.

The Sydney Morning Herald reported Friday 7 March 1986 an agreement between Anglicans and Catholics on the validity of Anglican orders. This agreement bears out our contention that Paul VI’s new “orders,” promulgated with his new “mass,” share the same invalidity. The genuine orders could never have satisfied the terms of agreement.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol 1, 495d: “..... when the old” (Catholic) “and the new” (Anglican) “rite are compared, it appears that the difference lies just in this: that the framers of the new have cut out all that in the old gave expression to the idea of a mystic *sacerdotium* in the Catholic sense of the term. There is also the connected fact that the introduction of the Edwardine Ordinal was the outcome of the same general movement which led to the pulling down of the altars and the substitution of communion tables, in order that, as Ridley expressed it, ‘the form of a table shall more move the simple people from the superstitious opinions of the Popish mass unto the right use of the Lord’s supper.’” The parallel with Paul VI’s *novus ordo* is compellingly obvious.

498c, *ibid.*: “..... whether the pronouncement of the Bull ‘*Apostolicae Curae*’” (which declared Anglican orders invalid) “is to be taken as an infallible utterance of the Holy See. But even if it were not it would not follow that it can be disregarded, and its eventual withdrawal confidently anticipated. What may be safely assumed is that it fixes the belief and practice of the Catholic Church irrevocably. This at least Leo XIII must have meant to signify when in his letter to Cardinal Richard, of 5 November, 1896, he declared that his ‘intention had been to pass a final judgment and settle (the question) forever’, and that ‘Catholics were bound to receive (the judgment) with the fullest obedience as *perpetuo firmam, ratam, irrevocabilem.*’”

Strange opinion: Error in papal teaching is possible only in matters not involving papal infallibility. Since the sacrament of the altar is in itself a matter of faith of the highest order, containing the dogma of the Real Presence of Christ, there can be no question that it is divinely guarded by the law of infallibility. Not subject to this law is the pastoral reform of Vatican II that led to the new rite of the Catholic Mass. As Paul VI explicitly stated Nov. 19, 1969, when introducing the *novus ordo* in Italy:

“But let everyone understand well that nothing has been changed in the essence of our traditional Mass. Some perhaps will get the idea that by the introduction of such and such a ceremony, or the addition of such and such a rubric, that such things constitute or hide alterations or minimizations of defined truths or ideas sanctioned by the Catholic Faith. But there is nothing in this idea, absolutely. First of all, because ritual and rubrics are not, in themselves, a matter of dogmatic definition.”

We have here an absolute, infallible statement of Pope Paul VI that “nothing has been changed in the essence of our traditional Mass.” What has changed are the rubrics and rite, which, as the same Pope stated, are “susceptible of theological qualification of varying value.” (Meaning?)

This strange **opinion** attributes infallibility to Montini’s obvious lie that his new rite (centuries late for inclusion in the Deposit of Faith) changed nothing essential in the traditional Mass. It certainly replaced the latter against Church Law. The new rite, foisted upon us as a successful “experiment,” containing at least three condemned heresies, lacking the three most essential parts of the Mass, is (if considered as a Mass) without question intrinsically invalid. Proof to the contrary should not be self-contradictory, should not be based on “authority” with a record of heresy and treason, should not accept or incorporate obvious lies as truth, should not ignore the fact of illegal, untraditional, deceptive introduction of a new rite, nor its absurd, diabolical forced replacement of our undoubted traditional Mass. There is no logical reason whatsoever either to proscribe the true Mass or to accept the new rite as a Mass. Montini never “ordered” its complete replacement in so many legal phrases, but he certainly claimed the credit in the 1976 consistory in which he belabored Lefebvre for disobedience to his “orders.” This new rite—nineteen centuries late and demonstrably heretical—is accepted impossibly as a valid Mass on the authority of a man demonstrably outside the Church for public heresy before his therefore invalid election. Why will anyone try to fool himself into accepting even the **risk** of idolatry? Why is not Pope St. Pius V’s law, *Quo primum tempore*, recognized as an exercise of papal infallibility? Especially by those who attribute absolute infallibility to Paul VI’s lie that “nothing has been changed in the essence of our traditional Mass”—thus implying that his new rite is the same Mass— which, by definition and content, it is **not**?

The *novus ordo missae*, like Montini’s other pet phrase “new and more authentic,” is a contradiction in terms. No possible authority can render an innovation a Mass. This innovation purported to advance Ecumenism, to provide an acceptable false worship to satisfy those who refused to participate or believe in the true. It was intended to replace true worship, to mock God and rob Him of His due, even if only occasionally. It **has** replaced true worship, which has become largely unavailable worldwide. It is the undeniable fruit of Vatican II’s first great achievement, its Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, to which Montini adduced his unowed obedience in introducing his *novus ordo missae*, but which ordered neither a new rite of Mass nor new sacramental forms. He not only followed the destructive course suggested by the revolutionary council, he manifestly lied to provide purpose to his criminal violation of Pope St. Pius V’s codification, when needed, of Divine Law. Why must we accept his further lies as infallible

pronouncements, especially when Montini himself removed the whole matter from the scope of infallibility? (to forestall the imputation of infallibility to Pope St. Pius V's 1570 action in defense of the oldest rite then in existence.) He then mendaciously equated his destructive innovation with Pope St. Pius V's act of preservation, and cited the latter as his precedent.

In introducing his new rites Montini violated his several times sworn ordination oaths, and obliged every priest and bishop who presided at or **allowed** his new rites to break their same oaths. The Church, furthermore, has forbidden any rite for Mass not in use before 1370. This prohibition covers all Protestant worship and its current poor imitation, the *novus ordo missae*. Why worry the irrelevant question of its impossible validity as a Mass? Who are we to concede it any other status than that conferred upon it by Church and Divine Law? The Church must pronounce? The Church **has pronounced**—in 1570.

Objection—I incline not to condemn the *novus ordo missae* as invalid. Did not Christ say (Matt. xviii, 20): “For where there are two or three gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them.”

Reply—While that reasoning would turn every non-Catholic “Christian” service of worship into a true and valid Mass, a note in my Rheims-Douai-Challoner Bible rather restricts: “This is understood of such assemblies only as are gathered in the name and authority of Christ and in unity of the Church of Christ (St. Cyprian, *De Unitate Ecclesiae*).” This also appears in the Haydock Bible, which notes further: “S. Chrysostom, Theophylactus, and Euthymius explain the words **in His name** thus, assembled by authority received from Christ, in the manner appointed by Him, or for His sake, and seeking nothing but His glory. Hence we see what confidence we may place in an oecumenical council **lawfully assembled**. T.—S. Greg. lib 7. Regist Epist. 112.” From Dom Bernard Orchard’s **A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture**:

“..... the reason why the Father’s help is certain is based on a general principle: the beloved Son Himself Whom the Father always hears, Jn. 11:42, is mystically present in the tiniest gathering convoked to do Him honour (‘in My name’; εις το εμον ονομα, not εν τω εμω ονοματι, suggests the idea of appurtenance, consecration, devotion to).” [εις with accusative = **unto**; εν with dative = **in**—practically inert.]

But the terms of your objection would still suggest that a novena, solemn vespers, or Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament are valid Mass.

You will look long and hard at the *novus ordo*’s preparation of the gifts, supposedly equal to our Offertory, to discover the slightest reference to Jesus Christ, the slightest implication of His existence, let alone His name. The Old Testament Jews, whose ceremonial this is, did not set out deliberately to ignore Jesus Christ; they simply lacked the specific revelation of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation until He came. But deliberate return to uninformed, insufficient, replaced forms of sacrifice and worship can hardly equal gathering in His name.

When again (Preface, Eucharistic Prayer IV) He is separated, as in Arianism, from His divinity, what becomes of the value of not only His name but His entire revelation? What is accomplished by His consecration, even were it not misquoted and deliberately changed from prayer into narrative, aping the Protestant services?

Can a forbidden ritual gather us in Christ’s name?

At Last *The Catholic Weekly* (Sydney), July 29, 1979, has allowed into its hallowed pages the suggestion that Paul VI’s *novus ordo missae* is not a real Mass. In a column vaingloriously entitled “**Thinking Catholic**,” John Young squelches his ancestors. His argument is hard to grasp; his loose terminology matches his thought. “**Is it infallible?**” he asks. Is IT a Mass? A law? An opinion? A butterfly?

“Can the Church be infallible in a matter which no pope has ever solemnly defined and no ecumenical council has ever taught?” To “many Catholics” he then ascribes an odd reaction for the purpose of correcting it. He skips to an “assertion of some extreme supporters of the Tridentine Mass, who say the rite now in use is not a real Mass. Can we be sure they are wrong? We can; but

if you have ever tried to discuss the matter with them, you've found that the argument gets very technical and involved! Some people can demolish their case; others can't."

He thus reassures the others. We've neither met nor heard from the **some**—and we **have** met Mr. Young. While, not surprisingly, **he** finds the traditional arguments involved, others complain that we oversimplify.

He advances a general agreement that the new rite is valid and invests agreement with infallibility. Can he then deny infallibility's support to the traditional Mass and the law that forbade its heedless change, suppression, or supplanting? Even the new rite's imposers had sense enough to avoid **this** trap. Paul VI, demeaned his own rite: "Ritual and rubrics are not in themselves a matter of dogmatic definition."

Mr. Young deplores the lack of conciliar teaching on the new "mass," conveniently forgetting that it is newer than any council, that it had never been recommended, ordered, sanctioned, or discussed even by Vatican II, and that the only bishops ever consulted, the Roman Synod of 1967, flatly rejected it. Was this synod, convoked by Paul VI, in communion with him, Mr. Young? Why, according to your rules, is not their rejection infallible?

The Vatican Council (1870) which defined infallibility confined its exercise to the Deposit of Faith—the very center of which was the Sacrifice of Calvary, equivalent by definition to the traditional Mass—received from Christ and His Apostles. From which of these has originated the new rite of "mass?"

Objection—We were taught in Catholic school to offer ourselves, our works, sufferings, joys, thoughts, words, deeds, prayers, intentions, all that we are or have, joined to Christ's Sacrifice at the Offertory. Yet you condemn the *novus ordo* because it offers the fruits of the earth and the work of human hands.

Reply—We were taught that the Mass is the unbloody Sacrifice of the Cross. We join these other things to Christ's Sacrifice because that is the means by which they could best obtain value in God's sight. But is Mass without these additional offerings any less a Mass? With them is it more a Mass? All the fruits of earth and work of human hands from creation to the Last Judgment can add nothing of essence or intrinsic value to the Mass. Weighed in the balance against the Mass they are literally nothing, and have no salvific effect. This the Catholic Church has always recognized and taught, and prayed accordingly: "Accept, Almighty Father, this Spotless Victim." The very fact that the traditional Offertory prayers were removed is enough to condemn the *novus ordo*. How much more damnable is it when for Christ's and His Church's propitiatory intention is substituted the Old Testament's insufficient sacrifice which Christ came, suffered horribly, and died to replace, so that we might be saved! We shall be judged on our beliefs and our works. If we are saved it will be on Christ's merits through His Sacrifice. It behoves us to offer nothing less.

SOUTHERN PASCH

Just before Easter 1979 there came to Adelaide another innovation—from the time of Moses. Our shepherds, having evicted the eternal Sacrifice from our churches, would return us to its fore-runner and type, the paschal lamb. The SOUTHERN CROSS (5 April) devoted more than a page to recommendations, instructions, and prayers for an abbreviated Jewish Seder to celebrate the Pesach, or Pasch. Repeatedly this rite quoted the closest approximations to the *novus ordo* substitute for the offertory, but nowhere referred to the Last Supper or to the reasons why the Church commemorates Holy Week.

The article encouraged Catholics to this non-Catholic form of worship, in flagrant violation of Canon 1258. Should there have been any slightest doubt of the intent, the 12 April **Southern Cross** carried pictures of Catholics who had followed the article's recommendations. Notably missing were prayer shawls and yarmilkes.

Innovators will say: "This is no participation with non-Catholics in their rites. Only Catholics were present."

At a true Mass we participate in worship with all Catholics of all ages, according to the Apostolic doctrine of the Communion of Saints—even if no other Catholics attend. At a black “mass” or voodoo ceremony all are involved in false worship, even if all are Catholic. If we participate in the rites of another religion, be it Judaism, Islam, or the worship of Baal, we associate ourselves in false worship with its practitioners of all times and places. We thereby apostatize. We deny Jesus Christ. We substitute for the worship He gave us. In deliberate return to Judaic rites which He deliberately superseded, we even correct and contradict Him.

We cannot assess the pull or appreciate the temptation to this form of sin. There is no reasonable road to hell, but this sterile, pleasureless path is exceptionally stupid, useless, and certain. “He that shall deny Me before men, I will also deny him before My Father Who is in heaven.” (Matthew x, 33)

The sperm bank solves all!

Now and again some one breaks into print bewailing the waste of genius. Look at all those great men whose capacity dies with them, and the race no longer derives the benefit of their overwhelming talents. The writer then ignores traditional methods of preserving genius and capacity from generation to generation such as stability, adherence to proven methods of instruction, and natural propagation of the race. He solves everything with a sperm bank. Had there been such provision we would have reaped the harvest of genius preserved from Einstein, Darwin, and Winston Churchill. We need not suffer unduly from loss of indispensable men like Franklin D. Roosevelt and Malcolm Fraser. Of course, Germaine Greer and Margaret Whitlam are beat immediately—these male chauvinist porcine writers!

Our first requirement would appear to be an organizational genius with tremendous persuasive powers to set up the bank. He must first resolve the discrepancy between genius recognized and the age at which recognition is achieved. A proven genius is usually well past his physical prime, and such sperm as he might be induced to part with would run increased risks of degeneracy or sterility. We can eliminate these risks by storing sperm of the entire male population between the ages of thirty and forty, then waiting to see how they turn out. Only the perfect should be retained; the program requires young women whose genes must be overcome. Only morons or prostitutes would be likely to accommodate the bank.

The problem need never have arisen had contemporary geniuses avoided family limitation. All other ages had sperm banks—**children!** And why should we preserve the examples the sperm bankers usually hold up? See the children they **have** produced!

ON RASH JUDGMENT—St. John Chrysostom

Judge not, that you may not be judged. What does this mean? Are we not to denounce those who are committing sin? And Paul too says this same thing; or rather Christ says it through Paul: **But thou, why judgest thou thy brother?** (Rom xiv, 10). And again later he says: **Therefore judge not before the time, until the Lord come** (I Cor, iv, 5).

Why then does he elsewhere say: **Reprove, entreat, rebuke** (II Tim. iv, 2)? And in another place: **Them that sin reprove them before all** (I Tim. v, 20)? And Christ also saying to Peter: **Go and rebuke him between him and thee alone. If he shall hear thee, thou shalt gain thy brother; and if he will not hear thee take with thee one or two more. And if he will not hear them, tell the Church** (Mt. xviii, 15-17)? And why has He set up so many to reprove, and not alone to reprove, but to punish? For He has commanded that he who will not hear any of these is to be looked upon as the heathen and the sinner.

Why then did He give them the power of the keys? For if they are not to judge, they are without authority, and in vain have they received the power of binding and loosing. And besides, if this were the case, everything would come to an end, in the churches, in the cities, in homes; for if the master did not correct the servant, and the mistress the maid, the father the son, the friend his friend, everything would go to the bad. And did I say unless friend should correct friend? Unless we

correct our enemies also, we shall never put an end to enmity, and everything would be turned upside down. Let us then carefully study the meaning of what is said here, so that no one may think that the remedies of our salvation, and the laws of peace are really laws of disorder and confusion. For He has, in what follows, made as clear as possible to those who have understanding, the perfection of this law, saying to us: **And why seest thou the mote in thy brother's eye, and seest not the beam in thy own?**

But if it still seems obscure to many of the more unreflecting I shall try to explain it from the beginning. It seems to me that in these words He does not absolutely command us not to judge any sins, neither does He wholly forbid us to do this, but that He is here speaking to those who, laden with countless sins, trample on others because of their misfortunes. He seems to be referring to certain Jews who, though bitter denouncers of the small and trifling sins of their neighbor, were themselves carelessly committing the gravest sins. And in fact, towards the end, rebuking them, He says to them: **They bind heavy and insupportable burdens, but with a finger of their own they will not move them;** and again: **You tithe the mint and cummin, and have left the weightier things of the law; judgment, and mercy, and faith** (Mt. xxiii, 4, 23).

It seems to me then that it was these He had in mind, seeking to restrain them beforehand, because of the things they were to say of His Disciples. For though the Disciples had not been guilty of sin, yet by these men certain things were held to be faults; such as, not to observe the Sabbath, not to wash their hands before eating, to eat with publicans. And of these men He said in another place that **they strain at a gnat and swallow a camel** (Mt. xxiii, 24). However, in regard to such matters He here lays down a universal law.

Paul also, writing to the Corinthians (I iv, 5), does not simply command them not to judge, but not to judge those placed over them, and in matters which are not clear; but he does not wholly forbid them to correct sinners. And neither was he reproofing all without distinction, but only those disciples who were doing this very thing to their own teachers, and those also who were guilty of countless sins and were at the same time slandering those who were without sin.

It is to this therefore that Christ is referring, and not alone does He refer to it, but He makes it a matter of grave anxiety and inexorable punishment: **For with what judgment you judge, you shall be judged.** For it is not the other person that you condemn, He says, but your own self. You are preparing a dreadful judgment for yourself, and your punishment shall be severe. For as with the forgiveness of our sins we begin with ourselves, so likewise in this judgment, the measure of our own condemnation is fixed by ourselves. For we ought not to condemn, or insult, but to admonish; we ought not to slander, but to counsel; not to attack in arrogance, but to correct with gentleness and affection. For it is not this other person that you are giving over to severe punishment, not sparing him when there was need to pass sentence on his faults, but your own self.

You see that these two precepts are both of them light, and that they are the cause of great good to those who fulfil them, as they are also the cause of great evils to those who disregard them? For he who forgives his neighbor, without any effort on his own part frees himself rather than his neighbor from reproach. And he who inquires into the faults of his neighbor, with forbearance and fellow feeling, great is the store of forgiveness he has laid up for himself, by this manner of practising forbearance.

What then, you will say, if he has committed fornication; am I not to say that fornication is a wicked thing, am I not to correct his evil conduct? Correct him, yes; but not like a foe, an enemy, one out for vengeance, but like a physician administering healing remedies. For the Lord did not say: Do not restrain the sinner from his sins, but, **Do not judge**, that is, Do not be a harsh judge. And besides, it was not of great faults or of things forbidden that He said this, but of things that do not appear to have been sins at all. And that was why He said: **why seest thou the mote in thy brother's eye?** And this is what many are doing even now. For if they see, for example, a monk wearing some extra covering, they invoke the law of the Lord against him, although they themselves are grabbing at everything, cheating day after day. And if they see him eat a bit more than he is accustomed to, they criticize him bitterly, though every single day they are themselves

eating and drinking to excess; not caring that together with their own sins, because of this rash judging, they are building up for themselves a still bigger fire, leaving for themselves no grounds for God's mercy. For when you sit in judgment on your neighbor in this way, you are yourself laying down the law according to which your own sins shall be examined. You must not think it severe if it is you yourself who will inflict the penalties.

Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thy own eye. Here He wills to make clear to us the great anger He feels against those who do such things. For whenever He wishes to show us that a sin is grievous, or that the punishment prepared for it is grievous, He begins with a reproach. Just as He said to the man who demanded back the debt of a hundred pence: **Thou wicked servant. I forgave thee all the debt** (Mt. xviii, 32), so here also He says **Thou hypocrite**. For judgment of that kind does not spring from concern for, but from bitterness towards your fellow man, and while it may put on the mask of benevolence, such a one is only giving vent to his own will, making up the worst possible accusations against his neighbors, taking upon himself the rank of a teacher, when he is not fit to be even a pupil. It is because of this that he is called a hypocrite. For you, you who are so bitter over what other people do, watching even for trifles, how is it you do not attend to your own faults; for there, even the gravest sins seem to escape your notice.

First cast the beam out of thy own eye. You see how He does not forbid us to judge, but commands us first to remove the beam from our own eyes, and only then should we correct the faults of others. For everyone knows his own faults better than those of others, and sees big ones more easily than little ones; and loves himself more than he loves his neighbor. And so if you do this out of care for him, have a care first for yourself; where the sin is nearer to you, and greater. But if you have no care for yourself, it is very plain indeed that you judge your brother, not out of care for him, but out of hate, and because you want to defame him. And if he must be judged, then let him be judged, but not by thee, but by One Who does no wrong, to Whom be honor, praise, and glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

Proceeding from the FATHER, the SON must be Eternal (John Chrysostom)

But if anyone say, "How can it be that He is a Son, and yet not younger than the Father? since that which proceeds from something else must needs be later than that from which it proceeds"; we will say that, properly speaking, these are human reasonings; that he who questions on this matter will question on others yet more improper; and that to such we ought not even to give ear. For our speech now concerns God, not the nature of men, which is subject to the sequence and necessary conclusions of these reasonings. Still, for the assurance of the weaker sort, we will speak even to these points.

Tell me, then, does the radiance of the sun proceed from the substance itself of the sun, or from some other source? Anyone not deprived of his very senses needs must confess that it proceeds from the substance itself. Yet, although the radiance proceeds from the sun itself, we cannot say that it is later in point of time than the substance of that body, since the sun has never appeared without its rays. Now if in the case of these visible and sensible bodies there has been shown something which proceeds from something else, and yet is not after that from whence it proceeds, why are you incredulous in the case of the invisible and ineffable Nature? This same thing there takes place, but in a manner suitable to that Substance. For it is for this reason that Paul too calls Him Brightness (Hebr. i,3); setting forth thereby His being from Him and His co-eternity. Again, tell me, were not all the ages, and every interval created by Him? Any man not deprived of his senses must necessarily confess this. There is no interval therefore between the Son and the Father; and if there be none, then He is not after, but co-eternal with Him. For "before" and "after" are notions implying time, since, without age or time, no man could possibly imagine these words; but God is above times and ages.

But they who doing evil, become also involved in evil habit,

so that the very habit of evil will not let them see that it is evil, will in turn become defenders of their own evil deeds. They rage when they are rebuked, like the Sodomites long ago, who said to

the just man who rebuked them for their most evil inclination: You came here as a stranger, not as a judge (Gen. xix, 9). So dominant among them became the practice of this abominable foulness, that wantonness now became justice; and one who opposed it, more to be censured than one who practised it. Persons like these, pressed down by malignant habit, are as though buried. What am I saying, brethren? They are in fact so buried, that we may say of them which was said of Lazarus: **he now stinketh**. The hard power of this habit is like a great stone laid upon the tomb; pressing down upon the soul, not suffering it either to breathe or to rise again.—St. Augustine

May 20, 1987 the Australian “Catholic” Bishops issued **The AIDS Crisis**, in which they recommend greater charity and understanding for the “victims.” They admit early: “There is no escaping the brutal fact that this world-wide epidemic of A.I.D.S. is one disastrous result of promiscuous sexual behavior.” [Do we hear “sodomy?” or even “perversion?”] “..... promiscuity is the main cause of our problem. What has always been sinful is now becoming suicidal.” “As a Christian Church we have a duty to present our teaching for consideration” [God constituted His Holy Church an advisory board—“a Christian Church?” Somehow I missed all these bishops’ dutiful protest against New South Wales gay rights legislation.] “A.I.D.S. should not be presented as a divine judgement on a sexually permissive society.” [still no “sodomy” or “perversion.”] “It is wrong to stand in judgement of individuals who have contracted the disease. By any criterion many are innocent sufferers. when we ignore or contradict the laws of nature harmful consequences often follow. damage from the pollution of our environment Hangovers we do not condone homosexual practices or the abuse of drugs although our attitude to all persons, especially those who suffer, must be one of respect, concern and practical help. We reject suggestions of quarantine and segregation for A.I.D.S. patients. Such discrimination could easily become a denial of basic justice and Christian love at a time of great need. ”

My father and two uncles died segregated—tuberculosis. They had the last sacraments—the ultimate charity. Bishops in their day spoke out against perversion, crime, and even minor abuses of public trust. They did **not** present segregation of victims of leprosy or smallpox as denial of basic justice. They did **not** discriminate against society at large for the “rights” or “benefit” of perverts who deliberately spread their own **vice** and its **known** consequences.

But why expect modernist bishops to perform their corrective duties in **this** field, any more than in those of worship or education?

The Sydney Morning Herald reported Friday 7 March 1986 an agreement

between Anglicans and Catholics on the validity of Anglican orders. This agreement bears out our contention that Paul VI’s new “orders,” promulgated with his new “mass,” share its invalidity. Valid orders could never have satisfied the terms of agreement.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol 1, 495d: “..... when the old” (Catholic) “and the new” (Anglican) “rite are compared, it appears that the difference lies just in this: that the framers of the new have cut out all that in the old gave expression to the idea of a mystic *sacerdotium* in the Catholic sense of the term. There is also the connected fact that the introduction of the Edwardine Ordinal was the outcome of the same general movement which led to the pulling down of the altars and the substitution of communion tables, in order that, as Ridley expressed it, ‘the form of a table shall more move the simple people from the superstitious opinions of the Popish mass unto the right use of the Lord’s supper.’” The parallel with Paul VI’s *novus ordo* is compellingly obvious.

498c, *ibid.*: “..... whether the pronouncement of the Bull ‘*Apostolicae Curae*’” (which declared Anglican orders invalid) “is to be taken as an infallible utterance of the Holy See. But even if it were not it would not follow that it can be disregarded, and its eventual withdrawal confidently anticipated. What may be safely assumed is that it fixes the belief and practice of the Catholic Church irrevocably. This at least Leo XIII must have meant to signify when in his letter to Cardinal Richard, of 5 November, 1896, he declared that his ‘intention had been to pass a final judgment and settle (the question) forever’, and that ‘Catholics were bound to receive (the judgment) with the fullest obedience as *perpetuo firmam, ratam, irrevocabilem*.’”

Occasionally we cite opinions of those who have arrived at many of our own conclusions without the slightest knowledge of our existence. From the typewriter of a new subscriber in Pennsylvania, whom we have **not** beaten over the head for fourteen years: —“Rather than render the dogma of infallibility such that we have no ‘sure interpreter,’ as Leo XIII warned, leaving us no confidence in the Magisterium except when it acts in the extraordinary manner (perhaps once a century?)—therefore Christ did not provide the means to accomplish the end that we hear Him when we hear His Church—I reject the concept that the Church can err in matters of faith and morals when teaching in the ordinary manner by the same, one magisterium. It appears this dogma is ‘explained away’ by pseudo-traditionalists in order to grant that a heretic may be Catholic, even Pope, at the same time. One is then forced into heresy, that is, to pick and choose what ‘ordinary’ teachings to follow.

“This seems the dreaded ‘lukewarm’ position, about which our Lord warned us. It is obvious that V-2 and its Popes are heretical. Some good phrases in V-2 documents remind me of the broken clock that shows the correct time twice a day. What ever became of ‘*ab uno disce omnes*’ and *ex pede Herculem*?

“I find it rather odd that so many pseudo-traditionalists dilute doctrine in order to prove they have a legitimate Pope to disobey.

“Even if not guilty of schism in fact because there is no Pope, they are nonetheless guilty of schism of intent. They intend to disobey the man they profess is Pope. I am, perhaps, more bitter towards the pseudos than to the heretics themselves. Why must Lefebvre have his cake and eat it too? Why hold JP2 as a legitimate Pope, and then disobey JP2’s discipline? Far better to prove to the laity and publicly acknowledge that JP2 is not Pope first, and then act like a Catholic bishop ought. How sad that so many pseudos don’t give a damn about the conscience problems of the laity, but think only of their own cults and sects.”

This reminds me of my son’s accolade for the Latin Mass Society of Australia: How inspiring to see all these people taking a stand against taking a stand.

“**All this bickering among traditionalists must cease.** There are only a few of us left.”— A priest visiting Sydney mid-November 1983.

Lacking a current standard of unity those who consider themselves Catholic can seemingly agree on little but the fact that things have changed. They quarrel and accuse each other of heresies which usually prove matters of opinion—often not even theological. Presentation of opinion, and often of fact, draws fire as limitation on freedom. The masonic heresy of majority rule, having destroyed all Catholic civil governments, has finally entrenched itself in the Church government. Thence it seems to have gulled within their small minority sphere the traditionalists, who should discern and face facts, without regard to numbers.

FACT—On the death of Pius XII the Conclave of Cardinals was faced, according to the news media’s minute coverage, with a dearth of papal timber. So it elected a man of short life expectancy who would appoint a Cardinal of papal calibre. He performed his duty—his first cardinal was the man who would have been elected had he already belonged to the College, that able, efficient administrator who was making things hum at Milan, Giambattista Montini. But the whole idea smacked of heresy. Nearly every type, of every degree of moral, intellectual, administrative, or temperamental capacity, had filled the office of Vicar of Christ, the Real Head. Would a farmer or fisherman be classed as papal timber? The whole idea is that Christ can use anyone; the real power lies in His message, not in the messenger.

FACT—This “interim pope” discovered a new method for governing the Church—**inspiration!** The discovery was a fact, not the inspiration, which

(**FACT**) served as sole excuse for convocation of a council to update the Church, to open to re-examination every Catholic doctrine but one (papal infallibility), to accommodate to modern man—to make drastic change in the Church which has

(**FACT**) one purpose, preservation and propagation of Christ’s eternal, unchangeable message.

FACT—This very convocation violated Pius II’s *Exsecrabilis*, which nullified such a council beforehand.

FACT—Roncalli, the jolly old “interim pope,” made changes in the Mass, in violation of St. Pius V’s law, *Quo primum tempore*, and kept his council in session after it had produced its Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy in blatant violation of the same law. Although he died before he could promulgate the constitution, he cleared its passage.

(FACT) He forced octogenarian Gaetano Cardinal Cicognani, President of the Liturgical Preparatory Commission, to sign the schema for presentation to the council.

FACT—This Constitution and Roncalli’s Mass changes produced the climate in which Montini suppressed the traditional Latin Mass and most of the sacraments.

FACT—Jesus Christ said: “By their fruits you **shall** know them.”

FACT—Montini, though not inspired, reconvoled the council already proven in violation of *Exsecrabilis* and *Quo primum tempore*.

FACT—This council voted at least another twelve explicit, previously condemned heresies and Montini promulgated them as Catholic doctrine.

FACT—Canon Law removes public heretics automatically, without declaration, from all offices in the Catholic Church.

FACT—Heretics, not being members of the Church, are ineligible for office or jurisdiction in the Church.

FACT—Montini, Luciani, and Wojtyla were public heretics **before** their “elections” by packed conclaves.

FACT—They were never popes; therefore they had (have) no power or authority to regulate, restrict, or permit—never mind change—certainly no power to convoke or re-convoke a council.

FACT—Catholics can accept **none** of their acts—innovative or traditional.

FACT—Catholics must reject all their laws, doctrines, regulations, and bluffs without exception, and adhere to the tradition of nineteen centuries.

FACT—The Holy See is vacant, through the automatic operation of Canon Law concerning public heretics.

FACT—Until Montini quietly dropped the requirement, all priests and higher clergy swore two most solemn oaths at ordination, consecration, or promotion: (1) a profession of the Catholic Faith, and (2) against the doctrines of modernism.

FACT—Had they kept their oaths, the first change could never have invaded one parish, diocese, or religious community on earth.

FACT—Those who will not recognize and accept facts will inevitably become confused.

Let us examine a few opinions.

1) John XXIII was a heretic for not submitting his inspiration to convoke a council to the norms of St. John of the Cross. The fact that an inspiration strikes during one’s prayers cannot exempt the recipient from proper tests.

Many indeed have inspirations while praying, but most recognize them as distractions. In John’s case personal inspiration was the only conceivable excuse for calling a council. He alone in Rome seemed to wish a council. Would it be too much to suggest that he lied in this matter as in so many others? Please note that at least one holder of this opinion holds also that Paul VI’s new “mass” is valid. John XXIII, the argument runs, is bound by the theology of St. John of the Cross, but Paul VI is not bound by Pope St. Pius V’s (moral) decree.

2) St. Robert Bellarmine holds that an heretical pope loses the pontificate *ipso facto* when his heresy becomes public knowledge. Having lost the papacy, the “pope,” becoming an inferior, can then be judged by the Church. Therewith the principle of papal authority remains intact in Bellarmine’s teaching. This is of utmost importance in our present situation when the validity of the sacraments, as they are administered in the prescribed conciliar form, is **called into question by certain traditionalist groups**. For even today, and especially today, the doctrine of St. Thomas

Aquinas holds true: “By faith alone do we hold truths which are above nature, and what we believe rests on authority.”

This opinion errs doubly in (1) granting this improperly and illegally convoked council power to prescribe forms for sacraments; (2) pretending that the council really prescribed or ordered change in sacramental forms. We do not call the “sacramental” changes into question; we condemn them outright as *ultra vires* and deliberately heretical, as well as never ordered by the council in the first place. Even a genuine council has no authority to effect **change** in sacramental **forms**. These changes—even to reclassifying **form** as **formula**—“correct” Jesus Christ, His Apostles, His Church, and its Tradition. They are outright lies, often enough previously condemned heresies, not above nature, cannot be accepted on faith, especially faith in authority which contradicts that authority upon which true faith rests. This strange opinion quotes St. Thomas on this point as a man suddenly faced with a crawl through the raging firebox of a steam locomotive would quote his swimming teacher. St. Thomas’ doctrine applies to genuine sacraments in the Church’s tradition. Absolutely nothing guarantees innovation in matters (or forms) entrusted to the Church for **preservation**, even supposing change (necessarily creating argument and probable doubt) warrantable for some genuine reason such as neither Roncalli nor his “council” ever advanced.

3) We classify John XXIII a heretic only from the time he decided to **continue** the council in knowing opposition to Christ’s will.

When will they face the fact that he **planned** and **convoked** the council in such knowing opposition? What else **is** updating, accommodation to modern man, exposing all but one doctrine (papal infallibility) to re-examination? Why was Paul VI not in heresy for reconvening the same council? It still had no proper base; it had already projected heretical change.

4) John XXIII continued to exercise the office of pope until his death. This was because, though he was a heretic, his heresy remained occult. He and Paul VI thus remained infallible. The Holy Ghost continued to support them in office.

By self-contradiction? Did some one expect formal resignations? Or public condemnations by prelates party to the plot? Or the Holy Ghost to strike them with lightning? Can we not reason from the condemned nature of Roncalli’s and Montini’s heresies that these heretics cannot have been popes? Do we not understand that we reduce ourselves to heresy in choosing among the teachings and actions of these “popes?” If they are popes they are infallible in matters of faith and morals. If they err—and they obviously **have** erred—in such matters they are not popes, and must be ignored in **all** their orders and teachings. All theological opinions fade before the law. Canons 188 n. 4 and 2314 §1 apply. A heretic is deposed by the fact itself of his public heresy, **without any declaration**.

5) Paul VI reconvoked Vatican II in all innocence, not realizing its heretical nature.

This opinion disregards the fact that Paul VI, an ineligible public heretic, had no authority to convoke a council. Many deceive themselves into belief in his orthodoxy and good will. He was “unaware” of the council’s heretical nature, despite his close rapport and residence with Roncalli through the first session. This view is utterly inconsistent with the dogma of papal infallibility. A genuine pope **under the guidance and protection of the Holy Ghost** could not fall into heresy and destruction of the Church by **accident**. He would necessarily know what he was doing and would necessarily choose deliberately to do it. He would necessarily oppose the Holy Ghost every foot of the way. Why must we beat the brush for improbable explanations? Why not the final apostasy, which is of faith? Why not at least “an enemy hath done this?”

6) The popes are not to blame for the postconciliar rot. The bishops work behind the pope’s back. They deceive him, thwart him, and disobey his orders.

We know that Montini and Roncalli worked behind Pius XII’s back, notably in dealings with communists. They deceived him in founding the “barbed-wire seminaries” for German prisoners of war, specifically in perversion of the curriculum. But if the postconciliar “popes” can be held

blameless because deceived, then **all** their bishops—including those who succeeded them in the papal office—must have deceived them. When each in turn assumed the office did he forget that he and all his fellow-bishops had plotted against the “pope” and permit himself to be deceived in the same manner in the same particulars? When the rot is universal—and what area has escaped it?—the blame attaches to the top. For the top man has the means and duty to know the situation and the authority to remedy it—immediately.

Opinions like these can apparently be held in good faith, especially by those bemused by inaccurate definitions of papal infallibility. I hesitate to brand them heretics, but they will take few prizes for logic or good sense. Wherever opinions of this nature prevail paralysis sets in. All must obey the “pope” instead of resisting and shunning the heretic. Paul VI shut down the engines, we hear, leaving the priest without a Church to authorize his priestly functions. This seems an accurate appraisal; to all appearances Paul shut down the engines. But he thereby exceeded the legitimate powers of a genuine pope. He accomplished his destruction only because most people would not believe the evidence of his public heresy, or mistakenly conceded him power of life and death over the Church. Only blind, stubborn adherence to these two misconceptions allowed Paul to succeed.

Could a genuine pope kill the Church? Certainly not by accident. Could a genuine pope **intend** to kill the Church? In any case it is every Catholic’s duty to resist—to profess the faith, to preserve the Church to the limit of his powers and ability, be he bishop, priest, or layman. None should permit heretics to limit legitimate functions. To avoid their limitation one must, then, quote the heresy, delate the heretic, and declare the Holy See vacant—his only justification for refusal to obey the usurper.

But none should assume unusual functions. Should a former missionary believe he can confirm, though he has left the territory in which he was formerly delegated, he must wrest law and logic to the utmost. When he has persuaded himself he must then persuade the laity. Since this seems another innovation to most laymen, traditional Catholics will hesitate to believe the priest, and extend their disbelief to his legitimate functions. In rejecting him they may never again hear Mass or receive the sacraments. The priest places another unnecessary burden on the laity, whether he confirms validly or not, and is responsible before God for those whom he thus puts off. No one wishes to associate himself with a doubtful sacrament; it may entail sacrilege or idolatry. Who needs another chance for damnation? Is this the safer course, to which we are bound in sacramental matters?

In a choice between a doubtful sacrament and no sacrament, such a priest may argue, one must choose the doubtful. He may then cite the unusual case of a child unlikely to live, born in an abnormal position, who must then be baptized on whatever part is presented rather than upon the head, which may be dead before it becomes accessible. Emergency requires emergency action, hopefully efficacious for salvation. Confirmation is not absolutely required for salvation. In addition to doubt surrounding the validity and liceity of such a priest’s use of the form, doubt also concerns the matter, which is Holy Chrism blessed by a **Catholic bishop** applied in the form of the Cross during the imposition of hands. What bishop has blessed his chrism? If the priest blesses his own chrism he exceeds the limits of his former, territorial, special papal delegation to confirm. Doubt is never permitted in our sacraments, especially when avoidable.

Some self-designated traditionalists, though they deplore the *novus ordo missae*, refuse to call it invalid. Others (e.g., Lefebvre) consider it valid sometimes. Still others believe it invalid but somehow capable of producing the Holy Eucharist. This opinion, that between a doubtful sacrament and no sacrament the doubtful is to be chosen, would leave all these people no alternative but to assist at the Sunday *novus ordo missae* when no real Mass is available. Why would they not be more obliged to assist (also against canon law) at a local schismatic **genuine** Mass?

Objection—A priest of no particular diocese says that he can confirm because given this faculty in his mission territory.

Reply—Was he delegated this faculty before or after Vatican II? Does he still operate over some

or all of this mission territory? In certain specific circumstances certain priests are granted the faculty to confirm—an extraordinary power not to be assumed under Canon 209.

The Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments (14 Sept 1946) issued a decree approved 20 Aug. by Pope Pius XII effective 1 Jan. 1947:

1. By general indult of the Holy See, the faculty to confer the sacrament of Confirmation as extraordinary ministers (canon 782, §2), only in the cases and under the conditions mentioned below, is given to the following priests and to them only:

- (a) to pastors who have a territory of their own, exclusive therefore of personal and family pastors unless these also have their own proper, even though cumulative, territory;
- (b) To the vicars mentioned in canon 471 and to vicar administrators;
- (c) To priests to whom the full care of souls with all the rights and duties of pastors has been entrusted in an exclusive and stable manner in a definite territory with a determinate church.

2. The aforesaid ministers can validly and licitly confer Confirmation themselves personally, only upon the faithful who are staying in their territory, including the persons who are staying in places which have been withdrawn from parochial jurisdiction; including, therefore, seminaries, guest-houses, sanatoria and other institutions of every sort, and religious institutes however exempt (c 792); **provided these faithful by reason of grave illness are in genuine danger of death from which it is foreseen that they will die.**

If these ministers overstep the limits of this mandate, they must fully realize that they act invalidly and confer no sacrament, and that moreover the provision of canon 2365 remains in full operation. (Canon 2365: A priest who, neither by law nor by concession of the Roman Pontiff, has the faculty to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation, and yet dares to administer this sacrament, shall be suspended. A priest who presumes to administer Confirmation beyond the limits of the faculty conceded to him, is automatically deprived of such faculty.)

(7 paragraphs do not apply. But) right after this decree in Bouscaren's Canon Law Digest, Vol III, "Discipline of the Code of Canon Law to be observed in Conferring Confirmation in Virtue of this Apostolic indult: 3. The chrism which is used in the administration of this sacrament, even by a simple priest, must be consecrated by a Bishop who is in communion with the Holy See, on the last preceding Holy Thursday; it is never allowed to administer Confirmation without chrism, or to receive the chrism from heretical or schismatic bishops.

"The Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith obtained further concessions which it published 18 Dec. 1947: Accordingly His Holiness granted to all local Ordinaries who depend on this Sacred Congregation, without prejudice to other indults the power by Apostolic indult (can. 782, §2) to give to **all priests** who are subject to them and have the care of souls, the faculty to administer Sacred Confirmation validly to the faithful, whether adults or infants, within the territorial boundaries of the mission and are in danger of death;"

The broadened concession is, therefore, in the number of priests, not in the conditions and limitations.

A Rescript of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments (N. 5869/48, 18 Nov. 1948) granted faculties to regularly assigned chaplains at maternity hospitals and orphanages to confirm children in danger of death, when a bishop is unavailable. The same faculty was granted missionaries of emigrants in favor of their subjects on the point of death.

It would appear that your priest has overstepped the bounds and lost whatever faculties he may have possessed. But this would not render him schismatic or heretical—merely in violation of Canon Law on this particular point. Whether or not he can confirm validly, don't risk sacrilege.

Quo primum tempore guarantees the priest his right to celebrate the Tridentine Latin Mass. Nothing guarantees the priest the right to confirm. He was ordained to celebrate Mass, not for extraordinary faculties.

FIAT VOLUNTAS TUA

Most traditional Catholics encounter tremendous difficulty in their efforts to practise their religion. Mass and sacraments are largely unavailable or tainted, either in their source or in heretical/schismatic tendencies of the priest. To all **appearances**, the Church has closed its doors and stopped its engines.

Had St. Paul not infallibly (Scripturally) prophesied a final apostasy, we would experience more difficulties concerning the state of the (to appearances) Church. But the Church has not shut up shop except to the extent that its *quondam* members have followed its putative members (“popes” and bishops) into St. Paul’s prophesy. Although these apostates had (have) neither status nor jurisdiction in the Church, they **appear** to have affected it, bringing on in fact, as well as in violation of their oaths and all ecclesiastical and divine law, a dire shortage of all Catholic practice. Beyond this I see little profit in speculation.

God has permitted this catastrophe, but man has willed it. When men won’t take reasonable care of their health they sicken. When muscles or brains are left idle they soften and decay. Graces repeatedly refused are withdrawn. So a generation largely forgetful of and little valuing the Faith and its practice has merited their loss.

Though we fall under our generation’s self-inflicted interdict, we remain Catholics, obliged, as far as possible, to **practise** our religion. No legitimate authority has released us from vows or oaths, from Friday abstinence, from Lenten fast, from the reasonably available **true** Mass of a **Catholic** priest on Sundays and Holy Days of Obligation, from Jesus Christ’s mandate to propagate the Faith. We live in strange circumstances under God’s **permissive** will; we are bound, nevertheless, to follow His **positive** will—that for which we pray whenever we pray the Lord’s Prayer.

I cannot resist quoting a letter from Illinois:

“..... what Roncalli/Montini/Wojtyla did was analogous to the introduction and acceptance of Federal Reserve Corporation notes into our monetary system, when the law of the land, still valid, doesn’t provide for their use as payment of debts for business with the states. I noticed several years ago that the income tax and phunny money ploys of Big Brother were conducted in exactly the same spirit, and often in exactly the same manner, as the V-2 gathering. Modernism is a philosophical and spiritual disease which also struck root, perhaps even more firmly, in the profane sphere. The monetary realists and strict interpretation tax students are set up and used the same way traditionalists are. The same enemy is behind both drives for spiritual and secular idolatry, so why should there be two methods when one works so admirably? The introduction of a counterfeit and acceptance of the same, when the legal standard has never been abolished lawfully and in fact is still in force, was performed dozens of times around the world in various nations, in regard to money; so why not try it with things spiritual? The psychology is the same; and it worked for them, but the U. S. Constitution (for what it is worth) is still there, and so is the Church, no matter how many people ignore it or pretend that their conciliar monstrosity is the same thing. There is no need for the usurpation of power—just get the counterfeit (money or doctrine or morals) accepted, never mind abolishing the legal and established medium of exchange or dogma. That is the significance of Paul’s ‘wishing.’ He couldn’t use power he never had, never having been eligible for the papacy (and he knew that better than anyone else), but if people want to believe that he is pope—why, fine! The result would be the same: loss of faith universally, the neglect (or destruction) of the sacraments, and so on

An old axiom goes: “Bad money drives out good money.” Some one has surely debased the coin of our worship. Legitimately?

Ever diminishing chance to assist at Mass leaves most of us with but one offering, our will, to be conformed to God’s.

When I have learned to do the Father’s will, I shall have fully realized my vocation on earth.
—Carlo Carretto

THE MOST SUCCESSFUL REVOLUTION SPILLS NO BLOOD.

It washes the brain. It slithers by and leaves the great majority unaware of its slimy passage, unaware its rulers have emerged from deep-laid plots and introduced massive subversion. So this great majority, trained to obey legitimate authority, continues to obey the illegitimate. Accustomed to benevolent government it simply refuses to believe the malevolence of the revolutionary usurpers because it has noticed no revolution, and therefore it could not have happened.

The revolution, meanwhile, preaches traditional virtues—obedience and humility—and trades on the good name of what it replaces. Its courts produce only travesties of justice. Its control of the means of communication, necessary for its initial success, becomes absolute. The revolution muzzles or neutralizes the few who detect it. It breeds prejudice against them by painting them pernicious. It colors them crazy so it need not argue with them. It seldom crosses the line into violence, for that would create wonder and perhaps investigation.

When such a revolution took over the Vatican one of its major weapons was papal infallibility, or rather its proven misapprehension by the majority of Catholics as power to impose and command obedience to innovations in worship and doctrine. This absurd obedience is the sole argument and excuse advanced by our perjured clergy, who pretend this argument has not been slaughtered repeatedly by better informed or braver priests around the world. It is inconceivable that the apostates know no better, and that they are deceived—blinded and brainwashed like the laity for whose misleading they are responsible. As Father J. P. Rayssiguier wrote publicly to Paul VI (1970):

‘I heard you say last June 29: ‘The rapport of the faithful with Christ has in Peter its minister, its interpreter, its guarantor. All must obey him (the pope) in whatever he orders, if they wish to be associated with the new economy of the Gospel—’

‘‘Such a claim, such a deception, such an error professed from your lips lays a great burden on our souls. Truly now, do you really believe that we must obey whatever you command, that we must accept your ‘new economy of the Gospel?’ —Impossible!

‘‘Only shortly earlier many pilgrims had come to you with the mildest, most deferential protest against the scandals of the ‘New Ordo.’ Now on this 29th of June you, with your aberrant propositions, lay scorn, with haughtiest, most cynical lordliness, on priests and faithful who had come from Spain, Austria, Belgium, Switzerland, and America to beg you to return the Holy Mass which you had taken from them.

‘‘Since you have reigned in Rome, Rome teaches a twisted, inverted, corrupted Gospel—a ‘new economy of the Gospel.’ In all conscience, in the name of the Church which you are leading into error, in the name of the Faith, we cannot accept your ‘new economy of the Gospel’—because the Gospel cannot be submitted to a ‘new economy.’ It cannot be manipulated, re-thought, changed, modernized, aggiornamented, falsified, or Montini-ized.

‘‘This new religion—this shameless, dissolute religion—which you now teach us and compel us to practise—the religion of Paul VI, is a false religion. God does not wish it. He condemns it as He condemned that of Luther.

‘‘In order to force us into your new religion you tell us that it is our duty to obey whatever you order. you—because you are a modern and a Modernist—have a false conception of obedience. You sneer at the ‘Church of the Middle Ages’; you sneer at St. Thomas Aquinas—whom you do not know, whom you do not like, whom you have never read. It is well-known that your theological knowledge is rather scanty

‘‘Learn then that according to the ‘Angelic Doctor’ and all Catholic tradition from Jesus Christ to John XXIII, the command of obedience to a Superior has value only if it yields obedience to God, only if the Superior orders it according to God.

“The act of personal will by which, as Superior and Teacher, you ordain to the abandonment of the Holy Mass is **not**—it is only too evident—in conformity with the Mind and Will of God; it is not founded on the Mind and Will of Christ. In the manner of a disciple of liberal Protestants you think against God, will against God, decree against God. To obey you in these things would be to disobey God, betray Christ and the Church. *Non possumus!*”

“Because God is the Light, Truth, Authenticity, Clarity, Loyalty, Justice, Faithfulness, He does not like the ambiguity and equivocation which without ceasing you profess—especially in your doctrine of the ‘new mass.’ Like a true Protestant you organize ambiguity and equivocation and have raised them to the level of a method and a Dogma. You have founded the religion of ambiguity, a church of duplicity. And now you fraudulently try to force us to accept the ‘Supper’ of the Protestants which diminishes Christ, the Priesthood, the Mass, the Holy Sacrifice. You tell us that we must accept all this because we must be ‘obedient’ to you!”

“You demand servility, false and culpable obedience to your errors and confusions. When Paul VI lowers himself to the level of a J. B. Montini (a non-priest) he no longer interests us and has no more rights over us, no title to our obedience.

“The everlasting and immutable theology of God’s True Church, which you apparently disdain, teaches: (1) We are clearly bound to obey you only in the measure that your precepts are an authentic echo of the Will of God; and (2) That we are dispensed from obeying you when a command emanates from an authority higher than you—that of the Holy Ghost speaking through living tradition, imperishable, through the mouths of your 264 predecessors on the throne of St. Peter, an authority which Paul VI disdains because it is ‘not in accord with the relevance of the new economy of the Gospel.’

“We are clearly not bound to obey you when you give commands surpassing the limits of your authority, when you abuse your power and are motivated by caprice. This is especially true in the case of your ‘new Mass,’ because ‘The faithful subjects are not submitted indiscriminately to their superiors in all things—but only in a fixed sphere, outside of which superiors cannot intervene without usurping their power.’—(St. Thomas Aquinas)

“This much is clear: **You do not have the authority to impose upon the Catholic faithful** the ‘new Mass,’ the impious Mass.

“The ‘new Mass of Paul VI’ which in your lamentable discourse of November 29, 1969 you declared to be conformed to Catholic Tradition, is in fact a new and false mass which you have had confected by the evil liturgist Bugnini (previously expelled from Lateran College when he tried to promulgate the same corruptions), by Calvinist Max Thurian, by Anglicans Smith and Konneth, by Lutherans George and Sheppard—your new mass with its subversive ambiguity, its sacrilegious profanation, its heresy, its impiety, is such an intolerable insult to the Catholic Faith to which it gives lip service that we cannot accept it.

“Alas; Rome and the Vatican are no longer the head of the Church. The salt of the earth is tasteless and insipid. The ‘self-destruction’ of the Church which you once publicly bewailed was set in motion by your own hand.

“May the Rome of Paul VI cease to be disobedient to Christ and the Holy Ghost.”

Until the revolution nearly all our clergy were educated in the Catholic Faith and were exposed for years to St. Thomas Aquinas. They knew the extent of their own apostasy, heresy, and cowardice. When you confront them please do not grant them the imputation or privileges of good faith. Nearly all have become pathological, habitual, brazen liars. They tell us they must obey the pope, that this is their only safe course, that they must not fall into schism or they cannot be saved. But they cannot be saved if they suffer the loss of the flocks entrusted to **their** care. If the innovations which they permit only in breaking their own most solemn oaths have driven anyone from the Church **they** are responsible. The clergy are not clergy for themselves but for us. They are bound to

show us the way, to tell us the truth. They will never take up their duties while we believe them obedient and helpless, but only when we hold up to them the mirror of inescapable fact.

Father Faber preached (London Oratory, Pentecost, 1861): “We must remember that if all the manifestly good men were on one side and all the manifestly bad men on the other, there would be no danger of anyone, least of all the elect, being deceived by lying wonders. It is the good men, good once, we must hope good still, who are to do the work of Anti-Christ and so sadly to crucify the Lord afresh. Bear in mind this feature of the last days, that this deceitfulness arises from good men being on the wrong side.”

“..... we must hope good still,” though forlornly, I suspect. All men sin; good men repent. Sin is not repented till its sinfulness is acknowledged. Revolution is not suppressed until its existence is recognized.

Letter from Brisbane

A priest, concerned at my traditional stand, told me that Catholics must obey the pope. “Where the pope is there is the Church.” I asked what to do when convinced that an enemy, possibly the Antichrist of prophecy, had usurped the Chair of Peter. If one had illusions about Vatican II one need only consider its fruits. Even the simplest Catholic could apply this test. No reply.

A daughter, concerned about rearing her children in the faith of their fathers, asked why they could not have access to **their** Mass. The archbishop’s spokesman informed her that their fathers’ Mass had been superseded—“no longer meaningful,” a far too familiar phrase, often the only excuse of our oath-breaking clergy.

Cardinal Benelli explained in a published interview that Vatican II and the new “mass” represented a “different ecclesiology.” There was no room for the old Mass in the “new ecclesiology.” Had we been told ten or twelve years ago that “the Mass that matters; the Mass that counts” would be forbidden, even the tame cats who accepted the fraud would have risen in wrath. The mask is off. Benelli officially admitted that the new “mass” is not our Mass, no matter how often our priests had reassured us “nothing has been changed.” Catholics should unite to restore the Mass. Priests should realize how great a reward awaits those who lead the fight.

“*Tolle missam, tolle ecclesiam,*” said Luther. Let us concentrate on the main issue: to save the Catholic Church restore the Catholic Mass. We owe this at least to the English martyrs who died rather than accept Luther’s and Cranmer’s reforms.

Reply: Benelli certainly removed the mask for the laity, but the clergy should have seen through it when the experiment was introduced. The *institutio generalis* even defined the fraud, and reaction poured in from around the world. But Bugnini quelled the clamor, changing the definition without changing a fraudulent word in the fraud itself. We need expect little support from our perjured priests, and none from that great traditionalist organization, *Una Voce*, whose chief, having interviewed Benelli and elicited the “new ecclesiology,” still refuses to admit the invalidity of the *novus ordo*.

Agreed, we need the Mass. We should concentrate on getting it back. But the Church survived over two centuries in Japan without it. “Going therefore **teach** ye all nations, **baptizing** them

” not necessarily getting them to Mass. Doctrine comes first, and probably last. I think each man should try to get everything back, and to specialize if he is more suited to certain aspects. But let us not narrow or restrict the fight unless we see that a certain approach will convert a certain individual.

KINGLESS ROYAL GAME

Our revealed religion has somehow degenerated into a great chess game in which we have no king (object of the game) or queen (strongest offensive weapon), and our bishops have horsed us around and rooked us. Formerly each bishop governed his properly assigned squares; by combining into this great rook, collegiality, they cover the whole board.

Realizing the resistance their reforms were bound to generate, they forced their priests into retraining programs, and used every gambit to neutralize the laity. A knight has a different approach, and frequently gums up the works. His move is set, always the same. Black is black and white is white. When he leaves the white he no longer lands inevitably on black; he may land on black or white, or both, at any undetermined distance, even off the board. What has taken him out of play? What has changed the knight-errant into a knight aberrant who no longer knows his proper move? Flattery and involvement, democracy, and local, “identity”-conferring peculiarities.

The gambit: Approach the better educated or professional man, the pillar-of-the-Church, the man with interest or reputation, the man whose views the parishioners would esteem, and ask his cooperation in the Church’s time of need to bring us all through this crisis. Who could refuse? Who looked for the booby-trap? We believed our clergy and bishops orthodox and honest.

To many dioceses came a sudden revival of the Legion of Mary, often tolerated as a well-meaning nuisance. Now it became a vehicle of interest, a channel to distract the sincere Catholic from the basic change. Most parishes experienced the institution of the commentatorship. The commentator kept us abreast of the ceremonies, called us to prayer, told us when to kneel, stand, sit, shake hands, or dance, and otherwise continually annoyed us. Who needed a guide through Mass? We’d assisted every week for years.

In the New York archdiocese the commentator would say: “In the Epistle St. Paul tells us” for two minutes or so while the priest waited to read the Epistle in English so we could hear what St. Paul told us. Meanwhile the Mass was systematically stripped of “**useless** repetitions.” As the changes multiplied and the Mass as abbreviated took longer and longer, we began to perceive how necessary the commentator had become. But who asked: **since we were lost, what else was lost?**

The layman was dragooned into reading first the Epistle, then the Gospel. He was admitted to “minor orders”—made an “acolyte” so he could usurp other priestly duties—sick calls, distribution of “communion,” etc.—again because the Church needs help,

But democracy, like water, seeks its level. All these knights who should have defended their Church are reduced to pawns, who will never make it to the endgame. Chess, however, boasts its Cinderella story. The lowly pawn that arrives at the last row becomes a knight or a queen, and may well decide the issue. You cannot foretell the effect God may grant your lonely, lost-cause, last-ditch effort.

* * * * *

Objection—I am surprised, shocked, & stunned at (your) “three kinds of Baptism.” You do not believe Christ in His teaching (John iii, 5) or the Council of Trent VII, Canon 2 and its *ipso facto* excommunication for unbelief.

Reply—Your canon recognized that water is necessary for the **sacrament** of Baptism. Baptism of blood or desire are not sacramental. They admit no one to further sacraments—not that there is opportunity. The unbaptized martyr is covered by Jesus Christ in St. Matthew’s Gospel (x, 32): “Everyone therefore that shall confess Me before men, I will also confess him before My Father Who is in heaven,” and (x, 39): “He that shall lose his life for Me shall find it.” St. Ambrose taught that Valentinian II was saved through his desire for Baptism, though his murder intervened before pouring of the water.

“..... the other two are improperly called Baptisms for this reason, that in defect of Baptism of water, the other two take its place, and through the merciful disposition of God produce the same effect.”—Fr. Angelo Raineri

One cannot adhere strictly to literal interpretations of Scripture when it is shown that the Church tradition (itself Scripture’s authority) has always understood the Scripture in a sense modified by other parts of the same Scripture. Neither quotation (John iii, 5; Trent VII, Canon 2 on Baptism) covers, excludes, or in any way affects the other two “Baptisms.”

We Present Father Guerard Des Lauriers, O. P.

in an interview last year (1980) with a Toowoomba subscriber who visited him in France. Father reads and writes English, but is not up to conversational Australian, hence the slow, laborious, written form.

Q—What do you say of John Paul II?

A—J.P. II is *schismatique*, because the situation remains the same (as under Paul VI) whilst he has the duty (to) re-establish **order**. It seems impossible to declare that J.P. II is *formaliter hereticum*, because it is impossible to ask him the question. *Sedet in cathedra Petri* = is pope *materialiter*. *Non est Vicarius Christi* = is not pope *formaliter*.

Q—We avoid the *novus ordo* and will not attend it. Are we right and doing the will of God?

A—**Never, never go to *novus ordo*.....**

Q—Do you believe that the results of Vatican II are because of a conspiracy (Masons or Jews or Communism—or all these)?

A—**Yes**—with complicity from the “modernistes.”

Q—.... Lefebvre has said that the Tridentine Mass and the *novus ordo* can exist together.

A—24 December 1978, Mgr Lefebvre **ASKS** the pope for that. Against this disastrous letter I wrote a letter published in *Einsicht*.

Q—Is the Chair of Peter vacant?

A—**Formaliter—yes. Materialiter—no.** I maintain this distinction until it shall be evident that J. P. II is heretic.

Q—Why did Mgr. Lefebvre ask for that?

A—..... to save his “Fraternity.” His purpose, I suppose, is good but he is blind.

Q—..... if the pope declared *ex cathedra* that this would be so ?

A—**No! Sacrilegium.** Lefebvre is blind for two questions: Validity of *novus ordo*, Authenticity of Authority.....

Q—Surely some of the documents of Vatican II contain heretical statements. How then can such documents be interpreted in the light of tradition?

A—**Impossible.** There are truths in Vatican II but not because in Vatican II.

Q—.... Do you agree with *Liber Accusationis in Paulum Sextum* by Abbe de Nantes, and Father Barbara’s Accusations?

A—YesBut I think impossible **to make the proof** that Paul VI and J.P. II are heretics. **They are**, but it’s impossible make proof.

Q—Why did almost all cardinals, bishops, and religious desert to the *novus ordo*?

A—*Mysterium iniquitatis. Irenisme. Ecumenisme. Papolatrie.*

This interview demonstrates that men who can see Vatican II’s errors cannot make the connection that in signing and promulgating erroneous religion men publicly espouse heresy—in this case previously condemned heresy. The same men refuse also to see that in introducing the condemned heresy of Arius into official worship, or in permitting this *sacrilegium* in a parish or diocese, men join Arius in the worst heresy the Church ever condemned, and become themselves condemned heretics. Father’s “pope *materialiter*” is made up of whole cloth.

Objection—There **is** in JP2 (as there was in Paul VI) a pope, but in view of his false teaching a pope without divine authority—a pope who apart from merely **occupying** the papacy and appointing, on the merely human level, occupants for the bishops’ chairs has lost his office. Like the pope himself, the bishops are as so many corpses till they either correct their heresies or in the name of the Church are served official notice of them by at least **some** diocesan bishops. Only by two such warnings would either pope or bishops cease altogether to occupy their offices for having become manifest heretics.

Reply—A man without divine authority is not pope, whether he appears to occupy the papacy or not. A public heretic is ineligible. If (as with Paul VI, JP1, and JP2) he is elected anyway, such

election is null and void. Any ecclesiastical actions, from appointment of bishops to canonizations to promulgation of a new code of canon law, suffer from the same consequent lack of divine authority

Corpses have none of the rights or privileges of living men. The first penalty for public heresy is *ipso facto* excommunication, which removes clerics from all offices in the Church without any declaration. Not only are two warnings superfluous, **where** are your diocesan bishops to give them? Where is the legal requirement that these notice servers **must** be diocesan bishops? Anyone may warn anyone; the law has already penalized public heresy. Augustine's (1922) **A Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law**: "The censure inflicted is excommunication incurred *ipso facto*, which *per se* requires not even a declaratory sentence. Note that the term *moniti* (2314 §1, n. 2) does not refer to the incurring of the censure. Consequently, no canonical warning or admonition is required." The public heretic has already left the Church; how can he head or hold office in it from outside? The other penalties include "**privation of every** benefice, dignity, pension, **office**, or charge; also infamy and, after a fruitless warning, deposition." But the first part of the law is clear. The fact that no one will assume the duty of providing the warning required for the paperwork does not continue heretics in office or authority. In the cases under consideration sufficient warning has been provided by the Church for nineteen centuries. Our "pope" and "bishops" are neither ignorant nor in good faith. They were all trained in the religion. They were not ordained without passing their canonical examinations.

Objection—The Conciliar Church is not strictly speaking another church or new denomination. The visible establishment has forfeited its authority, yet in the providence of God it carries on the Church in its human aspect as a visible society.

Reply—It preaches different doctrines. It confers new (invalid) sacraments. Its official worship is idolatry. It is not the Church God provided. Strictly speaking, it is not a Church but an apostasy. Apostates fall under the same canon (2314) as heretics. Again, no declaration is required. What you term the **Session** (external functions) of the Church should be recognized rather as the **Secession** of the establishment. It may call itself Catholic, but so does the Church of England.

Objection—Pope Wojtyla and his henchmen occupy the offices of the Church illegitimately—if nonetheless validly.

Reply—They have all either lost all offices or ineligibly assumed them through public adherence to heresy. This is the law of the Church. This is the plainest sense. What do you gain by such a stupid statement?

Objection—We have a pope **materially** but not **formally**, since Vatican II and papal promulgation of teaching clearly contrary to the infallible magisterium. Sedevacantist arguments prove a vacant **office** rather than a vacant **throne**. For a vacant seat or throne may lead to a disastrous attempt to elect a pope to fill a chair not in fact empty, thus creating a schism.

Reply—Schism? We already have a full-fledged apostasy. A man either **is** or **is not** pope. No one ever heard of a part-pope, or an ineligible public heretic filling the papal office. How is the office different from the throne? Is a good background in philosophy and theology really necessary to distinguish a Catholic from a heretic?

Objection—The difference between *sede vacante* and *officio vacante* is the distinction between the Matter and Form of the papacy. The one duly elected to the papacy is "matter" or recipient for the divine Authority or "form" which by right belongs to him.

Reply—Desperate problems evoke desperate solutions. We are not concerned with one **duly elected** but with an ineligible public heretic masquerading as pope. It is all very well to make this philosophical distinction between formal and material papacy, but **both** form and matter are **required—essential, of the nature of** the man, the office, the divine Authority. Lacking either, a man is not a man, a horse is not a horse, a tree is not a tree, a rock is not a rock. One may treat either aspect philosophically, but if either is lacking the "body" does not exist. One may be a formal or a material heretic, but either way one **is** a heretic—not possibly a Catholic. Again, what is gained by introduction of this irrelevancy? Hylomorphism may have its place, but this is not it. Please

remember that most current problems have come down to us from philosophers and theologians with degrees. Anyone who recognizes a heretic as pope joins that “pope” in his heresy. If you say JP2 is a material heretic materially pope, are you not also a material heretic?

Objection—Only the official Church, through canonical warnings, short of his open avowal or admission, can convict JP2 of formal heresy.

Reply—You agree that the “official Church” has been taken over. You know well that it will never take such measures. You **should** know that canon law makes such measures unnecessary. Montini and Vatican II promulgated previously condemned heresies as publicly as possible. Not only did his two successors vote for and sign these heresies, they each stated on usurping office that the major objective of their reigns would be further implementation of this heretic council. Does this not constitute open avowal and admission of heresy? The holding of heresy is a fact; guilt need not be considered. **Any** kind of public heretic cannot be pope, cardinal, bishop, priest, or minor cleric **in** the Church.

Objection—What would become of order in the Church if “every Tom, Dick, or Harry” could judge with the force—moral if not physical—of law?

Reply—What **has** become of order in the Church?

Why will people jump to conclusions **for us**? A sedevacantist recognizes our factual, popeless situation. He readily admits that we should have a pope, that a true pope is highly beneficial and desirable as a standard of belief and a focus of unity. (He might even stay home in Vatican City and deal with urgent ecclesiastical matters, of which we have far too many.) But the sedevacantist recognition of fact hardly constitutes an irresistible urge to elect or even find another papal claimant. Confusion already reigns.

He could well have done without Ngo Dinh Thuc’s two lines of “bishops,” too. These men seem particularly good at fogging issues. They speak of material and formal popes, material and formal hierarchies, material and formal heresies. Think of the possibilities! Material and formal masses, sacraments, marriages, episcopal consecrations, ordinations, canon laws, creeds, doctrines—the field is boundless. One could procure a material annulment from a material pope and his materially heretical court, and remain formally married until the matter can be adjudicated by a formally heretical court under a formally heretical pope.

I trust that the good Father who brought Hylomorphism into the argument will not class me with C. E. M. Joad and his jocose comments on the jugginess of jugs, but that he will appreciate my point: that Hylomorphism has no application to lunacy, schizophrenia, or split persons. A unit (rock, tree, horse, man) has, according to this theory, matter **and** form. Both are characteristic of or essential to the unit. If either is missing the unit does not exist. One cannot be materially pope (or anything else) unless also formally pope (or whatever). Different facets, different functions, different powers of the same object may appear, be recognized, be examined; but the moment they are divorced from the total object they are facets, aspects, functions, or powers of **nothing**. We have come to bury the whole heretic—not to set up his hollow shell and praise it—to recognize his **material** papacy. Why anyone should wish to recognize such a useless and nebulous concept completely escapes me. We have trouble enough without borrowing nonsense.

EINSICHT, March 1982, A DECLARATION (in four languages. Unhappy with the English version we translated the **signed** Latin):

..... But how does today’s Church look to God? Do these masses please God? By no means: because that mass is the same for Catholics and Protestants— therefore it does not please God and is invalid. The only Mass that pleases God is the Mass of St. Pius V, which is celebrated by few priests and bishops, among whom am I. In addition many are the things which God rejects, for example: in the ordination of priests, in the consecration of bishops, in the sacrament of Confirmation and of Extreme Unction.

Moreover these “priests” devote themselves to 1) Modernism, 2) False ecumenism, 3) Worship of men, 4) Freedom to embrace any religion whatsoever; 5) They will not condemn for heresy, nor expel heretics.

Therefore, as a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, I declare the See of the Catholic Church at Rome vacant, and I must, as a bishop, do all things that the Catholic Church of Rome endure for the eternal salvation of souls.

Munich, 25 February, 1982

PETRUS MARTINUS NGO-DINH-THUC, Archbishop

[Without consideration of the archbishop’s projected measures we emphasize that any assumption of ecclesiastical authority must be preceded and supported by a statement of this nature. The lack of such a public position places Lefebvre hopelessly in violation of jurisdictions which he therefore concedes.

Whatever our view of Archbishop Ngo-Dinh-Thuc and his activities, his declaration is the first essential to entitle any bishop to be considered Catholic. Unfortunately, his statement was issued in the year following his second set of illicit consecrations. We should undoubtedly appreciate such statements more from bishops who were never taken in by the seers of Palmar de Troya. But we’ll find very few never taken in by Paul VI and Vatican II.

ARGUMENT CORNER

Objection (from a priest who adheres to the phantom jurisdiction of a new bishop from the latest line of Abp. Ngo Dinh Thuc)—We provide a hierarchy for the Catholic Church, which cannot exist without a visible hierarchy. The example of the Japanese was isolated—the Church existed elsewhere at the time.

Reply—What appreciable difference to those Japanese? They were isolated in place; we are isolated in time. The Church Militant existed then in Japan; it exists now. It will exist as long as it has living members.

Where was your essential visible hierarchy until recently, when Ngo Dinh Thuc decided on his own impossible authority to provide it? Was the Church not dead, having no visible hierarchy? You provide, moreover, a defective, headless hierarchy. A visible hierarchy, you argue, is essential to the Catholic religion. Why not a **complete** hierarchy with a visible head? Exactly the same argument applies:

The Church requires a visible head as essential to its existence. Were this true the Church would have died several times before the current empty seat, and Thuc’s Declaration of the Holy See’s vacancy would prove him a heretic. Since the Church **can** survive with no pope, as you obviously agree, why is a bishop necessary? Supposing a bishop, or a complete or incomplete hierarchy, essential, why a third-class collection of nit-pickers and squabblers that no one in his right mind would have appointed to responsibility in the worst of times? Why a mob that assumes and tries to enforce (even by excommunication) authority and jurisdiction obtained from no reasonable or confirmable source?

Query—Do Abp. Thuc’s bishops automatically receive jurisdiction to exercise episcopal powers at the time of their consecration?

Reply—Under normal circumstances Canon Law provides that no priest is ordained and no bishop is consecrated without an assignment or benefice. But there are no jobs to which new priests and bishops can be appointed. Certainly no one can ordain or consecrate outside the usual channels unless he first declares the usual channels outside the Catholic Church, for good and demonstrated reasons. One must either bow to legitimate authority or condemn illegitimate authority. (This demolishes Lefebvre.) Abp. Thuc appears to have acted improperly in his more recent episcopal consecrations; unless he assumed leadership of the Church he could not confer jurisdiction on priests or bishops, old or new. Unless these new bishops are public heretics the faithful may approach them **as excommunicated priests**.

Objection—You suggest (TWIN! # 16 page 5) that it could be permissible to approach the new bishops for spiritual goods. You imply that by condemning illegitimate authority one gains greater freedom to disregard Canon Law. This most certainly is not so except where the law literally cannot be observed, e.g. Sunday Mass attendance.

Archbp. Thuc, like all the rest, resigned his office at Vatican II; he cannot magically recover it simply by returning to the Catholic fold. The office of bishop must be returned to him by a pope. A bishop may consecrate another bishop only when absolutely certain he has a papal mandate, a manifest impossibility when there is no pope. Even supposing he were a bishop Thuc has no right to assume leadership of the Church. Popes or clerics with papal power (which you suggest he could become) simply are not elected that way.

Reply—**The Catholic Encyclopedia** Vol XIV page 346: “As the Church cannot deprive a suspended cleric of the power of sacred orders but only forbids their use, it follows that acts of sacred orders remain valid after suspension.” (from the permanent **character** of Holy Orders.) “..... acts of jurisdiction become null and void after a suspended cleric has been denounced by name, because the Church has power to deprive one totally of jurisdiction.”

It is not my reasoning that one may disregard Canon Law. I point out the absurdity of anyone who has not assumed leadership of the Church assigning jurisdiction. I neither imply nor intend inference that anyone **can** legitimately assume leadership outside the usual channels.

Thuc is not to be trusted. He could be granted a fool’s pardon for Palmar de Troya **subjectively**, provided that he repented publicly and re-adhered to the faith. But this performance cannot empower him to assume jurisdiction. He has not the **office** of bishop, but he **has** the sacramental power of a bishop, which he **may**, perhaps, exercise validly no matter how illicitly. It is just possible that unbalanced as he could be (to judge on past performance) Thuc thinks he is pope and believes he may therefore consecrate whom he will. The validity of such consecrations may therefore be suspect in the same manner as any action of a mental incompetent.

Men involved in consecrations without papal mandate are **suspended**, but their actions in violation of suspension are **illicit**, not **invalid**. Thuc **is** a bishop, though suspended, at least formerly heretical, and possibly *non compos mentis*. He **has** declared the Holy See vacant, though well after his violations, and he is to that extent correct. He has no **right** to consecrate or ordain but if he is sufficiently sane his conferred orders are valid. He has a better case than Lefebvre. Thuc’s recent bishops(?) are or were properly ordained Catholic priests; the faithful may request the spiritual goods of them as excommunicated priests. If they are in heresy the faithful may still repair to them in absence of all other sources for the last rites.

In TWIN! #10, page 6, right column I wrote: “Bishops who voted against Vatican II’s documents ...(see page 87)... Never let the cowardly perjurers forget it.”

Among these cowardly perjurers we must include Marcel Lefebvre and Ngo Dinh Thuc. When, therefore, a man applies to either for ordination or episcopal consecration he comes within a category clearly legislated against by the Church in Canon 2372 (quoted page 235). Anyone ordained in good faith by such men forfeits the right to exercise the order thus received until dispensed from the prohibition. It seems clear then that no one may approach **any** of Lefebvre’s or Thuc’s priests(?) or bishops(?) or indeed any priests ordained by any Vatican II bishop since that council’s first heretical promulgation, for Mass or sacraments except under such conditions as make it immaterial whether the priest is Catholic—when one is dying and no Catholic priest is available. For there is no one to absolve or dispense their suspension.

Both Lefebvre and Thuc lie under suspicion of inability to confer orders, even illicitly, one from probable lack of genuine orders himself, the other from possible mental incapacity. Not only do those who repair to these men or their ordinands run the clear risk of idolatry, they certainly and concurrently violate Church law. The Mass(?) at any price?

Objection—On what grounds do you cast doubt on Thuc’s mental capacity?

Reply—A report from an American priest without reason or inclination to lie. According to him, Thuc was at the time of the report under the equivalent of house arrest—incommunicado—under the protective custody of his Bishop(?) Vezelis. In the circumstances, Vezelis should have been more than anxious to display a sane Thuc, if only to prove validity of his own episcopal

consecration. If mere physical health is involved, how much could it have been affected by a short telephone conversation? Could the Palmar de Troya crowd hoodwink a sane bishop? Trust in such a man's responsibility comes hard. Nor can I imagine circumstances which would justify the effort. Thuc's bishops(?), even if convinced of the rectitude of their own actions, have no possible jurisdiction; and they **must** know this. So all their actions fall under reasonable suspicion.

Objection—Continued study has convinced me that Thuc's bishops have jurisdiction normally attached to the episcopacy. They were legitimately ordained in view of the grave threat to preservation of the Apostolic succession (on which the Church itself depends). Despite their abnormal or "extracanonial" consecration and lack of canonical status and assignment to dioceses, they have a true mission from the Church. Laws are to be applied according to the intent of the legislator (*epikeia*) where otherwise inapplicable through vacancy, actual or moral, of the Holy See.

Traditionalist (non-schismatic) bishops are the only bishops certainly Catholic—none more uncompromisingly so than the Thuc bishops. The universal or indeterminate jurisdiction held by extracanonically consecrated bishops is such accidentally by reason of extraordinary circumstances not essentially (as in the case of a pope) unrestricted. As priests serve the remnant under supplied jurisdiction (Canon 209) so Thuc's bishops seem rightly able to claim respect and obedience of priests and faithful the world over—through jurisdiction not supplied but ordinary as though normally assigned to dioceses. Their authority has a precedent in the world-wide jurisdiction of each of the Apostles. So Thuc's bishops need only agree on the particular territory of each.

Rejection of these bishops seems to confront us with the end of the Apostolic succession on which the Church's existence depends. So long then as no flaws are to be found in my reasoning, these prelates, whatever their personal limitations, should be welcomed as the answer to our needs and prayers.

Reply—For the presence of flaws some semblance of reasoning is required, not merely a series of barely related wishes and begged questions. Did the Church exist in Japan between 1620 and 1865? Of course! As St. Jerome said, where the faith is, there is the Church. But where was the Apostolic succession? Certainly not in Japan. There is no proof that the Church must cease to exist in the absence of popes, bishops, priests, or Mass. Only faith and Baptism are really necessary. Rejection of Thuc's bishops leaves us no worse off than before they sprang from nowhere. Even should Thuc's bishops be validly consecrated and doctrinally orthodox, without proper canonical procedure and appointment they are not necessarily Catholic bishops, any more than a priest ordained in schism or heresy, even though he secretly or publicly dissent from that schism or heresy, can be a Catholic priest. These men may be priests or bishops, but Church law forbids us to repair to them for any but the last rites. Canon 209 may supply jurisdiction to existing Catholic clergy licitly ordained for office in the Church. It cannot serve as a blanket for wildcat ordinations or consecrations performed with no possible authorization. Anarchy was not the intent of the legislator.

Canon 209 **supplies** jurisdiction—therefore these new bishops have **ordinary**, unsupplied jurisdiction? In Socrates' name, **how**? If this *non-sequitur can* hold water, what prevents any layman from approaching a Greek Orthodox bishop for ordination, then demanding a piece of the action Schuckhardt-style?

Citation of the Apostles' personal prerogatives ignores Christ's personal command to the Apostles and their personal infallibility, which prevented disagreement on faith or morals. Episcopal privilege, insofar as attached to all bishops since, derives through the papacy.

The Apostolic Succession, the Church Militant, and the world itself **will** end, not necessarily at the same instant. We are not charged with responsibility for these beyond keeping the Faith as far as the mass dereliction of our perjured clergy allows. Maintenance of Thuc's bishops(?) will not necessarily achieve this purpose. At best, it can only divide traditionalists once more. No matter how good his intentions, a sailor cannot navigate by the stars in a fog. There is simply no demonstrable or credible rule which can grant any new bishop jurisdiction. No one can be bound to new, unprovable authority, especially by itself.

Objections to **Validity of the Thuc Consecrations** (Anthony Cekada)

1. What was Ngo Dinh Thuc's authority? To consecrate responsibly and licitly (as distinct from his escapade at Palmar de Troya) he would necessarily declare the Holy See vacant, and assume its prerogatives. Though he never assumed the authority, he declared the Holy See vacant Feb. 25, 1982, the year after he performed the consecrations at Toulon, over six years after Palmar de Troya.
2. His actions thus placed both him and those he consecrated in violation of Canons 2370 and 2372, automatically suspended until relieved by the Holy See, which he correctly though belatedly declared vacant, and Canons 2373 and 2374 which suspend them all *a divinis* for a mere year.
3. Cekada states erroneously three times that, given the Church's intention, only the imposition of hands and the last sixteen words of the sacramental form are required for validity. He likens this stripping of the ceremony to Baptism; but it more closely resembles the Mass, in which the essential form is ineffective outside its proper rite.
4. To cite the papal nuncio's acceptance of the validity of Thuc's consecrations is to ignore that he regularly accepts the "validity" of *novus ordo* "sacraments"—especially episcopal "ordinations." Whether or not Thuc's consecrations are valid, the nuncio's acceptance is both pointless and worthless.
5. It was nice of Thuc to admit erring "in good faith" in concelebrating a *novus ordo* service. Too bad he hadn't all his wits about him at the error instead of later when he admitted it.
6. Cekada deplores the fruits of the earlier consecrations at Palmar de Troya, but never refers to association of the later line with the Schuckhardt crew, possibly because Cekada is himself similarly involved.
7. That we lack bishops is no justification for wildcat consecrations. All involved exceeded the bounds of liceity. They were and remain a lawless bunch. We are no more correct in approaching them than in patronizing the Greek Orthodox, the validity of whose consecrations is generally accepted.

Cekada replied: The thesis of my article concerned the *validity* of the two consecrations, not whether they were *licit*. Moreover you state: "To consecrate ..(1. above)... prerogatives." I would be interested to learn which canon law commentary prescribes the "necessity" of such a declaration as a condition *sine qua non* for avoiding the penalties which you claim applied otherwise.

3. The requisite intention, the imposition of hands and the 16-word form are all that the Church requires for validity of an episcopal consecration. (See Pius XII's *Sacramentum Ordinis*.) When the correct matter and form are employed, the minister of the sacrament is, for that very reason, deemed to have intended to do what the Church does. (See Leo XIII's *Apostolicae Curae*.) You state, however, that episcopal consecration "more closely resembles the Mass, in which the essential form is ineffective outside its proper rite." Here again, I would be interested to learn which canonists or moral theologians teach that the form of episcopal consecration is "ineffective outside its proper rite."

4. I mentioned this only because some people asked about it.

5-7. Your comments here are (a) gratuitous and (b) gratuitously nasty.

Further comment: Cekada cares only about validity—utterly irrelevant, or we could resort to the Greek Orthodox. Why should he even care about validity? And we are nasty to bring up embarrassing associations which he went out of his way to cultivate and which prompted his defense of Thuc's orders, or to question Thuc's mental capacity, after he gave us his somewhat flippant estimate.

When does a law cease to bind? When fulfilment is impossible. If we cannot attend Mass on Sunday our obligation ceases. No bishop is obliged to ordain without authorization or jurisdiction. If one argues that the laws cited (2370, 2372, 2373, 2374) cannot be fulfilled because there is no competent authority, then to exempt oneself from fulfilling them obviously one must place himself above their application. (Why would a canon law commentary treat a subject which exceeds our

wildest nightmares?) Unless one takes that course the penalties apply, because he is subject to the laws. **We** claim these penalties apply? **The laws** specify that they apply. Cekada may not have read them.

Pius XII stated (*Sacramentum Ordinis*.) that the **form** of the sacrament in each case is the **Preface**, of which certain words toward the end are required for validity. Cekada would have it that these certain words—only a small part of the form— will result in consecration, despite Pius XII's provision that the entire rite must be performed and nothing omitted. Why the papal directive, equivalent to a law, though too late to be included in the 1918 Code, if the rite is unnecessary? Without the rite those sixteen words lack definition. "Fill up in Thy priest the completion (or perfection) of Thy service (or ministry)" means nothing in the new 1969 rite because this rite incorrectly defines episcopacy. To steal a leaf from Cekada's book, where is the law that renders these sixteen words plus the matter (imposition of hands) effective outside the entire rite? Why would a bishop take the chance, unless purposely to invalidate the sacrament? Why would anyone speculate on the effect of what is forbidden?

This is Ecône style. Years ago I told Gerard Hogan, who told the Toowoomba trads that nowadays it is so hard to tell what is or is not heresy, that the new rite of ordination was invalid. He said, as though it were an argument, that in Latin the form was unchanged. This is untrue, but he meant those fatal words remained in an utterly new, impossible environment, and that therefore this utterly new, impossible rite had the proper sacramental effect.

Ecône graduates grant validity (possibly correctly) to Thuc's illicit consecrations, and ignore the laws' effect, as they ignore the canonical penalties attached to their own illicit (and more than probably invalid) ordinations. They try to allow for Lefebvre's own episcopal consecrations, and for his admission and use of "priests" "ordained" according to the new Montini-Bugnini rite. The Ecône attitude follows Lefebvre's relegation of the illegitimacy of the last four antipopes to the field of theological opinion, refusing to recognize that Canon Law had settled this matter. Even the innovators knew this; the new code changed the law to keep them in office.

I have yet to work out a difference between Thuc's Palmar de Troya consecrations and those which Cekada tries to prove legitimate, or at least valid. For the former, however, Thuc returned to Rome and repented.

Canon 2370: A bishop who consecrates another, and the assistant bishops or the priests taking their place, as well as the one receiving episcopal consecration without having obtained an Apostolic mandate, are suspended by the law itself until the Holy See has granted a dispensation.

Canon 2372: Those who dare to receive Orders from an excommunicated, suspended, or interdicted minister, provided he has been declared such or condemned to one of the three aforementioned penalties, or from a notorious apostate, a notorious heretic, or a notorious schismatic, *ipso facto* incur suspension *a divinis*, reserved to the Apostolic See. (Covers Lefebvre also.)

Canon 2373: Suspension from the conferring of orders for one year reserved to the Apostolic See is automatically incurred: (1) by one who, in violation of Canon 955, ordains a subject of another Ordinary without the dimissorial letters of his proper Ordinary; (2) by one who, in violation of Canons 993, n. 4 and 994, ordains his own subject who has lived elsewhere for such a length of time that he could have contracted there a canonical impediment (i.e., without obtaining the testimonial letters from the local Ordinary of such place or places; (3) by one who, in violation of the precept of Canon 974, n. 7, ordains a man to major orders without a canonical title [as in all Lefebvre's and in Thuc's Palmar de Troya ordinations]; (4) by one who ordains a religious belonging to a religious home outside the territory of the ordaining prelate, even though the candidate presents dimissorial letters of his own proper superior, unless it has been legitimately proved that there is one of the reasons mentioned in Canon 966 for which the religious superior may present his subjects to other than the place where the religious house in which the candidate resides is located; if a religious organization has a privilege in virtue of which the superiors are free to send their candidates to any bishop, such privilege remains intact.

Canon 2374: A man who presents himself for ordination without dimissorial letters [as all at Ecône and Palmar de Troya] or with forged letters, or before he has attained the canonical age, or for ordination *per saltum* (skipping one or more orders), is automatically suspended from the order unlawfully received. A man who presents himself for ordination without the testimonial letters or when he is under a censure, irregularity or other impediment, shall be chastised with severe penalties according to the circumstances of the case.

Lefebvre lacked ordinary jurisdiction, and could provide neither title nor benefice for which he could ordain. Ecône has accepted JP2's new Code, but Lefebvre and Thuc both violated the Code in effect at the time(s).

The Catholic Church has four marks of identification, recognized by all ages. But it has always had another, a tremendous attraction for converts: **authority**. Catholicism dares to impose beliefs, rules, and strictures upon its members, and to claim ability to reward and punish, to hold the keys to heaven. We always took it for granted; it was most comfortable. Its erosion and perversion have thrown us on our own resources, which seem insufficient. At least many of us hunt around for substitutes. Some are unlucky enough to find them. But there is no substitute. Jesus Christ founded His Church, endowed it with its four marks, and stands behind its authority. No one else can. No one can correct Him. No one—not Lefebvre, not Thuc, not Schuckhardt—can create a substitute, nor even set up a legitimate religious association lacking Church approval. No one can go legitimately outside the Church for Holy Orders or Apostolic Succession, or hope thereby to attain any semblance of jurisdiction.

* * * * *

A SMALLER BUT BETTER CHURCH

At long last our clergy and hierarchy admit that the Church is shrinking visibly. This grudging admission implies also their complicity: "We now seek quality rather than quantity."

How do they determine quality? What elusive attribute renders one image of God worth more than another in His sight? We are all equal in our nature. God commanded His Church to make disciples of all nations.

The postconciliar Church masks its massive dereliction of duty by pretense that it doesn't want many of its own members, that it now operates under a different mandate, that only the quality should be saved. If this is tradition it is masonic tradition. Who is saved is off the point. The Church's commission is to convert all, to save all if possible.

Its new method: No hard sell—only soft soap. Butter up the non-Catholic. Emphasize the "good" in his religion, not its fatal flaws. Leave him in ignorance and call it invincible. Leave him without the ordinary means of grace, and hope piously, even dogmatically, that God will allow for its unavailability. Perhaps He will, but how will He treat those responsible for the unavailability?

All this talk of quality rings hollow in the presence of the down-grading of seminary requirements. The cleric is not educated to past standards. Thomism is derided. The Church's representative need no longer know its official language, in which his doctrines are formulated, his laws codified, his sacraments conferred. He may, then, not even realize that his "mass" and his "ordination" are not what they were. He may even consider himself emancipated—no Tridentine or anti-modernist oaths.

He may indeed be a fine fellow, but he can teach only what he has learned. His sacramental ministry is limited to Baptism, of which anyone is capable, and as Church representative and witness when a man and woman confer matrimony upon each other. His ordination confers the power to preach, and little else.

No wonder he is reduced to seeking quality.

THE POPE, THE COUNCIL, & THE MASS
(James Likoudis, Kenneth D. Whitehead)

Page 28: “..... we must realize how possible and even likely that no one would ever have paid the slightest attention to” (what Vatican II “really said or (w)hat the Popes have said subsequently, if we had not had the thorough shaking up that in fact we have had.”

[We would have ignored the earthquake’s noise had it not been for the earthquake. What the usurpers have said subsequently is part of the same Renewal, and based on Vatican II documents. All innovations have been imposed under obedience to Vatican II and its spirit.]

JP2, Mexico City, 1/29/79: “You cannot be faithful and remain attached to secondary things” [like Mass, sacraments, & orthodoxy] “valid in the past but already outdated.”

Page 29, JP1, 8/27/78: “..... We wish to continue implementing without interruption the legacy left us by the Second Vatican Council. Its wise norms must be applied.” [Are norms commands? If they must be applied they must be new.]

Page 30, JP2, 10/17/78: “First of all we wish to point out the unceasing importance of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, and we accept the definite duty of assiduously bringing it into effect.” “It seems clear that whatever we may be obliged to think of some gusts that blew in when good Pope John opened those famous windows we are nevertheless now equally(?) obliged to go forward **from** the fact of the Council and what it decreed. If mistakes have been made in the implementation of its decrees—and they have—if errors and abuses have cropped up—and they have—the remedy for them is nevertheless now to be found in a more careful implementation of the official reforms of the Council. The Church has to move forward not back.” [To correct mistakes, errors, & abuses?] “The revised Roman Missal containing the New Order of Mass is now an integral part of what is today ‘given’ for loyal Catholics.” [Thanks!] “To continue to protest about the *Novus Ordo* and to call for a return of the Tridentine Mass is to distract attention from more important issues of concern to Catholics—the integrity of Catholic doctrine in the face of unprecedented assault against it” [like suppression of true worship of God & its replacement with Judaism, Arianism, and Protestantism] “by forces of the modern world, for example. Possible further revisions of the Roman Missal to help enhance or restore(!) greater reverence and a more profound sense of the sacred” [forward to what always surrounded the traditional Mass?], “the possible revival of Latin as a liturgical language alongside the vernacular” [now that priests have all forgotten their Latin], “better” [perhaps more accurate] “vernacular translations of the Mass and the other sacraments—all these aims will be achieved in loyal submission to and docile partnership(!) with legitimate Church authority, not in acrimonious conflict with that authority because of the changes already made and which unfortunately haven’t always turned out as well as they could.” [By their fruits you shall know them?]

Page 31 “Thus the Third General Council of the Church at Ephesus decreed in 431 A.D. that ‘it should not be lawful to publish another faith or Creed than that which was defined by the Nicene Council’; the Fourth General Council at Chalcedon twenty years later explicitly confirmed this decree; yet the great Council of Trent decreed that a new Creed did have to be published”

[Trent understood not merely the sense of these two councils but even Latin. Ephesus according to Denzinger: *Statuit sancta Synodus, alteram fidem nemini licere proferre, aut conscribere aut componere praeter definitam a Sanctis Patribus qui in Nicaea cum Spiritu Sancto congregati fuerunt. Statuit nemini licere* = “ordered that no one is allowed.” *Proferre aut conscribere aut componere* = “to publish or draw up or compose.” *Alteram fidem* = “an alternate faith.” [Creed?] *Praeter definitam* = “against (that) defined.” [Nothing here forbids a creed in agreement with the Nicene. Compare St. Paul to the Galatians: “But though we or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides” (*praeterquam* = other than, in disagreement with) “that which we have preached to you let him be anathema.” L & W not only mistranslate but misunderstand and misinterpret in their haste to show that the Church can change its own rulings. Trent, in calling for a more detailed creed did **not** modify decrees of Ephesus and Chalcedon.]

Question # 2 pp. 33-42: “The term ‘pastoral council’ as applied to Vatican II is merely a popular description and does not refer to any specific type of council none styled specifically a ‘pastoral council.’ The reason that the ‘defining’ of doctrine was not the primary purpose of (Vat II) then,

was that all the doctrine that was necessary for a renewal of the faith had already been defined and was well known to all.” [Compare this wishful line with the report of one of Vatican II’s most active participants: “This was not a dogmatic council as both its ‘popes’ had stated. During the sessions when asked for definitions of subjects under discussion—religious liberty, ecumenism, collegiality—the Commission secretaries replied invariably: ‘We are not here to discuss dogmas or philosophy, but to deal with pastoral matters. We are a pastoral Council; it is useless to give definitions which would not be understood.’ So your Council is unique! Here completely inadmissible things happened. The Council was inspired by the Holy Ghost? Not necessarily. A pastoral non-dogmatic Council is merely a kind of instruction or sermon which, of itself, involves no infallibility.” Lefebvre present; L & W absent.]

“..... most of Trent’s work was nevertheless ‘pastoral’.”

[Trent’s pastoral work consisted of regulations for clergy and religious. The council met to combat Protestant error. But Vatican II was pastoral as distinct from definitive.] Nicaea promulgated twenty disciplinary canons? [It was convoked for dogmatic reasons. All know the dogmatic definitions. Who can dredge up one disciplinary canon without research?]

The Fourth Council of Constantinople was called to deal merely with disciplinary matters? [It promulgated several dogmatic canons against Photius.] So this made it **pastoral**, like Vatican II? [So where are Vat. II’s canons? More semantic tricks!]

Vatican II issued two dogmatic constitutions (*Lumen Gentium, Dei Verbum*), the same number as Vatican I (however relevant. Garibaldi interrupted the Vatican Council before it could discuss more. Neither “dogmatic constitution” of Vatican II covered dogmatically anything not previously covered much more clearly. If L & W can show something new we shall quite happily demonstrate its heresy.]

Page 37: “When Jesus Christ taught that ‘I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life’ (Jn. 14:6) and ‘The Bread which I shall give for the life of the world is My flesh’ (Jn. 6:51), these doctrines are not drawn up in dogmatic canons with anathemas attached, but they remain no less true for all of that—and no less binding on the belief of Catholics.”

[Anything Christ taught is necessarily true (though clumsily quoted) and is part of His Revelation, to which He attached the supreme anathema, “He who believes not shall be condemned.” No truth of Vatican II had not been previously better expounded. Our day needed no council to clarify our doctrine. Any Catholic who can read through Vatican II’s documents without spotting heresy cannot have been properly instructed.]

“The whole point of bringing together at a Council all the Catholic bishops from all over the world was, precisely, to teach and where necessary to apply those teachings to the problems Catholics and the Church face today.”

[Oddly enough, the Church did just that for nineteen centuries, during many of which no council sat, and has, at and since Vatican II, completely stopped these activities in favor of religious freedom and ecumenism. Any discipline enacted by Vatican II was completely ignored without penalty. It is unlike all councils except Seleucia and Rimini in ambiguity. It defined no doctrine, condemned no heresy, and went out of its unnecessary way to propound its own. It erred grievously in just those matters in which a council claims infallibility. Obviously not protected from error, it fell under Pius II’s interdict on appeals from a pope to a council. It proved false in its first vote, in which it rejected its prepared agenda. Roncalli accepted this vote, though insufficient under council rules requiring a two-thirds majority to reject. He continued a council which could only waste time during preparation of new schemas. Had a real pope convoked a council for a legitimate purpose, in the face of such behavior he would immediately have dissolved it. Roncalli had called the council and assigned theologians to prepare its agenda—two years’ work. Where was the council’s respect for the authority (whatever its nature) which had convoked it? But Roncalli could not act properly now, any more than in convoking the council in the first place. Proper action would make him look foolish, and fill his niche in history with mocking snickers. And how could he involve all the bishops in his Renewal unless he could keep them in session?

Cardinal Heenan once stated that innovation had to be gradual because no one would have swallowed it at one gulp. Similarly, had it been introduced without the bishops' commitment to their own council, few bishops would have implemented it. They succumbed to their own involvement, especially in collegiality and episcopal conferences.

So now they had two choices, debate or recess. They took up a schema on liturgy (fortuitously prepared unofficially) on the unwarrantable assumption, condemned by Pope Pius II, that councils are competent to meddle with the heart of Catholicism, Christ's Mass and sacraments.] L & W refer to obedience owed Vatican II's "disciplinary" enactments, as, for instance, that the Church's "liturgical books are to be revised as soon as possible." L & W "safely conclude that the Catholic faithful are obliged to follow Vatican II" because it was a general council of the Catholic Church [which Pius II interdicted].

Page 41: "Some try to reason, erroneously: 'The Council was not infallible (meaning in the same way the Pope is infallible when he makes an *ex cathedra* definition); therefore we need not follow it.' This is a fallacy." [Let us replace one word, and see what happens to their argument for the *novus ordo missae*. For **Council** substitute *Quo primum tempore*—a papal decree never abrogated, still in force, in the field of morals—man's highest moral obligation, divine worship—well within the scope of papal infallibility—**but to be obeyed even if not.**

Vatican II, not a Catholic council, had no authority to order revision of liturgical books. Supposing its authority, where and when did it order a new rite for our Mass? Or a new form for Confirmation, Holy Orders, and Extreme Unction? Or completely new rites for these and other sacraments? Whose Mass and sacraments are they? The Council's? The pope's? What happened to Jesus Christ? What happened to His Church, that it may be despoiled by a pack of incompetents?]

Page 43, top: "The Pope's authority over the regulation" [heedless change? proscription? replacement?] "of the liturgy and" (of) "the administration of the sacraments stems from his supreme authority"

Pp. 45-6: "Here we have to establish that: 1) the Church does have the authority (to establish the New Order of Mass and replace the Tridentine Mass) and can indeed 'change' certain externals in the form or manner of the liturgy or the sacraments including the Mass (and such externals are all that have been changed in the New Order of Mass); and that: 2) the Pope, possessing supreme authority over the whole Church, also possesses supreme authority over the manner in which the Mass and the other sacraments are to be celebrated or administered, changed in their externals or retained intact."

[Externals? The three principal parts of the Mass?]

"When Vatican II decided to recommend the changes that later became the New Order of Mass the Council was in no way departing from the Tradition of the Church Moreover, in revising the Roman Missal at the behest of the Council, thereby substituting the New Order of Mass for the Tridentine Mass, Pope Paul VI was simply exercising a power which Pope Pius XII also expressly recognized in *Mediator Dei* as indeed being vested in the Pope alone"

[Vatican II had no such power; "Pope alone?" And revising a Missal = abolishing it in favor of a brand new rite having little if anything to do with tradition? *Mediator Dei* from beginning to end dealt with how to involve the congregation in the Tridentine Mass.]

Mediator Dei, excerpts:

54. For in the liturgy are human elements as well as divine. The latter, obviously, having been established by the divine Redeemer cannot under any circumstances be changed by men;

56. The clearer and more definite formulation of doctrine on the Word Incarnate, on the Sacrament and Sacrifice of the Eucharist, and on the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, caused the introduction of new ritual formulas, reflecting more clearly in the liturgy the light thrown upon these doctrines by the declarations of the Church's teaching authority,

61.in order to protect the sacredness of divine worship against abuses introduced by individuals

and by particular churches. The sixteenth century saw a great increase in the number of such abuses, and privately invented devotions were proving a danger to the integrity of faith and devotion, to the great advantage of heretics and the spread of their errors.

63. deliberately to introduce new liturgical customs, or to revive obsolete rites inconsistent with existing laws and rubrics, is an irresponsible act which we must condemn.

64. The use of the Latin language prevailing in a great part of the Church affords at once an imposing sign of unity and an effective safeguard against corruption of true doctrine.

66. The desire to restore everything indiscriminately to its ancient condition is neither wise nor praiseworthy. It would be wrong, for example, to want the altar restored to its ancient form of table; to want black eliminated from the liturgical colors, and pictures and statues excluded from our churches;

67. it is a zeal both unwise and misguided that would go back to ancient rites and customs and repudiate the new regulations which under God's wise Providence have been introduced to meet altered conditions. [Lest anyone imagine that the New Order of Mass has been properly introduced to meet altered conditions, the conditions were rigged by introduction at Vatican II of a new and heretical ecumenism, which the New Order of Mass supports.]

68. This attitude is an attempt to revive the "archaeologism" to which the pseudo-synod of Pistoia gave rise; it seems also to re-introduce the many pernicious errors which led to that synod and resulted from it and which the Church, in her capacity of watchful guardian of "the deposit of faith" entrusted to her by her divine Founder, has rightly condemned. (Cf. Pius VI, Const. *Auctorem Fidei*, 28 August, 1794, nn. 31-34, 39, 62, 66, 69-74.)

Vat. II, C. S. Liturgy: 34. The rites should be distinguished by a noble simplicity; they should be short, clear, and unencumbered by useless repetitions [of prayer?]....

50. The rite of Mass is to be revised the rites are to be simplified Elements which, with the passage of time [but all before Innocent III, 1198-1215], came to be duplicated, or were added with but little advantage, are now to be discarded. Where opportunity allows or necessity demands(!), other elements which have suffered injury through accidents of history [and, presumably, the negligence of the Holy Ghost] are now to be restored to the earlier norm(?) of the Holy Fathers. [But all things were so restored, said *Quo Primum*, following the Council of Trent, with the outlawing of all new rites. We are now blessed with mutually exclusive restorations of the same Holy Fathers.

Similar aims of the Synod of Pistoia, "recalling (the liturgy) to a greater simplicity of rites, by expressing it in the vernacular language, by uttering it in a loud voice" were condemned by Pius VI (*Auctorem Fidei*, Aug. 28, 1794): rash, offensive to pious ears, insulting to the Church, favorable to charges of heretics against it 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. The proposition asserting that "it would be against apostolic practice and the plans of God, unless easier ways were prepared for the people to unite their voice with that of the whole Church"; if this be understood to signify the introduction of the use of the vernacular language into the liturgical prayers, it is condemned as false, rash, disturbing to the order prescribed for the celebration of the mysteries, easily productive of many evils.— **Bullseye!**]

L & W, page 47: "in this Apostolic Constitution, Paul VI himself notes that, in revising the Roman Missal at the request of Vatican II, he is doing exactly what Pope St. Pius V did when he revised the Roman Missal at the request of the Council of Trent."

[This double lie only irks the traditional Catholic and the historian. Neither Trent nor Vatican II ever ordered a new rite of Mass, nor did St. Pius V introduce one. *Quo Primum* and *Missale Romanum* both "restore the traditions of the Holy Fathers." Who lies? The canonized saint or the pastoral genius who never served a day in a parish but managed to expel nearly all tradition therefrom.]

L & W Appendix II, Paul VI, Nov. 19, 1969: "The reform which is about to be brought into being is a response to an authoritative mandate from the Church" [Vatican II]. "..... not an arbitrary act. It is not a transitory or optional experiment. It is not some dilettante's improvisation. [Thrice he

could have fooled me.] “It is a law” [still unidentifiable as such]. “..... This reform puts an end to uncertainties, to discussions, to arbitrary abuses. It calls us back(!) to that uniformity of rites and feeling proper to the Catholic Church, the heir and continuation of that first Christian community, which was all ‘one single heart and a single soul’ (Acts 4:32) Nothing has been changed in the substance of our traditional Mass. 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.” [Some are more identical than others.]

If nothing was changed what was the new rite’s purpose? To bring order out of the deliberately induced vernacular chaos? It introduced its own proper uncertainties and abuses. It ousted the traditional Mass in order to attract those who refuse to believe in the Mass, while breaking down all remaining stability and driving literally millions from church attendance. Undoubtedly the success story of the century, it is not possibly a true Mass. Its disastrous effect was foreseen and intended. If it is necessary for salvation have any Catholics of earlier times been saved? If it is a vehicle of grace why have priests left its service in their thousands?

Trent saw desperate confusion (in absence of ecclesiastical law) in Catholic (non-Catholic?) worship, and recommended order. Pope St. Pius V imposed the necessary standardization, thus confirming the oldest, safest rite in existence. His law filled a void of which the reformers (and some trendy Catholics) had taken every advantage but one—they never corrected Christ’s consecratory words.

Vatican II saw absolute liturgical stability governed, regulated, enforced by papal decree, bound on earth and in heaven (= eternity). It arrogated to itself competence to disobey existing law for no legitimate reason—to fracture our unity, to rock everything, to correct the Church, for the presumed benefit of the uninterested. So each area was blessed with its own badly mistranslated vernacular variation. Paul VI surveyed all this chaos and “solved” the problem—with an entire new rite, to be imposed mercilessly on all Catholics, despite their entirely predictable (Paul himself predicted it Nov. 26, 1969) conscientious objection to unwarrantable changes in the Mass (and sacramental) forms, removal of principal parts, and their substitution with Jewish rite and Arian heresy. He told all the world that nothing had changed, but would not permit the unchanged Mass. Never claiming infallibility (Would not St. Pius V have exercised the same infallibility?), he promoted this conciliar and ordinary magisterium infallibility (undefined, of course) so in effect he could sit in the same *cathedra* and we must all obey him.

But could anyone determine where he sat? Even during the council he attended an ecumenical service in St. Paul’s-outside-the-Walls, and didn’t even preside. He did the same in Sydney in 1970. His present successor has graced two like occasions in Australia, joined Anglicans in prayer at Canterbury, Jews in a Roman synagogue, Buddhists and other pagans at Assisi, diabolical animists in Africa, and fire worshippers and Hindus in India. Montini and Vatican II apologized to all who had left the Church for causing their departure. Wojtyla has apologized to those converted from savagery for stealing their murderous and cannibalistic “cultures.” Papal(?) understanding of worship has changed from that of the Church. Even without clear evidence to the contrary, could anyone accept that they have left our own worship unchanged?]

Page 98: “Why would it be wrong for the Church to incorporate into the words of consecration of the Mass the revealed truth that Christ **did die** for all men?”

[**Christ’s words!** The **substance** of the **sacrament** over which the **Church has no power!** A criminal change which, even if it could produce the sacrament, introduces doubt into the centre of our religion! This sheer innovation, never used in any Mass recorded throughout history, had been discussed and rejected by St. Thomas Aquinas, the Roman (Trent) Catechism, St. Alphonsus Liguori, and officially by Pope Benedict XIV. But it was inserted into most vernacular “masses” as a “translation” of *pro multis*. Who can trust anything else in the translations? Or who provides the Latin originals? The faithful are lumbered with the vernaculars.]

Page 100: “Regarding the motive of the translators for introducing a different translation” [into more than one vernacular translation!] “the authors have no information and decline to speculate.”

[So they speculate.] “For if many died through one man’s trespass,’ (Rom. 5:15) unless ‘many’ here can actually be translated as ‘all men,’ this phrase of St. Paul would actually constitute a formal denial of the Church’s dogma, defined *inter alia* by the Council of Trent, that the original sin of Adam and its consequences were in fact transmitted to all men rather than just to ‘many.’” [If true, irrelevant! So who wrote whom? Death had entered the world through one man’s sin; but had all men died? Trent quoted St. Paul; **he** never contradicted Trent.

Much is made of a supposedly inaccurate translation of Christ’s words, which we are to believe He could not make clear, nor could the Holy Ghost have inspired the Evangelists or the Church with their correct meaning—until Joachim Jeremias and the ICEL. No one knows what language (probably Aramaic or Greek, both in common use) Christ used in consecrating. But if **many** may mean **all** in a Semitic idiom, why may not **all** mean **many**? To wit, “Many of you drink this.”]

Page 104: “When a vernacular translation of a sacramental formula is submitted to the Holy See for approval, **it** examines **it** carefully. When **it** is satisfied that **it** expresses the meaning intended by the Church, **it** approves and confirms **it**, stipulating, however, that **it** must be understood in accordance with the mind of the Church as expressed in the original Latin text.” (Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 25 Jan. 1974)

[Since the vernacular “for all men” is approved as the translation of “*pro multis*,” either the vernacular means “for many” or the Latin means “*pro omnibus*.” Sufficiently clear?]

Page 105: “St. Thomas Aquinas concludes—not with very great conviction—that ‘it seems incorrect’ to hold that ‘the words “This is the chalice of My Blood” alone belong to the substance of this form but not those words which follow.’”

[Obviously they’ve read little St. Thomas, who habitually used “*videtur inconveniens*,” often followed immediately with “Others say more accurately.” This is his dispassionate method. What his editors may comment is *non ad rem*.]

“Now, while both St. Thomas Aquinas and the Catechism of the Council of Trent are normally of very great authority, it nevertheless does not seem necessary to follow them in this case. St. Thomas is still only a single theologian, not the official Church;” [and there are **two** of Likoudis & Whitehead!] “and despite its name the Catechism was not itself a conciliar document.”

[L & W won’t follow them here because there have been liturgies from which “for many” is missing, though none ever contained “for all” in this context. No allowance is made for differences in rites, though if non-existent there would be only one rite. The Greek Confirmation form was always considered valid, though it differs from the traditional Latin form. But Pius XII “changed” the Latin form of priestly ordination because the Greek rite differed. Luckily he kept the entire rite unchanged, and ordered that no change be made, so we could be sure. Paul VI, of course, shredded the rite, even changing the form as defined by Pius XII. But several popes have prescribed the form for the Latin rite Consecration, some (Innocent III, for instance) before St. Thomas was born, all before Paul VI & Hannibal Bugnini.

“If anyone removes or changes anything in the Form of Consecration of the Body and Blood, and by this change of words does not signify the same thing as these words do, he does not confect the sacrament. If anyone adds or takes away anything even if he does not change the meaning of the form, he does confect, but he sins grievously.”—*Missale Romanum, De Defectibus, Cap. V, “Formae*.

One cannot argue that the old Missal has been rescinded. It does not say “He has no permission to confect.” It states plain fact. Facts are not subject to revision by lawgivers. Laws can be changed? You cannot remove the law enough to change the governed matter (Christ’s words or meaning) and then re-apply the “law” to a different formula. It has lost all force in permitting the change. This fact is backed not only by Pope St. Pius V but by every pope who (according to L & W) revised his Missal and left it in, even John XXIII (if you believe he was pope).

Maurice de la Taille, a major theologian of this century, devoted his **Thesis XXXV** to this subject. His evidence and arguments are unbeatable, especially given L & W’s contention that the Church has never defined the matter. If the traditional Consecration prayer has not been defined by its

centuries-old inclusion in the Mass, certainly inclusion in the vernacular new order “masses” can neither define nor confirm the variation.]

But on page 116 L & W admit that **they** have at last **settled** the matter: “..... let us be content with the faith of St. Cyril of Alexandria as to the words required to bring (consecration) about—**the very words which we have already shown to be alone essential** St. Cyril wrote about these words as follows:

““Christ said indicating the bread and wine: “This is My Body,” and “This is My Blood,” in order that you might not judge what you see to be a mere figure. The offerings, by the hidden power of God Almighty, are changed into Christ’s Body and Blood,”

[This quotation refers to certain of the consecratory words, but expresses no opinion whatsoever on whether they alone are required. They certainly do not purport to be the only words St. Cyril used in the context of the Mass.]

Page 120: “In its new Eucharistic Prayers as well as in the revised offertory of the new rite” [taken from the Old Testament, offering fruits of the earth and work of human hands] “the Church has taken pains to avoid the misleading impression of a sacrifice of bread and wine during the offertory, for there is only the one sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ accomplished during the consecration of the elements. In the offertory of the Tridentine Mass such expressions as ‘Receive, O Holy Father ... this immaculate host which I... offer Thee...’ and ‘We offer unto Thee, O Lord, the Chalice of salvation.....’ caused many erroneous theories to crop up concerning a ‘natural’ sacrifice which many thought preceded the real sacrifice. Many generations of liturgists as well as many of the faithful were troubled by this.” [possibly because they were as ignorant of the meaning of the Latin word *hostia* (**victim**, not **host**) as L & W. Almost any fool can see that the Tridentine offertory offered the same Victim as the Consecration, in prayer for specific supernatural benefits out of all proportion to those obtainable through the sacrifice of a piece of bread, and that this situation no longer obtains in the *novus ordo missae*, in which the insufficient Old Testament sacrifice replaces Christ’s Sacrifice with which He replaced the Old Testament sacrifice. Strangely, the usual argument is that the traditional Mass erred in offering our true Victim, because there was still before the consecration only bread and wine on the altar, and that the *novus ordo* had corrected this time lapse. This is easily overcome, even against those who confine God to the rule of His own creation, time, by asking whether Calvary had already taken place. Anyway, according to L & W’s argument, no one should have questioned the traditional rite, under obedience.]

They drag in the *Anaphora* of St. Hippolytus, as substantially the New Order’s Eucharistic Prayer II. [These resemble each other only in brevity. Hippolytus was at various times heretic and/or schismatic, and was an antipope for about eighteen years (217-235), during the reigns of Sts. Callistus, Urban, and Pontian, with whom he was eventually reconciled and martyred. His *Anaphora* resembles a skeleton Mass, but may as easily have been not so intended. Whence would come an antipope’s competence to institute a rite for Mass? Who would use it?

Beyond the intention clearly expressed in the new rite is the clearly implied intention that it replace the true Mass (if only occasionally), breeding doubt and suspicion, to say the least, even without the insuperable obstacles to validity in the new rite’s (not merely human but heretical) origin and definition: “The Lord’s Supper or the Mass, is the sacred assembly or gathering together of the people of God, with a priest presiding, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord.” This definition, though correct on the authority of its authors, was changed to ambiguity to stop the general outcry, but not a word of the rite it correctly defined was changed.]

Page 124: “It is misleading to continue to circulate the first version above as if it represented an official post-Vatican II Church ‘definition’ or proved anything at all about the nature of the New Order of the Mass. To those who might reply that the General Instruction was revised only after the incompleteness of the first formulation was pointed out, this simply proves that those, if any, whose intention it might have been to see the first, controversial ‘definition of the Mass’ quoted above, published in an official Roman document, were finally not able to succeed in doing so.” [Had they not succeeded, who would have seen the first definition? Or was the General Instruction an unofficial document from Athens?]

“..... even the first incomplete version was never intended as a **full definition**” [Now L & W can determine the intention which, as they say, “might have been” harbored in the minds of “those, if any.” If so, why did the definers not stick to their own correct definition? They had gone too far, been caught out, and scurried for cover.]

Page 130: “..... the virtually universal acceptance of the new Missal by the bishops of the entire Catholic world” [eastern rites?] “is further proof of the fact that there is nothing heretical or contrary to Catholic tradition which would prevent its acceptance by the Roman rite of the Church

.....” [Yes! It is surely orthodox because accepted by these men whose pulpits and schools reek of false doctrine!]

Page 140: “The actions of the Holy See in late 1972 in the cases of Fr. Hans Küng and Fr. Edward Schillebeeckx certainly underline that the Pope meant what he said when he said that his pontificate would emphasize doctrine and discipline.” [They also show that these two heretics had escaped discipline for years under at least two “popes” equally obliged to muzzle and correct them. They had at last publicly attacked **papal infallibility**, so necessary as a bluff to inflict the whole Renewal.]

Page 159: “We must go forward with the Pope(s) we have, if we are going to remain truly Catholic. That better fruits have not yet come from the conciliar reform can be laid at the door of those who have failed to implement the liturgical reforms properly.”

[On the contrary, they were all implemented with the greatest enthusiasm in the manner prescribed from Rome. **Evil tree, evil fruit!** But we are not to fight, but rather to accept this cross of apostasy and idolatry as though such acceptance would not involve **us also** in the general apostasy, sacrilege, and idolatry.]

Page 162 resurrects the accidents of history and that other lie that Vatican II ordered a new rite of Mass, and predicts disastrous rifts in the fictitious unity of the Roman rite should the traditional Mass return, even though it originally promoted real unity.

Page 165: “..... Council and the Holy See decreed and carried out far-reaching changes in the Church’s life and worship (proving thereby, in fact, that such things **could** be changed),” [much in the fashion of murderers and robbers. This man was alive until I proved that he could be dead, but I bear no guilt for effecting this eventually inevitable change. That man could feed his family until I stole his money and abolished his job. See? Such things **can** be done!]

Page 166: “Those who have rejected the New Order of Mass and the authority of the Church to impose it may have sometimes preserved ‘the appearance of piety’—but many [all?] of them have also cut themselves off from the Church. Although the Pope could restore the old Roman Missal as a pastoral option, he could surely never admit as the reason for doing it the belief that the Church has established something less than ‘Catholic’ in the *Novus Ordo*.”

[Let us pass lightly over the fact that no one has yet identified the words which abrogate *Quo Primum* or proscribe the Mass it protects.]

Page 187: “How can we surmount this apparent contradiction?” [By calling it **apparent** instead of **obvious**? Even the authors of the Declaration on Religious Freedom left their defense to the ingenuity of the future, contenting themselves with its highly controversial adoption. The popes whom this Declaration contradicts are now shown by L & W to have addressed themselves to other questions. But John Courtney Murray never perceived this hugely relevant, though unlikely, “fact.”]

Page 190: “For the doctrine that no man may be coerced in the matter of his religious beliefs, or prevented from acting upon them, is an eminently traditional” [undefined] “doctrine, viewed from the angle from which the Council considered the matter. The Second General Council of Nicaea surely recognizing precisely this same principle when it legislated about Jews pretending to be Christians, but secretly keeping the Sabbath and other purely Jewish observances: ‘Such people must not be received into the communion, nor in prayer, nor in the Church. But let them be Hebrews openly, according to their own religion.’ In other words, the **rights** of Jews, as human persons, to worship according to their consciences, and not to be prevented from acting according to their consciences in religious matters—and even to have their own synagogues publicly recognized, tolerated” [not necessarily encouraged or approved] “and protected by the Christian emperor—all these rights of Jews were clearly affirmed even by this early council of the Church.” [From “in other words” on, this is pure speculation. One could as well speculate that the council meant: “Stay honestly in your synagogue; don’t infiltrate and pollute our Church!”]

Page 192 finds that this heretical declaration was meant to press Catholics' rights under communism. Historically, communists appreciate one argument, force.

On page 198 we hear that Vatican II failed to condemn communism because it had already been condemned. [So why push religious freedom if already approved, as L & W state?]

Page 193: JP2 "repeated the Council's definition of religious liberty when, in an address to Italian Catholic doctors delivered on Dec. 28, 1978, he called for 'respect' in legislation and in fact, of freedom of conscience, understood as the fundamental right of the person not to be forced to act contrary to his conscience or prevented from behaving in accordance with it."

[Suppose your conscience permits abortion or euthanasia. The postconciliar "Church" recognizes no conscientious objection to the *novus ordo missae*.]

Pp. 212-3: L & W quote St. Robert Bellarmine: "Just as it is licit proper to a superior." (see pp. 67-68)

L & W: "..... for it to apply at all in the case of the changes in the Church it would have to be shown that a Pontiff was, in fact, 'attacking souls';" [Would it not apply to "above all, him who tries to destroy the Church?" From the changes made, even from those yet only projected, we have a clear case against our last four "popes." Bellarmine said more than this famous quotation, in his same book, *De Romano Pontifice II*, one chapter later: "..... it is proven with arguments from authority and from reason the manifest heretic cannot be pope." (see page 68)

Until now Luther and Cranmer devised the most successful attacks on the Church since Mohamet. Their strategy: **Destroy the Mass. destroy the Church.** Paul VI more successfully followed their example. No matter how much or often he lied about it, his new rite is **not** the same as our stolen Mass, as demonstrated over and over again. We cannot depose a pope, but we have shown over and over again that the last three "popes" were public heretics before "election," therefore ineligible. As Bellarmine said, they **put themselves** out of the Church. How can a non-Catholic be our superior in the Church?]

Page 214 admits the laity's right to the Church's special goods, even quoting Pius XII in nearly identical words to Canon 682 of the 1918 Code. [L & W's book was issued in limbo, before the latest code and after the earlier Code had become only a dead letter.] *Lumen Gentium* 37 is also quoted: "..... the laity are empowered— indeed sometimes obliged—to manifest their opinion on those things which pertain to the good of the Church. If the occasion should arise this should be done through the institutions established by the Church for that purpose and always with truth, courage and prudence and with reverence and charity towards those who, by reason of their office, represent the person of Christ."

[Do L & W really believe that this was not tried? Or that traditional Catholics received any reply until forced out of our beneficent, benevolent representatives of Christ? (Or that any reply whatsoever adverted to the problem presented? Or demonstrated charity? Or failed to portray the traditional Catholic as a crank, a fanatic, or a kook for his **lone** adherence to the religion in which he was reared?) Or that anyone must now believe or practise differently from all his ancestors to be saved? Or that he must be subject to those who have publicly, deliberately, knowingly [Who should know better?] left the Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, and no longer preach its doctrine? Or that the same criminals who have destroyed doctrine in our schools would not pervert the ordinary means of grace or distort the meaning and application of obedience to fortify their own position against reaction to their own scandalous achievements?]

Page 218: "Rome cannot be blamed for the crisis." [Who, then? Local clergy or nuns? Why are they not removed? Are they not out of control—disobedient? Or the laity? If so, why blame the traditional Catholic? Minority rights? Whose crisis? Is some area not in crisis? Responsibility for a universal crisis lies at the top.]

Page 219: The hierarchy is obliged to enforce both orthodoxy and discipline. [At and since Vatican II how have they enforced either? They have proscribed the traditional Mass, but cannot control the "abuses" of their inadequate, heretical substitute. Obviously they have neither wish nor courage to

“regulate” this new monstrosity. Any such tendency is strangled in episcopal conferences, whose agenda are prescribed from Rome. But don’t blame Rome for the worldwide crisis! Who else could straighten things out? If Rome can, why has it not? If it can’t, what authority has it? Obviously only over the traditional Catholic; all others can do as they please.]

Page 223: “The authors do not for a moment accept that the Church no longer bears her traditional marks. We only point to the fact that some Catholics have come to believe it in the midst of the post-conciliar confusion and ambiguity. Other Catholics are aware that whatever aberrations may have occurred are not what the Council or post-conciliar Church really called for but indeed go against what they called for. these Catholics too can face a problem a real problem of conscience: to what extent can they go along with or obey things which apparently have the sanction, or at least the tolerance, of the bishop, by the very fact that they are going on, but which do not accord with what the Holy See has enjoined? Is a bishop who sanctions or allows such things still entitled to the obedience of the faithful subject to him? Do the faithful have to follow him when he is apparently not following the Pope? such a bishop continues to be entitled to obedience in **everything that he does legitimately command.**”

[So we are reduced to measuring his actions against what correct knowledge each of us can muster, to choose which, if any, of his orders are legitimate. Can we all access the same information? A prescription for anarchy.]

Page 224: We must wait till the “pope” declares him not in communication with the Holy See before we can ignore him.

[But our local heretic probably agrees entirely with his boss heretic, or he would be out on his heretical backside. Neither heretic can be our superior unless we hold the same heresy. We can and must oppose heresy and those who publicly espouse it.]

Page 226: “..... errors and abuses have sometimes been allowed to parade as if they were the real reforms of Vatican II.” [Especially in the Mass and sacraments.]

But even after all these lugubrious pages devoted to their struggle with all their problems, L & W prove in Appendix II that human(?) humor rebounds ever triumphant over all. They quote Paul VI in two general audience discourses of Nov. 19 and 26, 1969 on his new rite of “mass.” These are **hilarious!**

DE HAMISH FRASER NIL NISI BONUM.

Requiescat in pace. Let us give him credit for sincere belief in the nonsense he published. There is no need to speak ill of the dead, though it **is** the safest course— let him speak for himself (**Approaches** 93-94, pages 8-10):

There is the question of attendance at the *Novus Ordo Missae*, which no one more heartily detests than we do. As both Mgr. Lefebvre and Michael Davies point out, it is neither invalid *per se* nor heretical. [**No?**] But that is about all that can be said in its favour. Yet, the fact remains that, as a valid mass, it is still a potential source of graces for anyone who attends it with appropriate dispositions. [**arson, murder?**] It is no less true, however, that, having been designed with the help of Protestants by neomodernist liturgists under the direction of the Freemason Annibale Bugnini, with an “oecumenical” rather than a specifically Catholic intention, the *Novus Ordo Missae* cannot but exercise a subversive, Protestantising influence on those who attend it **unless they are being continually alerted concerning its equivocations and the subtle, subliminal and more overt influences which exude from it inexorably.** [Part of the instruction? The celebrant warns them? Or are only “Approaches” subscribers equipped to cope with the detested *novus ordo*?]

We would most respectfully suggest to Mgr. Lefebvre and the priests of the Fraternity that their attitude to the *Novus Ordo Missae* should be **to warn against its dangers, and therefore continually to give the faithful positive instruction concerning the NOM, rather than merely negatively to discourage or forbid attendances at NOM masses. For the present negative attitude means that traditionalists who never attend NOM masses are almost entirely in**

ignorance of what is happening in ordinary parishes. [Did Edmund Campion send his people to Cranmer's service? Did Peter Canisius send his to Luther's? Did Athanasius send his to the Arian-occupied churches? Do Catholics really care what goes on in apostate parishes?]

We make this appeal also in the light of the Message of Our Lady of Fatima. For whereas no one knew better than she what would be the state of Mother Church in our time and, in particular, that by now it would be physically impossible for the immense majority of the faithful to attend a celebration of the Old Mass on a Saturday, she nevertheless demanded Communions of Reparation on First Saturdays.

[Fraser commits a cardinal sin: he imposes private revelation on us all. He evidently thinks no one in 1917 and for another fifty years could receive Communion, to comply with the demand. Or that an obligation necessarily carries with it its means of fulfillment. As well argue that Church precept to assist at Mass on Sundays and Holy Days of Obligation proves that Sweden and Japan had Mass in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to accommodate their Catholics.]

No truly objective ecclesial perspective is possible today unless it is seen within the context of the Message of Our Lady of Fatima. That is why Frere Michel de la Sainte-Trinité's study, "**Fatima: The Mystery of the Third Secret**" should be compulsory reading We are privileged to be able to publish it as a supplement to this issue of **Approaches**. We quote from it:

"Replying one day to some one who questioned her about the content of the Third Secret, Sister Lucia said: 'It is in the Gospel and the Apocalypse, read them!' Sister Lucia once indicated chapters VIII-XIII of the Apocalypse."

Some secret! Published nineteen centuries! Perhaps this is why Sister Lucia has never published it, as she was directed, she says, to do in 1960. A private revelation, if genuine, obliges the recipient, not the pope, if any. Sister Lucia received the order; why has she not complied? Was she muzzled? By some one whose orders she would accept in preference to Our Lady's? Or has she doubts?

If the Message of La Salette is genuine, Our Lady said that Rome would lose the Faith. Would she have forgotten this by 1917? Is there some compelling reason why Our Lady, having revealed the message to three children in Portugal, should return Jan. 2, 1944 ("a little known fact") to instruct Sister Lucia to write down the Message and entrust it to Rome?

"The letter was intended, in the first place, for Bishop da Silva, and he could have read it immediately. Sister Lucia told him so, on behalf of the Most Blessed Virgin. afraid of the responsibility he did not dare do so, nor did he want to acquaint himself with it. He then sought to entrust it to the Holy Office, but Rome refused to accept it."

Neither Da Silva (who had asked for the written Message) nor the Holy Office was in any way bound by even a genuine private revelation to some one else. But does it not seem strange that the Mother of God would give out a message that she would have known would not be published according to her wishes? [Free will again?] If Sister Lucia has doubts, or keeps her secret for some other reason, why should it preoccupy us? Have we not the entire message necessary for salvation from Jesus Christ and His Church? Why should this speculation be "compulsory reading, especially for all traditionalist Catholics?"

If the Message was, in fact, that we live in the time of the Scripturally predicted apostasy, as Frere Michel seems to think, we already can see this—though not all saw it in 1960. Prophecy after the event seldom errs.

What is the last hope of the world? Paul VI said it's the United Nations. Devotees of Our Lady of Fatima say it's the rosary, or the consecration of Russia to Mary's Immaculate Heart. Could any of these (or anything else) benefit the world more than Jesus Christ's Sacrifice? Such things, logically, can save the world only in the absence of that Sacrifice.

Many letters push private revelations. Some demand that I publish and recommend them. I have refrained; no private revelation proves the Catholic religion; the private revelation is approved by

the Church only insofar as it agrees with the Catholic religion: nothing in the private revelation contravenes Catholic faith or morals.

The Church's limited approval proves that nothing in the approved revelations of La Salette or of Anne Catherine Emmerich contradict Catholic faith or morals. Both revelations contained prophecies that Rome, infiltrated by the enemy, would lose the faith and the Church would fade away almost to nothing. I will never base an argument on those revelations themselves, but I hereby argue, against those who deny the possibility that we now experience the apostasy infallibly predicted by St. Paul (II Thess ii), that the Church never condemned but rather approved private revelations containing the aforesaid prophecies as in no way contrary to possibility, tradition, faith, or morals. Such fulfillments, then, do not oppose or deny either papal infallibility or Jesus Christ's promise to be with His Church all days. For obviously, if this were the case the Church would necessarily have condemned the private revelations of La Salette and Anne Catherine Emmerich.

Argument—You are obliged to publish the truth about the secret of Fatima. John XXIII read it and feared to let it out; it disclosed that he was not really pope. Pius XII had returned to ancient custom and selected his own successor.

Reply—John XXIII did just that—selected Paul VI—to keep his council going. No one tells me secrets; I might publish them. Whatever Lucy wrote was to be revealed in 1960. If it declared John XXIII no true pope, then I have published it, though I need no revelation to determine or confirm that a heretic is ineligible for the papacy. If it confirms some one else as **secret visible** head of the Church pray excuse my skepticism at an apparent contradiction in terms. If we grant that the Blessed Virgin Mary ordered Lucy to write a message to the pope for publication in 1960 we should grant also that she would know who would read it and what he would do with it. But she made no alternate provisions for its publication. Could Lucy not tell some one else? But Lucy evidently believes she has fully complied with her orders, and is not obliged or obliged not to exceed them. Fatima is a private revelation, which we are not bound to believe. Not even the secret pope or phony pope were so obliged. The message is so private we can't find it, so how are we to believe it?

The Bergins, Hafferts, and Blue Army types, nearly all these self-appointed official patrons of Our Lady of Fatima, accept and attend the *novus ordo* idolatry, the while they tell us with almost gleeful anticipation that the day will come when we shall have only the Rosary left. Possibly true, but they will have contributed to universal loss of the ordinary means of salvation, which they have consistently refused to defend. They say that we **shall** lose our Mass and sacraments, but that it is impossible that we **have** lost them. They insist on obedience both to the Blessed Virgin and her message and to the four “popes” that refuse obedience to that same message.

Objection—You neglect an approach in not recognizing and quoting private revelations and prophecies. Many of our current difficulties have been prophesied, some by many mystics and visionaries in many times and places. Nothing should be excluded that will advance the cause of tradition.

Reply—No doubt many of these prophecies can be trusted absolutely. But what can they prove? The same situation, whether or not prophesied, confronts us. A prophecy adds nothing to our argument, and is not accepted as an argument. It is far too easy to deny that our situation fits the prophecy, or to show that the prophecy was somehow fulfilled at another time. If we allow prophecy **A**, some one will introduce prophecies **B**, **C**, and **D** either in agreement or in opposition. Where shall we draw the line? How shall we control the flood? Who has time?

We confine ourselves to scriptural prophecy. This covers a situation such as ours. We do not insist that ours is the fulfilment of St. Paul's prophecy of apostasy, though we believe it is. What **will** happen **can** happen, perhaps more than once. We believe this prophecy was meant, among other reasons, to reassure us—to keep us from being scandalized—from thinking Christ could desert His Church. He did not say, after all, that His Church, like the Apostles in the Garden, could never desert Him. He chose Judas one of His Apostles. He never said His Church could never choose a Judas as His vicar. He said the disciple is not above the Master.

He said (Matthew xxviii, 19-20): “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.” Challoner comments: “..... not one but **all nations**; and instruct them in **all truths**. And that He may assist them effectually in the execution of this commission, He promises to be with them all days, even to the consummation of the world” But what if they fail or refuse this commission? He promises to be with them to fulfil His command, not to forget it. Not since Vatican II has a “pope” or bishop taught all truth. On the contrary, all false religions and heresies have been told there is good in them, despite their explicit opposition to Christ and His truth. Presumption is that sin against the divine virtue of Hope by which we expect salvation without making use of the proper means to obtain it. We can be sure that Christ will be with us all days only when we are with Him, when we love Him, when we prove it by keeping His Commandments, especially His last.

Prophecies are proved in their fulfillment. But not all fulfilled prophecy is divine in origin. Fulfillment is often in the eye of the beholder.

Objection—Must we not believe Church-approved private revelations?

Reply—No! Church approval signifies merely that a private revelation contains nothing contrary to faith or morals. It adds nothing to the Deposit of Faith, which alone we are obliged to believe. It does not corroborate but must conform to that deposit. The Church can neither confirm nor deny prophecies of future events, except insofar as they are doctrinally or morally absurd.

Objection—You appear to go right down the line with **Britons Catholic Library** in its Letter No. 1.

Reply—Fortunately, neither you nor they can be wrong every time, as, for instance, in citing Cardinal Mindszenty as an example of orthodoxy because he was kept from Vatican II. Yet this man approved the vernacularization of the liturgy, because “it promotes nationalism,” and would not give his blessing to three representatives [I was one] of the Latin Mass Society of Australia until he had completely clarified that he did not thereby approve our views on the Mass. Those Britons are sincere enough, I think, but they have never encountered the Catholic Church except on paper. They are too late on the scene to appreciate how it worked before Roncalli opened the windows to the falling night. One must admit an alarming diversity of views among those who call themselves traditionalist writers. Britons may not secure unanimous agreement among us, but the effort, probably doomed to failure, is laudable.

According to their “Catalogue of Poisonous Priests” they expect little English-speaking clerical help. Astounding, however, is the space they devote to trifles. Who could care whether a recent convert in his euphoric exuberance had indulged in hyperbole? Or why another should be branded a gossip for reporting an interesting statement that no one could take seriously? Have we here violation of the eighth commandment, whereby a reputation is damaged by unnecessary accusation, whether calumny or detraction? The fact of scandalous behavior justifies no one in its publication to those not concerned. Unless we have conferred a good name we cannot remove it.

Having seen or experienced some strictures imposed on genuinely and completely orthodox Catholics by these zealous Britons regarding availability of Mass and sacraments, I am not inclined to entertain at face value all their charges or ultra-puritanical attitudes. A priest on the scene just may know how to apply law in individual cases. He may even know circumstances unknown to absent or blanket critics who work at least partially on hearsay.

When I hear **The Remnant** prints a priest’s articles I recall when it printed part of my own letter. My letters have surfaced in the secular press and even in Sydney’s **Catholic Weekly**.

When I hear that a priest is ruled by his housekeeper I wonder: **What’s new?** Such a situation may easily overtake a priest who pays insufficient attention to material concerns—the type who must be told when he needs a haircut.

But the appearance on page 58 of an utter misapplication of Canon 436 (1918 Code) astonished me; these Britons had tried it on me earlier and been answered. Indeed they knew in the first place

that 436 appears among the qualifications and duties of a vicar capitular (Canons 434-444 incl.), a priest who fills in as head of a diocese pending appointment of a bishop. “When the see is vacant let nothing be innovated”—no unusual collections, no new school projects, no changes in parish boundaries. No one ever dreamed a vicar capitular would introduce a new catechism or change Mass, or even Mass times. This law has no bearing on our sedevacantist case, and its use as though pertinent weakens case and credibility. The Britons don’t use it even to indicate the Church’s attitude to change—perhaps wisely, for it is not—but rather as the final word on the subject—which, though unnecessary, I wish it were.

We also have come under Britons’ pressure. It is our duty to call this or that traditionalist priest or writer a heretic. Or else we uphold his heresy. But when a heresy deceptive enough to be taken seriously is called to our attention we assail the **idea** in hopes that its protagonists will see its absurdity. We went for years without attacking Lefebvre, even defending him against what we considered attacks for the wrong heresies. For more years we attended the Mass of a priest we considered sufficiently sane to celebrate Mass. But we never pried too deeply into his reasons, and left him only when he made his heresies public and insisted that we also hold them to receive the sacraments. We know a priest whose mental breakdown could be at least partially attributed to pressure from one of the Britons. We were instructed to condemn a fine priest who would never consciously have embraced heresy in any form, and would have died for the Faith as cheerfully as he lived for it eighty-eight years. Our fight is for the Faith, and only incidentally against men when necessary—as against Lefebvre and Thuc. One who is sure of his position requires no support. But these two groupies needed all the support they could scare up. One would think, viewing the present state of the Church, and indeed of the entire world, that the fallacy of majority opinion’s probability had been sufficiently discredited.

One can almost understand the perverted logic that keeps Lefebvre’s own poorly trained “priests” with him. If he is wrong then so are they—which is inadmissible; they have put in their time and money and have nothing for it? Even when he drove them forth for exceeding his own orthodoxy (rather easy of accomplishment) they never concluded that he was wrong in the first place as well as more recently. They may then not be priests! Or, if they **are**, they may be suspended *a divinis*, rendering their Masses(?) illicit—mortally sinful for themselves and those who assist.

But what are we to think of older priests, genuinely ordained, who flock to the standards of Lefebvre, Thuc, or **his** new bishops(?)? When these priests stood alone, and cared for the spiritual and sacramental needs of the faithful, they were either right or wrong. If wrong, how has adherence to a new, unnecessary “authority” mitigated their error? If right, what benefit have they derived from their new association—beyond another hurdle to be justified, **if possible**? Having walked a tightrope they now attempt it on stilts.

Least comprehensible are those genuine priests who conclude that their traditional course has been wrong—that they have misled and endangered souls—and leave their misled, endangered souls to the tender mercies of Lefebvrites or Thucites. For if these genuinely mandated, genuine priests have erred in continuing their mandate longer than have their “authorities,” what possibility exists that those two sets of groupies, both clearly lacking such mandates, will not mislead their flocks even further afield and place them in far greater jeopardy?

The strongest legal position, of course, is that of the priest who remains at his post and keeps all doctrine and tradition. Naturally, his apostate bishop(?) will exceed his vanished authority and remove this priest, who will then set up shop across the street and continue to care for those whose care was assigned him. Had five priests in each diocese adopted this course they could have torpedoed the whole Renewal.

BRITONS CATHOLIC LIBRARY Letter #2 (June 1984) pp. 42ff

deals with reception of converts, including the lapsed Catholic returning to the Church from heresy. “... he must, in addition to his profession of faith, withdraw the error or errors that he has been professing, express his detestation of them, and vow to renounce them forever. Since an abjuration

of error in front of a bishop or priest must be made in the presence of an additional two witnesses (Canon 2314/2), **we think it can be assumed** that, if at all possible, the abjuration of error in front of a **layman** should always be made in front of at least two witnesses as well. In addition, the heretic returning to the bosom of the Church” [how identified?] “must undertake to put right any scandal he has caused, by retracting his heresy or heresies in front of any Catholics in front of whom he has been professing them as far as this is practical.”

Is this “heretic” truly returning to the Church's bosom? By undergoing a canonical ceremony before a layman? What authority empowers this layman to act for the Church? Canon law, which Britons apply most strictly to others? Canon 209, which they largely disallow in our present circumstances and which concerns clerical jurisdiction? A pope or a bishop with genuine jurisdiction? According to Britons [and we agree] neither exists. Who, then, selects and appoints this layman to what position? Who submits **him** to the necessary examination for orthodoxy? It would never do to install a Jansenist, a puritan, an amateur, a new convert to judge or restore Catholics.

Britons continue: “N.B.1. It is not suggested that a ceremony of this sort in front of a layman replaces that in front of a priest and confers on the heretic forgiveness of his crime of heresy.” [Then why should anyone take the trouble to undergo this legally baseless, unauthorizable ceremony?] “... we” (Britons) “are confident that, as far as the **external** forum is concerned, the much abused principle of epikeia really does apply” [that the lawmaker really would intend subjection to a kangaroo court], “and that a person who makes such an abjuration may be regarded by the Faithful as one to whom St. Paul’s injunction, ‘A heretic avoid,’ no longer applies; for otherwise it would be impossible, in the absence of priests, for a person who left the fold through heresy or schism ever again to be able to associate with other Catholics.”

Unless, of course, “You heretic!” had never been hurled—in a moment of over-reaction or poor judgment—in the first place. If I antagonize some one, call him a heretic, I can hardly expect him to listen closely to my arguments. There **is** a difference between “You heretic!” and “Let’s examine your opinion.” Few traditionalists intend heresy, and many will listen to reason. Few respond to pressure, or we would have gone along with the postconciliar innovations. It benefits no one, for instance, to read a man out of the Catholic Church as a heretic for a reference to the “sedevacantist heresy.” For such a heresy really exists. It stops not at the obvious proposition that we have no pope, but continues to the inconsequent necessity of electing a pope by some new procedure. Neither the necessity nor a legal means has been demonstrated. But I shall not brand people who in their zeal promote this error **heretics**. I understand their overanxiety for the Church, their urgency to act for the Church’s supposed benefit. I hope to persuade them of both the impracticality and the uselessness of their election, which cannot, in any case, provide a shadow of basis for assumption of jurisdiction.

We would all welcome a genuine pope. Would it not be nice to have Mass and sacraments? The test and trial of our generation is to keep the Faith while losing everything that requires the clergy.

Britons remind a mutual friend of that German officer in “Those Magnificent Men In Their Flying Machines.” Any fool can fly a plane, as shown by his competition. Therefore **he** could fly, though he had never tried. All needed was the instruction book. When he ditched it was not **his** fault. Skip weather conditions, light, obstacles; just follow the book. Rank presumption! But hardly the end of the matter. Britons presume further that they really comprehend the instructions—and all the technical terms in which they may be couched.

ARGUMENT CORNER

Objection—Your one sentence concerning a priest whose mental breakdown could be at least partially attributed to one of the Britons accuses that Briton of a most heinous crime. Furthermore, he was in no way to blame. The Briton had been given the task of getting rid of an American priest for his people, and needed some clerical authority to condemn the miscreant. He wrote an accusation of the American priest under obedience to your priest.

Reply—All those Americans were in grave spiritual danger, which they could have eliminated by leaving their priest. Do what is right and leave the consequences to God? So a voluntarily assumed “duty” to save those who could have saved themselves, if necessary, overrode all consideration for our priest, already under pressures, and his flock, now deprived of his services. Nor did the Briton owe our priest any obedience. Nor did our priest initiate anything in this matter; the job, duty, pressure, and written condemnation all belonged to the Briton, according to eye-witnesses. Despite the predictable result, I accused this Briton of nothing more than bad judgment. The result of his pressure was more than he had foreseen. But judgment is not Britons’ long suit. Rashness or interference, perhaps?

G. K. Chesterton’s **The Poet and the Lunatics** spins a tale of a man who thought he could kill anyone because, being king, he was above the law. Gabriel Gale, the poet, explained that the greatest lunatic of all is the solid, practical businessman gone mad. Can this apply to Britons Catholic Library, headed by a brilliant businessman who has discovered a bankrupt Church to take over? At least he can instruct the rest of us in our Faith.

“..... rigid orthodoxy is **not** satisfactorily indicated by the mere fact of not having been sucked in by any of the Satanic traps currently operative; its only real test is zealous and enthusiastic acceptance of unfamiliar (and uncomfortable) Catholic doctrines brought to one’s attention.”

—Britons (un)Catholic Library Letter #3, Vol. 2, p. 104

Then we discover that most of these Catholic doctrines are unfamiliar because undefined— theological opinions not universally held, and special or temporary applications or misapplications. Britons would have us all in turmoil and despair—exactly the conditions imposed on most Catholics by Vatican II and its four antipopes. Wherever Britons tread, Mass and sacraments are further restricted, especially to Gibsons. One may err on either side of orthodoxy, particularly in the absence of direct knowledge or experience of orthodoxy ascendant in its proper sphere in daily action. Theological opinions can generate such fog that no one can be sure of any Catholic doctrine.

Obviously one can commit mortal sin having never heard the term. The natural law is written in our hearts, even if we remain uninstructed in all theological opinion, or even Catholic doctrine. Genuine ignorance that a certain action is intrinsically wrong will not make the action meritorious, but it **will** reduce or obliterate culpability. Deliberate ignorance, however, is sinful in itself, and will only aggravate guilt. Ignorance is not presumed in an instructed Catholic.

But St. Bernard (BuLL #3, p. 149) presumes and attributes ignorance to the malicious persecutors of Christ and His Apostles—persecutors (1) who knew they had condemned Christ on false testimony and for “blasphemy,” which His public words and actions had belied beforehand, and (2) whose persecution of the Apostles continued after His supreme proof—His Resurrection— which they themselves had gone far out of their way to substantiate. They **knew** the facts, yet refused belief. They and their whole religion turned themselves knowingly into the first heresy, post-Christian Judaism. Deliberately they believed not, and are condemned.

The same theologian wrote: “The Apostle, while he was persecuting the Church, sinned gravely without the slightest doubt, as he himself admits.” To prove this he quoted I Timothy i, 13, conveniently omitting the last half of the verse which seems to prove the exact opposite. “Who before was a blasphemer and a persecutor and contumelious. But I obtained the mercy of God, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief.” There was no doubt of blasphemy, persecution, or contumely, all objectively sins. But where does St. Paul admit his culpability (not merely his sorrow or deep regret)? On the contrary, he obtained mercy while headlong on his way to broaden the scope of his persecution and contumely.

From the very fact of confession and its purpose it must be granted that the Catholic Church is thoroughly conversant with sin, its nature, its gravity, its occurrence, its imputability, its guilt. We therefore recommend the article, **Sin**, in **The Catholic Encyclopedia**. Its eminent sanity should suffice to overcome Britons overemphases and misunderstandings. When you have waded through

the eight pages you will have verified the catechism statement that mortal sin requires grievous matter, sufficient reflection, and full consent of the will, and that while one may commit the act he cannot shoulder the guilt unknowingly.

Most catechisms are to instruct Catholics, most of whom never owned or easily consulted **The Catholic Encyclopedia**, nor even the theological speculations available to those who can evidently be misled by some of their facets. Where the Britons are correct they tell us nothing new. There seems little point in disturbing ourselves by reading their unprovable theological and legal opinions and applications. We have enough on our plates with the Johns and the Pauls—the main event. Britons at the tail end are absurd, writes Bill Strojie, Pharisees with a Catholic law book.

Pharisees?! Oh, no, no, no, no! Pages 170-176, BuLL #3 emphatically deny this charge. Canon Law is so important to us all, partly because King David recorded how day and night he studied the laws. And well he should; was he not responsible for their enforcement? How many laymen through the ages were concerned with the codes in effect? Who had ever heard, for instance, of Canon 882, by which we can imagine ourselves in danger of death and therefore ask any apostate or heretic priest for absolution? But page 169, BuLL #3, spells out the requirements:

“(a) If a Catholic has access to such a priest and wishes to invoke Canon 882 and go to him for sacramental confession, he must undergo the labour of preparing and making a general confession on the assumption that he has not received valid absolution during the last fifteen to twenty years. And at the very least he will almost certainly have to confess that he has been outside the Church, through schism if not worse, for part of that time, and that he has been a party to many sacrilegious confessions and masses whether *Novus Ordo* or illegal Tridentine.”

All your confessions for the last fifteen to twenty years were worthless or worse, and must be repeated? What ever happened to Canon 209, whereby the Church supplies jurisdiction in common error?

And what ever happened to Jesus Christ’s words on the Pharisees in St. Matthew’s Gospel xxiii, 4 & 13?

“For they bind heavy and insupportable burdens and lay them on men’s shoulders: but with a finger of their own they will not move them.”

“But woe to you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because you shut the kingdom of heaven against men : for you yourselves do not enter in, and those that are going in, you suffer not to enter.”

Let us examine a few opinions. They may be theological or pharisaical, but they do not appear to bind.

1) Any priest who celebrated the *novus ordo missae* thereby apostatized from the Catholic Church. When he returns to the Catholic Church it is as a layman. He has no current *celebret*, and in the absence of a Catholic bishop or pope cannot procure one. Therefore he may never celebrate the true Mass unless requested by the faithful under Canon 2261 of the 1918 Code.

This final judgment by a lay convert leaves yet another unforeseen impediment to availability of the true Mass—this excommunicated priest may legitimately doubt that those who request Mass and sacraments from him are really the faithful. By the time priest and those requesting his services look into each others’ qualifications they may all be dead.

It is conceivable that a priest, being a busy man, may not have had time to read the documents of Vatican II. Unsuspecting, trusting in his superiors, he may never have realized their criminal negligence (to be charitable) in admitting condemned heresy into the Church. It is possible for such a priest to have celebrated Paul VI’s new rite under unsuspecting obedience without having had time to read it through first, as he so often would have celebrated the traditional Mass. What could be different? It may have taken him several hundred repetitions to realize that all was not what it should be. It may be that this priest had **not** apostatized, at least consciously. When, therefore, he

realized the situation, refused the new conciliar “Church,” and stopped using its invalid “mass” and “sacraments,” he need not come under the laws governing excommunicated priests or heretics. There may have been no reason for the Church to receive him “back” as a layman.

In any case, to whom would he make his submission? Where is the competent authority to permit or deny him the use of his priesthood?

Suppose that he **has** been guilty of apostasy. Has he not repented? Is he not obliged to provide the ordinary means of salvation? Where is the competent authority which can judge him in these matters?

Most of us can no longer find the sacrament of Penance. Does this mean we must go to hell? Is there still not perfect contrition to secure forgiveness of our sins?

Can we deny the same benefit to the returning priest? The cases are not exactly parallel, but they are close enough to make us suspend judgment. On the other hand, no compelling reason exists to accept every word of such a priest as Gospel. His track record for logic and doctrine sports a few blemishes. He has been, outwardly at least, on both sides.

9) When you season or salt your food for the purpose of increasing enjoyment you commit a mortal sin. We include this major theological opinion not in expectation that anyone will consider it, but rather to ascribe it to its promulgator, the chief author of Britons unCatholic Library Letters (BuLL).

Can we really postulate, or even speculate, that God created our appetites and the delights that satisfy them for the purpose of placing us all in His enmity? What a foe of salvation is a good cook! I have no chance! I’ve been surrounded by good cooks all my life, even, believe it or else, in the army!

If we salt our food (I don’t, incidentally.) are we manufacturing the flavor, or did God create it? He attaches pleasure to satisfaction of our appetites so that we may have a lively interest, apart from duty, to nourish our bodies, to keep them alive and healthy. There is no question of preferring salt or sauce (even compounded from God’s natural sources) to God. Behind asceticism and mortification is the idea that we give up voluntarily, for God’s sake, God’s **good** gifts, while acknowledging their value and thanking God for their availability. If they are of no benefit, but rather occasions of sin, would it not be meritless to forego them? When one sprinkles ashes on his food to prevent enjoyment, is he not destroying part of the food’s purpose? Does he not run the risk of suicide by slow starvation or gastric revulsion? Why did Christ change water into wine? A miracle (among other reasons) to save embarrassment and to give gustatory pleasure. Did not Jesus Christ Himself say (Mark ix, 49; Luke xiv, 34): “Salt is good?” Does not the first chapter of Genesis end: “And God saw all the things that He had made, and they were very good.?”

When a man proves himself so utterly fanatical on everyday basics, why must we take his word on theology or canon law?

Objection—You say (TWIN! #18) Britons Catholic Library’s effort to unite traditionalists is laudable. I especially admire their capacity for scholarly research. But they have taken some positions that arouse concern:

- 1) Wife beating and torture are sanctioned by the Church.
- 2) We are forbidden to receive the sacraments from a repented *novus ordo* (excommunicated) priest unless we are in imminent danger of death.
- 3) The Church forbids natural birth control and family planning.
- 4) No priest today has jurisdiction to provide the sacrament of Penance.
- 5) No priest today is permitted to confer the sacrament of Confirmation.

Reply—(1) No cleric may beat his wife or engage in torture. The early Church was on record against torture, though it was tolerated during the inquisition partly because of the character of those examined and of concomitant grave danger to the state. Those convicted of capital crimes were formerly tortured to secure a confession to set the consciences of the jury at rest. All official

torture was the province of the secular government, its heritage from Roman law. The **state** burnt heretics to preserve **civil** stability.

(2) Canon 2261 §2: Except as provided in §3 the faithful can for any just cause ask for sacraments or sacramentals of one who is excommunicated especially if there is no one else to give them; and in such cases the excommunicated person so asked may administer them and is not obliged to ask the reason for the request. §3 concerns one **declared** excommunicated or a *vitandus*, to be asked only in danger of death. A *vitandus* is one excommunicated **by name** by the Holy See, which is now vacant. Where this becomes a matter of opinion is whether the priest who celebrated the *novus ordo* realized the extent of his crime. If the realization made him return to the Church it is unlikely that realization preceded the return by much.

In Canon Law permissions are broad, restrictions, narrow. So the excommunicated priest or bishop may confer **all** the sacraments which the priest or bishop in good standing may confer. Considering the fact that excommunicated priests have no jurisdiction it follows that either (1) jurisdiction is not absolutely essential to sacramental validity or (2) jurisdiction is conferred through the request itself.

(3) Canon law declares procreation and education of children the prime purpose of marriage. Even natural birth control should not be undertaken without sufficient reason discussed with a confessor. I knew a couple who had all they could do to support the children they had, so they slept in separate bedrooms. But the better course is to let God plan the family. He feeds us all and should He withhold the essential we die and come to rest in His hands. The limited family deprives itself. But it is not necessarily evil to abstain for grave reasons.

(4) Most priests were granted faculties shortly after ordination. In the absence of competent authority to withdraw these faculties how can the priests lose them? No one ever had to stay away from the confessional because his bishop had died. Similarly a priest could usually secure confessional faculties outside his own diocese merely by phoning the local chancery office; it was practically automatic. Why should the faithful be deprived because there is no Catholic bishop to grant faculties at the local chancery office? If a priest's faculties were removed by competent authority for sufficient reason such as mental imbalance that is another story. But even where priest and/or people are mistaken in belief in the priest's jurisdiction the Church supplies it under Canon 209. Britons' opinion may be equally probable, but it binds no one.

(5) A priest who was permitted to confirm in happier days (as in Latin America or eastern rites) would seem just as capable in these times. A priest without such permission cannot assume it. Confirmation after all is not strictly essential to salvation though I'd hate to have been without it.

I can understand your reluctance to accept Britons' positions. In their inexperience they exaggerate their own competence. They can unearth authority, however obscure, irrelevant, or subject to their misinterpretation, for anything they would have so.

With no pope we remain Catholic. Why struggle into another risk—a man who **may** be elected (by whom?) pope? How will he restore order unless the world (or even only the true Catholic) accepts both him and the risky method which **may** have elected him? What gain?

At risk? Credibility. Reward? Further complication. Greater confusion. More unnecessary division and fragmentation among the few remaining Catholics.

And if we expect to convince *novus ordo* Catholics of their apostasy we place one more unnecessary hurdle before their already reluctant minds.

TWIN! #19, page 1, commented briefly on **Britons Catholic Library's** impositions on returned heretics. Britons have, as far as lies in their power, conferred status on my remarks by retorting (June '88) in a mere 64 pages (Letter #5, Vol. 2A). I favor overkill, but

Britons puzzled out that I meant that their "heretic" may never have left the Church [Correct!], but was "hastily branded by a Catholic" [No—by **Britons**] "over-zealous in maintaining doctrinal purity" [as perceived by Britons, who have no experience of the Catholic Church]. They paraphrase me to the effect that I hesitate to call **anyone** a heretic. Direct quotation would have shown my reluctance to call **traditionalists** heretics. But even the wildest *novus ordo* heretic reacts negatively to being called what he is. It suffices to prove that his actions and/or tenets are heretical—let him draw his own conclusions. Nor have I hesitated to call every bishop alive, especially Abp.(?) Marcel Lefebvre, and every "pope" since Pius XII heretics. Unlike Britons, I never included Fr. Oswald Baker, John McGrath, Bill Strojie, or even Britons themselves, though

Britons hold or have held objectively heretical views which have been extrapolated from their own publications or correspondence, but which Britons “refute” by ascribing my quotations thereof to my “typical dishonesty and deliberate misrepresentation blatant falsification sneers and lies.”

To Britons’ assertion that they never judge their “penitent heretics” in a jurisdictional sense (which they agree, after my comment, is beyond laymen’s capacity) I oppose their own words:

- 1) “The convert **must** recite in front of a Catholic” [not a Jansenist or puritan] “selected” [by whom? guaranteed Catholic by whom?]. “If previously Catholic reason for defection professed one or more heresies, he **must**, in addition, withdraw the error(s) express his detestation vow to renounce them forever.”
- 2) “This last terrible oath ..(not quoted—irrelevant)... is borrowed from the Roman Pontifical Our only regret we did not incorporate it long ago into the formulae of recantation used by **all those converts** with whose reception we have been associated.”

You and I, gentle reader, rejoice when former Catholics bemused by their apostate clergy finally see the light and return to the Church they never intended to leave. For what else converts anyone from the postconciliar “Church” but appreciation that the postconciliar “Church” teaches and promotes heresy? But Britons—puritan and amateur judges—set up this unnecessary, antagonizing hurdle which may just drive the harried former Catholic back to his “charitable” apostate clergy. Britons can’t even see where they err. The probable reason for such an interminable, irrelevant defense of indefensible procedures, and for the pharisaically burdensome procedures themselves, as well as obsessions with gluttony, high colonics, and unconscious mortal sin, is the chief Briton’s total lack of a sense of humor and its major contribution to a sane perspective. There may, somewhere, be traditional Catholic priests or writers whom he has not tried to destroy. Never fear—he’ll ferret them out.

NO TIME FOR CRANKS?

The chief perpetrator of the interminable BuLL writes:

“in T.W.I.N. 22 you have ascribed to me opinions which we do not hold. I request that you inform your readers of this fact

“The opinions erroneously attributed: 1) that salting or seasoning food for the purpose of increasing enjoyment is mortally sinful. (p.6) 2) that except in imminent danger of death Catholics are forbidden to receive the sacraments from a priest who has incurred excommunication by joining the Conciliar Church even if he repent. (p. 12) 3) that the Church unconditionally (the word **unconditionally** was not used but it was clearly implicit) forbids ‘natural’ birth control. 4) that no priest today has jurisdiction to provide the sacrament of Penance. The first three of these I have never believed or suggested, either in speech or in writing. The last I once held as a tentative and provisional position but have publicly changed this in view of the discovery a) that there is at least one truly Catholic priest left in the world and (b) that despite the current inapplicability of Canon 209 jurisdiction can still be supplied by other means.”—N. M. Gwynne

Note the basis for this change, the discovery of a Catholic priest, whom, incidentally, he has restricted in celebrating Mass to occasions when the faithful request it. He had previously discovered Fathers Buckley, Landwehr, and Lucian, and asked them for Mass and sacraments. When he had helped drive one crazy and discovered the other two in heresy, they—not he—cut all ties. When Father X falls out of favor or dies, Martin will either discover another Catholic priest (though he has left himself precious few prospects) or return to this (4) tentative, provisional opinion, which fits so well with page 12’s (5).

Eventually I replied: The **Objection** in TWIN! #22, page 12 came from a man in Texas shortly after he had received TWIN! #18.....

You “once held as a tentative and provisional position” “that no priest today has jurisdiction to provide the sacrament of Penance.” It was decent of you to change this publicly because you held a tentative, provisional position—as you hold all your erroneous opinions—publicly, positively, as

though firm and undeniable. How many other opinions do you hold this way? So what are we to think of any of your opinions? Anything you have said is subject to change when you encounter changed circumstances—a continual hazard. When your present “truly Catholic priest” joins at least three others in your discard, will you revert to your provisional position? Will you discover another “truly Catholic priest?” (Yes, a man already “ordained” by Lefebvre!) Will you fabricate a **new** law?

I like the parenthesis in “(3)(‘unconditionally’ was not used but it was clearly implicit)” Please apply equal implicitness to my use of “mortally” sinful. You said everything but, including “actually sinful.” And you treat the whole trivial field as deadly serious—grave enough to require an oath from Zenon Kuzik. Either it is as grave as you treat it, or you required an oath over a trivial matter—granted precariously that you possess authority to require an oath on any subject.

Should you wish to deny the four opinions attributed (properly, I believe) to you, please utilize the space wasted in your own overblown sheets. I shall, of course, if you insist, print the substance of your protest, but you won’t like its treatment.

You seem not to appreciate that the deeper you plough publicly into theological trivia, the less your credibility and influence. When you joined(?) us you should have left your pharisaic tendencies behind. Religion and theology are by nature little susceptible of self-teaching, even from the best of books—from the Bible itself. You have no real experience of the Church or its attitudes.

Incidentally, have you ever publicly withdrawn your misuse of Canon 436? Or have you expressed a single regret for rendering Father Buckley *hors de combat*—useless to the Catholics of Queensland? You created a vacuum which Lefebvre’s crew hastened to fill. How many souls do you think you imperiled unnecessarily because **you** had to be right versus Father Landwehr, who concerned no one in Queensland in the least?

You are a meddler. You sow discord—nay, you restrict Mass and sacraments, decrease God’s glory—wherever you go. The Catholic Church, and probably the world in general, would benefit immeasurably from your silence. A man should recognize his limitations.

In a way, however, it’s good to see Sigmund Freud corrected. He attributed all ills to his own failing, sex. You have subjected all to gluttony, which more than half the world has no opportunity to indulge.

Martin replied: “The only purpose was to draw attention to the fact that in T.W.I.N. 22 you attributed to us a number of views which we do not hold and to ask you to fulfil the elementary duty of bringing this fact to your readers’ attention. I confirm that again I ask you to do so. Whoever your source in Texas was, he certainly did not quote to you what we have written either publicly or privately, and you would find that he would be unable to give proof that we had said what he alleged. [He furnished photocopies.]

“With regard to your threat, ‘I shall, if you insist, print the substance of your protest, but you won’t like its treatment,’ what further comments you add are up to you. As you are presumably well aware, you will be answerable for them not to us but to God.” [What a blessed relief!] “The same applies to your suggestion that you may subject us to a ‘full scale treatment’ in which you ‘believe (you) can improve on some of (our) recent assailants.’

“..... (your) other points were either invalid or based on incorrect information. If you would like me to set the facts straight I shall be pleased to do so. (My) only condition would be that you agree in advance to publish the entire correspondence.” [Aside from the probable infinity of his writing, who could agree to such a condition before seeing what he writes?]

“..... I would be assuming that in the closing letter you would not be introducing new material but merely commenting on what is already under discussion.” [Obviously this precludes “full scale treatment” and excludes all his other writings.]

I quote from Martin’s letter (19 Sept 1984) to Texas:

“The correct position on receipt of the sacraments from excommunicated priests is that: (a) A Catholic may, subject to certain conditions, receive the sacraments from an excommunicated priest

under Canon 2261; but (b) if the priest, in addition to being excommunicated, is a heretic, the Catholic may under no circumstances receive the sacraments from him except in danger of death, because to do so would be to commit the mortal sin of *communicatio in sacris*. a priest cannot validly absolve unless he has jurisdiction. It is not a question of its being illegal (which it is); without jurisdiction the sacrament of penance is actually invalid. Where express jurisdiction is not possessed by a priest (and to the best of my knowledge and belief there is now no priest in the English speaking world who does possess jurisdiction), it can be received either when the penitent is in danger of death or under Canon 209. But Canon 209 does not apply to the circumstances of our day because it applies in the case of

(a) either common error (which is **not** the same as ‘common ignorance’)

(b) or in positive and probable doubt of law or of fact; and there is no doubt whatever about the law which limits jurisdiction or the fact that priests now do not have jurisdiction. All that can be said is that people are either unaware of the fact and the law or are ignoring it, which is not the same thing.”

Let the reader judge whether our Texan correspondent misunderstood or misrepresented Martin’s written doctrine, remembering that he rightly considers members of the postconciliar “Church” heretics. There may be some disagreement over “English speaking world,” which seems merely included in “priests now do not have jurisdiction.” On the whole I consider that Martin holds, or has held, “opinions erroneously attributed” #2 and #4.

From Martin’s letter (18 Oct 1984): “I had not fully clarified the jurisdiction question in my own mind at the time we wrote Letter No. 2.” [This had not prevented his insistence, especially to priests, on his own interpretation.]

From Texas (29 Oct 1984): “It is apparent to me that for the same reason[s], you could be mistaken about so tricky a matter as the interpretation and application of Canons, even in normal times, let alone in our current devastating Church crisis Perhaps you will agree that if the law to the faithful is as cut and dried as you claim you would not have gone so far as to publish Letter #2 while still not having clarified the jurisdiction question in your own mind. Can you furnish me with official Church documentation that wife beating and torture are approved by the Church?”

Martin (6 Nov 1984): “..... having only become a Catholic less than five years ago, I by no means got it right in the early days, and am by no means certain to get it right today or in the future. you do not know the doctrine of mortal sin and exactly what is meant by ‘full knowledge.’ We deal with this whole subject In Letter No. 3 [which provoked page 9, TWIN! #20.] “..... I expect I can make mistakes on all sorts of canons, but this does not mean that I have any business doing so. The law exists to be obeyed, and therefore it is the duty of the faithful to exert themselves until they understand it sufficiently well to be able to comply with it.” [a duty never before imposed upon the faithful.] “..... Wife beating and torture are dealt with, for instance, by St. Alphonsus Liguori, Doctor of the Church, in his *Theologica Moralis*.”

Martin believes, then, that wife beating and torture are sanctioned by the Church. He raised no **Objection** to that as an opinion “erroneously attributed” him. Somehow he has wrested a theological opinion into Church doctrine. Not even Doctors of the Church are infallible, nor are all their teachings adopted by the Church. St. Alphonsus, as Martin cites him, clearly opposes the early Fathers of the Church, beginning with St. Paul and including Tertullian, Origen, St. Cyprian, and St. Augustine, all of whom deplored all forms of torture; they had seen its futility against Christians, and believed results against heretics or pagans equally suspect. Disagreement, then, places the subject either in the realm of opinion or outside the revelation. One could also say “The Church has sanctioned bingo!”

One method of determining the Church’s mind on particular opinions of theologians, even Doctors of the Church, is to see whether these opinions are reflected in the catechisms used to instruct the faithful. The living magisterium, reliable when Catholic, told us our obligations, both laws and beliefs, as was its proper function. The zealous convert, however, tells us we must conform to what **he** has discovered in the writings of certain Doctors, as though the magisterium had never heard of

these matters. His zeal is proof against remonstrance and reason; he thinks we conspire to cover up uncomfortable “truths.” He makes our acceptance of these the test of our humility, good will, and orthodoxy. The boy who has just mastered the multiplication tables examines us on solid geometry, trigonometry, advanced algebra, astronomy, physics, and nuclear fission.

Let us cite one example. St. Alphonsus Liguori, Martin’s mainstay in imputing mortal sin unawares, stated, contrary to Catholic doctrine, that God hates both the sin and the sinner, and quoted Wisdom xiv, 9: “But to God the wicked and his wickedness are hateful alike.” St. Alphonsus had no right whatsoever to remove that verse from context, nor to apply it except as used—buried in the middle of two chapters damning idolatry. Verse 8: “But the idol that is made by hands is cursed, as well it as he that made it: he because he made it; and it because, being frail, it is called a god.” Verse 10: “For that which is made, together with him that made it, shall suffer torments.”

In checking the Vulgate we find “are hateful” a translation of “*odio sunt*,” not of *detestor*, *abominor*, *abhorreo*, or the like. The words used have a secondary meaning of **vexatious** or **annoying**, the sense of “**I hate this!**” as used in the southern United States under such provocation as blowing a tyre ten miles down a country road, then discovering that one’s son blew one last week and there it sits unrepaired in one’s boot (trunk).

“Toward the end of my sojourn in London, N.M.G. ‘obliged’ me to live in ‘obedience’ to Frederica” (Martin’s wife) “and himself. The two drew up a list of what I was to read and eat from day to day, so that virtually every minute of my life was to be controlled by them. One weekend they went away, leaving the usual ‘guidelines’ to be followed. Upon their return, Martin was not satisfied that I had eaten as per his instructions. He virtually forced me to place my hand on a Bible and declare that I had not sneaked out of his flat for a meal elsewhere. Martin demanded, not only an oath on a trivial matter, but also the ‘right’ to run some one else’s affairs. Oh yes, despite any objections made to him he nearly always found an answer, **but**, when I asked him how he could condemn salt, considering that Our Lord had said ‘Salt is good,’ his response was simply: ‘That’s a problem’ (or words to that effect).—Zenon Kuzik

Martin (21 Jan 1985) to a Queenslander: “Do you add salt and pepper to your food? Do you add a sweetener to tea or coffee or cereal or whatever? Do you have salad dressings on your salads, or sauces on other dishes? (To add something to your food purely to make it taste nice rather than because you need it for nourishment is a sin, by the way.)”

(18 March 1985): “..... to eat something solely because it tastes good or to add something to food solely to make it taste better (in other words without any nutritional advantage) is actually sinful. there is nothing actually sinful about making it taste good, although there is much merit to be gained by mortifying one’s palate and eating what does not taste good or what is least tasty; but it certainly **is** sinful to eat something because it tastes good and for no other reason — and this is the case with all condiments, because they do not have any nutritional value and virtually all of them — e.g. salt and sugar — are positively harmful.” (Martin errs again. Anyone may compile a list of spices and condiments in general use, look them up, and see for himself that nearly all (even sugar and salt) benefit mental or corporal health in some way, nutritional, medicinal, or preventive. Like most puritans, Martin cannot distinguish between use and abuse, between moderation and excess. To them all pleasure is vice.)

In BuLL #4, Vol 4, Part 2 Martin published: “..... to eat anything, **or to add anything to one’s meal** (e.g. spices or sauces), solely for the sake of pleasing the palate is sinful” He goes on to cite the authority of St. Basil the Great in “**Concerning True Virginit**,” recommending certain practices to **monks**. Martin is out of bounds again; he can’t comprehend the size of the playing field. But he manages to convey the impression that if we enjoy God’s good foods and flavors we prefer these minor things to their Creator—that sin holds sway in our wretched lives. He enlarges this failing into GLUTTONY, the “capital vice which the Fathers of the Church regarded as the source and fountain from which all other vices gushed forth.” The Fathers lived in the decadent stages of the luxury-loving, gluttonous Roman Empire with its Lucullan feasts and *vomitaria*.

I ask my readers: Do you not receive, even as I, the distinct impression that according to Martin seasoning food is mortally sinful? Even if not, do you believe him normal—completely sane—in branding it as **any** kind of sin? Again, is this Church doctrine? Or rather shaky opinion, theological or otherwise?

Has Martin some deeper purpose, beyond arguing irrelevancies and picking nits? Is all this distraction from our main problems deliberate? He appears to believe that only he in all the world can judge which doctrines are Catholic and which theological opinions are to bind. When I find myself utterly alone on a doctrinal point I immediately suspect and re-examine. All odds oppose solely perceived dogma.

Martin excels at family interference. In one case he insisted, because a man had stated idly that were he single he might join in TFP activities, which, according to Martin, made him a heretic, that his wife leave him immediately. The man, naturally, refused to accept Martin's authority, but the wife, a convert, had to be shown that Martin, despite his brilliance in argument, had imposed greater penalties than had ever the Church, even upon those excommunicated by name by the Holy See. Canon 2267: "All the faithful, **except** a husband (or wife), parents, children, servants, and subjects, are bound to avoid communication in **profane** affairs with an *excommunicatus vitandus*, unless a reasonable cause justifies communication." Martin's minor deity, Canon Law, in this case carried so little weight that he forbade his own wife to associate further with this woman (her aunt) because she would not obey Martin and leave her husband. Yet he wrote to Queensland (18 March 85): "..... to tell some one who was sick that he must adhere to the normal fasting laws of Lent would be a crime, because one would be treating some one with a rigour which the Church herself neither uses nor approves" Consistency is indeed, as F.D.R. said, a vice of small minds.

I have set down a few of Martin's peculiar arguments to show why I feel no great compulsion to accept his competence, orthodoxy, or authority.

BALLOT BALONEY

"If Don John of Austria had married Mary Queen of Scots." I once read an essay of that title. It speculated that history's course could have been changed for the better. It took no account of effects on the "wedded" couple, at least one of whom would doubtless have gone mad. Had Cardinals Wolsey and Richelieu manifested greater zeal for God and less for their respective kings, history might have explored a few alternatives, one of which just might have been that others would have filled their respective posts—a younger Cranmer, perhaps, for Wolsey. Had Leo X not sworn his illegitimate, ineligible cousin, Clement VII, into eligible legitimacy, we might have had a stronger pope to deal immediately with Protestantism's rise, which Leo's own behavior largely provoked. In TWIN! #3 (Nov. 1977) I cited these two as refutations of the premise that papal elections always return the Holy Ghost's choice.

I could also have cited Alexander VI, Innocent VIII, and Anacletus II. Benedict IX was such a scandal and disgrace that all heaved huge sighs of relief when Gregory VI **bought** his office. It was necessary to end his profligate tyranny; actuarially he could have held the papacy another fifty years. Simony seemed preferable to ground glass in the gruel or civil war, and no worse than the pressure involved in his election. Was it the Holy Ghost's method? Did He prevent it in cases in which the Church accepted its results? Would He prevent simony or horse-trading in a projected papal election by the laity? History proves that any fool can be elected pope. If he intends to fulfil his obligations the Holy Ghost will preserve him from doctrinal and moral error in his *ex cathedra* pronouncements. So it smacked of heresy to elect an "interim pope" in the 1958 absence of a cardinal of "papal calibre." Any other fool in the College could have done at least as well, and probably lived longer. There have been outstanding popes. Some would have stood out in any age or any group. Problems thrust greatness upon others. Still others, in absence of unusual challenge, performed adequately. Some fell far short. Through all their tenures—and all *interregna*—the Church continued. Were some mere demonstrations that God brings good out of evil? Or were they all the choice of the Holy Ghost? Who or what guarantees an adequate result to a proposed lay election? At least cardinals know each other to some extent, and can assess potentials. If people

receive the government they deserve, after the last four “popes” and our universally corrupt national governments, can we risk it again?

HOW TO ELECT A POPE?

Under Canon 20, it is said, traditional Catholics may set up legal machinery to elect a pope. This immediately puts me out of countenance because I receive much credit for setting myself up as pope. Were I the only self-appointed candidate we would have no problem.

There is no doubt whatsoever that a legitimate pope is a boon to all mankind. I would love to see a pope. There may be a way to get one, but I don't believe all self-designated traditional Catholics can agree on what or who is a traditional Catholic. I certainly would never concede a vote to Lefebvre or any member of his organization, even if they wished to vote (unlikely—they consider JP2 and Paul VI legitimate popes). Walter Matt, Urban Snyder, Michael Davies, and the Latin Mass Society would never permit Bill Strojie, Benjamin Dryden, or Father Noel Barbara to vote. We should need an inquisition to qualify electors. Then, supposing we could come up with a legitimately elected pope, who would **recognize** him?

In 1943 our division was assigned a new commanding general. He brought with him several lieutenant-colonels to take over the infantry regiments. The regimental commanders were reassigned to make room. So when the new lieutenant-colonel took over our regiment the executive officer issued a bulletin in which he assumed command of the regiment; he was senior to the new commander. So division removed him and sent him back to the Zone of the Interior for reassignment or retirement. This worked so well that one of the battalion commanders followed suit, and was also relieved and sent home by division. Suppose that when John XXIII or Paul VI had sufficiently published his adherence to heresy, the senior Catholic prelate, probably a cardinal, had publicly assumed command of the Church until such time as a pope could be legitimately elected. But the opportunity is gone. It may return, however, perhaps as a result of a final cataclysm that may wipe out most of humanity. Or we may never again enjoy the privilege of a real live pope, in which case we must preserve our unity with the Communion of Saints individually. The Japanese have proved that it can be done.

Teresa Bennis argues (**The Church That Cannot Die**) that we must elect a pope. For if we have no pope—no visible head—no standard of unity—then Christ would have failed His promise. [We must elect a pope because we have had none since 1958. If Christ's promise depends on unbroken succession to the end (how defined?) has the thirty-year popeless period conflicted with His promise? If so, how can **we** save **His** promise? If not, at what point will it conflict? Forty years? Fifty? Never?]

“The Church simply cannot exist without Her foundation,” she writes, “for Christ is the true foundation, and His promises cannot fail. In essence then, to deny the need for a pope is to deny the Trinity for He prayed for us ‘that they may be one, even as We are one; that they also may be one in Us.’” Talk about private interpretation!

We need a pope? We have not always but normally had a pope. But we have had none visible these thirty years. What **now** escalates the urgency?

Further along, failure to elect a pope becomes a violation of Canon 1325. So all timid non-electors [how determined?] fall under suspicion of heresy. Surely all can appreciate the underwhelming force both of logic and law as set forth by this lay authority. We need a pope to settle questions and disputes? What questions? Orthodoxy of Vatican II? Legitimacy of Lefebvre's Orders, or those conferred by him or Ngo Dinh Thuc? The Church customarily rules on and for **Catholics**, not schismatics, heretics, apostates, etc. No ruling is necessary—only demonstration and recognition of facts. Lienart's or Montini's freemasonry? Easily determined by their actions. A genuine priest's or bishop's obligation to provide Mass or sacraments? Obvious. Whether Canon 209 may be used to supply jurisdiction? Why else is it in the code? Is that not its purpose? For the benefit of the laity? The laity is guaranteed certain rights—provided by the clergy. But who has conferred our right or imposed our duty to elect a pope? Who can confirm that the man elected by some new system is

ratified in heaven or supported by papal infallibility? The elected man will declare it? Infallibly? I believe that enough genuine Catholics are sufficiently misinformed that they could very well elect Lefebvre. He is, of course, ineligible, but so were those other public heretics since Pius XII. Such an election, even if feasible, presents further problems without commensurate benefits. How feasible? All Catholics over fourteen years of age who possess the use of reason **must** be summoned, say the proponents. Who can trace them all? Those who have severed connections with the postconciliar “Church” are numbered in the millions. They do not necessarily keep in touch with organized groups, or subscribe to trad publications. So if regularity of the proposed election is based on universal suffrage of eligible voters, the proponents cannot possibly contact more than a splinter—my guess: <5,000. (6 attended.)

Ash Wednesday (1990) I received a book and a request from its authors for its review in TWIN! It seemed an appropriate Lenten penance. **Will the Catholic Church Survive the Twentieth Century?**, by T. Stanfill Benns & David Bawden, begins and ends with long fairy tales which waste time, reduce interest, and provide climate for more fairy tales in between. Extraordinary copyright strictures on direct quotation not only handicap the reviewer; they cut down dispersal of the important(?) message—part of which is that everyone must spread the message and act upon it. But the authors cannot copyright their sources, any more than they can stick to the point. Elimination of all before page 10, pp. 100-108 on The False Prophet, pp. 235-7 on prayers, and pp. 337-49 on Fatima and Countering (the first five) Objections would have cut costs and dead weight. **Licity**, found in no dictionary of my acquaintance, substitutes every time for **licity**. Only the constant use of *Vacantis Apostolica Sedis* grates more.

Page 65 “explains” denial of an article of faith. If one publicly doubts **Mary immaculately conceived**, he has denied an article of faith. How? He could suggest the possibility that Our Lady was stained with original sin; or by saying he is not sure that she **immaculately conceived**. Both doubt an article of faith, and are therefore heresy. He could say that Our Lady deserved death, thereby implying that she possessed original sin, which is what brought death in the first place. He implicitly denies that **Mary conceived immaculately**, thereby committing heresy.

B & B should have consulted Denzinger: “..... the most Blessed Virgin Mary in the first instant of her conception, by a unique grace and privilege of the omnipotent God and in consideration of the merits of Jesus Christ the Savior of the human race, was preserved free from all stain of original sin” **Immaculately conceived** means what? The adverb explains how she performed the verb in the active voice. It also shows that no word was omitted by the printer, which is shown in any case by agreement with the subsequent **Mary conceived immaculately**. Do the authors understand the Immaculate Conception? If so, why did they not phrase the doctrinal statements properly: **Mary was conceived immaculate**? Does this not cast doubt on their competence throughout?

Page 96: Roncalli appointed 33 (35 on page 108) cardinals, making a proper majority of proper electors impossible. [But a candidate could have attained the required percentage of the (52) true electors plus enough of the 33 to legitimize the election in the eyes of those who realized only later that the 33 should have been disqualified. Thus 34 genuine cardinals could legitimately have elected a pope, and any combination of 22 additional votes from either genuine or Roncalli-appointed electors would have corroborated the result for the general public. (52 genuine cardinals could not elect a pope but six lay people can?!)]

Page 97: Dialogue mass, substituted for Tridentine, omitted Last Gospel and initial *Judica me, Deus*, inserted St. Joseph, “the only Old Testament figure to appear there,” into the Canon [all ascribed to Roncalli. The omissions were certainly projected, but introduced after Roncalli died. St. Joseph receives no direct mention before the New Testament; but the traditional Canon mentions Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedech.]

Page 147: The comparison of the traditional consecratory prayer with the *novus ordo* narrative of institution omits from the latter “which shall be broken for you,” a change for no other purpose than

to place the crucifixion in the future and unduly emphasize the ceremony's identity with the Last Supper to the crucifixion's exclusion.

Pp. 154-6 assume that traditionalists depend on *Quo primum tempore* to authorize validity for their attendance at traditional Masses [What is valid attendance? It could be illicit if one pays no admission at a race meeting, or is being paid for his attendance elsewhere; invalid if he came on crutches or in a wheelchair.] *Quo primum*, incidentally, declared [Where? How?] that popes only can change the liturgy [a broader term than Mass]. Nor has it anathematized any other rite *per se*. [Where was the *novus ordo* at the time? But it forbids heedless change in existing rites and introduction of new rites—newer than 1370 A.D.]

Thus B & B gratuitously throw out a major safeguard. Never fear; we don't need it! They have discovered a better argument, though its existence has passed largely unnoticed. They introduce (in 1990) Pius VI's *Auctorem fidei*, for which they practically demand our thanks, especially if we never read Patrick Omlor's **The Robber Church** (March 6, 1971), W. F. Strojje's **Letters**, or my own two books, **Paul VI's Legacy: Catholicism?** (page 130) and its 1988 update, **Is The Pope Catholic?** (page 138).

Page 204 "**proves**" that certain priests have no jurisdiction, because we lack both pope and true bishops. Let us charitably ignore their insistence (pp. 278, 332, 335, & 419) on the *de fide* existence somewhere of a Catholic bishop. They have failed to explain how a priest who has jurisdiction can lose it when there is no one to restrict or remove it. Such a loss never previously resulted from the death of a bishop or pope.

Page 271 states that the laity demanded greater participation in the Mass. I recall making no such demand. Nor have I ever met a Catholic layman who would admit having done so. The earliest changes (congregational responses and singing at the *Missa cantata*) were only seminary practice—which, admirable as they were, the laity accepted reluctantly.

Page 272: "Now having preknown that Antichrist would reign and, if possible, even the elect would be deceived, no one can object to the fact that Christ built into the promise of perpetuity the 'vacancy' we see before us today." According to the rules of English grammar then, no one has pre-known the reign and the deception. Spoken arguments can be ungrammatical but comprehensible from voice tone, emphasis, gestures, or the like. But written arguments must conform to accepted rules, or they will promote, as here, contradiction of what they intend. Let us assume, however, that B & B intended to belabor us with the obvious fact that Christ, being God, knows all things, past, present, and future, and that He knew what He promised when He promised it. It would seem, therefore, that our present undeniable vacancy of the Holy See is no violation of His (possibly misunderstood) promise. Why, then, this thirty-years-late rush to "correct" His "failure?"

Page 273: "Even though the Vatican Council had not yet defined that Peter was to have perpetual successors, this was held and taught by the Church from the beginning before its definition." The Vatican Council stated as proven historical fact that (in 1870) St. Peter **has** perpetual successors. But the argument continues that Paul IV allowed for the lapse of **any** popeless period; he knew the papacy would survive. So if he knew this it must be so—the papacy, vacant through usurpation by heretics and apostates, continues to exist. So how does one who sees no necessity for a lay papal election share in the Hussite heresy (as charged on pp. 261, 265, 297, & 358) that no pope is needed? It is more than obvious from our fractured condition that a pope is necessary for Catholic unity. But if the physical presence of a genuine enthroned pope is necessary for salvation, or for individual membership in the Catholic Church, then heaven's gates are shut. Considering what it took to open them last time, how will **we** do it? Incidentally, page 265 quotes the Vatican Council correctly that Blessed Peter **has** perpetual successors, but pp. 298, 315, and 358 upgrade this considerably by insertion of **must**, an incorrect translation—used nonetheless as a cogent reason to stage a rush papal election by suitable laity. (Page 380 quotes correctly, but inserts an interpretive parenthesis: "lasting to the end.")

Pp. 328-9 prescribe the first duty of the abandoned flock: to find a new shepherd. The flock was “abandoned” in 1958. After 31 years we are now rushed into a 90 days from this recent publication election because (a) no one could prove John XXIII a usurper until this book, and (b) parallel law on which this procedure is based sets such a time limit. B & B take account neither of the impossibility of their self-assigned task within such time nor of their own citation of the fact that a law impossible to fulfil cannot bind. But they place this obligation to elect on all true Catholics, most of whom will never have heard of this election until accomplished(?). If, as B & B argue, all must promote, participate in, or accept the result of, this election, but have been prevented by insufficient advertisement or time, or by exclusion, for unspecified or improperly imputed heresy, let us all, when possible, fulfil our B-B-imposed obligation. How? We hold another (better publicized, broader based) election! As things are going, we shall soon have more popes than priests.

War brings terrible consequences, through which no one should be put needlessly. Therefore, says **The Catholic Encyclopedia** XV, 549a, “a state going to war must weigh its own probable losses in blood and treasure, and its prospect of victory, before it may rightly enter upon a war: for the interests of the common good at home inhibit the exercise of force abroad, unless reasonably calculated not to be an ultimate graver loss to one’s own community.” It’s easy to find objections after a scheme has failed? Father Baker suggested this parallel June 17, a month before the Kansas election.

Three intrepid men face the moment of truth. Let’s count the votes. To be elected (page 410) one needs two thirds of the vote plus one vote. $2/3 \times 3 = 2 + 1 = 3$. But no one can vote for himself. A man with two votes can win only by abstaining. Can he thus perform his duty to elect a pope? Can he know whether to abstain before the tally? Suppose two abstain. So let’s disqualify a voter for age. One writes (page 354) that strictly speaking he is not Catholic; he was baptized since Pius XII’s death. Can the chief architect of the election be denied his vote? Who disqualifies him? The man who had him baptized? But this is all shrouded in Conclave secrecy, so no one will ever know. We may accept this mystery on faith in Pope Michael I, as we await his consecration as Bishop of Rome.

The least number of electors under such rules is six. If you can’t find six men to elect a pope, forget it! Even fewer will accept the outcome.

According to news reports, six electors took part. I knew six were present, but I had taken T. Bennis at her word (page 348):

“Q — Aren’t you really a closet ‘fem’ who wants to include women electors in the Conclave?
“A — Surely you jest. Would either of us have gone out of our way to adhere faithfully to all the articles of faith, law, and opinions in this work, and yet advocate unbridled liberty in something so exquisitely sensitive as the ordering of the Conclave? If you must know the truth in this matter, others have suggested that I be allowed to vote, and I personally wish it was possible. But I would **never** consider such participation, even though we have found precedents in early elections and the opinions of medieval canonists to support the theory that women could be allowed to vote. But under Canon 21, even though an opinion in favor of liberty exists, probabalism (sic) cannot be used whenever there is a question of the means to eternal salvation. Since Pope Boniface VIII has declared that all must be subject to the Roman Pontiff in order to be saved, we must consider any election of a pope a means necessary to that end. Therefore, the participation of women cannot be countenanced. If women took part, those anxious to invalidate the election would claim they could then be elected and resurrect Pope Joan. Furthermore, there is the danger of scandal whenever men and women are in close proximity for an extended length of time. While there will surely be many women in the outer room, praying and anxiously awaiting the triumphant “*Habemus papam*,” there will be none found in the Conclave. It will require a great deal more than a cheap shot like this to topple all the evidence amassed in this book.”

Such principles! But how soon they went down the drain when three more electors were needed. At what point did they consider that a law impossible to fulfil cannot bind? Now, out of the

required five votes, three were cast by women, including the new “pope’s” closest collaborator, and his mother.

Page 416 sports the book’s most interesting paragraph: “..... we must follow the safer course and assume that Collin never even became a priest, for he was ordained by Lienart, already known to have been a Freemason. Here we must make a very important addition to all the information concerning Lienart and his ordinations and consecrations. In a decision of Pius XI concerning the ordination of priests by a known Freemason, Abbe Lacroix (who admitted his masonic affiliations in his last will and testament), the Pontiff ordered all priests ordained by him to be absolutely reordained. This indicates that the principle advanced by St Thomas, that apostates cannot be said to have the proper intention, was held to be true by Pius XII.” [Lacroix was removed from his diocese (Tarentaise) early in St. Pius X’s pontificate, and died during that of Benedict XV.]

Page 466 assures us that the world cannot end without a reigning pope. Perhaps we should convince Michael I to resign at once.

MOST CANNOT THINK STRAIGHT

In 1968 Patrick Omlor published **Questioning The Validity Of The Masses Using The New, All-English Canon** in which he clearly demonstrated change from Christ’s words in the Consecration to some one else’s words in the narrative of institution. Among the first to dispute this fact was Loras College’s Rev. William G. Most, who argued that Vatican II taught that **many** = **all**.

Why not? Vatican II taught other absurdities as well. But a logical polemicist will not ordinarily cite an authority which his opponent will not believe, recognize, or accept. The Talmud or the Koran won’t protect a Catholic’s Easter ham.

Most then suggests that a pope can change Christ’s words which effect sacrificial transubstantiation and that the changed words will produce the identical result— simply because a pope proposed this absurdity. Most argued that Omlor’s appeals to St. Thomas Aquinas and to Trent’s Catechism— explicit and documented— were mere inferences. These, he said, had not explicitly condemned the new, undreamed-of “consecration” formula—though they had condemned deviation from the quoted traditional form. Most then “discredited” St. Thomas and the Trent Catechism, before again begging the question that different words from different sources (one of them **not** divine) can have the same supernatural effect. Identical effect is supposedly guaranteed because the selfsame incompetent authority that imposed the innovation subsequently approved it. Would he expect disapproval?

Nearly two decades later Fr. Most applied his faultless logic to defense of Vatican II, with equal success. He writes in **Catholic Apologetics Today—Answers to Modern Critics** (TAN Books & Publishers, Rockford, Ill.) page 5: “But today, young and old alike are affected by the immense upheaval in the Church and many claims that everything has changed. It is no wonder many are uncomfortable with their Faith.”

His modern critics seem non-Catholic: Küng, McBrien, Avery Dulles, and a bevy of biblical controversialists on whose views no Catholic would waste ten seconds. But he ignores many genuine objections. Sometimes he even sides with us.

Page 15: God does not foresee anything. God is completely unchangeable. But time is a constant succession of restless changes. Ahead of me now is a moment I call future, but quickly it becomes present, and just as quickly, it turns into past. God is not immersed in such a sea of changes. He is in eternity, with no change. Therefore for Him there is no past and no future— everything is one great eternal present to Him! So He does not foresee anything—He sees all as present.

Page 96: “Peter’s authority to bind or release will be a carrying out of decisions made in heaven. His teaching and disciplinary activities will be similarly guided by the Spirit to carry out Heaven’s will.”

Yet Most can torture reason into accepting changes in our Mass and sacraments, instituted by our unchangeable God, on the pretext that Paul VI could legislate counter to St. Pius V on such a vital matter as what constitutes the Eternal Sacrifice—thus carrying out different eternal decisions to suit different times “to carry out Heaven’s” [unchangeable] “will”—thereby according the status of a valid Mass to not only various Protestant forms outlawed by St. Pius V but even the Old Testament sacrifices which Jesus Christ Himself had deliberately superseded. He covers this tremendous objection with a single sentence: “We must be careful to notice that this question (Did Vatican II revolutionize all theology?) concerns doctrine and does not concern legislation, such as changes in the Mass or questions of prudence” He ignores (1) whether changes in Christ’s Eternal Sacrifice can be legislated, (2) whether such legislation was in fact attempted, with what justification, and (3) whether that Sacrifice can be divorced from theology or doctrine.

Another major objection is treated with question beggary. Most quotes a notorious Vatican II heresy, as though proven orthodox by Vatican II’s espousal, to support a parallel heresy. He purports to refute (page 221) claims of “numerous errors in Scripture, even religious errors.” Thomas A. Hoffman writes, for instance, that to try to refute all charges of error is “basically patching holes on a sinking ship.” Bruce Vawter even says the terms “infallible” and “inerrant” are “antibiblical.” Because these claims are so very important(!) worthwhile to examine the underpinning Confusion is injected at once, by the common assertion that the Word of God is “human and time-conditioned.” true but potentially misleading. The Bible is human in that there is a human as well as divine author the Holy Spirit uses the human author in such a way that the human author retains his own literary style, but yet he writes without any error what the Holy Spirit wills time-conditioned in that the kinds of expression used by the human author will be affected by the culture of his own time certain parallel in the case of official documents of the Church. Paul VI in *Mysterium Fidei* insisted, “The rule of speaking, which the Church with long labor over the centuries, not without the protection of the Holy Spirit, has arrived at and has confirmed by the authority of Councils must be preserved as holy, nor should anyone at his own wish or on pretext of new knowledge presume to change it.”

Yet admitted a sort of time conditioning so language may be capable of improvement. Hence the Doctrinal Congregation, by order of Paul VI, on June 24, 1973, told us, “With regard to this historical condition it sometimes happens that some dogmatic truth is first expressed incompletely (but not falsely), and at a later date receives a fuller and more perfect expression.” Yet “the dogmatic formulas of the Church’s Magisterium were from the very beginning suitable for communicating revealed truth, and that as they are, they remain forever suitable to those who interpret them correctly” In the same spirit, Vatican II, in its Decree on Ecumenism, wrote, “If the influence of events or times has brought deficiencies in conduct, in ecclesiastical discipline, or even in the **expression** (*enuntiandae* = **formulation** according to translators Flannery and Abbott) of doctrine these things should be suitably rectified at the proper time.”

Most signally fails to hear a howling heresy. He quotes one of Vatican II’s major absurdities to support the prior absurdity—that dogmas proposed for our belief have been incompletely, insufficiently, ineptly, insensitively formulated, expressed, or taught—too early, he implies, for proper use of words not yet available, or concepts never before appreciated, best expressed as “new and more authentic,” a contradiction in dogmatic or religious terms. If this particular promulgation of Vatican II is accepted, there is no basis for the truth of any Catholic doctrine. Infallibility cannot exist at any level. Any pope, council, bishop, priest, or other half-baked Catholic who would seriously advance that the Church may have deficiently expressed, preached, formulated Catholic doctrine would immediately cut the ground from beneath his own feet.

But it does not say that the Church did this? Who else formulates doctrine? These words are not spoken of the actions of heretics. Vatican II was convoked for **their** justification and supposed benefit—to draw them collectively into our Church, apologetic because only through the Church’s fault had they rejected it—convoked also, never forget, to re-examine everything except papal infallibility, necessary to enforce acceptance of its collegialism, ecumenism, and praise of anti-Christian religions. This treacherous absurdity—that Christ’s Church proclaimed Christ’s eternal

doctrine deficiently due to the influence of events or times—obviously constitutes the weasel words on which to base ecumenical discussion—to bargain instead of to evangelize—to compromise what is not ours to compromise.

But I omit the parentheses which showed what the Council really meant? **In parentheses?** These words, “which must be carefully distinguished from the deposit itself of faith,” are supremely irrelevant. How is deficiency in formulation of doctrine anything but error? Even if not, the argument remains: If these people say their predecessors formulated deficiently, on whose authority shall we believe their own formulation? What can we then believe in the entire structure of Church doctrine? If these words stand our whole religion falls.

But Father Most confers on these absurd words his own brand of orthodox infallibility, and uses them to defend (unnecessarily) against modern critics—non-Catholic Biblical scholars and their private interpretations.

Father Most (page 199): “Not one of the changes I found was a reverse of doctrine. All changes were of a different nature in that they consisted of giving answers to previously debated points. There are at most only ten such changes Some of these are not entirely new, but we will mention them because of important renewed emphasis. 1) The Council probably, though not clearly, taught that baptized Protestants are members of the Church in some lesser way.”

[Clarity from Vatican II? It deliberately took both sides of each issue that should never have been raised, (1) to secure votes from diametrically opposed bishops, (2) to allow Most and his ilk to defend its non-existent legitimacy and orthodoxy].

Ecumenism 3 (Flannery's translation): “The brethren divided from us also carry out many **liturgical**” (Abbott says **sacred**) “actions of the Christian religion. In ways that vary according to the conditions of each Church or community, these actions most certainly can truly engender a life of grace, and, one must say, can aptly give access to the **communion**” (Abbott says **community**) “of salvation.”

More ambiguity! Latin rite Catholics habitually tie “separated brethren” to Protestants, to whose public worship no possible graces pertain. But “brethren divided” probably includes the Orthodox, most of whom retained rites, sacraments, and Apostolic succession—though not jurisdiction. Everyone believed this, so why include it? To provide something in a limited sense true, which could then be applied in the widest sense, another sop to Protestants, another tool of ecumenism, another attempt to deceive. But the main issue, that baptized Protestants are members of the Church in some lesser way, directly contradicts Pope Pius XII as he expounded traditional doctrine (*Mystici Corporis Christi*, 21): “Only those are accounted really members of the Church who have been regenerated in the waters of Baptism and who profess the true faith, and have not cut themselves off from the structure of the Body by their own unhappy act or been severed therefrom, for very grave crimes, by the legitimate authority those who are divided from one another in faith or government cannot be living in the one Body so described, and by its one spirit.”]

Most again: “2) The Pope and the Bishops form a body or college with the Pope as head. This is parallel to the relating of Peter and the Apostles. This is not really new, since most major decisions have always been made in this collegial way, though the Pope can even define alone.”

[Collegiality is a new word to Catholics. No exact parallel can be drawn between the Apostles, each with his personal infallibility, and their successors, the diocesan bishops, who have jurisdiction from the pope and infallibility only in concert and complete agreement with him on faith or morals. This particular innovation has been represented as the continuation of the unfinished work of the Vatican Council in 1870, interrupted by Garibaldi, Mazzini & Co. Perhaps the conquest of the Papal States was permitted only to prevent that Council's fall into this very error.]

Most: 3) Not all Jews bear the special guilt for the death of Christ, just those who shouted for His blood before Pilate.

[Let the record show that post-Christian Judaism has always and everywhere persecuted Jesus Christ's Mystical Body. When the Roman persecutions ceased, Constantine was forced to legislate against continuing Jewish persecution of Christians, particularly of former Jews. The largest scale killers and persecutors of Christians in all history are the communist governments of Europe led, operated, and manned almost entirely by Jews. How would Fr. Most view the proposition that not all men—only those on the scene—bear the effects of Adam's sin?]

Most: 9) Section 50, Church in the Modern World, reaffirms that procreation is the primary purpose of marriage, mutual love being subordinate. (There have been claims that the Council reversed teaching on the ends of marriage.)

[This reaffirmation escaped the translators. Abbott's footnote: "The Commission charged with drafting this text made every effort to avoid any appearance of wishing to settle questions concerning a hierarchy of the 'ends' of marriage. Thus, the passage includes a beautiful reference to children as 'the supreme gift of marriage,' but this sentence makes it clear that the present text cannot be read as a judgment on the relative importance or primacy of ends. Since the clause has been phrased with so much care, it may be useful to cite the Latin: '*non posthabitis ceteris matrimonii finibus.*'" "While not making the other purposes of marriage of less account" seems an accurate reading. *Posthabitis* = placed after, esteemed less. So Section 50 **refuses** to state what Most **says** it states. It deliberately pretends that a hierarchy of the ends of marriage has not been established—or reinforced by Canon Law. What is not affirmed in such voluminous treatment, set up as the final authority of our times, is denied.

FULFILLED PROPHECY: GENESIS XLIX, 10:

"The sceptre shall not be taken away from Juda, nor a ruler from his thigh, till he come that is to be sent: and he shall be the expectation of nations." (Douai, Vulgate, Septuagint)

This verse, though Fr. Most quotes Jewish sources and comes up with a variation, is acknowledged by all as a Messianic prophecy. So how was it fulfilled? Apparently its relevance began with David, for Saul, who first held the sceptre, sprang from the tribe of Benjamin. But Juda kept custody until nearly six centuries before Christ, when most of the tribe migrated perforce to Babylon (interregnum?) for their sins and unfaithfulness. Roughly 70 years later Cyrus allowed them home, where they rebuilt the Temple and had another stab at home rule, which lasted till Alexander's generals and their offspring took over. Then came the Maccabees, who died out about 40 years B.C. But most (and Father Most) nonetheless accept the prophecy as both infallible and fulfilled. Positive as it sounds, it seems to mean that whenever the sceptre would be held Juda would hold it, except for several decades just before the end, when that Idumean monster, Herod, would occupy the throne. More favorable fulfilment would doubtless have followed had the kings—and their people—deserved better.

But let anyone suggest that "I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" should depend on the preceding condition (that they teach all nations "to observe whatsoever I have commanded") or on the worthiness of the generation, and most (and Father Most) will reject the idea out of hand, despite the infallible prophecies found in St. Paul (II Thess. ii) and the Apocalypse. **Genesis xlix, 10** and **Matthew xxviii, 20** sound equally certain. Perhaps they may be interpreted with equal latitude—right down to the deserved foreign misrule at the end. Regarding the first, Fr. Most writes (page 137, **Catholic Apologetics Today**): "Therefore we could say that the prophecy of Jacob was still realized, but not as fully as it would have been if the people had been faithful to God."

Objection—You have repeatedly stated that Vatican II publicly taught error and heresy in article 2 of its last promulgation, its Declaration on Religious Freedom: "..... 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 in matters religious no one is to be forced to act in a manner contrary to his own beliefs. Nor is anyone to be restrained from acting in accordance with his own beliefs, whether privately or publicly, whether alone or in

association with others, within due limits. The Synod 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. This right of the human person to religious freedom is to be recognized in the constitutional law whereby society is governed. Thus it is to become a civil right.”—Abbott’s translation (Flannery’s phrasing differs slightly)

But Fathers William G. Most, Brian W. Harrison, and the Acts of the Council show that this does not contradict traditional defined Catholic doctrine. As the Chemere-le-Roi group concludes: “The right to religious liberty is therefore essentially different from the liberty of conscience condemned in the 19th century. On this point there is no contradiction between *Dignitatis humanae* and *Quanta cura*.”

Reply—Then why did the Declaration never make this point? The new “doctrine” was certainly phrased to be taken as correcting and updating Pius IX and Gregory XVI. By mistake? Vatican II had already (Ecumenism 8) introduced common worship with non-Catholics in the exact phrase, *communicatio in sacris*, used in Canon 1258 to forbid it, and to penalize it with “suspicion of heresy.” And why should anyone consider an explanation that takes no account of the Declaration’s applications, in the Acts of the Council published twelve years later? Little subsequent explanation was needed to clarify the teaching of any dogmatic council of the Catholic Church. It was unprecedented to preach new truth and leave it to theologians to force into orthodoxy,

It seems pointless to argue over what was promulgated by an illegally convoked “pastoral council” which had apostatized two years earlier with its first public promulgation, the Liturgy document. Never forget that the Vatican II Declaration on Religious Freedom (DRF) has **granted nothing whatsoever to Catholics**. “All men” does not include us, as we soon discovered when requesting Article 2’s application to our rights to traditional customs, doctrines, rites, and sacraments. It grants its “rights” only to anti-Catholics (He that is not with Me is against Me— Luke xi, 23), to those who adhere to heresies, false religions, or no religion—to those, for instance, like the Moslems, who propagated their “religion” by force and permitted no deviation, no “heresy,” in their dominions They put down fifteen major Christian insurrections in the Sahara. A prime Islamic tenet, its practise curbed in recent centuries only by French and British imperialism, grants a true believer who dies killing Christians instant Paradise. One need only look at the Protestant Revolt, in which all men were permitted to ratify the “judgment” and “responsible freedom” of their local prince (motivated so often by greed for Church property) and his “free exercise of religion in society.” These quotations are taken from the first article of the DRF, which begins: “A sense of the dignity of the human person has been impressing itself more and more deeply on the consciousness of contemporary man.”

This double-Dutch appeal to modern man, so much more knowledgeable and capable than his illiterate ancestors, so much more conscious of his innate dignity and worth, is a religious instruction (certainly no more than that) of a genuine council of the Catholic Church? There are two reasons for human dignity: God created man a little less than the angels, and Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, gave up His life to redeem man from slavery to sin. Were these recent events, that man should suddenly become aware of his own dignity? This masonic overemphasis on human dignity applies first to the size of the family. It became undignified to act like beasts and raise large families because man, being “responsible,” could not count on divine help, and he or his children or grand-children might fall below the poverty level. Patched pants and darned sox are so darned undignified.

In Abbott’s **Documents of Vatican II**, John Courtney Murray presented DRF in context: Its first draft came from the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity as Chapter V of the Decree on Ecumenism. He continued: “The principle of religious freedom has long been recognized in constitutional law, to the point where even Marxist-Leninist political ideology is obliged to pay lip-service to it. In all honesty it must be admitted that the Church is late in acknowledging the validity of the principle. In any event the document is a significant event in the history of the Church. It was, of course, the most controversial document of the whole Council, largely because it raised

with sharp emphasis the issue that lay continuously below the surface of all the conciliar debates—the issue of the development of doctrine. The notion of development, not the notion of religious freedom, was the real sticking-point for many of those who opposed the Declaration even to the end. The course of the development between the Syllabus of Errors (1864) and *Dignitatis Humanae Personae* (1965) **still remains to be explained by the theologians**. But the Council formally sanctioned the validity of the development itself; and this was a doctrinal event of high importance for theological thought in many other areas.”

A new development requiring theological squaring with known doctrine need not **directly** oppose *Quanta Cura* to be wrong. **Development** is near enough. **New** is more than enough.

Why start development with Pius IX? He could have gone back to St. Peter (I Peter ii. 13-18): “Be ye subject therefore to every human creature for God’s sake For so is the will of God, that by doing well you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: As free and not as making liberty a cloak for malice, but as the servants of God. Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king. Servants be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle but also to the froward.” Evidently our first pope thought slavery compatible with human dignity. Nor had he seen a Christian king. Back to Murray:

“The issue of real freedom was in itself minor. But Pope Paul VI was looking deep and far when he called the DRF ‘one of the major texts of the council.’”

We perceive, then, the DRF’s purpose: Dialogue with the Church’s enemies, as forbidden by Pius XI (*Mortalium Animos*) Having killed the missionary effort, Vatican II will now bring in whole religions. Traditional conversion of individuals, respecting their human dignity, gives way to wholesale methods smacking of both democracy (doctrine by vote) and totalitarian scorn for all human rights, especially those of Catholics. As in the Reformation, non-Catholics may follow their leaders.

Bp. De Smedt of Bruges, Belgium listed four chief reasons why very many Council Fathers had insisted that the council proclaim man’s right to religious freedom: 1. This is one of the truths committed to the Church’s custody by Christ; 2. Nearly half of humanity is deprived of religious freedom by various kinds of materialistic atheism; 3. The Church must show men how to live peacefully together, when people belong to different religions or none; 4. Many harbor resentment against the Church, believing that it demands free exercise of religion where Catholics are in the minority but disregards the right where Catholics are the majority.

[So to court non-Catholic popular opinion the postconciliar “Church” has deliberately removed the rights of Catholics in predominantly Catholic countries. Is not a people which has kept the Faith entitled to more than is a pluralistic society? Their hard-won rights and those of their Church were deliberately thrown away by Montini, who reviewed the various concordats for renegotiation. Concordats are negotiated with governments which restrict the Church’s rights. Montini’s renegotiations opened the door to divorce laws, legalized abortions, and Protestant “missionaries” to “Christianize” uneducated or illiterate Catholics who cannot—but need not have had to—controvert heresies. And what would St. Pius V have said to a mosque in Rome?]

The Catholic Encyclopedia (1913), Vol XIV, p. 769d: “If, in those lands where she still enjoys a privileged position as state Church, the Catholic Church would not allow herself to be driven from this position without a protest, she has not only a right, but is even under obligation to offer this protest. For a justly acquired right should not be surrendered in silence.” [Far less voluntarily!]

DRF drew its most effective support from the modernist European alliance and the Americans—reared in the pluralistic atmosphere generated by the Freemasons who engineered the Revolution and formed the American government and its constitution. (These have forsaken the Age of Reason to the point where they enforce the God-given inalienable rights of atheists.) Nearly all Americans, clergy included, believe this new *modus vivendi* an improvement on traditional Catholic civil government, which, due largely to freemasonry and its plots, no longer exists.

This entire DRF wasted time and paper. It was an unnecessary sop to non-Catholics implemented to the unnecessary disadvantage of Catholics, especially where they form the majority. There may have been merit in arguing different interpretations during the council, despite its notorious endorsement of mutually exclusive theologies. [Dr. David Wells, a Protestant observer at the council, explains that sometimes this self-contradiction was the only way the opposing factions would let a document see the light of day.] But we have nearly a quarter-century's history of anti-Catholic interpretation by Paul VI and the bishops who attended his phony council and voted for this ecumenism-oriented rubbish. Fr. Most's and Fr.(?) Harrison's orthodox interpretation of this new unCatholic right somehow escaped both the conservative bishops who opposed it and the modernists who put it into practise.

We know that Fr. Most is a theologian because he admits it, even publishing books that recognize the impossible validity of Montini's *novus ordo* "mass." But Brian Harrison, a 1972 convert, has never had opportunity to observe the Church in action or to attend a proper theological course. After his infrequent attendance at the traditional Mass when celebrated at Oak Hill College in Castle Hill (northwest Sydney), we next saw his name on an A.C.T.S. pamphlet (#1694) which brought us up to date on what Martin Luther had really wanted, a matter of tremendous relevance to our time, "A contribution to Dialogue with Protestants." It was only half a step to his clear perception of Vatican II's total orthodoxy, which has all but wiped out the Catholic Church and all its tradition. The question is not so much whether DRF opposes *Quanta Cura* but whether it does not oppose all Catholic doctrine, all history, all orderly society. When certain rights are specified by civil law other rights are often suppressed because **not** specified. Many a heresy (Donatist, Albigensian) was stamped out because it destroyed civil peace and order. Everyone knows from his own experience that the mind cannot be compelled. We can choose between right and wrong, or we would not be in this mess. But we have no right to choose the wrong, or Jesus Christ would not have imposed the supreme penalty for refusal to believe Him and His Apostles. When He sent them He somehow failed to set them the task of recommending civil legislation. They never attacked the widespread institution of slavery, for example; it gradually withered when and where the Church was generally accepted. If religious rights be guaranteed by civil law, where is the merit in upholding doctrine or morals? If all becomes easy or automatic, where is our trial? But think of the fun we could have down at Clancy's brandishing a law signed by Hawke guaranteeing our traditional religious rights! And if the Aborigines are legally confirmed in their "sacred sites" we have a precedent for Catholic recovery of Westminster Abbey, Canterbury Cathedral, and the English common law and throne.

Bishop DeSmedt "demonstrated" that papal attitudes had "developed" according to two laws (progress and continuity) from *Quanta Cura*'s condemnation to *Pacem In Terris*' "complete conformity" with DRF. The proposition that freedom of conscience and of cults is the proper right of every man, and this should be proclaimed and asserted in every rightly constituted society had drawn Pius IX's condemnation because, said DeSmedt, "of the ideology of the rationalists who founded their conclusions upon the principle that the individual conscience is under no law, and, therefore, is subject to no divinely given norms." But somehow this major anti-Catholic goal of rationalistic ideology has metamorphosed into a human right to be promoted by its greatest victim, true religion.] "Freedom of worship ..(condemned)... when based on religious indifferentism Church-State separation based on rationalistic principles of juridical omnicompetence of the State, according to which the Church is to be incorporated into the monistic organism of the State and is to be subjected to its supreme authority."

How have any of these conditions improved? Masonic and totalitarian regimes have multiplied. General acceptance of these heresies has conditioned the modernists into refusal to accept Pius IX at his word. Faced with the likes of Garibaldi and Mazzini, DeSmedt implies, could he appreciate that they might lower their profiles when their goals were achieved?

DeSmedt again: "Let our document be studied as it stands. It is not a dogmatic treatise, but a pastoral decree directed to men of our time." [This sentiment is not included in the document. The reader is to assume that **here** the Church is **teaching**. What other excuse is there for a conciliar

document's publication?] "The whole world is waiting for this decree. The voice of the Church on religious liberty is being waited for in universities, in national and international organizations, in Christian and non-Christian communities, in the papers, and in public opinion—and it is being waited for with urgent expectancy."

Wouldn't that remind you of the great expectancy for Paul VI's contraception study results? Who are all these expectorators that they have a right to sanction of their secularism, laicism, indifferentism, and general godlessness from the Catholic Church? Successful creators of a hostile climate have somehow acquired title to Church approval for their new, probably passing, creation. We are to abandon the rights of truth for the privileges of error. And **hurry up! They're all waiting!**

What ever happened to the idea that the Church teaches to make all its own, and legislates for its own? We understand that Freemasons wish to be free, especially of religion and morals. "In freemasonry," said the Archduke of Austria's assassins, "it is not wrong to kill." An extreme but logical outcome of freedom of conscience.

DeSmedt's dissertation on "development" of doctrine on religious freedom as defined in Pius IX's *Quanta Cura*—published in Denzinger's Handbook of Creeds and generally held infallible—included as "developments" certain statements of Pius XI and Pius XII elicited by contemporary abuses in Germany and Russia. These statements neither are included in Denzinger's nor put forward rights other than those of truth, true religion, and its adherents. But DeSmedt's report certainly influenced the great majority of Council Fathers.

Wiltgen has shown that DRF was the U S. bishops' baby—that few else gave two hoots for it. "John Courtney Murray, S.J., the leading American *peritus* on religious freedom" (Wiltgen) contributed most to DRF, and probably as well to DeSmedt's Dec. 19 report. But, as shown by his Introduction to DRF in Abbott's translation, he knew DRF opposed *Quanta Cura*. In requiring future theological explanation of this "development" he conceded that his group's explanation to the Council hardly constituted sufficient theological explanation. "But the Council formally sanctioned the validity of the development itself"—thereby proving that it could err doubly in a single action. Would the supersophisticated Murray have accepted Most and/or Harrison and their artless arguments (that paraphrase affects concept) as theological explanations?

No one fooled conciliar *peritus* Hans Küng. He stated unequivocally that DRF as promulgated opposed traditional Catholic teaching. Was not such opposition his special field?

Divine consistence

The First Commandment thundered from Mt. Sinai established the necessary base for all the rest, God's supereminence and entitlement to proper worship, and forbade idolatry. First Commandment = primary purpose of religion = divine worship. God established the feasts and prescribed the rites of the Old Law. He decreed the size, shape, and content of the Ark of the Covenant. He set limits on the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies, and punished King Ozias with instant leprosy for transgression. He showed amply that divine worship is of divine, not human prescription, the proper province of divine law, as befits our chief obligation and chief means of grace.

So meticulous in the types and foreshadows, God turned sloppy with the substance. Jesus Christ, we are supposed to believe, when He came to fulfil the Law and the Prophets, left us to our own devices in our divinely revealed religion's chief purpose—divine worship and sacraments, the rites of religion. Holy Scripture fails to mention it? Gospels were written, not to document customs and rites with which their first readers were familiar before they were written, not to record Christ's every word and action, but to prove Jesus Christ fulfilled the prophecies and is God. So in this complete revelation on which His glorification and our salvation depend, He omitted such minor matters as rites for its central purpose?

Despite all the foregoing, a parish priest who presides at the *novus ordo* and allows laymen to distribute communion stated adamantly as though it were his last base of sanity that rites of public worship are mere matters of discipline, unconnected with faith or morals. He stated just as adamantly that St. Pius V could bind only his own time in legislating for the Mass. He discounted completely the quotation he had thrown at me to support Paul VI's new rite:

Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven. Even were Paul still alive, he is nowhere on record as imposing his new rite to the exclusion of the true Mass. True, he stated years after its introduction that he had done so, but he lied, as so often. Paul spent less than a year in a seminary. But St. Pius V taught philosophy and theology sixteen years, and was later Inquisitor General, the Church's chief authority on faith and morals. By the words of *Quo primum tempore* with which he legislated for the Mass, he **evidently** believed that he made a law to bind all time—that he expounded divine law when the Protestant revolt had made its explicit legislation necessary. His law, addressed to the whole Church on a matter of faith and morals concerning our obligation to worship God in spirit and in **truth**, included in the revelation, filled all requirements for an infallible statement. Not only does his law bind in itself, it is supported by the 1917 Code of Canon Law, which states (Canon 2): "All liturgical laws heretofore decreed for the celebration of Holy Mass, the recitation of the Divine Office, the administration of the sacraments and sacramentals and other sacred functions, **retain their force**, except insofar as the Code explicitly corrects these laws." The Code never tinkered with the laws in the Missal.

"To the marks of originality in canon law another characteristic must be added; its enduring quality..... Canon law as such is identified with whatever happens to the Church; its continuance, therefore, can know no other limit in time than that of the human race itself." (**What is Canon Law?**, Rene Metz, Hawthorn, 1960) The very concept that laws die with the man who promulgates them is absurd. What could one say of papal laws governing the election of a subsequent pope? Can anyone imagine the rush to submit matrimonial cases whenever a new pope is elected, even illegally? If the Code, or *Quo primum* is gone, what is the status of Vatican II's documents? They are most certainly not divine law.

Liturgical law is not divine law, said the old priest. But what said the Vatican Council which defined infallibility? *Dei Filius*, Canons, Chapter Two, canon 2: If anyone shall say that it is impossible or inexpedient for man to be taught by revelation concerning God and the worship to be rendered to Him, let him be anathema. We must, therefore, believe in both possibility and expediency—clearly implying factuality. This canon, then, takes us back to revelation for our worship. Revelation ceased with the death of the last Apostle. It is impossible for a rite dating from 1969 to fill this essential requirement, even had its introduction grievously breached no Church law. Even the 1983 Code supports existing liturgical law.

If you say taught by revelation **concerning** worship, not revelation prescribed the worship, is revelation to teach of non-existent worship? Should you maintain that Jesus Christ taught His Apostles nothing of this, either at the Last Supper or after His Resurrection, you are limited by Canon 2 to one alternative: the Apostles determined the rites under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Either way, a legitimate change in rites in 1969 is clearly outside revelation, and renders the very council which defined and limited infallibility a liar.

Some erroneous belief keeps priests, and perhaps bishops, from acting in accord with their ordination oaths. The way this priest clung to his two fallacies suggests that these errors weigh heavily with many. It may be worth trying this summation on the local parish priest. He'll hide behind another deliberate misconception? Send it in—send them all in, and we can work on them, too. If nothing works, persuade these obtuse clerics to will us their skulls. There's a market for solid ivory.

Moral Theology, writes Heribert Jone, OFM Cap, JCD, is the scientific exposition of human conduct so far as it is directed by reason and faith to the attainment of our supernatural final end. It is divided into three parts: The doctrine on first principles, on the commandments, and on the sacraments.

So it is no surprise that most manuals of moral theology treat Mass, sacraments, and law. Henry Davis, SJ (Moral and Pastoral Theology, Vol I):

The divine positive law is superimposed on Natural law, and has been explicitly promulgated. Its existence is known to us only by Revelation, and it comprises the Mosaic Law and the New Law. The Mosaic Law, as such, no longer binds man. It comprised precepts, moral, judicial, and ceremonial. These were abrogated as the formal Mosaic Law, though its moral precepts were confirmed and promulgated in the New Law. Concerning the exact time of its abrogation, theologians are not agreed.

That it was, as a fact, abrogated, the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem implicitly declared. After such abrogation, therefore, **to fulfil the ceremonial laws of the Old Testament would have been and would still be false worship of God**, because it would be a repudiation of the Messiahship of Christ. Consequently, when the New Law became sufficiently promulgated the works of the Old Law were both dead and **sinful**. [Old Testament ceremonial, **formerly** proper, is now sinful. How can heretical or pagan ceremonial, **never** proper, be other than sinful?]

The New Law was instituted and promulgated by Christ our Lord, as Supreme Lawgiver and Infinite Wisdom, but in such a way as rather to fulfil than to destroy the Mosaic Law. He instituted and promulgated it by enunciating numerous precepts These precepts are theological, as referring to Faith, Hope, Charity; moral, as contained in the Decalogue and confirmed and perfected by our Lord sacramental, as referring to the Sacraments and the Sacrifice, and these may be called new moral precepts in a wide sense. Lastly, Christ left to His Church the power of framing such other ordinances as should be vitally necessary for discipline, for divine worship (**differentiated** from discipline) and ecclesiastical order. The New Law binds all mankind:

Going therefore teach all nations teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you (Mt. 28).

This New Law is not subject to change, and it is to remain in force for all time, because Christ is with His Apostles and their successors for all time, **as they expound this identical Law**. There is none more perfect to take its place and there is no power that can abrogate it.

The sacrifice of the New Law is the Passion and death of Jesus Christ, as shown in the traditional Offertory. The new "Preparation of the Gifts" replaces this clear intention with fulfillment of Old Testament ceremonial laws (Passover rite) thereby repudiating the Messiahship of Christ.

De defectibus, Cap. V, "Formae" (traditional Missal): "If anyone removes or changes anything in the form of consecration of the Body and Blood, and by this change of words does not signify the same thing as these words do, he does not confect the sacrament."—not "he has no permission to confect." Fact! Not subject to revision by lawgivers.

Only your opinion, say the self-linded clergy. So it is nice to see an authority, whose works are standard seminary textbooks, support me (Henry Davis, S.J., **Moral And Pastoral Theology**, Vol. III, p. 133):

Section 2. Obligation of the Rubrics.

The Rubrics of the Mass are general and particular. The general Rubrics are embodied in the prescription printed at the beginning of the Missal; the particular Rubrics are printed in red letters in the body of the Missal.

Amongst the general Rubrics, some are doctrinal, and are embodied in the title, *de defectibus in celebratione Missarum*. These Rubrics are binding to the extent that the doctrine expressed in them is to be held. Rubrics in general are either preceptive or directive. Those which are preceptive bind under sin. Rubrics which must be observed during the actual celebration of Mass are considered preceptive, unless the contrary is evident.

Why return to the self-evident? That old parish priest insisted that Christ died for all, and that no one knows what words Christ used to consecrate at the Last Supper. Here is a central, vital,

essential point on which Christ has been quoted at Mass for nineteen centuries, and **no one knows what He said!**

Aramaic, the priest said. Perhaps. But the omnipotent God could not make His meaning clear? The Church has stood authority for the meaning and for all translations for nineteen centuries. No matter how varied in idiomatic expression, not one of these translations, not one of these rites, not a single **heretical** rite, has ever placed in His mouth **for all** or **for all men**—until Paul VI's new, more authentic rite in its vernacular translations. From such words only a small step is required to proclaim the condemned heresy, **apocatastasis**—that all men, even those in hell, will be saved eventually, because Christ never prayed in vain. If the Church never knew the words or the meaning for nineteen centuries, what possible authority can it claim now, in this particular or in any other?

Revelation rests on shaky translation? The Church **guarantees** the translation, which is therefore fixed, not subject to change or reinterpretation. The Church's official Roman Catechism: "In our sacraments the form is so definite that any, even a casual, deviation from it renders the sacrament null. Hence the form is expressed in the clearest terms, such as exclude the possibility of doubt."

Any deviation **must** produce doubt, and is therefore **intended** to produce doubt—not permitted in Mass and sacraments by **Divine Law**. The Missal's *De defectibus V Formae* precluded such doubt. To introduce this criminal doubt it was necessary to supplant the whole Missal, incidentally(?) destroying the record of liturgical law contained therein. Most Catholics—even bishops, unfortunately—never knew it existed. Paul VI never abrogated it for fear it would come to public notice. Nor did he **officially** impose his new missal to the exclusion of tradition. He pretended to experiment. He then pretended that his unwarranted, forbidden experiment had succeeded, all without his baneful influence brought to bear. But he cloaked his intention till the deed was done. He then adduced the accomplished fact as evidence that he had been responsible, and that the changes bound everyone because he was pope. "Whatsoever you shall bind....."

A fallacy! He could not quote this text in support of **his** tradition-destroying action without admitting that it applies to Pope St. Pius V's tradition-confirming law. Paul acted with every appearance of fraud. It seems utterly beyond the comprehension and courage of the bishops to recognize that he was an antipope and **must** be disowned, condemned, and combated for their own salvation. It would seem safe enough to condemn a dead man. They have few qualms over combating St. Pius V. Bishops have the problem that in logic they must also disown, condemn, and combat the current antipope. But what can be expected of a group that admits powerlessness to permit a priest to consecrate in the vernacular with a correct translation of the new rite in Latin? This is the genius of the Renewal and its postconciliar Church, to extend the proper laws that protect tradition to protect and support the very violations of the laws themselves.

Objection—No one knows what words Christ used to consecrate at the Last Supper.

Reply—Aside from their inclusion, in substance at least, in all Catholic and most schismatic and heretical rites, we find some words in the Gospels.

Objection—But two Evangelists were not present.

Reply—St. Mark wrote St. Peter's Gospel, St. Luke, Our Lady's. Do you seriously argue that St. Peter let St. Mark's Gospel loose on the world without knowledge of its contents? What has become of the concept that the Bible is the inspired word of God, so defined by the Catholic Church?

* * * * *

Vatican II and its four antipopes have joined the world, now a sacrament, formerly classed with the flesh and the devil. They speak to modern man in his own tongue. You are a nice lad, and God will reward you. **Not** You skate on very thin ice, thawed by the hellfire beneath! We can each take our own path to eternal glory. **Not** You have not believed and are in mortal danger. Let us all search out the truth, which may appear in different guises to different people. **Not** You must hear **us**

because God gave **us** the truths necessary to salvation and commanded us to instruct you. All religions contain some good and their official worship pleases God. **Not** I am the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not have strange gods before Me. Let all confide their requirements. **Not** Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you. Dance and rejoice around the table. **Not** I will go in to the altar of God. Go your own way, do your own thing. **Not** If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me. He that will save his life shall lose it: and he that shall lose his life for My sake shall find it. For what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul? Or what exchange shall a man give for his soul?

Or they liberate woman. Perhaps, they say, you've outgrown your husband and children. It happens. Inquire into an annulment. Perhaps you may even marry the priest at the tribunal. His laicization will come through faster than your annulment, for he has an even greater need for self-fulfilment. Why keep sacred vows if they make you unhappy? Nothing is worth that!

Sin? What's that? Anyway all shall be forgiven you because you have loved all. **Not** If you love Me keep My commandments.

Who needs a weathercock for a guide? Who listens to a pack of yes-men? Where are the men who should lead us? Men? One real bishop anywhere in New South Wales could and would have prevented passage of a gay rights law, or of legalized murder of the unborn.

Freedom of choice is the slogan. Abortionists have always had this freedom, like other murderers. What they want is not freedom to choose correctly but freedom from consequences. Why should they accept responsibility for the wrong choice for their actions? Had they exercised their precious freedom properly earlier there might have been no harmless, defenseless baby to kill.

Everyone wants rights. Responsibilities belong to others.

Sex is ordained to procreation. Why should a sexual pervert expect society's protection or respect for his most antisocial vice? But these perverts insist on their **rights**, whatever **they** are. A normal human has no sexual rights outside marriage. The primary purpose of marriage is procreation and education of children. Perversion has no children, no legitimate purpose, consequently no rights. But the perverts demand rights not granted normal men, rights inherent in their perversion, rights at the community's peril and expense.

An atheist has no moral responsibility to human society in any form. He cannot properly be a citizen. He can only be persuaded or forced to behave reasonably. He has no motive to support anyone or anything but his own interest, which outweighs the public good every time. If he accounts for his existence through evolution he is the acme of humanity, until his son, one generation closer to perfection, matures.

One may profess to believe in God's existence but not believe God has any interest in him or in humanity in general. Logically, then, he cannot be a Christian. If he has any religion, defined as relationship with God, it is tenuous indeed. If he has any moral standards they have been preserved through habits and laws, and carry no real conviction. When he has no cogent reason to behave he will take the line of least resistance. As more and more men fall into his class, civilization declines, holding up ever decreasing good habit, example, and law for the next generation. When older folk say the younger generation is going to the dogs, some one, usually of the younger generation, discounts this opinion on grounds that every older generation voices such sentiments. This is the very reason why such opinion should not be discounted; it is a universal judgment, based on long-term observation. At sixty-six I dared not go places where I was safe at six.

This is a major fruit of the breakdown in religion, broken down worldwide much more rapidly since the Second Vatican Council enfeebled and perverted the Catholic Church. As a civilization we have scraped by for several centuries on what we have retained of our Catholic heritage. Like it or not, the only civilization worthy of the name is the Christian civilization. Even where not Catholic, it leans on the rock, the changeless morality, the oldest, strictest, most numerous Church,

the Catholic Church. Now that **it** has abdicated and nearly vanished, we can see our civilization shrinking, melting, fading with it. Unless we fight hard we shall lose our ordinary means of salvation, and with it we shall lose everything else that makes life bearable—the converse of Jesus Christ’s admonition: “Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you.”

How shall we fight? What can **we** do? We have certain rights under Canon 682 of the Code of Canon Law in force since Pentecost Sunday, 1918: “The laity has the right to receive from the clergy the spiritual goods and especially the necessary means of salvation, according to the rules of ecclesiastical discipline.”

Your glib bishop or your happy priest will chuckle, inform you, you poor idiot, that we now have a new code since 25 January 1983, and ask you how the law read before 1918. Unlike the 1983 code, the 1918 code changed nothing. It codified, synthesized, organized the unwieldy sets of laws then in force. It provided that its laws should be read in agreement with the former laws which they replaced. The streamlining of the various codes into one certainly simplified the canon lawyers’ task, but that was an avowed purpose. The 1983 code, on the contrary, has the sole purpose of shoring up the pretended legality of Vatican II and its innovations. It cuts the number of laws from 2414 to 1752. It replaces Canon 682 with Canons 212, 213, and 214:

212 §1 Christ’s faithful, conscious of their own responsibility, are bound to show christian obedience to what the sacred Pastors, who represent Christ, declare as teachers of the faith and prescribe as rulers of the Church.

§2 Christ’s faithful are at liberty to make known their needs, especially their spiritual needs, and their wishes to the Pastors of the Church.

§3 They have the right, indeed at times the duty, in keeping with their knowledge, competence and position, to manifest to the sacred Pastors their views on matters which concern the good of the Church. They have the right also to make their views known to others of Christ’s faithful, but in doing so they must always respect the integrity of faith and morals, show due reverence to the Pastors and take into account both the common good and the dignity of individuals.

213 Christ’s faithful have the right to be assisted by their Pastors from the spiritual riches of the Church, especially by the word of God and the sacraments.

214 Christ’s faithful have the right to worship God according to the provisions of their own rite approved by the lawful Pastors of the Church; they also have the right to follow their own form of spiritual life, provided it is in accord with Church teaching.

This last is supposed to free our clergy from duties under Canon 682 to provide the Mass and sacraments, under the infamous notion that they can change our rite. But under this new right of interference, they must hear us when we protest as well as when we dream up innovation. So we can make them read and make them listen. But no one can make them answer. They **have** no answer. So they sit there, taking the space of genuine shepherds, and pretend there is no protest. To fight effectively, then, we must draw their attention. Since our presence is ignored, let them ignore our absence. Let all shun the weekly idolatry. Let the churches become as hollow and empty as their modernist message.

Should you feel too uncomfortable, should you not quite believe that the new mass is not a mass, therefore idolatry, and think you must participate, at least boycott the collection. But in either case write each month to your priest and bishop explaining your absence and/or refusal to support him till he returns to the Catholic Church and acts in accordance with his solemn ordination oaths.

I know; the innovators planned empty churches. But some priests and bishops may **not** know this. Nothing is perfect. Not **all** are plotters. Some feel as victimized as we. This tactic may bring them to their senses. They may even join the fight, but don’t bet your shirt on it. Cowardice becomes habitual. But this double boycott **will** dissociate you and me from the apostasy, and thereby increase our chance of salvation. And it will suit most of us better than smashing that table and burning those new, heretical books.

* * * * *

19 October 1981 we wrote to eighty Queensland priests and enclosed copies of our letters to the bishops of late January, 14 February, 25 June, and 26 September 1980 and 11 August 1981. We suggested that bishops might entertain complaints and grievances from priests rather than mere laymen. Only one priest replied— requesting no more correspondence of this nature. We receive few replies and no answers from clergy and bishops because—we are told—they recognize the futility of arguing with fanatics and lunatics.

Having read our letters which detail tremendous grievances (their habitual oath-breaking, heresies, destruction of our ordinary means of salvation) they make no slightest attempt to rectify matters, to pacify us, or even to guard against irate maniacs. The priests and bishops behave as though we never existed. They request no police protection; they hire no bodyguards. Their utter lack of precaution against our fanatic reactions indicates their unshakeable belief in our normalcy, stability, and moral responsibility.

Priest-pilots of the far, far West—Jeff Scully, parish priest, Quilpie

A few weeks ago, Fr Tom Martin, from Longreach, piloted me to Birdsville so that we could take part in the Birdsville Fete, run by the nursing Sisters of the Birdsville Hospital.

Working on the principle that it's no good having a dog and barking yourself, the Sisters worked out ways to put us to work.

Tom was put in charge of the dart board and I was commissioned to give a Freddo Frog to anyone who could either catch a "fish" out from a tank of blued water with a magnet on the end of a piece of string, chip a tennis ball into an ice-cream container with a golf-club, or knock five Coca-Cola cans over with two tennis balls.

On the Sunday morning after the Fete, we had an ecumenical service in the Birdsville hospital.

As well as Tom and myself, two patrol padres were present—Aub Baker who conducts the Burke and Wills Patrol from Toowoomba, and Trevor Lanthois, conducting the Sturt Patrol from Adelaide. Both ministers belong to the Uniting Church—Aub from the Methodist tradition, Trev from the Congregationalist.

Thirty or 40 locals also attended. During the service. Aub baptised a baby into the Uniting Church. Tom gave the address.

We shared a beaut weekend. And there are some reflections I would like to share with you.

Firstly, the plane: Fr Tom Martin and Fr Justin Clare are priest-pilots in the Rockhampton diocese.

Tom is based in Longreach and this year has been covering the far, far West region every month by plane. That's the most regular service they've had in that country. And arguably the most effective.

However, I suspect that if it is to be a service that is "here to stay" we probably should be doing some long-range thinking on how all the dioceses could work together to keep pilot and plane regularly in that country.

After landing at one airstrip, Tom said to me, maybe a little tongue in cheek, "Well, that's another one we walk away from."

It made me think that as well as wear and tear on the plane, there is wear and tear on the pilot. No doubt the adrenalin pumps a bit faster for the pilot than the motorist, so after a few years, a pilot may be looking for a spell.

A "pool of pilots," who could man two planes operating from the north to the south of the State in which all dioceses are involved?

Both the Rockhampton and Townsville dioceses have had some experience with the flying ministry. I would be interested in hearing how they see "the way ahead."

A second aspect of that Birdsville weekend was the way the local community kept the home fires burning while I was away.

When I've been away before, a priest from Charleville came out, or the Sisters led a Eucharistic service. This time, the lay people led their own Eucharistic service, and it seems to have been a success.

In fact, I was lucky to get my job back when I got home. To me, it seems a move in the right direction. So often in the past, if a priest couldn't be present the local community just didn't gather around the table of the Lord.

The third aspect of the weekend was the success of the ecumenical service itself. A more regular presence—maybe with the plane—has potential in our efforts at Christian unity.

Well, I'm not sure if this week I wanted to tell you about the Freddo Frogs or get in a few plugs . . .

About 1984 this item appeared in Brisbane's **Catholic Leader**. Scully appears not to realize the horrifying extent of his dereliction of duty. Nor does the editor who without comment included Scully's tale in a diocesan paper. Scully, responsible for the education and spiritual welfare of his parishioners, left them minus his priestly services on a Sunday to run a booth at a fete—not even a church fete—and to participate in non-Catholic worship in clear violation of Canon 1258. He reported this without fear of disciplinary action for either his admitted dereliction or his non-Catholic views. But he and his editor and his bishop have proved beyond doubt that (1) they consider the priest unnecessary to the "Eucharistic service," (2) this "Eucharistic service" is (a) of less value than an ecumenical service and (b) not a Mass. For when could Sisters or lay people celebrate Mass? But this, Scully writes, denigrating his own status, is a move in the right direction, better than his performance of the *novus ordo missae*. If it supplants the *novus ordo* and loses him and his ilk their jobs he is correct.

Woywod & Smith, **A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law**, 1946: "The Code makes various **acts** of co-operation in heresy a distinct offense called '**suspicion of heresy**.' Various Canons state the acts which constitute the offense of suspicion of heresy: Canons 2316 (co-operation in sacred rites with heretics, propagation of heresy), 2319 (agreement to educate one's children as non-Catholics, procuring their baptism or education outside the Catholic Faith), 2320 (sacrilegious abuse of the Holy Eucharist), 2332 (appeal from Decree of the Roman Pontiff to an Oecumenical Council), 2340 (stubborn perseverance in excommunication for one year), 2371 (reception of orders through simony, ordaining or administering other sacraments through simony)." Each of these Canons imposes suspicion of heresy in its own text.

Scully's self-accusation convicts him of suspicion of heresy. But that won't worry him. This offense is deleted from the new Code.

Canon 1365 One who is guilty of prohibited participation in religious rites is to be punished with a just penalty.

Canon 1366 Parents and those taking the place of parents who hand over their children to be baptized or brought up in a non-catholic religion are to be punished with a censure or other just penalty.

Canon 1367 One who throws away the consecrated species or for sacrilegious purpose takes them away or keeps them incurs a *latae sententiae* excommunication reserved to the Apostolic See; a cleric moreover may be punished with some other penalty not excluding dismissal from the clerical state.

Canon 1372 A person who appeals from an act of the Roman Pontiff to an Ecumenical Council or to the College of Bishops is to be punished with a censure.

We can all define : yesterday's interpretation of infallibility.

KILLERWOCKY

'Twas Norfolk and the mitred Joves
All slickly ecumenicoves

Beware the Alanclark, my son!
Beware the vampire bats, and shun

He took his crosier staff in hand:
So floated he by the flumb dumb tree

And uppish though he thought he stood
Came raving through the Norfolk wood

One, two, three, four! He mopped the floor
With dour intent he by-passed Trent

“And hast thou slain the Mass, milord?
“O fiendish day! Helloo! Hellaay!”

'Twas Downham and the mitred perv
Through underhanded means will serve

* * * * *

Sad is the plight of the celibate wight that has no one to drink with.

Parish priests may roll to bed a-clinging to the banister.

Parsons have teetotal wives to pour booze down the sink with.

Nuns, however, pour it down by bottle, mug, and canister.

Priests and nuns can hit the grog and no one is the wiser.

Sacristans can lap it up; they're seldom tagged as sinister.

Simon pure the parsons are, and should you ask me why, sir,

Protestant churches might dismiss an alcoholic minister.

The last line is taken verbatim from The Sydney Morning Herald, July 5, 1985. The article concerned alcoholics, 7,000 priests and 9,000 nuns, often sacristans.

Did foul and foggie in the gloom
On Baker lowered the boom.

The teeth that clamp, the ears that twitch.
The churchly sons of which

Long time the Baker foe he sought
Deep lost in modern thought

The Alanclark with head of fog
Bemired in mental bog

With crosier crook he cleared the track
And will not e'er come back.

“Come to my arms commishy boy!
Paul chortled in his joy.

Intent on propagating gloom
The Holy Mass to doom.

THOSE MYSTERIOUS PRIESTS, Fulton Sheen (paraphrase)

Four or five decades ago it was easy to be Christian; the air we breathed, the family climate in which we were raised, were not alien to the Sermon on the Mount. Now Christianity is under attack. **These, then, are wonderful days!** Now we must stand up and be counted. Dead bodies float downstream. **It takes live bodies to resist the current.**

God may be thinning His ranks for a great conflict with the demonic forces. Character is not so much built from day-to-day small choices, but by a few crises with great stakes. True Catholic life is not made from routine acts of piety, but by a crisis in which we can unite with the Shepherd or oppose Him. Great days in which we can make decisions affecting eternity.

Excessive desire to be loved makes us less lovable. As we forswear the desire to be loved and praised, we lose our crippling anxiety.

Creeping into the Church is this new diabolic super-egotism which betrays the shame of being Christ's. "If I dressed like a priest or a nun, or accepted the authority of the Church when it opposes to the world, I would be divisive." **We were meant to be divisive.** Our preaching should make others aware of their antagonism to God by stirring their consciences. So the hidden enmity against God comes to light. Preaching Christ was meant to divide. He is the "sign of contradiction." No Church is strong when "tolerated" by the world. The Church is weak when its delegates fear not "keeping in good" with those who flaunt the authority of Christ. Only because the salt is "divisive" to the meat can it flavor. Only because light is "divisive" to darkness does it illumine. The Lord made the mark of a disciple the carrying of the Cross; the ambassador who turns it into a cushion to woo the world's opinion, may well fear: "Whoever is ashamed of Me and Mine, the Son of Man will be ashamed of him when He comes in His glory...."

An instance of the jealousy of God in how His priests exercise His sacred liturgy: The two sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, became liturgical innovators after too much alcohol, forbidden during worship liturgy (Exodus 24, 8-9), and practiced some kind of "hippie" liturgy. For this God struck them dead.

A sign of Christ's visibility is the sight of a priest or religious. When a diplomat attends an official function he wears diplomatic attire. When an ambassador of Christ the Head of the Church appears at the altar he wears the vestments dictated by the Church.

Does not a common dress of a religious community portray a common mind? Suppose the Los Angeles Football Team appeared for a game with eleven attires: a track suit, a tuxedo, a tennis outfit, a hunter, a surgeon, a Franciscan, a bishop, a pilot, a policeman, a "hippie," and a deep sea diver. Suppose, further, no quarterback, and each player calls his own signals. Would the confusion be worse than in some religious houses today?

Fatherhood in the priesthood has declined—often implicitly rejected with "Don't call me 'father,' call me 'Joe.'" Is there a conscious loss of spiritual progeny. Can fleshly abortion have produced in the priesthood an abortion of the spirit? The very refusal to condemn the disconnection between love and life matches the decline of converts in all dioceses of the Church. Are priests taking the "pill" in the sense of not procreating children in Christ? On Judgment Day, when we appear before the throne of Christ, He will ask us "Where are your children?" God hates sterility in those whom He made fecund in the Spirit. Discontent with celibacy in the Church is in direct proportion to failure to convert souls to Christ.

Karl Marx turned the political thinking of the world from the importance of the individual to the primacy of society. One extreme in spirituality would baptize Marxism: the Christian exists solely for the community. Thus, spirituality in its exaggerated form has changed the Christian from a pilgrim to a sociologist; from a pray-er to a demonstrator, and from an intercessor to a protester.

Our friendly bishop had an absolute genius for selecting quotations. His book included a gem from **If Winter Comes**, by A. S. M. Hutchinson: "...plumb down in the crypt of every man's soul is a hunger, a craving for other food than this earthly stuff. And the churches know it; and instead of

reaching down to him what he wants—light, light—they invite him to dancing and picture shows, and you're a jolly good fellow, and religion's a jolly fine thing and no spoilsport, and all that sort of latter-day tendency He can get all that outside the churches and get it better. Light, light! He wants light. And the padres come down and drink beer with him, and watch boxing matches with him, and sing music hall songs with him, and dance Jazz with him, and call it making religion a Living Thing in the Lives of the People. Lift the hearts of the people to God, they say, by showing them that religion is not incompatible with having a jolly fine time. *And there's no God there that a man can understand for him to be lifted up to.* A man wouldn't care *what* he had to give up if he knew he was making for something inestimably precious. But he doesn't know. Light, light—that's what he wants; and the longer it's withheld the lower he'll sink."

All excerpts true! But Sheen treats symptoms, not the disease itself, the postconciliar "Church." Men have sacrificed liberty and life for ideas—even false ideas— but seldom for organized mediocrity. A man on fire to save souls from damning error can live not merely celibate—no small sacrifice—but in complete isolation from his own kind and culture. He can bury himself in heathen, stone-age, cannibal, leprous, or any outlandish or alien environment to bring its unfortunate inhabitants Christ's saving grace and truth. But can he climb the necessary heights when:

- 1) Vatican II tells him not to convert souls to Christ because there is good in their devil-worship; it would be a shame to disturb them?
- 2) all he can preach to them is an alternate method of salvation, for which the entire race is inevitably destined anyway?
- 3) his bishops accept and welcome indigenization and syncretism, & "ordain" his workmates with witch-doctors dancing attendance?
- 4) he cannot celebrate Mass or confer Sacraments for which he was ordained?

What keeps him from following tens of thousands of his brethren into "laicization" deliberately facilitated to promote lay take-over of clerical functions through "necessity?" Every dedicated priest could have been expected to leave this useless "Church" in his inescapable knowledge that his sacerdotal purpose is utterly frustrated.

Yet we can cite cases—parish priests who realize something is wrong, who go out of their way, even to the Irish College in Rome, scene of their priestly preparation, to pin down the cause of their difficulties. One such priest consulted his old theology professor. "Go back to your parish and do as you have always done. Ignore everything that comes out of Rome; Rome is in enemy hands."

"You have it from the horse's mouth!" said one of our subscribers. "What do you intend to do about it?"

And the brave priest replied: "I'm going to do just what the man in the red hat tells me." Peace, it's wonderful! And security.

Let's read the Classics!

Remember the first radio quiz program, **Information, Please!**? A regular panel member, a former teacher and journalist, a man with an amazing instantaneous memory, John Kieran showed his innate good sense and conservatism: "When some one writes a new book I read an old one."

Remember the seven sacraments? When some one invents a new sacrament I look up an old one, in this case Penance. I reproduce a sermon preached *circa* 1890 by Father Patrick Danehy, included in **Treasury of Catholic Doctrine** (1912):

Wide as the earth is the domain of sin. To the thoughtless this may appear nothing startling. But to the Christian soul, ever so little given to reflection, it means that evil—mighty, attractive, widespread, and far reaching evil—holds sway over God's creatures. Wealth is no safe-guard, and poverty is powerless against it. It counts among its victims the mighty and the renowned, as well as the weak and obscure. It even seems to prefer the great, the beautiful, the wealthy, and the strong, the better to display its prowess by laying low what is considered resistless. With a thousand wiles

it lures man to its snare. It suits its inducements with unerring precision to the weakness of each individual. It gratifies the sensual man in one way, the ambitious in another, the revengeful in a third, the proud in still another; to each assuming the most winsome guise in order to undo him. The young alike and the aged of every rank and whatever clime succumb to its attack. If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us. (I John i, 8) "For the imagination and thought of man's heart are prone to evil from his youth." (Gen. viii, 21) Nor do its consequences end with life. Death has no terrors for it. It is the one power not divine that reaches beyond the grave. It goes with man to the very judgment seat. Boldly seating itself in the innermost chambers of the human soul, it refuses to be cast out save by the hand of God alone. Manifold, mighty, and mysterious power, it lords it over mortal man with the unerring certainty of fate; and unless man calls upon God's aid in time, it will deliver him up to the Judge Who will thrust him into the prison whence he shall not go out forever. The consequences of grave sin are eternal.

The great question, then, for sinful man is: how can I be freed from sin? All other questions are trivial in comparison. How long shall I live? Will my life be of affluence or misery? Shall I be honored or obscure? Where or how shall I die? These questions and their like are the veriest bagatelles when set beside this other: Who can forgive me my sin? Now we want the voice of God to answer. For we want no uncertainty on this point. And God answers. He has made His answer to ring throughout the world in every age in the ear of sinful humanity. In this age and this city, as in the first age at Rome, or Corinth, or Jerusalem, He speaks by the voice of His Church. Whoever hears the teaching of the Catholic Church hears the teaching of Jesus Christ Himself. "He that heareth you heareth Me." For "as the Father hath sent Me, so I also send you." And "I will send you the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of truth, who will teach you all truth." And if a man will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican. Here, then, is God's promise, this His answer. And all they who will not accept her authority to speak for God have made shipwreck of the faith, and are cut off from the household of Christ. They stop their ears to the men whom Christ sent to teach and convert the world. And as faith cometh by hearing and they refuse to lend ear to the teaching of God's representatives, they simply refuse to believe the teaching of God Himself. The teaching of these representatives of God is that they, **the bishops and priests of the Catholic Church have power to forgive sins.** To these Jesus Christ said plainly: "whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." (John xx, 21) The bishops and priests of the Catholic Church can and do forgive sins, because Christ empowered them so to do. The claim to this power can be traced to no other source than Christ, and men could not put forth such a claim unless they had God's warranty for it. The Catholic Church has taught this doctrine from the beginning. The plain words of Holy Scripture prove it true.

I suppose that if any man could be thought of as the author of confession that man would be a Catholic priest or bishop. They alone are supposed to profit by it. Such is the charge. I must call attention to a fact well known to the historian: No such innovation was ever attempted without leaving its mark on the annals of the time. When a new doctrine was broached, a commotion arose in the Church. The rumor spread abroad as on the wings of thought. Its author was known. He was at once denounced before the competent authorities. If a cleric, the father of the new doctrine was deposed from his sacred office. If he still continued to disseminate his false teachings, and drew after him a large number of followers, the bishops of the country assembled and in order the more effectually to ward off the evil from their respective flocks, issued a solemn warning to them not to admit it into their minds, and with the weight of their authority again condemned it. Or if the gravity of the case seemed to call for so unusual a measure a general council of all the bishops of the Church was assembled, and all minds not fossilized in error set at rest forever as to what was the Church's real teaching, and what the false doctrine that was condemned. Now if confession were invented by man and not taught by God, all this would certainly have taken place at the time of its introduction. For it is not such a doctrine as could by any possible means be introduced unawares. Confession is a stern reality. There is no such thing as making it by halves. It is confession whole and entire or it is nothing. Now what assembly of bishops condemned confession on its first appearance? Nobody knows. What council declared it a novelty in doctrine, and therefore a thing coming from man and not from God? Nobody knows. What council warned the

Christian world against it? Nobody knows. In what country and what year was the council held? No one knows. Above all, what was the name of the man who first broached it? This surely must be known. For the Church has never neglected the command of St. Paul (II Thess. iii, 14), "If any man obey not our word note that man and do not keep company with him." Hence we know the names of false teachers in every age from the first till now. We know every error in doctrine taught from the first age till now. No hard fought battle leaves more unmistakable traces of its occurrence in the scarred and furrowed landscape than is left upon the face of history by a new heresy. Nor need its author fear that his name will be forgotten. No man writes his name with more lasting ink on the scroll of history than the heresiarch. It is as sure of immortality as that of Judas Iscariot. Who, then, was the daring man, and not that only, but the successful man who got his new doctrine of confession and the power to absolve from sin believed; and not alone believed, but practiced? His name must be upon every lip. It must be known to the very school-children. They know the name of Mahomet. Yet Mahomet never induced men to adopt a practice half so humiliating to proud man as confession. You may interrogate every century from our own up to the days of Christ our Lord, and each will answer: I do not know the man who introduced the doctrine of confession. Ask every country upon earth. It will reply: He did not live within my borders, he was no citizen of mine. We are forced to the conclusion, then, that confession and therefore the absolving power as well traces its origin to no man, but to Jesus Christ.

Our foes insist that Catholic priests and bishops are sharp, shrewd men, capable of and bent on deceiving Catholics for their own gain. As an instance of this they tell us that pope, bishops, and priests conspired to make the people believe that they were bound to come to the priests and confess to them their sins. It is thereby admitted that the Catholic clergy are not a body of benighted illiterate men. But let it once be shown that they invented confession, and they will stand before the world branded as the most foolish body of men that ever lived. For, look you! Men have enslaved their fellow men, and put them to torture. But before making slaves of others they did not first sell themselves into slavery. Before flogging their slave they did not first flog themselves. If confession, then, be a torture, will priests themselves submit to it? If it be the enslaving of the soul, will they bow their neck to the yoke? If they do, then they are the veriest zanies, or else they did not invent confession. But we began with the admission that they are endowed with mental acumen rather above than below the average. Therefore if they go to confession themselves, we may be sure that confession was not introduced by them. Now beginning with the pope and coming down through the ranks of the clergy to the most obscure priest in the world every one of them confesses his sins to a priest as well as the laity do. And not only once a year, or once a half year, or once a month, or once a week, but many confess daily.

If there is any hardship, any slavery in confession, it bears doubly upon the priest. For he must himself confess and listen to the confessions of others. If it were possible to do away with confession from the earth, the priests of the Church are the very ones who would most actively urge it. For of all the irksome carking duties they must perform the most unsavory is that of hearing confessions. If any priest in the whole Catholic Church were asked which of his many duties is most distasteful to his natural liking, he would not hesitate to answer: Hearing confessions. Why, then, do they continue to hear confessions? Because the duty of confessing was imposed not by them but by God. Nothing short of the overwhelming conscientious conviction that God has made it his duty to hear confessions could ever induce a priest to do it. The charge, then, falls to the ground. It is refuted at every point. The teaching of the Catholic Church remains in possession as it was before the heresies of the sixteenth century were heard of.

The doctrine of confession, then, is no novelty. It traces its origin to Jesus Christ. For His Church so believed and taught and practiced from the beginning.

Many of them that believe came confessing and declaring their deeds. (Acts xix, 18) Observe that they **who believed** confessed and declared their deeds. And the fruit of their confession was seen by all when "they that followed curious arts brought together their books and burned them before all." (*ibid.* 19)

This practice we observe throughout the ages. St. Irenaeus, speaking of a number of Christians who had been drawn into a false belief by a certain false teacher, relates the outcome: “Some, touched in conscience, publicly confessed their sins” and their sins were many and heinous, as he explains, “while others, in despair, renounced the faith.” (*Adv. Her. xiii*) Now if they believed at that day there was any other way of obtaining pardon for their sins than by confessing them, as did those who returned to the bosom of the Church, and receiving absolution from the priests of the Church, they need not have abandoned their faith.

Tertullian teaches the same doctrine, and adds the same alternative. “If you still draw back (from confession) let your mind turn to that eternal fire **which confession will extinguish** And as you are not ignorant, that, against that fire, after the institution of baptism, **the aid of confession has been appointed**, why are you an enemy of your own salvation?” (*De Punit, c xii*) Here again we have a witness to the belief of the Church—that the sinner must confess his sins, or be forever lost in them.

St. Cyprian, speaking of Christians hesitant whether to renounce the faith and sacrifice to idols rather than be put to death: “they confessed their sin, **with grief, and without disguise, before the priests of God**, unburdening their consciences and seeking a salutary remedy, however small and pardonable their failing may have been.” (*De lapsis*, p.190)

And in the same passage he writes: “I entreat you, my brethren, let all confess their faults, while he that has offended enjoys life; while his confession can be received; and while the satisfaction and **pardon imparted by the priests** are acceptable before God.”

Origen, the great light of the schools of Alexandria, writes: “They who are not holy die in their sins; the holy do penance; they feel their wounds; are sensible of their failings, **look for the Priest**, implore help, and **through him** seek to be purified.” (*Hom. x on Numbers*) Again: “If we discover our sins not to God alone, but **to those who may apply a remedy** to our wounds and iniquities, our sins will be effaced by Him Who said: ‘I have blotted out thy iniquities as a cloud and thy sins as a mist.’” (*Isaias xlv 22: Homily xvii on Luke*) Confession to God alone then is not sufficient. We are required by God to confess to His priests.

St. Basil the Great says (*regul. brev. quest. 229 tom. II*) very plainly that we must not rashly tell our sins to everybody but that “confession of sins must be made to such persons as have power to apply a remedy.”

The Novatian heresy consisted chiefly in denying to priests the power to forgive certain sins. St. Pacian says: “But God alone, you Novatians will say, can grant the pardon of sins. That is true; but what is done by His ministers is done by His own power. What did He say to His Apostles? ‘What you shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; what you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.’ And why this, if sinners might be bound only and not loosed.” Here he brings out clearly the teaching of the Church of that day that the priests and bishops of the Church had from Christ the power of loosing as well as of binding, and that no sin was outside their power to pardon. He continues:

“But you say ‘The Apostles alone had this power?’ Then they alone had power to baptize, to confer the Holy Spirit, and to purify the gentiles from their sins. For in the same place where He gives them power to administer the sacrament of baptism, He also gives them the power to loose sinners. Either, then, both these powers belonged peculiarly to the Apostles (and then we could not even baptize) or both together continued to their successors. And therefore, since it is certain that the power of baptism and unction is descended to the bishops, to them has likewise come the power of binding and loosing.” (*Ep. I ad Symp.*)

With many a man, when he hears the word **confession**, a thrill shoots through his nerves, his soul is panic-stricken. “What! Go to confession? Never! I will never tell my sins, my thoughts and hidden desires, to a man like myself.” Now listen to St. Augustine’s reply, in his commentary on the psalms. “O man, why are you afraid to confess your sins? What you make known to me in confession, I know less than what I do not know at all. Why should you blush to confess your sins?”

I am a sinner, as you are; I am a man, and account nothing human foreign to me. As you are a man, confess to man; sinful man confess to sinful man. You are free indeed to choose which you prefer; do not confess your sins and they will not be known, it is true; but know at the same time that unless you confess you will be damned. For this reason God requires us to confess, that He may free from his sins that man who humbles himself. He damns the man who does not confess, to punish his pride.”

Profane history is not less interesting nor conclusive than the foregoing. If any class of Christian men could escape the duty of confessing, it would be kings and emperors. Proverbially loth to submit to restraints upon their inclinations, they did not fail to employ all their mighty authority to rid themselves of such restrictions and give loose rein to their appetites. Hence if we find them confessing their sins, we may unhesitatingly conclude that they acknowledged that the duty was imposed upon them by a higher than human authority. Now from the day when the spirit of the Catholic Church had overcome paganism and begun to leaven the public life of the nations of Europe, we find these potentates not merely going to confession like the least of their subjects, but keeping constantly attached to their person for this purpose a bishop or priest, called the royal confessor. St. Ausberg, archbishop of Rouen, in the seventh century, was confessor to King Thierry I. In the same century, St. Viron, bishop of Ruremonde, was confessor to Pepin, the father of Charles Martel. St. Martin, a monk of Carbie, was confessor to Charles Martel himself in the eighth century; in the ninth St. Aldric, bishop of Mans, was confessor to Louis the Debonnair. His son and successor, Lothair, had for confessor Donatus Scotus, bishop of Feluze. St. Udalic, bishop of Augsburg, tenth century, was confessor to Emperor Otho; and Didacus Fernandus was confessor to Ordonnic II, king of Spain. In the eleventh century, Stephen, a priest of the diocese of Orleans, was confessor to Queen Blanche. And in the twelfth century, Henry I of England had for his confessor Atheldulf, prior of the monastery of St. Oswald, afterwards first bishop of Carlisle.

We know also that from the eighth century there were confessors in the Christian armies, as well as in the courts of princes. This is clear from the Council of Germany held in 742, which forbids priests to go to war unless their presence is absolutely necessary. Among the cases it recognizes necessary is that of hearing confessions of the soldiers. The council also exhorts each commander to see to it that the soldiers under him be accompanied by a confessor. The same provision is made in the capitularies of Charlemagne, beginning of the ninth century.

Here, then, we have an array of witnesses from both sacred and profane history, which show as clearly as any fact of history can be shown that the Church from the beginning taught and practiced confession. When, therefore, the divine institution of confession, its necessity, and its usefulness were wholly denied for the first time in the sixteenth century, we find the bishops of the Church assembled in the Council of Trent setting forth in most solemn manner the Church's teaching on this point as on others that were gainsaid (Sess xiv, ch. 2, canon 6): “If anyone deny either that sacramental confession is instituted by God, or is by God's appointment necessary to salvation, let him be anathema.”

This is nothing less than an authoritative definition of what we have seen the Church teaching and practicing from the first. What may we conclude? Either the Church was right when she taught this, or she was wrong. If wrong, then for fifteen centuries the Church of Christ did not know what the teaching of her Divine Founder was, on this vital matter, and the millions and millions of Christians who had lived and died during these ages had followed her guidance only to fall with her into the pit. And as she and every church laying claim to the name of Christian during all those centuries taught and practiced this doctrine, our Divine Lord was Himself responsible for their ruin. They did but obey the Church as He commanded. But, if the Church was right, then Christ is the author of confession, and the absolving power of his priests which postulates it. Confession is, therefore, a Christian duty laid by Christ upon every sinner born into the world, and they who deny it deny that which Christ taught and His Apostles promulgated. They are knowingly and willingly outside the pale of salvation. For “he that believeth not” the doctrines taught by Christ's representatives “shall be condemned.” But where does He teach it? Have we any confirmation in Scripture?

The words of our Divine Lord, both clear and conclusive, are recorded in the Gospels of Sts. Matthew, Mark, and Luke. "And it came to pass" (Luke v, 17) "on a certain day, as He sat teaching, that there were also Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, that were come out of every town of Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem: and the power of the Lord was to heal them." "And it was heard that He was in the house, and many came together, so that there was no room, no, not even at the door. And He spoke to them the word. And they came to Him bringing one sick of the palsy, who was carried by four. And when they could not offer him to Him by reason of the multitude, they uncovered the roof where He was: and opening it they let down the bed wherein the man sick of the palsy lay. And when Jesus had seen their faith He saith to the man sick of the palsy: 'Son, thy sins are forgiven thee.' And there were some of the scribes sitting there, and thinking in their hearts: 'Why doth this man speak thus? He blasphemeth. Who can forgive sins but God only?' Which Jesus, presently knowing in His spirit that they so thought within themselves, saith to them: 'Why think you these things in your hearts? Which is easier, to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven thee, or to say, Arise, take up thy bed and walk? But that you may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (He saith to the man sick of the palsy) I say to thee, Arise, take up thy bed and go into thy house.' And immediately he arose; and taking up his bed went his way in the sight of all." (Mark ii, 2-12) "And the multitudes seeing it," adds St. Matthew (ix, 8) "feared and glorified God that gave such power to men." Few events in the life of our Blessed Lord have been so minutely recorded. Note the occasion. The fame of our Lord's wonderful works had drawn about Him the social and religious leaders of Israel. They had come from afar, and out of all the chief cities of the land, and in a spirit by no means friendly. Wrapped in all their frigid dignity, those subtle scribes and haughty doctors and saintly-seeming Pharisees sat about Him awaiting, as was their wont, the word or act which might serve them for an occasion of declaring Him a false teacher—to be avoided, not obeyed. Our Divine Lord knew their state of mind and was prepared to remedy it. "The power of the Lord was to heal them." Nor was the opportunity long delayed. As He was yet speaking to them, four men approached the house bearing a litter upon which lay a wretched man stricken with paralysis in every limb. But the people, massed closely together, filled every foot of room within the house, save only a little space immediately in front of Jesus, while outside a dense throng pressed round the door that they might hear, if possible, every precious word. Nothing daunted, however, the newcomers mount the roof, and, removing the tiles, let down man and bed into the midst before Jesus. I doubt not the most callous heart melted at the sight of this living death. Those who had come out of curiosity felt that the looked—for moment had arrived. They would now see a miracle. For surely Jesus would heal the palsied limbs. Jesus saw indeed the limp and lifeless limbs, but He looked also upon the soul. The misshapen body was a thing of beauty in comparison with the hideous deformity of that sinful soul. Which, then, will Jesus heal first, Who with equal ease can heal both? "Be of good heart, son," His compassion pouring forth in consolation. All felt that now their anticipations were to be realized to the letter. But while they thought full surely His next word would be a command to stand, or to stand forth in the sight of all, Jesus added these most wonderful words: "Thy sins are forgiven thee."

What sudden change is this that falls upon His hearers? A look of blank amazement comes into every face. They who were before full of confidence in His power were now filled with misgivings. They who had wavered twixt doubt and entire unbelief hesitate now no more. The conviction could not be resisted. He was plainly a deceiver; but a blasphemer as well. And the learned men thought within themselves: "Why doth this man speak thus? He blasphemeth. Who can forgive sins but God only?" Here, they judged, was a seducer of the people. They were awaiting a sign that He was God's chosen one. He actually lays claim to a higher power than that of Moses and the prophets, yet gives no sign of His title to it. For who could know whether His word—"thy sins are forgiven thee"—was verified? Probability was quite against it. Even a false prophet might say the same thing. But who could prove that His words did what they said? "Who," in short, "can forgive sins but God only?"

This was precisely the frame of mind our Lord desired. Knowing their questions and doubts He fixed his gaze upon the wise men who encircled Him, and answered their inquiry with another. He

knew they thought it easier to say, thy sins are forgiven thee, since no human eye could look into the soul and determine whether the sins were actually forgiven. Therefore Jesus added straightway: "But that you may know that the **Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins** (He saith to the sick of the palsy) I say to thee, arise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house." And the man arose in the sight of all, took up the bed on which he had lain for many a day, and went to his home rejoicing.

Note well what Jesus did. He performed a wonderful miracle—which no man can do unless God be with him—for the purpose of convincing all of a certain definite truth, which He states in advance: "that you may know the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins." They needed no proof that God had such power. That they readily acknowledged. So our Divine Lord performed this miracle to convince them that God had communicated this power to man. For He Himself was a perfect man, like unto us in all save sin. And He exercised this power, not as God, but as man, not in heaven, but here on earth. Nor did His hearers fail to grasp His meaning and intention. They were wholly seized with astonishment, and as they returned homeward from that wonderful presence, "They praised and glorified God Who had given such power to men." Jesus had laid claim to this God-like power. His enemies had denied His claim and pronounced it blasphemy unless supported by a sign from heaven. Jesus met their challenge even before they had time to utter it. The sign from heaven was given. The palsied man arose, and carried a burden. In every movement of that restored body men saw the power of God. The proof was complete, overwhelming. They who had asked "who can forgive sins, but God only" had now their answer plain. God can forgive sins. But so can he to whom God gives that power. God gives that power to men. For a man, "the man Christ Jesus," exercised it, and His miracle proves the exercise legitimate.

Christ gave this power in the person of His Apostles to the bishops and priests of His Church. "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. xviii, 18) To bind or loose supposes bonds, and in the case of the Apostles these are spiritual bonds. Now spiritual bonds are none other than sin and its effects. Christ, then, gave His Apostles the power of binding or loosing, as they should deem proper, what sins soever should be brought under their judicial action, and with the solemn promise added that their sentence on earth should be ratified in heaven. St. Paul says (II Cor. v, 8): "He hath placed in us the ministry of reconciliation." Now sinful man needs reconciliation for sins committed after baptism as well as before. And we know that as the Church, including the Apostles, reconciled man to God through baptism in the latter case, so in the former she secured his forgiveness through confession and absolution in the sacrament of penance. Hence St. Paul, exercising this office in the case of the incestuous Corinthian, declares explicitly: "If I have forgiven anything, for your sakes I have done it in the person of Christ."

St. James enjoins upon all Christians when sick and unable to go to the priests (v, 14-16) to "call in the priests of the Church," and adds: "the prayer of faith" (of the priests) "shall save the sick man, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him." But this is promised only upon condition that he confess them. For the Apostle adds: "Confess therefore your sins one to another"; that is, to the priests, for though they be men like yourselves, yet they have the power to forgive you your sins. "If we confess our sins," says St. John (I John i, 9), "He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity."...

Our Blessed Lord has left us his very words by which He imparts this power—and in such wise as to require that the sins which they are to forgive shall clearly be made known to them. On the evening of the first Easter, when He had risen from the dead, the ten Apostles were assembled in an upper room for fear of the Jews. Jesus appeared in their midst, the doors being shut, and said to them (John xx, 22): "Peace be to you. As the Father hath sent Me, so I also send you." When He had said this He breathed on them; and He said to them: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." Plain words our Lord could not have chosen. They confer upon the Apostles the power of forgiving and retaining all sins of all mankind. The power is twofold, and they are to forgive or

retain according to the merits of the case. The sinner himself is, from the very nature of the case, the only one who can make known to the Apostle the merits of the case; the sinner must make confession of his sins before the minister of God can know whether he is to forgive his sins or to retain them. The judge, then, in the sacrament of penance must know the law of Christ and the guilt as well and dispositions of the sinner. Then only is he competent to forgive or retain “In the person of Christ.”

That this divine power is handed on by ordination throughout the ages to the Apostles’ successors is self-evident. Our Lord Jesus Christ certainly willed just as ample means for the sinner’s return to God today as was afforded to the first Christian. Therefore the power of forgiving sins must reside in the bishops and priests today as fully as in the bishops and priests of the first day—the Apostles. They of today have the same ministry of reconciliation, the same twofold power. Hence the sinner’s duty is likewise the same today as it was then. He must confess his sins to them honestly and fully with deepest sorrow of heart and earnest determination to sin no more.

Here, then, is God’s answer to “Who can forgive sins but God only?” The priests of the Catholic Church have this power vested in them by Jesus Christ. Our reasons for this belief are clear and cogent. The very nature of this power and its accompanying obligations is such that without God’s authority plainly evident no man could induce his fellow men to believe him possessed of it. The priests of the Christian Church practiced it from the very beginning. Christ’s words and those of His Apostles in many places of Scripture show that He gave them this God-like power. And unless a man admits this teaching of the Catholic Church those passages of the New Testament must be ignored as wholly devoid of sense or meaning. This alone ought to suffice to bring every consistent professing Christian to embrace this doctrine. For it will be found true in this as in every case where the sects have rejected the teaching of the Church; the Church’s doctrine alone sheds light on Holy Scripture and makes it intelligible.

DUAEDIMIDEITY—A NEW HERESY

Why? Are there not more than enough already?

No one waxes rich and famous sticking to facts. Heresy is where it’s at, man. So bear with me while I expound this highly original doctrine. No one in his right mind could imagine this heresy; therefore it has never been specifically condemned.

To ease the task for those whose duty it is to condemn heresy we name our egregious error in Latin. Words of this abstract nature are usually feminine, so we use the feminine form of two, *duae*, not to be confused with the Douai Bible, Admiral Dewey, the *Propaganda due* Lodge of freemasons, or the Dewey decimal system. Latin for **half** is *dimidia pars*. *Deitas*, of course, is deity, or the state of being God. The essence of our new doctrine is *aggiornamento*; we update the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, formerly true and binding on all Catholics, until the Incarnation, that is. But when the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity assumed human nature He became half man and half God, or demigod, if you will. Therefore in God there are now two and one-half divine Persons (thus exemplifying the average family) as any cretin can calculate. After a few roars of scornful laughter, let us examine the consequences.

Formerly I would have been denounced to the Holy Office, which would have delved immediately into the idiocy and condemned it forthwith, allowing me to withdraw it or publicly to leave God’s Holy Church. Since Vatican II, however, neither I nor any other heretic is canonically warned or otherwise annoyed. Therefore, under provisions of Canon 2315, which applies **not** to public heretics but to certain specific offenders **under suspicion** of heresy, I may parade myself as a Catholic and frequent the sacraments; I may continue to preach absurdity and lead Catholics stupid enough to believe me into clear, obvious, unmistakable heresy simply because those whose duty it is to condemn me have not bothered even to warn me. I can therefore, it follows, believe any fool thing I like and remain Catholic. What has happened to Christ’s “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned” (Mark xvi, 16), which pre-necessitates a complete, specific body of doctrine?

Suppose, then, that owing to proper authority's criminal laxity I acquire a red hat, and in the ordinary course of events the bottom of the barrel is scraped and I am elected to the papacy. Forget that as a public heretic I was eligible for neither office; now that I am installed and the whole Church recognizes me as pope, legality bolsters absurdity and I lead and govern God's Holy Church (to which I cannot by reason of my public heresy belong) and my idiotic doctrine invades the catechism class. We must grant that many nuns would teach this nonsense also, without demur. Would it be bishops', priests', or parents' duty to acquiesce in heresy out of obedience? How many would remember to stop their descending right hands at their throats while saying "In the Name of the Father and of half the Son.....?" Would everyone repeat more than fifty times in his daily rosary "Holy Mary, mother of whatever" without raising the roof? Could we ask the Father anything in half a name? Even the Catholic press might object.

Yet cowards and malfeasants hide behind a fanciful misapplication of Canon 2315; they would do away with all canonical penalties for public heretics for the absurd reason that these heretics, they say, have not been warned. But the Church **has** warned the faithful over the centuries in unmistakable words officially pronounced by pope after pope, council after council.

Until Vatican II no one ever heard of a bishop, priest, or theology student without his Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, a standard text in which both Catholic beliefs and condemned propositions are detailed. When, therefore, the bishops of Vatican II voted, and Paul VI promulgated as Catholic doctrine, propositions long publicly and solemnly condemned by the Catholic Church, they all knew they promulgated heresy.

They all publicly embraced propositions specifically condemned as heretical, many penalized by automatic (*ipso facto* or *latae sententiae*) excommunication. They are therefore anathematized without further question or process. They have shown obstinacy and pertinacity in heresy. If you wish to postulate that irrelevant, inapplicable Canon 2315 somehow exonerates them you must disregard the **fact** that their entire theological course warned them off heresy and instilled correct doctrine to preach. All history has warned them. Since Vatican II, moreover, they have been subjected to a massive literature of protest and correction, public and private, from bishops, priests, laity, and even non-Catholics, and have refused to advert, **in duty**, to the points and issues raised. They know only too well that they have no defense, except absurd misapplication of irrelevant law.

* * * * *

The middle of the second century marks the starting point of a series of open attacks upon Christianity by the pagan philosophers scholars assailed the Christian religion with the weapons of historical criticism and dialectics. Their writings were soon eclipsed by the work of the Platonist Celsus, whose **True Discourse** (about 178) is the most violent diatribe that pagan antiquity produced against the religion of Christ. Therein insult is heaped upon the Christians, their sacred books, their dogmas, their worship, their whole life. The Bible is made out to be a mass of silly fables; Christ and His disciples, as commonplace impostors: the rapid spread of Christianity, as the result of the panic caused by the terrors of the last judgment and the fire of hell; the organization of the Church, as the most dread peril that ever menaced the prosperity and security of the Empire. The work is skeptical and abusive, false to the point of flagrant lying, humorous to the point of low comedy; yet it betrays extensive knowledge, remarkable keenness, and consummate cleverness. There was only one man capable of at once presenting a complete and victorious refutation of it—Origen. For a while he withstood the persistent entreaties of his friends, not through lack of courage, but because he was convinced that any human effort was powerless to re-establish destroyed or shaken faith in men's souls. He says: "If it were possible, indeed, for me to enter along with my words into the conscience of everyone without exception who peruses this work, and to extract each dart which wounds him who is not completely protected with the whole armor of God, and apply a rational medicine to cure the wound inflicted by Celsus I would do so It is the work of God alone to take up His abode invisibly." Yet he decides to do so, "to refute the statements of Celsus and thus to prepare the way for the triumph of the truth."

In the preface Origen declares what he conceives to be the true proof of Christianity, which is not a mental exercise, but which makes a man pass from unbelief to faith, or strengthen a Christian in his belief. He declares: "I venture, then, to say that this 'apology,' which you require me to compose, will somewhat weaken that defense [of Christianity] which rests on facts, and that power of Jesus which is manifest to those who are not altogether devoid of perception." But what, in Origen's mind, is that "apology which rests on facts"? What, especially to his mind, shows the truth of Christianity is the moral power and the moral perfection of the Church. "There is not a single juggler," he says, "who by means of his proceedings invites his spectators to reform their morals." "Nor would the Christians, had they owed their origin to a rebellion, have adopted laws of so exceedingly mild a character as not to allow them, when it was their fate to be slain as sheep, on any occasion to resist their persecutors." And again he says:

"Agreeably to the promise of Jesus, His disciples performed even greater works than these miracles of Jesus..... Many, too, who were lame in the feet of the inner man, as Scripture calls it, do not simply leap, but leap as the hart." And he adds that the spread of Christianity and the persecution daily increases the power of the Christian faith. We might almost suppose we were listening to the words of the Vatican Council declaring that "the very Church herself, in view of her wonderful propagation, her eminent holiness, and her exhaustless fruitfulness in all that is good offers a great and evident claim to belief, and an undeniable proof of her divine commission."

This, however, does not mean that the apologist makes little use of other proofs: prophecies, miracles, and our Lord's explicit declarations. For Origen devotes to these proofs the major part of his book. But, since his aim is that of practical apologetics, he wishes first to bring before his reader the proof that he can best grasp, the moral miracle of the life of the Church.

Further, whatever proof is offered, it will be effective, says Origen, only for a soul that is well-disposed. "Respecting the whole history related in the Gospels concerning Jesus, there is need of candor in those who are to read, and of much investigation and, so to speak, of insight into the meaning of the writers." But this is far from the prompting which inspired the work of Celsus. Celsus is not at any pains to understand the Scriptures; he consults nothing but his hatred; he parodies, he scoffs, he descends even to buffoonery, and thus, instead of throwing light on anything, he darkens everything; in place of rising, he sinks.

None of Origen's works better reveals the depth of his apostolic soul; an apostle writes or speaks, not to gratify himself with vain notions, but to influence souls, to convert them to Christ, to save them.—History of the Catholic Church, Fernand Mourret, S.S.

THE BULLETIN cover is usually devoted to some current *cause celebre*—"Apartheid Ends!" or "A Message to Garcia." August 18, 1987 it surprised a matched pair of hands in the act of fracturing a white wafer over a golden cup, all under the banner headline, **WHY I LEFT THE PRIESTHOOD**

The most cursory glance at the five-page cover story develops the fact that its author is not a priest—he merely dropped out of the seminary (if it still merits that designation), St. Patrick's, Manly. The apprentice chef stops peeling potatoes. The carpenter's helper throws down his broom.

Tony Abbott lists his qualifications for the priesthood: Sydney University degrees in Law and Economics, involvement in student politics, a **Rhodes Scholarship**, played Rugby for Oxford, two blues as a boxer. All this prompted a priest, presumably a seminary instructor, to ask: "What are we going to do with you?" Thirty years ago the answer would have been: **Teach** him canon law, apologetics, exegesis, philosophy, and theology. But these have joined the "anachronistic bells, soutanes, and lectures in Latin." This wholesale discard has promoted what Dr. Grove Johnson, seminary president at the time, reported to the February 1984 Episcopal Conference session: that seminary life was often marked by "futility, aimlessness, and abiding boredom"—to be expected from a school without a curriculum.

Abbott: I felt “had” by a seminary that so stressed “empathy” with sinners and “dialogue” with the Church’s enemies that the priesthood seemed to have lost its point. academic “formation” involved gradual immersion in contemporary Catholic theology.

On questions such as the meaning and significance of Christ, sexual ethics and social justice issues, most major theologians seemed to be at war with the Vatican. Some said that modern theology was a courageous attempt to drag the Church into the twentieth century; others that it was a cover for theologians’ lack of faith. It is the view, for instance, of Rev. Dr. David Coffey, St. Patrick’s best-known theologian that the very fullness and perfection of Christ’s humanity constitutes his divinity.

[A theologian? Contemporary, perhaps, but Catholic? What **was**—**is** the Second Person of the Holy Trinity before the Incarnation? What greater proof of the postconciliar “Church’s” blatant heresy is needed than that this theologian thrusts his poison unimpeded, undelated, through the devastated diocesan seminary?]

Abbott: a dagger aimed at the heart of the faith. But what if the modernists were right? The attractive notion that splendid humanity constituted the imitation of Christ ... steadily undermined my less-than-enthusiastic acceptance of the predominantly sacramental character of priestly ministry.

[Denizens of a modernist seminary are inculcated with little appreciation of the removed sacramental aspects of the no longer **priestly** ministry? Shades of Pelagius! Or freemasonry? Heady stuff, this humanism! Man needs no Redeemer; he can save himself—through human perfection. The sacramental priesthood is thus rendered relevant only as a subject for debate “long into the night.”]

1985, “a year of unrest” under Dr. Gerry Iverson, saw the introduction of newer psychological techniques, and the departure of 22 seminarians, more than a quarter of the total. **Abbott:** There was something sapping in a system which shrouded itself in flaccid jargon: “..... maturing vision of our life together here deeper awareness of our giftedness enriching the whole canvas of seminary formation deep optimism and joy which is the immediate fruit of our saying ‘yes’ to the God who calls” There was something disturbing, for all the real ambiguity of male sexuality under celibacy, in the ready acceptance of homosexual orientation.

In response to a feature in the **Northern Herald**, which gave a simplistic view of St. Patrick’s, I wrote denying that it was the difficulty of the course which caused a high dropout rate and suggested that the Herald focus on the “real reasons why people leave—which include ennui, psychosomatic illness, and an unwillingness to conform to whatever model of the priesthood happens to be momentarily fashionable.” my letter, the responsible authorities felt, confirmed my need for a stint in a parish and for professional advice. Some others shared my concerns and we comforted each other that it was really the seminary staff who needed psychological investigation. But it was the seminarians who were exposed to psychological weighing of “suitability for ordination” and who had to grab for a goal upon which they had set their hearts and which the seminary authorities seemed to dangle before them like a ball on a string.

Lack of sensual intimacy is something that priests have always had to handle. In my case this had become a heavy burden because I was not naturally drawn to the life of the priesthood and because the modern Church—by minimising its mystique and spiritual *elan*—had eroded any other basis for its undertaking.

The seminary authorities were anxious to inhibit my writing on Church issues to prevent trouble with the Archbishop who was not only my episcopal sponsor but also their immediate superior. But they did not seem to understand that the more they played up lay ministry and ecumenism, and played down the unique role of the priest in the one true Church, the more the struggle seemed pointless.....

[“Archbp.” Clancy took advantage of a change in diocesan boundaries to unload Abbott’s sponsorship onto “Bishop” Patrick Murphy, who refused to accept the hot potato. A man who had

discerned a **few** of their inconsistencies just might eventually spot the lot. Nevertheless, it **is** new in the Church that seminarians publish; no real pre-Vatican II bishop would have tolerated this either. But a third invalidly “ordained” prelate, Bede Heather of Parramatta, accepted Tony, who finally took him off the hook March 27.]

Abbott: Looking back, it seems that I was seeking a spiritual and human excellence to which the Church is no longer sure that she aspires. My feeble attempts to recall her to her duty betrayed a fathomless disappointment at the collapse of a cherished ideal. The same sense of boundless human potential, of man soaring to God’s right hand, which led me toward the priesthood led me away in the end

If this truly raises questions of the nature and value of seminary training, then it must concern all who love the Church or the spiritual values of which she is the champion. If I have seriously misunderstood the reality of St. Patrick’s, let that be explained. If St. Patrick’s **does** represent the coming Church, let that be plainly stated. But if St. Patrick’s is simply the best that the Church can provide at the moment let that be squarely faced so that something better may promptly take its place.

Jolly good luck, Tony! You have a case! Traditional Catholics will not query you. Too long have we published our own largely ignored recriminations, inspired by love for the Church, to fill our apostate clergy’s doctrinal vacuum. **We** have not left the Church; the “Church” has left **us**. You have not deserted the priesthood; the priesthood itself has vanished. You have saved yourself from leading the sheep into organized idolatry. (That’s where they’ll be, but **you** won’t bear the responsibility.) In your position we would have acted no differently, except that Dr. Coffey might have been ceremonially incinerated!—or at least forced to read **Dom Columba Marmion**: “We must recognize in Jesus a primary sanctity, of the divine order, found in Him alone, the fruit of the hypostatic union. This ‘assumption’ of a body and soul by the Word communicated to the whole human nature of Jesus an incomparable sanctity, that of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity.”

Even Coffey must admit that God operates flawlessly. When He creates He creates **perfectly**. Adam, the first man, was a **perfect** man, endowed with preternatural and supernatural gifts, such as corporal immortality and sanctifying grace (lost together through original sin). If the “fullness and perfection of Christ’s humanity constitute His divinity,” why was Adam not divine? If divine, how could he have fallen?

Possibly through regular attendance at Dr. Coffey’s classes? Or split personality? Or has Lionel Murphy’s Family Law provided an appropriate procedure whereby the hypostatic union itself may be dissolved?

Objection—Vatican II did no more than Trent, which also changed everything.

Reply—Every ecumenical council of the Catholic Church from Nicaea (325) to Vatican (1870) was properly convoked to deal with schism or heresy. They all defined for all time what had been called into question. They determined the true doctrine to be defined from the traditional and immemorial doctrine and practise of the Church. Trent defined more than all the rest together because the Reformation had, for the first time, called all traditions and doctrines into question. Hus, Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, Zwingli, and a host of branch heretics had denied practically every major truth, previously agreed to by all Christendom, even the schismatics. These matters—known to all—were not open to discussion or change but only to clarification and definition in the face of heresy. They all come under: Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven (Matt. xviii, 18), that is to say in **eternity**—**not** till some one in authority desires to loose it. Dogmas once defined hold forever as they had held from the beginning of the Church either implicitly (through lack of challenge) or explicitly. The definition changed nothing —it merely declared the eternal truths of our Faith.

Vatican II was called in utter absence of serious challenge to doctrine, practise, or authority, in violation of Church law (Pope Pius II’s *Execrabilis*), to make drastic changes in the Church. It far exceeded its competence in its first officially promulgated document, the Constitution on the

Liturgy. It then proceeded to vote and publish—over the papal signature of the worst heretic of them all—at least twelve previously condemned heretical propositions. We are left with an authority that contradicts our eternal authority. If Vatican II is correct, on what can it base its claim to authority, if not on the nineteenth-century authority which it contradicts? Trent was wrong, it says, but four centuries later it speaks with the selfsame authority of the selfsame Church four centuries in error. For there is no other acceptable authority. Vatican II and its four antipopes **cannot** possess or even claim genuine authority. They have cut the ground from beneath their own feet.

All genuine popes and councils in history agreed on the doctrine and morals of Christ and His Church, belief in and observance of which lead to salvation. But Vatican II and its five antipopes have, in their consummate pride, discovered new ways to salvation, new morals, new doctrine, which correct and improve on Christ and His Church, and which constitute great risk to salvation. They embraced the “synthesis of all heresies” (St. Pius X), **modernism**, a rationalization of the Faith which tries to ascribe all its facets to natural development and evolution. This heresy denies divine qualities to Jesus Christ, and looks forward to man’s perfection as he learns more and more from new revelations denied the Apostles and all times before our own enlightened age. It pretends that nothing is supernatural, for instance, that Jesus Christ is present only symbolically in the Holy Eucharist, which heresy, held by Berengarius of Tours (999-1088), was condemned by the Sixth Council of Rome under St. Gregory VII.

St. Gregory called Berengarius, whose heresy had been condemned in 1050, to Rome in 1079 and forced him to sign a profession of faith in which he withdrew this specific heresy. The profession: I, Berengarius, believe interiorly and profess publicly that the bread and wine, which are placed on the altar, through the mystery of the sacred prayer and the words of our Redeemer are substantially changed into the true, proper, and life-giving flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. After the consecration it is the true body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, and which hung on the cross as an offering for the salvation of the world, and which sits at the right hand of the Father. And it is the true blood of Christ which was poured forth from His side. And Christ is present not merely by virtue of the sign and the power of the sacrament but in His proper nature and true substance as is set down in this summary and as I read it and you understand it. This I believe, and I will not teach any more against this faith. So help me God and this holy Gospel of God!

TRADITIONAL PUBLICATIONS ABOUND

in all sizes, shapes, styles, and secondary purposes. Every now and then one issues an impassioned plea for unity. Since a chief end of publication is to advance ever better arguments for the preservation of Catholicism through its essential traditions, since such arguments are developed in different areas, from different bases, at different times, by men in different stages of realization, unity appears practically impossible, especially in methods. We had unity—until John XXIII and his Vatican II destroyed it. We work for its return, each according to his own lights, his abilities, and often those abuses of the postconciliar Church which most repel him. We are not all universally competent. We read each other’s output for ideas that we can pass on or develop, and sometimes discern areas of disagreement. When these latter strike us as serious we have been known to correspond over them. These sooner or later reflect in question boxes or argument corners, in which we try to resolve or expose differences and prove how clever we are. But mostly we write simply because there is no unity with the past, with tradition, with the Communion of Saints, with the Catholic Faith, which essential unity we try to recover.

At 25 I wrote a short book sarcastically entitled **The Liberation of Poland**. Our war had started ostensibly to liberate Poland, invaded and enslaved from both sides. Winston Churchill had just opened the bag and liberated instead the cat. I fumed, shouted, screamed, and wrote. No one would publish my reaction, and I suspected censorship of the type that kept Carlton J. H. Hayes’ **Wartime Mission in Spain** off bookshop shelves. Years later I re-read my deathless prose, and appreciated its loose style and prolixity—I would not have published it myself. But everyone knew that Poland had been victimized by not only its enemies. Better writers publicized the facts, but nothing was done—neither the first nor the last major miscarriage of justice. Horrible as it was, the

persecuted, starved, deprived, and murdered Poles could still be saved eternally, some through the injustice itself. At any rate the ordinary means remained available somewhere.

During Roncalli's occupation of the Vatican, I noticed a weakening of doctrine, a questioning of morals, and a general fog in Catholic education. I returned to writing, this time against the softening attitude toward birth control, but no Catholic publication in the United States would use it. Even my parish priest advised delay "**until we see what the Council says.**" It surfaced eventually in a secular weekly in Washingtonville, New York. But everyone knew the Church's doctrine on birth control, based on Holy Scripture and the natural law, therefore unchangeable.

When, after years in state schools, my children at last had the chance to attend Catholic schools, I belatedly discovered what trash constituted their religious instruction, and again resorted to the pen, writing at last to Rome, to Cardinal Wright, who never replied.

Eventually discovering the absurd proscription of the traditional Mass and sacraments, and then saddled with editorship of the Latin Mass Society of Australia Quarterly Newsletter, I began to study in earnest. Our ordinary means of salvation were fast disappearing from the face of the earth. I discovered a whole traditionalist literature: **The Wanderer**, **The Remnant**, Michael Davies, Hamish Fraser, Marcel Lefebvre, Georges de Nantes, and others who objected to this or that abuse but never reached a logical conclusion on responsibility. Since there seemed no comprehensive book in English to relate effects to cause, I wrote one.

For publication I sent it to **TAN Books & Publishers**, Rockford, Illinois, then spent over a year in futile attempts to extract any kind of acknowledgment even to my letters of inquiry. When the postal trace confirmed delivery I stopped wasting time, rewrote the book, begged the money, and had **Paul VI's Legacy: Catholicism?** printed in India. Another traditional Catholic had also sent **his** book to **TAN Books**. **TAN** had preserved a stony silence to his inquiries, too. But **TAN** had shortly afterward published **The Great Sacrilege**, in which my friend found many of his own phrases.

Traditional writers owe each other. I owe Patrick Omlor, Yves Dupont, Hugh McGovern, William F. Strojje, Leonard Hurst, Hugo Kellner, *Veritas*, Wigand Siebel, Noel Barbara, and several private correspondents. I don't always agree with them. I seldom use their arguments unless I can carry them further. They have (or had) larger circulations—why waste time and space in duplication? Though we all pursue the same goal we differ in method, and sometimes in conclusions. We have not all access to the same information. Not all read Vatican II's documents immediately. Some trusted our clergy and hierarchy longer than others, partly because Vatican II was implemented in various places at different speeds. I seldom condemn those who have not drawn my conclusions; given time and further papal and clerical activity they will eventually agree with me. I cannot claim to have arrived instantaneously and infallibly at my own conclusions; they took time. Time was when I believed John XXIII and Paul VI genuine popes—before I had read enough of their public utterances to identify their numerous blatant heresies. When I call anyone a heretic I specify the points which make him a heretic—his public opposition to defined doctrine—as concisely as I can, always to warn against his evil influence. If he has no influence I may argue with his anonymous ideas or statements. But I call no one a heretic on the basis of undefined theological opinion, especially when such an opinion, well-known to genuine bishops and priests, was ignored or contradicted in their catechisms. I favor overkill in genuine religious argument, but not in side issues or in boring the enemy to death.

Aeneas Sylvius (later Pius II) Bishop of Trieste (1447 or 1448) was sent to Cologne to win over the archbishop (to Nicholas V), and succeeded. Regarded by the University as an apostate, he found it necessary to justify himself in a letter to the rector. He had gone to Basel, he said, an unfledged nestling from Siena; he had heard nothing but abuse of Eugenius IV, and was too inexperienced to disbelieve. Dazzled by the eminence of the Council's leaders, he followed in their track, and vanity led him to write against Eugenius. But God had mercy on him, and he went to Frankfurt as Saul had gone to Damascus. At Frederick III's court he first began to hear both sides, gradually became neutral, till Cesarini's arguments convinced him to leave the Council's party. His

chief reasons were:

- 1) The wrongful proceedings against the pope, who was neither heretical, schismatic, nor a cause of scandal, and therefore ought not justly to be deposed;
- 2) the nullity of the Council, which had been translated by the pope, did not represent the Universal Church, and was not supported by any nation in Europe except Savoy;
- 3) the Council did not trust the justice of its own cause; was the faith to be found only at Basel, as Apollo gave oracles only at Delphi—by refusing to go elsewhere the Council showed disbelief in itself. — **A History of the Papacy**, M. Creighton, Lord Bishop of London, Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York, & Bombay, 1900

This fifteenth century bishop's first reason, accepted by the University of Cologne, finds almost by-the-way agreement in this century's (1913) **The Catholic Encyclopedia**, Vol. XI, p. 457, in the last paragraph of the article Papal Elections, by William H. W. Fanning, S.J., Professor of Church History and Canon Law, St. Louis University: "As late as 1378 Urban VI was chosen, though not a cardinal (.....). A layman may also be elected pope, as was Celestine V (1294). Even the election of a married man would not be invalid (.....). Of course, the election of a heretic, schismatic, or female would be null and void."

Volume IV, p. 435, Section XIII on Councils, by J. Wilhelm, S.T.D., Ph.D.: "**Can a council depose the pope?** This question is legitimate circumstances have arisen in which several pretenders contended for papal authority and councils were called upon to remove certain claimants. The Councils of Constance and Basel, and Gallican theologians, hold that a council may depose a pope on two main grounds:

- (1) *ob mores* (for his conduct or behaviour, e.g., his resistance to the synod;
- (2) *ob fidem* (on account of his faith or rather want of faith, i.e. heresy). In point of fact, however, heresy is the only legitimate ground. For a heretical pope has ceased to be a member of the Church, and cannot, therefore, be its head. A sinful pope, on the other hand, remains a member of the (visible) Church and is to be treated as a sinful, unjust ruler for whom we must pray, but from whom we may not withdraw our obedience."

The question of obedience to the heretic never arises; he cannot be our head.

CALVARY SERVED NO "MEMORIAL MEALS"

The small group beneath the cross had no illusions as to what was taking place. There were no kisses of peace, no coming together of the people of God, no awareness of participation in the community, no awareness that they were about to partake of a memorial meal. Silently and prayerfully they beheld their Savior hanging on the Cross. His sacred body was not the gleaming gold, the smooth ivory, or the polished image we usually associate with the crucifix. His body was covered with countless wounds inflicted by the savage scourging, the carrying of the cross, the actual nailing of His hands and feet to the Cross. It wasn't a pretty sight. As the blood dried His sacred body, by now one solid mass of open wounds, slowly turned to an almost black hue. His face, streaked with blood and spittle, was almost beyond recognition. All this He had freely accepted as the price of our redemption.

During His brief years of ministering to His followers, He had personally selected twelve men to be His Apostles. Where were they now? One had deliberately betrayed Him for a handful of silver he was never to use. Another, who would eventually be His first Vicar on earth, had spent the better part of the night denying that he ever knew Him. Where were the other ten? Who knows where they hid in fear of their lives? Only one stood beneath the Cross and gave Him comfort during His sufferings.

The small group on Calvary gave mute testimony as to what it took to be a follower of their crucified Savior. It would never be a popular course. It wasn't then and it isn't now. All the world could offer its Savior was a crown of thorns and a bloody cross. It offers nothing less now. His followers would always be numbered as the few—not the many. But to those who chose Him His

Crucifixion and Death on the Cross were central to their belief in Him. It was so at the time and it hasn't changed since.

Any movement or trend to downgrade Calvary or to change the emphasis given to the Crucifixion and Death of Our Lord puts the followers of this movement or trend in the same company with those who fled from Calvary or who denied they ever knew the Crucified Lord Jesus Christ.

The central theme of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was the Passion and Death of Jesus on Calvary. Those who would change this to place the emphasis on **only** the Last Supper stamp themselves with the same mark given to Judas and can expect to get about the same use out of their thirty pieces of silver as did he. [Minimally edited from The Francinta Messenger]

KEEPERS OF THE KEYS, Wilton Wynn: Page 61: When Montini moved to Milan as archbp. in 1955, his books filled ninety cases. His favorites were the works of modern French Catholic philosophers.

Pp. 100-103 (heavily edited): The first eight general councils were called by emperors; only thirteen popes have dared. The last before John met in 1869, over three hundred years past Trent. Both Pius XI and XII considered a council. Paul VI lacked the nerve. John had no such problem.

.....

Councils have usually been called to face specific crises. The 1870 Vatican Council was interrupted, and in 1925 Pius XI spoke of reconvening it, but was dissuaded. Who needed a council when the pope was infallible?

Pius XII prepared for a new council to meet challenges of the century from 1948 to 1951. The preparatory commission recommended action against (1) existentialism, (2) false concepts of revelation's relation to theology, (3) multiple errors in scriptural studies, (4) various forms of materialism, humanism, naturalism, (5) errors perverting matrimony, (6) communist doctrinaires, (7) class-struggle advocates, (8) those who maintain that any "sincere" man, though unbaptized and not visibly connected with the pope, is a true and proper Catholic, (9) those who hold that dissidents differ only in name from the faithful, etc.

"Such proposals were a reverse-image of much that was eventually done at John's council, but in a negative way they reflected the need to confront modern issues." "The commission finally handed its documents to Pius on January 4, 1951, John knew that he had inherited this treasure trove of preparation. there are certain procedures for helping a pope pass judgment, but John bypassed them all in calling his council.

Sometimes the warmth and humanity lacks spontaneity. Security creates barriers to JP2 reaching out to the crowds. So he stages it. Only two days after a deranged priest tried to kill him in Fatima, Portugal, John Paul frightened the public with his disregard of security in Vila Vicosa, about a hundred miles east of Lisbon. The pope was tightly protected by cordons of police standing shoulder-to-shoulder on either side of his path. Suddenly he veered right, broke through the cordon, and shook the hands of peasants in the nearby field. Soon he was immersed in peasants; security had seemingly broken down. Much later I learned from security forces that this little incident had been carefully coordinated with the police. A similarly staged incident took place the following day in Oporto, when the pope broke through a police cordon to kiss a paralytic child in a wheelchair.

More staging embellished a youth rally in Tokyo. A group of little Japanese girls dressed in Polish costumes sang Polish songs and did Polish folk dances for their visitor. Two of the little girls abruptly broke ranks and, holding hands, timidly approached JP2 to ask, "Won't you come and dance with us?" He looked surprised, hesitated, and then, with a shrug of the shoulders and a broad grin took one of the little things by hand and walked into their circle, and they danced around him—a touching scene.

I was in that same hall a few hours earlier as the little girls rehearsed. An old American Jesuit sat in an armchair as stand-in. While the girls were dancing, two of them broke ranks and, holding hands, timidly approached the old Jesuit to ask, "Won't you come and dance with us?" The stand-in

looked surprised, hesitated, then shrugged his shoulders and stepped into the circle while the children danced around him.... Sometimes he uses the technique of repeating words or phrases that have a special meaning in the country he is visiting, and linking his message to those phrases. In France, he spoke of “*Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite*” and called them Christian virtues. In his trip to Latin America in early 1985, he preempted [endorsed?] the advocates of liberation theology by peppering his speeches with words like “liberation” and phrases like “the option for the poor.”

Page 194: Khrushchev had permitted Russian Orthodox observers to attend the council on the understanding that the council would not condemn communism. [They’ll send in their spies if we promise not to insult them! Was the Church to gain prestige from Orthodox(?) observers?] More than two hundred amendments calling for condemnation of Marxist regimes were proposed from the council floor. Because of John’s commitment Paul intervened personally to see that all these were rejected—a striking Khrushchev success. [And clear instance of the support of the Holy Ghost!]

On pp. 236-240 this non-Catholic quondam news bureau chief, who has no interest in preserving the Church or concept of its divine origin and universal relevance, who details his intimacy with the self-seeking Keepers of whom he writes, displays for approval the devious serpentine wisdom with which Roncalli guided his council into the brave new present. John changed little structurally but aired out the stifling atmosphere, and “through his style, his spirit, and his deeds he opened the windows to winds of change that blew through the Church long after his death.”

Bishops arriving at the council received discreet phone calls from John’s “intensely loyal personal secretary,” Archbp. Loris F. Capovilla, dissociating John from his own curia and urging free and open discussion. John made sure that the liberals got “equal time.” [Catholics have received no time since.] He broke a deadlock on Ottaviani’s document on revelation by recalling it for revision by a new commission, neatly balanced by Cardinal Bea’s inclusion. When Ottaviani tried to exclude Karl Rahner from the council “John blandly feigned surprise that Rahner might have slipped into error, and he ‘solved’ the problem with a seemingly naive suggestion: ‘Why don’t you discuss the matter with Cardinal Koenig?’”—who had brought in the heretic as his personal theologian.

“In setting up the Secretariat for Christian Unity under Cardinal Bea, John went a long way toward getting rid of the Catholic Church’s claim to exclusivity in truth.” [Fine euphemism!] He overruled Ottaviani’s cancellation of an ecumenical prayer service, and the “truly revolutionary act” went ahead.

John addressed his encyclical *Pacem in Terris* to “all men of good will,” and sent Khrushchev an advance copy. [It is one thing not to condemn communism and quite another to promote it.] The Italian Christian Democrats had opted for an opening to the Left, to bring the Socialists into government. Ottaviani tried hard to have the encyclical revised, but John published it anyway, pulling the rug from under Ottaviani’s project for a new political party. Added to *Pacem in Terris*’ impact was the widely held suspicion that John’s “intensely loyal personal secretary,” Archbp. Loris F. Capovilla had engineered the opening to the Left.

“John did not specifically name Marxism but his reference to it was clear when he wrote: ‘Who can deny that those movements, insofar as they conform to the dictates of right reason and are interpreters of the lawful aspirations of the human person, contain elements that are positive and deserving of approval?’”

Pp. 240-249 extol Montini’s multifold modernizations. Paul VI replaced the Black Nobility with black bishops. He dispensed with “privileges conferred by civil governments.” He introduced new liturgies in modern languages—like Pidgin. He junked the Roman Index of forbidden books, while Australian dioceses ordered their priests to destroy all their Catholic books printed prior to 1958. But even Wynn recognized that he stated positions and would not enforce his words. He reaffirmed the traditional rule requiring clerical celibacy, then granted 31,324 priests’ requests for laicization. His encyclical *Mysterium Fidei* held largely to tradition and even warned against change in

eucharistic terminology. But he “privately assured a curial official that he had not intended to condemn those” (Dutch and Belgian) “theologians.” Schillebeeckx and Cardinal Alfrink told a news conference that Rome had assured them that their new theories did not contradict the encyclical. “It now appeared that ‘*Mysterium Fidei*’ had been issued mainly to placate certain Roman conservatives, while to the liberals Paul was saying that theological speculation on the subject could continue.”

Next Wynn approves JP2 at length. Conservatives love to tell us how Old Krakus dealt severely with several indefensible heretics, Ed Schillebeeckx, Hans Küng, and Chuck Curran. So what did he do? Wynn says none was declared a heretic, defrocked, excommunicated, or even silenced.

The Belgian was treated with special courtesy out of respect for his standing as a scholar. The Vatican finally stated publicly that some of his views on the priesthood were “at variance with the teaching of the Church.”—no punishment.

Küng’s books are still sold at Catholic bookshops. [Who but modernist “Catholics” would buy them?] He continues to teach at Tübingen, but not as a Catholic theologian.

Curran was sent a letter, which the Vatican made public 19 August 1986: “..... you will no longer be considered suitable nor eligible to exercise the function of a professor of Catholic theology.”

[How can JP2 step on these men in the light of his own record?] Wynn describes him as the first pope to enter Canterbury Cathedral, the first to preach in a Lutheran church, the first to enter a synagogue, certainly the first to invite every type of pagan to Assisi to pray [to whom?] for peace.

“Supporting the reforms of the council, however, did not mean that the Polish pope would allow any tampering with Church doctrine or discipline.” [Hadn’t the council tampered enough?]

We hear a tremendous amount of misinformation on Separation of Church and State, said to be a major principle of the U.S. constitution, which said only that Congress would establish no particular religion. But this unlegislated slogan is cited to prevent free public exercise of religion and to divorce morals from government, which then funds wars, abortions, and other crimes with taxes levied on church members, and supports foreign, even hostile governments with taxes levied on U.S. citizens.

Separation of Church and State is new to the civilized world. Who can imagine King David separated from the Jewish priesthood? Nebuchadnezzar parted from his idols? Saudi Arabia without Islam? The Mikado shorn of Shinto? Or Greece and Rome minus that hierarchy of gods and demigods to which St. Paul referred as devils? Authority, as Christ told Pilate, comes from above—the further above, the more convincing.

From Constantine’s time all western civilization leaned on the Catholic Church, though in some areas in more recent centuries indirectly. The Greeks and Protestants never considered separating Church and State. The German princes introduced the formula *cuius regio eius religio*—whose rule his Church. They believed they could not rule a divided or irreligious people.

This unification of Church and State in the same person led to loss of rights everywhere. Russians were to follow their czar into his Orthodox Church. Englishmen must adhere to Henry’s Church. So must the Irish, though not the Scots or Welsh. The Netherlands divided along religious lines. France and Spain were forced into intolerable situations. American colonies originated in quest for dissident religious autonomy, again overriding minority rights. In the resultant diversity our constitution could not cope with an established Church.

The atheist French and communist revolutions opposed and persecuted religion more fiercely than anyone in all history. These same groups have led the pursuit of one-world government. Country after country has fallen under the yoke of anti-religious governments. U.S. presidents promote the New World Order.

Europe has gone a long way toward political union. What passes for the Catholic Church, which always opposed world government other than spiritual, has fallen under a deadly blight, reversed its

doctrine, eliminated rites of worship, and changed its approach from converting men to compromising with religions. To unite all under a one-world government it is almost necessary to garner all into a one-world religion.

Were this my intention, I would not start from scratch. I would target the religion doctrinally and numerically strongest, the religion constituting the most effective bar to one-world government, infiltrate it, water it down so that all might join without pang of conscience, loss of principle, or change in belief, while imbuing its members with the notion that this would be only charity in action. I would involve everyone in my program. I would assemble all the bishops, point out that we had still converted less than a fourth of the world's people, gull them into believing this our fault, and into accommodating our truth to the majority. The majority must be right, you know.

Having won over the bishops, I would send them home to subvert their clergy, especially those still in training. I would reward originality and scorn tradition. I would order traditional books destroyed, and replace them. New methods would disguise new content. And I would urge continuously that sterling virtue, obedience.

The clergy would then involve the laity. Select the most prominent in the community and hand them the priest's duties and functions. Let them read wretched new translations of various parts of the religious rites. (Translation would mask every kind of destructive innovation.) Let them finally replace the clergy altogether.

Unleash the brothers and nuns on the world. Let them vanish into the lay community. Let the laity take over education. Let the younger generation grow in variety and foolishness, unaware that what they hear under Catholic auspices is not Catholicism. Let more and more learn less and less, and rejoice in their freedom. Let all participate to the utmost in busy futility and organized idleness—too addled to assay the degradation of their means of salvation.

In the process I would eliminate every doctrine and practise which could conceivably repel Protestants, Jews, Moslems, and satanists. When I abolish the clergy I avoid problems with women priests, celibate priests, priestly training, sacraments, sacramentals, real presence; all are equal—won't the Moslems be pleased! When I simply drop the usual papal renewal of indulgences, won't the Protestants be pleased! When I introduce the Passover rite and deny the Holy Trinity in official worship, won't the Jews crow! When I stop the missionary effort and broadcast to all and sundry that they also travel the highroad to salvation, however understood, won't all the others rejoice! When I tearfully apologize to converts from savagery for stealing their cruel culture, who can doubt my sincerity and universal charity? What will keep all religions from joining me in a world religion—almost necessary for world government? The alternative, world atheism, is far harder to achieve.

But what will I have achieved? I now lead the one-world religion. A small step will make me head of the one-world government. I would then hold absolute power in opposition to Jesus Christ and His Church. Would that not make me the Antichrist?

What is this craze for one-world government? Besides violating his oath of office, a president in promoting it demonstrates at least that:

- 1) The national government is inadequate, our system, a failure.
- 2) He is a failure; he can't operate it.

But grant this infinitely more complicated system which can function only by reducing us all to a least common denominator. Is it any wonder that Christ asked whether on His return He would find faith upon the earth?

Thomas Jefferson operated on the principle that the best governed society is least governed. St. Thomas Aquinas wrote that the province of government is protection of the individual. Union of our original states was for defense, coinage of money, and the like. Federal government had no function not explicitly surrendered by the states. The most efficient government is local, in which local people under local scrutiny address the peculiar needs of the region and its people. In our federal government we have little control over our representatives, who seem to vote issues on

party lines, who can't even sit without party affiliation, who legislate continuously because they have no other excuse for sitting. This has resulted in such an overloaded legal system, such top-heavy government, that in 1953 my 75-year-old uncle, an honest lawyer, later a master in chancery in the Illinois Superior Court, stated seriously that were it not for the communist threat he would favor tearing down the entire system and starting over. We had not yet realized that that was the reason for the communist threat: to keep all pacified while big government usurped ever greater control to facilitate facing down the communists. Now, we are openly taxed to support them. Franklin Roosevelt used the depression for control until war provided a better excuse. Our taxes supported communism as it grew into an even greater threat, a superb "reason" for permanent emergency measures. The whole totalitarian scheme would have collapsed without our tax money to support and trade with it. We won two world wars, only to see victory twice handed to the enemy. Since then we have not been allowed to win a war. So there must have been other reasons for the Korea and Vietnam disasters.

(Sydney Morning Herald, Rev. W. G. Hardie, July 16, 1981):

The community has cause for deep concern at the number of abortions performed by doctors who have taken a solemn oath to do all in their power to preserve human life. The fact that other doctors are using their time, talents, and immense resources to produce a few test-tube babies is an anomaly that calls for investigation by the government, the Australian Medical Association, and responsible doctors. As a retired Methodist minister, I would like to know how it is possible for the medical profession to condone such double standards in conflict. It is time the cost to the nation, on the one hand, by the taking of human life, and on the other, the huge use of resources to create something which is daily being destroyed in ever increasing numbers, are brought under investigation and priorities set right.

Two letters from Tom Matthews, Tasmania, synthesized

.... it has ever been obvious that an honest showdown, a give-and-take battle, is the last thing the *novus ordo* authorities want. They've always believed, with reason, that they have the advantage; being in control they need only let resistance weaken into apathy. Humanly speaking and reasoning, they are right. But not all who rebel against the new Protestantism will let their Catholic consciences wither and fade. Or we'd be no different from any of the near-forgotten revised versions of Christianity that clutter history. But, incontestably, we are one and the same essentially as the Catholic Church has always been, and no one can show otherwise. *Novus ordo* authorities must avoid honest debate on that issue at all costs.

The world is now virtually pagan, or atheist—the effect is the same. On the surface the aforesaid manproof "Roman Catholic Church" has at last been humanized—"civilized." At any assessment, she has now, at last, virtually admitted she is no more and no better than any other "church." Hence she has, at least in part, been forgiven. Oh, yes, the pope still pretends to believe in that antiquated creed and absurd moral code. But give him time; a few years will see another pope—a Freemason more like than not—then we'll at last have the universal Church. Isn't that the way the educated non-Catholic thinks?—if he thinks at all. I much doubt that the modern thinks of anything **basically** but himself—his "success," his pleasures, his power—in any or all of his egocentric spheres.

I can't believe our time is set for anything but the fall. True, we abhor communism, but the heads of all nations quite evidently act alike—"in the public interest." Hence secret commissions to "eliminate," to "liquidate," or worse still, to coerce via threat of strangulating "policy" pressures those nations whose economics can be crippled "unless" or whose political ideas are reckoned "unacceptable" overall. No nation now acts honorably if by so doing it is disadvantaged economically or politically. "Necessity" and "expedience" are held to explain or justify everything. Hence nations of the West will never be united militarily or politically against the unholy communist atheism of Moscow—they are too selfish individually. In Europe each non-communist country eagerly awaits the opportunity to profit at its allies' expense whenever Moscow tempts in some economic policy detail. And who can keep a tally of the traitorous sell-outs to Moscow—by

top politicians? Broadly speaking, the historic advice “enrich yourself” is the common aim and practice of the modern politician. And doesn’t the general effect of all that moral corruption sink in, in the public mind—if we can use such a term? There’s only one crime—to be caught. If you could plunder Fort Knox today the general feeling would be “he got away with it, didn’t he?” That’s the sure test. But the general effect on the calibre of a people—of a nation? That’s the unconsidered factor, perhaps the fatal factor in the event of war as war must be in the days ahead. Quite obviously, an iron control based on authority unquestionable will give communism instant effect. Whereas the legacy of unimpeded non-cooperation and “rights” of democracy will inevitably produce discords and chaos in general. Never has the effect of such a situation been so catastrophic as must be such an effect today. We all realize that—if we think of it. The one purpose always fostered and aimed at by the authority of the day is to keep the public reassured—at all costs.

Contrast Paul VI’s “**Nothing has changed—nothing absolutely**” with Benelli’s “**new ecclesiology**.” So that justifies the unjustifiable. They hardly bother to pretend now that “nothing is changed.” As the average citizen would say, “they got away with it, didn’t they?”the common use of the lie as an instrument of policy. Truth? An oddity! A sign of immaturity! No politician respects another who falls back on the truth—proving himself dull, slow-witted, inept. The most unscrupulous, if clever, can get to the top. He becomes a successful, honored, esteemed figure, for he got there, didn’t he?

The Ant is a Social Insect

The individual is hatched for a purpose—soldier, worker, queen—and cannot change its caste or orientation. However talented, it cannot rise to the top of the ant hill. Without mind, thought, choice or conscious purpose, it fills its place in the hill as the hill fills its place in the natural economy. Its purpose, then, as with any tool, is determined outside itself, in the mind of its Creator. The ant is irresponsible.

Men of all ages have recognized the absurdity of infinite regression. Everything must begin. Since it is not there to begin itself it must have a Creator. This Creator must be able to *create*—to bring something into being from **nothing**—else we only push the problem back one more impossible step. Creation is an inescapable fact, and obviously requires a pre-existing Creator Who endows each creature with a purpose. The Intelligence that created ants, magnetic fields, galaxies, and the time itself in which they operate has no need to proceed by trial and error.

Creation, the first fact after the Creator, is not taught in our schools. Nor is it ignored. It is replaced by a myth—at best a trial and error method—ultimately a denial of creation and its Creator—**evolution**. This theory of which recorded history provides no example is taught as a science in our education system. Religion is not; we stick to demonstrable facts, not to matters requiring faith. So for faith in a Supreme Being Who created us we are expected to substitute blind faith in Darwin, who discovered this theory which had escaped all those superstitious ages of men, who realized the debt they owed their forebears. Since no instance of evolution appears in history—it would have made headlines in any age—pre-history was invented in the millions and billions of years, on the assumption that the impossible takes a little longer. Such a long-established process would hardly have ceased abruptly when man began to keep records.

When man needs a skill, a tool, a shelter, a frame of reference, he develops it. This is not evolution but application of his natural gifts, almost always built upon the experience and civilization preserved by his ancestors.

The very few lost or abandoned children that survive in the wild are invariably retarded. When captured they take years to civilize. No wild man, no “primitive” ever civilized himself. Example is needed.

Evolution, since it obliterates the Creator, absolves man of responsibility. To whom is he responsible? What purpose has his existence, individually or as a race? Without responsibility no civilization is possible. Without civilization’s protection few of us could have survived. We might all have been eaten by ants.

How square observation of nature's tremendous wonders with the fable, evolution? Whence this iron-clad all-pervading order without an Orderer, a Designer, a Cause? It evolved? By natural selection or blind chance? It all boils down to rolls of the dice by a non-existent gambler?

What is the purpose of this fable? Who benefits by teaching the child that he is the acme of progress, the end product of ever improving evolution, a generation closer to perfection than his parents? Will he ask who set the standard for perfection? Or how he will know when it is achieved? Is it self-sufficiency? Individual? Racial? Is it superefficiency? Is it universal happiness? Based on individual or racial goals? Is it affluence? ZPG? Freedom? From work? From children? For starvation? For extinction? Is it universal agreement? What will happen to the horse player?

The sole beneficiary is the merchant of instability, of endless change, of destruction.

Montclair, New Jersey, 1924-5 school year—Sister Leonidas was sick one day, and her class moved in with our first grade. Sister Eustace took all two hundred in stride, and came in due course to the daily inquisition into that advanced grade two subject, spelling. She asked a boy to spell **city**. "S-i-t-y," he bellowed. Each of fifty boys in turn spelled "s-i-t-y." Each in turn was pronounced wrong. But the first girl asked answered correctly. She may not have been included in the plot. Co-education it may have been, but no boy would be caught dead speaking to a girl of his own class on the school grounds. (Grudged exception for a twin sister). The boys possibly would not show each other up, may have thought they had the day off, that unanimity in error proved they had not been assigned this word, that they could prevail by force of numbers, or that Sister Eustace could not flunk them all. She could and did.

Nearly all priests and bishops from Vatican II on have told us that religion is spelt "changeable," "evolutionary," or "accommodated to modern man." Possibly they fear to show each other up. Or all these innovations lay beyond their assignment. Perhaps they think to prevail by force of numbers. God cannot flunk them all. But Sister Eustace would.

ARGUMENT CORNER

Objection—There's no suffering in hell. You wouldn't throw a cat in the fire, would you? And you're a mere human. Neither would the all-just, all-merciful God throw a human soul into a fire.

Reply—Cats are not free to reject God, so they seldom go to hell. But men have been known to torture or kill them. Egypt suffered a long list of horrible plagues which most men would not wish on their worst enemies. Christ warned us to fear not him who can kill the body, but Him Who can cast body and soul into hell (Matthew x, 28), which He described as a lake of everlasting fire. He said that one who scandalizes little ones were better cast into the sea weighted by the neck with a millstone. Eternal frustration of our God-oriented nature would seem to fit the term **suffering**. Let man abolish hellfire and see what control remains over what is left of the world's morals. One of religion's major benefits is the chance to avoid hell—a compelling reason why we must preserve our religion unchanged.

Objection—But I run no risk of hell. I follow my priest, bishop, and pope. It's up to them to steer me right, to provide the means of salvation. Following them I can't go wrong.

Reply—Back to Egypt. One man, the Pharaoh, withstood God's commands. But who got the boils? Whose firstborn were slain? Everyone who failed to declare himself suffered the final plague. The Jews butchered their lambs and sprinkled blood on their door posts. Why won't ordinary Catholics even register a protest? Humility and obedience may benefit you greatly. But the truth shall make you free.

Objection—Wasn't that unfair to the poor Egyptians?

Reply—Too bad you weren't around to keep God fair through all our wars, famines, floods and earthquakes. The General Judgment will clear up such matters. They weren't all that poor till Joseph expropriated them and settled his people on their best land. We continue to emphasize individual responsibility. We can't hide in a herd, no matter who drives it.

Objection—But I’ve always obeyed the Church. I can’t change.

Reply—Have you recently assisted at the Mass with which you grew up? To which the Church obliges you? Have you knelt for communion? Have you a rail where you **can** kneel? Are your confessions the same? Are your children or grandchildren baptized or confirmed with the same rites, forms, or intentions? Do they attend schools where Catholic doctrine is not what you learned? Do you permit this deliberate destruction of their souls? Are your priests ordained as formerly? Do they understand the language in which the Church has formulated its doctrine and published its Canon Law? When you lie dying, if one of them can be persuaded to leave the golf course, will he or she anoint you, with oil blessed by a bishop according to the Extreme Unction your ancestors received? How are your fasts and abstinences? Do you: Attend church Saturday evening to satisfy your Sunday obligation? Allow lay distribution or in-the-hand communion in your presence? Sit quietly through homilies honeycombed with doctrines never before taught you? Go along in brotherhood to non-Catholic churches? Are you subject to the same Canon Law? How do you obey the Church? Where is the Church you obey? What makes you think you haven’t changed?

Objection—But obedience is the test. Rebellion is the hallmark of the freemason, the satanist. If we do not obey we shall not be saved.

Reply—Obedience is owed no one out of his competence, function, or proper sphere. Even a bishop’s vow of obedience to the pope (traditional rite) is “in accord with Canon Law.” You lean on simplistic arguments; so try these:

- 1) There is no doubt that the traditional Mass on which we grew up is a true Mass—as Leo XIII said, the way in which God has shown that He wishes to be worshipped. **Anyone** who forbids or obstructs true worship of God is His enemy.
- 2) Mass and sacraments were, by definition, instituted by Jesus Christ while on earth. No man can institute a new Mass or sacrament because he is not divine and because he is nineteen centuries late.

Objection—You don’t want some one telling you what to believe.

Reply—In almost every facet of life we are offered experts for work that we ourselves perform only indifferently or not at all. Thus we may be left at the mercy of the plumber, electrician, veterinarian, dentist, auto mechanic, barber, cobbler, manufacturer, tailor, or soda jerk. It is often much wiser to let the carpenter or bricklayer construct our house, or General Motors assemble our car. So in this paramount matter of salvation I am to put my puny intellect to the herculean task of working out what I should believe. I need advice, help, and authority. Can I trust another human to save my soul? Can another human trust me? For nineteen centuries we have had this infallible authority to tell us what to believe. Our problem arises from its apparent reversal of form at and since Vatican II. This problem disappears at the moment we reject Vatican II and the antipopes connected therewith. We are then left with another problem: how to maintain our membership in the Catholic Church of those nineteen centuries and the Communion of Saints. We follow St. Paul’s advice: stand firm, and hold the traditions we have learned.

Objection—Sedevacantists are preached the latest nefarious doctrine that although a pope may fall into heresy, Catholic doctrine makes it clear that a heretical pope is automatically deposed at the moment his heresy becomes public. Such a baleful dogma would greatly impair papal claims to obedience in normal times.

Reply—Which is the baleful dogma, that a pope may fall into heresy, or his automatic deposition? The nefarious doctrine is no one’s opinion, but rather quotation of Canons 188 #4 and 2314, as well as *Jus Canonicum de Personis* (Joannes Chelodi), all published this century—after the 1870 definition of papal infallibility. The last quotes Innocent III, who “openly grants the possibility” of an heretical pope in a published sermon. Pope St. Leo II condemned Honorius for heresy. Either Honorius was a heretic or St. Leo erred grievously in condemning him. So only one of them could have been pope? John XXII on several occasions publicly preached that the soul comes to the Beatific Vision only after it is re-united to its body at the General Judgment. He is considered to have preached (publicly) as a private teacher, not *ex cathedra*—papal infallibility was therefore unaffected. He himself argued that the matter was open to discussion because **he** had not defined it.

Objection—St. Robert Bellarmine would not have discussed the cruel hypothesis had he lived after the Vatican Council (1870) had fixed the doctrine that a pope’s faith can never fail and that he tells the Truth infallibly, when speaking *ex cathedra*. He was too respectful of the Magisterium.

Reply—Can you even suspect Bellarmine’s reaction to an 1870 definition which could not have been defined unless held by all ages of the Church? Pope Paul IV issued *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio* (later embodied in Canons 188 and 2314) when Bellarmine was seventeen years old.

Nearly all who show us Bellarmine’s mind omit the selection from *De Romano Pontifice*, 30: “..... it is proven (see earlier article, **East Lindfield—16 Nov. 1980—Father Patrick Fox, C. M.**) refusal to believe God.”

Objection—A genuine pope, properly enthroned, possessing the infallibility of his office and the support of the Holy Ghost, cannot fall into heresy.

Reply—It follows that if a man teach heresy while holding the papal office he was never pope in the first place. He was ineligible by reason of apostasy, public heresy, defective election, or positive intention not to fulfil traditional sworn papal duties but to pervert the papacy. Whether or not Roncalli was properly elected, he took over the office with every intention of convoking a council to update and change the Church, to re-examine every doctrine except papal infallibility, in opposition to the council which not only defined papal infallibility but had again laid down the ancient principle that doctrine defined is defined forever, not subject to updating or re-examination. “We declare that the judgment of the Apostolic See is not subject to review by anyone; nor is anyone allowed to pass judgment on its decision. Therefore those who say that it is allowed to appeal to an ecumenical council from decisions of the Roman Pontiff as to an authority higher than the Roman Pontiff wander far from the straight path of truth.” (Denz. 1830) Just over a thousand years earlier (865) Pope St. Nicholas I had decreed (*Proposueramus quidem*, Denz. 333) “..... it is surely evident that the judgment of the Apostolic See is not subject to review by anyone; nor is anyone allowed to pass judgment on its decision.” Therefore St. Pius X’s judgment and decision (*Lamentabili sane*, 59) to punish with excommunication *latae sententiae* any who hold the position that “Christ did not teach a determined body of doctrine applicable to all times and all men, but rather inaugurated a religious movement adapted or to be adapted to different times and places” is subject to neither review nor judgment, especially by a “pope” who in applying this condemned proposition automatically excommunicated himself, provided that he had not previously done so.

Objection—The Church would cease to exist if she could lose one of her marks. Apostolicity demands that jurisdiction can never disappear; yet sedevacantists hold that there is no pope, no means of electing one, and no diocesan bishops left. Therefore the Gates of Hell have prevailed; consequently the sedevacantists must be wrong. This keeps me within the Society of St. Pius X.

Reply—How does apostolicity demand that jurisdiction never disappear? They are not synonymous. The Orthodox have Apostolic succession but no jurisdiction. The usurpers in Rome have ceased to pass on the succession by abolition of proper ordination. They have killed the prime Apostolic function, missionary activity, dissociating themselves from Christ’s promise—proving that they are not the Church. Lefebvre and all his priests and bishops neither had nor have jurisdiction or any means of obtaining it. Should one convert to Catholicism he would realize the illegitimacy of his ordination and the canonical penalties on illicit orders, which prevent their legitimate exercise. Why should **our** position keep **you** in Lefebvre’s Society? You misrepresent our position, which is not that there can be no pope, but that the five to succeed Pius XII, not being Catholic, cannot be or have been pope(s). What did St. Paul mean when (2Thess ii) he predicted an apostasy? Who will be taken out of the way? The pope? He could not have meant that apostates would keep the four marks of the Church. Our very fragmentation proves that we lack a standard of unity, a pope.

We have had five usurpers without a nodding acquaintance with infallibility wreaking havoc according to the plan of Anacletus II. What has the Holy Ghost to do with antipopes? They could do as they pleased. The gates of hell have prevailed over the apostates, not over the Catholic Church, which continues visible in some of the laity. If we can’t find Mass or sacraments we have not thereby left the Church. If we remain Catholic the Catholic Church remains.

Who has been pope since Pius XII? Not those five apostate heretics! Had the gates of hell prevailed over the 17th-19th-century Japanese Catholics? They kept the Faith. Their marks? Where the Church functions it is known by its marks. Are they visible in the St. Pius X Society? Or in the post-conciliar “Church” in which it originated?

Objection—Up to 1979 you repeatedly quoted favorably the traitor Lefebvre in **Paul VI’s Legacy: Catholicism?** Now you attack him. You doubted whether in the *novus ordo* a true consecration takes place. Now you are sure it does not take place. In your book you are doubtful about the new 1968 ordination rite. Now you are sure the new rite does not make valid priests. Are we to believe you in 1979 or in 1983?

Reply—Objective facts depend in no way upon who recognizes them or when. Where I quoted Lefebvre I agreed with him. My book’s purpose was to condemn all postconciliar innovation—not all men, even bishops. My book had no room for side issues. Lefebvre attended Vatican II; I did not. I was forced to quote witnesses. Hostile witnesses convince more than favorable. Have you some disagreement with what I quoted from Lefebvre? How can such selective quotation either be termed blanket approval or affect later unconnected criticism? By 1979 (see my book Appendix II) I had lost all regard for Lefebvre. My previous support of this traitor had been based on insufficient information concerning Lefebvre’s own words and actions—not on misunderstanding of the Catholic Church, its laws, or its doctrines.

Can anyone who understands English draw any inference of doubt on your other two subjects from my book? I hold in my book, before, and since, that all postconciliar changes in worship and sacraments were introduced—in violation of natural law, positive divine law, ecclesiastical law, ordination oaths, and plain reason—by public heretics acting beyond the competence of the offices they pretended to occupy, in supposed obedience to Vatican II which never ordered such activities, for the purpose of destroying the Mass, the sacraments, and the Church. Nevertheless I have looked in my book—to determine your basis for my doubt. On page 38 I descry: “When it deliberately incorporates doubtful changes why may we not doubt them?” **Part** of an argument addressed to *novus ordo* celebrants underscores that the absolute best one can say of the *novus ordo* is that it is doubtful. Any Catholic should refuse to permit the slightest doubt in our worship. **All** doubt must be settled or avoided.

[I skip a few pages of repetition. I quoted by the paragraph from **Paul VI’s Legacy: Catholicism?**, citing pp. 43, 78, 82, 89, 109, 110, 111, 137, & 145.]

In Section Five (pp. 97-119) I treated **New Sacraments**. Even their names (Wedding, Deading, Penance?, Eldering) demonstrate my complete belief in their complete invalidity. Why would I write a book to quibble and doubt? I could have let the talented, articulate Michael Davies speak for me. I present facts and logical conclusions therefrom. Why am I responsible if you neither comprehend nor believe either? But don’t pretend that I have left the matter in doubt or have changed my opinions. **You and your “priest”** are inconsistent. You refuse heretic Paul VI’s new “mass” as you should but you insist on accepting his new “ordinations” of the same date to the office of celebrating it. You pretend that the new rite’s intention is to confer the priesthood, but you ignore that it redefines priesthood. Christ conferred Orders on the Apostles at the Last Supper when He **commanded** them to **do what He had done**—to sacrifice and Transubstantiate. This made them priests. Did it confer on them the power to forgive sins? If so why did He confer this power (again!) after the Resurrection? If it was necessary for Him to specify this power—to add it to the priesthood He had already established—why is it unnecessary for the bishop and in the rite of ordination? How is it unnecessary or implied in the climate of challenge that has prevailed since the Albigensians, the Lollards, the Reformation, all of which also challenged the power to sacrifice and its results (propitiation, Transubstantiation)? Why then is this power to forgive sins conferred specifically on the new breed bishop if not in admission that it was not conferred when he was ordained priest? The new rite deliberately omits both Jesus Christ’s own Scriptural specifications of the powers of the priesthood. Since both **were** specified in the rite and the innovators removed both it must be taken as certain that Christ’s (and the Church’s) intention has been intentionally removed.

The new priest is, furthermore, completely uneducated in the Church’s intentions. The new

ordination rite cannot give him the intention to receive what he fails to understand. He stands alone—no sponsors, no instructors, probably no bishop. For the new episcopal ordination is, if possible, even more useless.

The new “ordinations” violate the provisions of *Sacramentum Ordinis* as surely as the new “mess” violates *Quo Primum*. Aside from Canon 1261 (“It is the duty of the local Ordinaries to see that the precepts of the sacred canons concerning divine worship are faithfully observed and that neither into public nor into private worship nor into the private lives of the faithful any superstitious practices are introduced or anything admitted that is contrary to faith or discordant with ecclesiastical tradition or has the appearance of sordid profit-making.....”) and *Sacramentum Ordinis* no law specifically forbids bare form here possibly because no one is ever ordained in a time-exigency emergency situation and no one would dream of running risks in such important matters. No one legislates against non-existent crimes or situations.

The burden of proof rests entirely on the innovators whose maliciously destructive intentions in **breaking the laws** made to protect Mass and sacraments are not in the slightest doubt. These men, you agree, are heretics. So how is anyone a heretic in rejecting their heretical, illegal, illicit, invalid innovations?

Objection—If Christ’s words were necessary to confer the power of forgiving or retaining sins, all of St. Thomas’ confessions were invalid because he was absent on the recorded occasion.

Reply—The Gospels never pretend to record all Christ’s words or actions. Why would they record special conferral of powers on St. Thomas, who could also have received such powers from one of the Apostles present? Make no mistake—it **was** necessary verbally and specifically to confer these undreamed-of powers on the Apostles. Who would have accepted such if only implied—without Christ’s clear authority and responsibility?

Objection—According to my authority these words and their accompanying imposition of hands were not in the ordination ceremony for the first twelve centuries. So how are they now necessary?

Reply—**The Catholic Encyclopedia** agrees with your authority. So these words are not part of the **form** of Holy Orders. But they **do** confer a necessarily God-given power in Christ’s own words. They define certain priestly powers formerly assumed in the rite as part of the priestly office. Everyone knew what a priest was. Since Vatican II definition of the priesthood has changed. The new Eldering never mentions this power to forgive sin, “conferred” in the new episcopal “ordination” as a new power, proper to a bishop. What was the purpose of excluding priestly powers’ definition introduced to defend against Albigensians, Wyclifites, and other pre-Reformation heretics in these days of modernism the synthesis of all heresies? Agreement with heretical concepts? What is not affirmed is denied.

Objection—You quote Canon 817 to conclude that the *novus ordo* is invalid. This Canon does **not** say that it is invalid if either bread or wine is consecrated without the other.

Reply—But it **forbids** (*nefas* = wicked) such separation. Any violator displays utter contempt for the Church’s intention which is to offer Christ’s **sacrifice**. Sacrifice is signified in shedding the Blood from the Body. Consecration(?) of either Body or Blood alone cannot so signify therefore is not Mass nor part thereof. The Church’s intention, necessary to the Mass, cannot exist in a rite which omits or destroys one or other of the Consecrations. The *novus ordo* destroys **both** Consecrations by eliminating the **Action**, leaving only a Protestant-style narration imbedded in a rite defined as other than a Mass. No Mass, no Consecration! And the fact that you quote me to that effect from my own book should suffice to prove even to you that in 1979, right or wrong, I entertained no doubt whatsoever of the complete, intrinsic, never-failing invalidity of the *novus ordo missae*.

May I draw your attention also to the first line of my Preface: This book was written before Paul’s death. Only minor editing and a few references to his two antipope successors were added.

Objection—You implied that Pius XII’s change invalidates all ordinations after Nov. 28 1947.

Reply—Pius XII changed not a word of the ordination rite. He further forbade any change—in line with the preservation of tradition for sacramental security. The new “ordinations” violate Church

law and custom. What other purpose have they than sacramental insecurity and destruction? If ordination rites and definition of priesthood were unchanged by Pius XII, as I have stated, how have I implied that ordinations after *Sacramentum Ordinis* before the forbidden introduction of Montini's new rite are invalid?

Objection—You say: “Christ Himself elected Judas, and why may not His Church elect traitorous popes?” But in a sense Christ had to choose Judas to bring about His own betrayal and redemptive sacrifice.

Reply—That neither removed Judas' free will nor lessened his guilt. But in the same sense perhaps the Church, the Mystical Christ, must elect traitors to accomplish the Church's parallel betrayal, St. Paul's predicted apostasy. Indeed, I cannot see how else it can happen. Considering Catholics' tremendous, not to say blind, loyalty to their popes, it seems to me that popes must lead such an apostasy. Apostasy worthy of St. Paul's notice and prophecy must exceed the Arian heresy, the Moslem conquests, the Orthodox schism, the Reformation, and the charismatic movement. It must therefore be “better,” more convincingly led.

We often encounter the objection that Jesus Christ promised to be with His Church all days. The objector then sets the condition that it must be a visible Church. When we point out that we who hold the Catholic Faith in its entirety and practise it as publicly as possible are certainly visible, the condition is extended to a visible pope and hierarchy.

When a pope dies there ensues a period when there is no visible pope. Ordinarily this lasts mere weeks—the time required to elect a pope. But more than once we have been years without a visible head. Even more often we have suffered a superabundance of simultaneous visible heads, some of whose conflicting claims appeared reasonable to equally sincere, differing (usually doctrine was not involved) Catholics. On one momentous occasion—between Christ's death and resurrection—we had no visible head and no prospect of electing a successor. Nevertheless the Apostles knew what to believe. And we know the Catholic Faith. Who are we to set conditions under which we accept Eternal Truth?

We have had sixty-nine *interregna* of two months or more, forty-six of four months or more, thirty-one of six months or more, twenty-two of ten months or more, sixteen of a year or more, four over two years, one of two years nine months, and one of three years seven months. During all these extensive periods was there not a Catholic Church?

Objection—Why are you so concerned with loss of Apostolic Succession? You can always buy the services of the Liberal Catholics.

Reply—I hope we won't pay much, because their rites are worth about as much as the *novus ordo*, which appears to have been constructed in imitation of many Liberal Catholic practices and ideas. Leadbeater's “**The Science of the Sacraments**” demonstrated the impossibility of the proper intention, even if the rites could otherwise accomplish anything. Page 130: “It is clear therefore that the actual book of the Gospels can hardly be regarded as worthy of exaggerated respect, for there are unquestionably other volumes in which the Sacred Lore is set forth more accurately and far less allegorically. But the reverence with which we still continue to greet it is paid to it as a symbol. the book of the Gospels is the Christian presentation of the Ancient Wisdom, the Gnosis, the Truth that makes us free; it holds for us the same position as the Dharma, or Law of Life, does among the Buddhists. Therefore we pay it reverence, therefore we thank Christ for it, however imperfectly this especial manifestation of it may represent His teaching.”

Page 303: “Baptism by a deacon is less powerful than that by a priest, as he is not so fully connected with the Lord; that by a layman is still less effective, for he cannot draw upon the reservoir or attract the force through the Lord Christ in that special way The rite is intended to help, and does so with varying degrees of efficiency according to the means employed.”

Page 301: “We know that the body of man was gradually evolved from lower forms.”

Page 344: “It is obviously the will of God that as His people climb higher and higher up the ladder of evolution, and so learn to see Him more clearly and to comprehend His plan better, they should have the opportunity and the privilege of co-operating in this mighty and wonderful scheme of His.”

Page 77: “Sin is anything that is against the divine Will—that is, against the current of evolution.”

Page 81: “Auricular confession is entirely optional, and is not required as a preliminary to the reception of Holy Communion. Its frequent and systematic practice is not encouraged, since it is felt that under such conditions the detailed confession is apt to become a matter of routine, and its spiritual value in the life of the individual thereby defeated.”

Page 389: “The Orders of the Church of England are valid.”

Page 322: “I have often been asked whether we are willing to repeat the Sacrament of Confirmation for those who have received it from the Church of England. We do not, of course, insist upon it, for there is no actual necessity for this or any other Sacrament.”

Page 396: “In the Roman rite (consecration of a bishop) many more questions are asked with regard to belief, and in some of them the wording is so grossly material that it would scarcely be possible for one who understands the truth to answer them in the affirmative.”

Objection—There seems no remedy for the ecclesiastical situation you describe except revolution, which the circumstances appear to justify. But even though the Church government is totally corrupt, a revolution must be mounted by a group, recognizable as the Catholic Church, all in agreement. There must be an acknowledged leader, a man of such stature and eminence that all Catholics may safely follow.

Reply—You set us unnecessary, impossible conditions. Why should the truth be restricted? A Catholic is one who holds all the Church’s doctrines and traditions. He is one in belief and practice with the Holy Catholic Church of all times, professing the religion revealed by Jesus Christ through His Apostles. When he satisfies these conditions he is recognizably Catholic, whether or not recognized. You cannot de-Catholicize or fault him because so few agree with him or recognize his Catholicity. His first step toward fulfilling your conditions is to convert you. But if, eventually, he satisfies your requirements for just revolution he will be no more nor less Catholic than now when you deny him the right of revolting because most people refuse to see his point and he can’t induce a cardinal to lead him. If the circumstances justify revolution, and revolution is the sole means out of a hopeless situation, then he is entitled and bound to revolt. The Catholic Church itself began as a minuscule minority. It had the grace, power, and truth of its Founder and His mandate to propagate them. These are undiminished. We are not and never were alone, even though we have been reduced through the Reformation and masonic wars and revolutions to the same privation of religious rights that obtained before Constantine. There should be no need to revolt were there Catholic governments left to defend our rights—to intervene like Franz Josef in 1903, when he headed off Rampolla’s probable election to the papacy.

Objection—You preach the rights of truth. Is this not a bit abstract?

Reply—Isn’t that what Stalin asked—how many divisions has the pope? Let’s go back to Hebraic theology, as quoted in **The Catholic Encyclopedia**, Vol I, p 332: God’s being is fullness of goodness and truth, foremost among God’s moral attributes, the immediate outcome of His divine operations. For God is an infinitely pure Spirit. His being is Intellect and Will. Truth is the final object of intellect, and goodness of will. Of the two perfections truth ranks higher. Truth is the first of all perfections. The Hebrew word for truth, *Emeth*, is composed of three letters, *Aleph, Mem, Thaw*. *Emeth* begins with the first and ends with the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet. *Aleph*, according to the sages, denotes that God is the first of all things. There was no one before Him of whom He could have received the fullness of truth. *Thaw* signifies that God is the last of all things. There will be no one after Him to whom He could bequeath it. Thus *Emeth* is a sacred word expressing that in God truth dwells absolutely and in all plenitude. *Emeth*, as the Jewish divines truly say, is the mark of the essence of God.

It hardly seems far-fetched then to insist that truth has absolute rights over all. We can make practical application of this “abstract.” We can refuse obedience or any other form of recognition to the lie and to the liar. When we refuse to condemn the liar, the perjurer, the usurper, we grant him the recognition by which he continues his totally corrupt rule. Gandhi’s civil disobedience grew till it made British rule impossible in India. If ecclesiastical disobedience were to take hold we could drive the usurpers out of Rome. Unfortunately, most people that can’t stand all the change stay away from church. This is what the innovators intended. A far more effective tactic would be to

object loudly and at great length the moment something offends. We need not stand still for this erosion of our religion. We can wear down the innovators. Why should they be happy? We're not! Let us drive them further up the wall than they have tried to drive us. The gravity of undeniable charges may cause them to fall back to normalcy or even orthodoxy.

Objection—You may conscientiously agitate for the return of the traditional Mass. But you go too far when you attack the Holy Father. If we do not adhere to him we are in schism.

Reply—Are we not in schism if we refuse to adhere to Pope St. Pius V who supported the traditional Mass by unabrogated, unabrogable law? Non-adherence to Pope St. Pius X, who condemned the modernism rife in the Church's precincts, leaves us additionally in heresy, in the august company of the last five "popes" to whom you wish us to adhere. The last three, furthermore, have put upon us rites of sacrilege and idolatry. If we will not oppose them, if we allow them the name of **Catholic** or **pope**, even while refusing their rites we condone them—we associate ourselves with these impostors and adhere to their schism, heresy, sacrilege, and idolatry. It makes little difference if we preserve a fiction; to avoid facts is not to avoid schism, but rather to plunge us into schism and worse. It is no part of our Faith to uphold a pope when he errs, even less to insist that a public heretic is or can be pope simply because he is elected. Nor is it essential dogma that his election was legal, proper, or possible. Indeed the opposing propositions are obvious.

Objection—Are not Mass and Sacraments more important than opinions of the priest or bishop? Must we not give God His due, no matter what the priest thinks?

Reply—What the priest or bishop believes determines whether he is Catholic. Heretics cannot act for the Church.

"..... St. Theodore of Studium (759-826) says (1) the eucharistic bread of heretics is heretical, (2) that it is not the Body of Christ. Or (1) it is such that the eating of it is a communication with heresy, and (2) **it is not received as the Victim of the Saving Sacrifice unto eternal life**. Indeed, for those who communicate with the food of heresy it is the food of death; and just such as the food is, such, too, will be the condition and the eternal lot of the partakers. This is strengthened by another epistle written to a person forced by violence to the communion of heretics.: 'What a calamity! What shall we say of this abduction of the unwilling?! What of this forced partaking of communion under a threat of bodily harm by one who is unwilling to partake of **heterodox bread**? The Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ **is a voluntary sacrifice** (O most Christian thought!). it is given voluntarily to the willing not to the unwilling For in his Epistle Peter says: **Feed the flock, not by constraint but willingly**. Hence those who violently force the unwilling to their communion must know that in doing so they act like the Gentiles, **not offering them the body of the Lord which is freely offered**, but, on the contrary, what has the appearance (because it has the appearance of what is forced) of what is sacrificed in libations in which honor is **reluctantly** given to the devil' (Ep. I, 12, 136. P.G. 99, 1436)."

So according to this heavily persecuted monk, whoever attends the mass of a heretic not only apostatizes but comes as well under suspicion of idolatry. What is the insurance premium? **BOYCOTT!**

Objection—Our priest celebrates the true Mass but will not hear confessions for lack of jurisdiction. He sends us to an old *novus ordo* priest and tells us to ask for absolution in Latin.

Reply—Your priest may think he has reason to refrain from hearing confessions, especially if he thinks you **can** get to confession. But we can resort to heretics or schismatics for sacraments only *in extremis*, only when our own are unavailable. A *novus ordo* priest is a public heretic; by canon law he can have no jurisdiction. Every bishop in Australia, Great Britain, and the U.S.A. is a public heretic who can have no jurisdiction to confer or withdraw faculties. A priest **must not** send anyone to a *novus ordo* priest. In the event that Catholics have no other recourse he **must** assume jurisdiction under Canon 209 for the salvation of souls. According to Tertullian (*De Baptismate*, VII), "He will be guilty of the loss of a soul, if he neglects to confer what he freely can." He referred here to laymen who have the opportunity to baptize in emergency. I can see no essential difference; the same principle applies.

Faculties go with the job. What use is the power to forgive or retain sins if it can't be used? They are withheld after ordination long enough for the priest to know where he gets them. But they cannot be arbitrarily withdrawn without good reason (such as sacrilegious abuse, insanity, or breaking the seal of the confessional). A priest out of his own bishop's jurisdiction could always secure the local bishop's authorization, usually by telephone from his chancery office. So why ask a heretic for what bishops cannot reasonably refuse?

Your priest appears inconsistent. He will not permit his bishop to prevent his celebration of the true Mass, but he defers to a bishop in the lesser matter of jurisdiction. He ignores *here* the episcopal authority to which he bows *there*. Yet by divine and ecclesiastical law there is no current episcopal authority.

Objection—We needed Mass in the vernacular so we could understand it.

Reply—All instructed Catholics understood that the Mass is Christ's Sacrifice of propitiation and redemption. Hundreds of cheap prayerbooks provided a translation of the Ordinary of the Mass. Only the lazy, uninterested, or illiterate could not understand the words. Is it essential to validity or effect that we understand the words? Why not the Mass itself in all its unfathomable mystery? And the machinery of its operation? How it presents Last Supper, Crucifixion, and Resurrection, and applies Christ's merits to sinners? Its essential connection with the Blessed Trinity and Incarnation? All these, you imply, we must understand. Has the vernacular cleared them up for you?

Objection—You want Lefebvre to condemn Vatican II as heretical and its popes as heretics. This would require him to set himself up as pope.

Reply—Did St. Athanasius, St. Bernard, St. Norbert, or Fathers Noel Barbara, Saenz y Arriaga, or Georges de Nantes set themselves up as popes? It is every bishop's Catholic duty to condemn Vatican II and its heretic "popes." Are all these bishops thereby required to set themselves up as popes?

Paul VI almost completely destroyed the Catholic Church. No one could have done this innocently or by mistake. This sweeping, chaotic "autodemolition" is so evidently deliberate, planned, and malicious in both content and method that its origin is clearly satanic. How shall Satan's kingdom stand divided? Every form of Satanism is involved. Whether the chief contributors are Illuminati, monopolists, communists, Freemasons, Talmudic Jewry, the world government crowd, or any combination of these overlapping groups makes little difference. And such is the climate that unmasking the last four usurpers as **Freemasons** would have little impact on the ordinary "Catholic," who would probably say that if the pope is a Freemason there can be nothing wrong with freemasonry. Just as he would dismiss us as bigots for referring to their ancestry.

We must keep in mind that our generation had become so lax that we deserved this punishment and that our salvation depends on how we react to a test that rivals Job's. We had it too easy—no test, no reward. The world has gone crazy—it has blown out its own brains and hardened its own heart. Satan and his plotters have corrupted it, but hardly unaided.

Objection (clerical)—Agreed, Montini was no good, the *novus ordo* is not Mass, Vatican II was a disaster planned by men out to make over the Church—a new Church—whether or not they realized it meant destruction of the old. Most bishops were hicks from the sticks, tricked into signing the documents. These, except for some of the stuff on religious liberty and ecumenism, were "time bombs" rather than clear heresy. The central factor, modernism, is hard to pin down. Vatican II did not claim to define, being "pastoral" and practical. Later the thugs made it more binding than Nicaea, Ephesus, and Trent. JP2 at least says that Vatican II's documents must be read in the light of former councils.

Reply—Attempts to read Vatican II's documents in the light of Trent, Nicaea, or Holy Scripture, or any other attempt to read heresy in the light of orthodoxy, can lead only to denunciation and condemnation. Modernism, however hard to pin down, is easily recognized in its shifting definitions, its loose terminology, its imprecise, ungraspable thought, and its foggy double-talk. Our doctrines are clear; we need not stand for their obfuscation. Documents that read like soft-headed,

mealy-mouthed sermons should attract immediate suspicion from instructed Catholics, even bishops.

Objection—I have a poor opinion of JP2's reign so far, but I can't prove him a heretic or a traitor. But you say "When ineligibles claim the papacy they must prove themselves eligible," which is begging the question. When a pope is elected by due process (and don't yell that all the cardinals were heretics) you have to disprove his claim, not vice versa. "We need not prove the obvious." That's an easy way to dispose of the question.

Reply—Due process cannot elect heretics. The first requirement for the papacy is membership in the Catholic Church. Obviously, most cardinals, including those recently elected to the papacy by your "due process," signed Vatican II's documents, which contain previously condemned heresies. Even the non-signers have not publicly condemned them; they condone heresy and permit its continuing substitution for the orthodoxy it contradicts. They all continue to support the suppression of the Mass instituted by Jesus Christ and its replacement by that *novus ordo* which you agree is not Mass. Most cardinals permitted to vote by the new modernist laws were created by John XXIII and Paul VI, who would waste little time appointing men who disagreed with their own modernist approach. (What are **your** chances of being appointed bishop?) Still, it **is** the simple, easy way to dispose of the question. Why look for a harder? Why arbitrarily rule out the obvious solution of the problem? JP2's claim is disproved by his public heresy, which removes his eligibility.

Objection—There are many staunch believers in traditional doctrine to whom this is not obvious. We feel bound to accept JP2. I felt so about Montini, even knowing him a disaster. We can rarely reach certainty about things so complex. What defense to faith have I? Only the faith I was taught, mainly by my mother and the nuns at school. The faith does not solve the complexities of current history.

Reply—Nor does seminary training, apparently. History, of course, presented no complexities till our day. Somehow all the great heresies were laid low, usually in the end by the very simple demonstration that they opposed the doctrine of Jesus Christ and His Apostles. The very fact that modernism proposes them all again ("the synthesis of all heresies") should simplify arrival at rejection both of its doctrines and of those who promulgated and continue to stand behind them. **If the situation is insoluble through application of Christ's doctrine, then that doctrine is at fault; He has not given us sufficient grounds for our faith.** But not only His grace but His doctrine is sufficient for us. Complexity is in your mind. "Unless you become as little children you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven." To a child things are simple—black or white, right or wrong—and cannot be complicated by shades of grey or possible extenuation.

Objection—Most priests who try to preach in depth on the Trinity, Incarnation, etc. fall into a bit of error now and then. They are not heretics. The issue is more serious here, but so are the catastrophic consequences of your conclusion. For you the papacy itself would be finished. You have deposed the last 3-4 popes. The Gates of Hell must have prevailed. If you were right we must admit that Christ's promises to Peter and the Church have failed, and go into the outer darkness.

Reply—Since John XXIII opened the windows the outer darkness has entered. We have deposed no one; we merely call attention to basic principles by which it is impossible that these men were or are popes. If they are not popes they come under no guarantees to Peter; they are not his successors. Your conclusion denies facts, complex or not, of history: antipopes, interregna, and the Church's survival through these. It affirms the absurdity that the Holy Ghost guides these last four usurping heretics in countless contradictions of their predecessors who must have been guided by the Holy Ghost. If they were or were not, how are these four so guided? These four have contradicted their infallible predecessors in faith and morals. They are therefore not infallible in these fields, and so are not popes. They cannot speak to us for the Holy Ghost unless He has taken up self-contradiction.

Christ said He would be with His Church all days after commanding His Church to preach His Gospel in its entirety to all nations. Here, in a nutshell, are the Four Marks—**One, Holy** Gospel preached (**Apostolic**) to all nations and ages (**Catholic**)—by which His Church is recognized. Will

Christ recognize His Church by its declarations on religious freedom, or its willingness to listen to error, to dialogue with atheism, instead of its efforts to wipe these out? Will He recognize it by its several sets of doctrines to suit each generation, each stage of civilization? Will He commend it for ecumenism, the death of its Apostolic purpose? This new “Church”—even if recognizable—no longer obeys Him, carries out His mandate, His assistance for which, said Challoner, is the purpose of His promise. Why must He be with **it** all days? Are you a better judge than He whether He has kept His promises? Have you never preached that God never deserts us; we desert Him?

The Church is not better than Christ, that it should have greater privileges and exemptions. Could the eternal God desert the equally divine, eternal Second Person of the Blessed Trinity? Yet Christ was made subject to the power of evil and killed. In the process He cried out: “My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?” Why should His Church escape this **feeling** of utter desolation, which, it seems to me, must descend upon **some** generation, probably very close to the end. Are we to get off scot-free? Are we better than all those martyrs? More privileged than Christ Himself? Why must our faith depend on the existence right up to the end of a properly filled papacy? Faith in St. Paul’s prediction of a great apostasy would seem to preclude the possibility. What Catholic wishes to apostatize—to embrace damnation? We must be led into it by those whom we will follow.

We were trained in the Faith; we should know it. Obviously those who contradict the Faith do not belong to it. Christ is not with **them** all days, but with those who continue to preach the Faith in its entirety unchanged, who therefore clearly belong to it—no matter if the devil himself straddles the papal throne.

Objection—This is fine for you—convinced you’re right. But what of the people you influence? Will you be responsible for them?

Reply—We have subscribers, not necessarily followers. Most subscribe because, also trained in the Catholic Faith, they agree with us. This publication began at the request of former Latin Mass Society members when that organization’s policy and newsletter changed to avoid trouble with the *novus ordo* apostates. Our purpose is to furnish ammunition to the warrior, to maintain argument to refute the innovator, modernist, liar, and heretic—to give reason for the faith that is in us, no thanks to us but to Jesus Christ Who gave it to us. Are we to trust Him and His eternal truth, or men who try to change it hourly while they insult our eyes and ears telling us that nothing is changed? If we considered ourselves not responsible for others we would cease publication immediately.

Objection (teacher)—I attend the (new) mass in my parish church. I would not go to the traditional Mass. Christ said to Peter: “What you shall bind on earth is bound also in heaven, and what you shall loose on earth is loosed also in heaven.”

Reply—But the Mass, like the Sacraments, was instituted by Christ, not by Peter. And what is bound or loosed by popes cannot involve heaven in its countermanding by antipopes and usurpers.

Objection—You may go to the old Mass if you like. I would not presume to criticize you. But you have no right to criticize me. That is God’s prerogative.

Reply—Would you grant parental rights to punish or correct an erring child? How is he to be trained or taught? When he tells me that all bishops and priests teach the contrary can I avoid criticism of those priests and bishops? Can I say they are mistaken without imputing them ignorance or guilt? Can I prove their teachings lies without proving them liars? If he comes home from school with the basic mathematical function that $2 + 2 = 3$, some criticism, some exercise of the human faculty of judgment is called for—criticism of the teacher, textbook, **and** student himself for stupidity. If I wait for God to perform my God-given duty my child will grow into an ignoramus, an agnostic, a gullible fool who can neither discern, nor criticize, nor exercise his own judgment.

Objection—But I must obey the constituted authority or I may not be saved. I am as Catholic as you.

Reply—Salvation is the same as ever. Can its requirements be changed? Suppose you take the field with your cricket eleven. As the bowler starts his run to deliver the ball the umpire stops him and forces him to place one foot on a plate to stand and deliver. The wicket and stumps vanish.

Two men are chased off the field. Foul lines are laid out. The batter steps up to home plate and is given only three chances to hit the ball. When he hits he begins to circle three bases ninety feet apart. He cannot score a run till he returns to home plate. When the rules change is the game still cricket? Does it run three days or two hours? Is the object a string of centuries or five runs? These changes have obviously made it a whole new ball game. You can't win at cricket playing baseball rules, even at the umpire's request or command.

We had a religion prescribed by the Triune God through Jesus Christ, the Blessed Trinity's Second Person incarnate, Who offered His own salvific sacrificial immolation on Calvary and commanded us to do likewise in our universal worship, thus replacing the non-salvific, insufficient Old Testament sacrifices—fruits of earth and work of human hands—to **one** God, not yet specifically revealed as the Divine Trinity. The Mass was a whole new sacrifice, according to new, humanly unimaginable rules. Can we say (even should we grant the umpire power to change the rules) that when he reinstates the old rules, when instead of Christ's Body and Blood he has us offer the old fruits of earth and work of human hands to the Father Who alone is God, that this is a mere non-essential change—that we still offer Mass? We have obviously returned to Old Testament Judaism—to the time of preparation. For What? When we are joined with all men in the search for truth—the truth that Christ came to teach us—how are we His followers? Have we not rejected His Gospel on grounds of inadequacy and insufficiency? Have we not postulated mankind's superior intelligence that will discover greater, more salvific truth, presumably from deeper wells and more authoritative sources? How is **this** Catholicism? Is it not proclamation that the Blessed Trinity is a committee of liars?

Objection—I heard that you sometimes attend the *novus ordo*.

Reply—For what? Idolatry? Luckily I am on record in the November 1975 issue of The Latin Mass Society of Australia Newsletter, which I edited; no one changed a word of my response to a request for my position:

I must utterly reject the *novus ordo* promulgated by Paul VI April 3, 1969 because: It violates St. Pius V's infallible application of the Church law, *Quo primum*.

It was imposed to replace the ancient, official, nearly universal Tridentine Mass, by the wish and hope of Paul VI in "obedience" not owed to a pastoral council which ordered no new rite.

It was invented nineteen centuries too late to be in the tradition of the Church by a group containing six Protestant clergymen, who could not have intended a Mass—they are Protestant precisely because they cannot believe in the Mass.

Our Offertory, which offered our only sacrifice, the Body and Blood of Christ on Calvary, is replaced by a Jewish Passover rite offering ourselves and the work of our hands, which was never done by the Church, and was, moreover, specifically ruled out from the first.

The Consecration, the effective prayer of the Mass, effected by the words of Christ as attested by every rite of the Church from the most ancient times, has been replaced by a narrative which misquotes Christ and changes His meaning as understood by all ages of the Church.

The priest's Communion has been merged into the distribution of communion to the people, never before required for a Mass.

Those who say the essentials remain cannot consider the three principal parts of the Mass essential to the Mass. But without them there is no Mass. Canon Law 817 forbids consecration of one species without the other, or of both *outside* a Mass.

It is clearly beyond the power of any office, even the papacy, either to forbid a true Mass or to replace a tradition of the Church with an innovation. The Church, as several popes and councils declared, has no power over the substance of the sacraments.

The *novus ordo* contains no prayer or doctrine so phrased that Protestants could not use it in conscience. It contains, moreover, features highly objectionable to Catholics—ambiguity, heresy, irreverence, blasphemy, sacrilege.

Since we already had a perfect Mass there is no need for a new one, and there is no authority which can retain or maintain legitimacy while ordering the end of the true Mass or the start of the new hash.

It is beyond the power of the Church to teach me, or to command me to accept, anything new,

since the Church was doctrinally perfect and complete from the hand of Christ. If I am now taught some new thing necessary for my salvation, how can any previous Catholics have been saved? Why did Christ withhold it from them?

I believe in the Communion of Saints, and I must belong to it—I must believe and worship as all previous generations of the Church did. The only one I can imagine that would try to deprive me of this necessary continuity is the devil, whom I am commanded to resist.

If I assist at a *novus ordo* I condone heresy, blasphemy, and sacrilege, and not only can I not fulfil my Sunday obligation, but if I adore at its “consecration” I **commit idolatry**.

(This statement continued more than twice this length, and treated most of the sacraments as modified by the Renewal. It ended):

I cannot ignore the obvious interconnection of all these unwarranted, unnecessary changes. I cannot ignore their common dependence on a council called to make changes in the Church. I cannot ignore their common schism from the tradition of the Church. I cannot ignore that a new “priesthood,” new “sacraments,” and a new “mass” must add up to a new religion. As with all the new religions of the Reformation, it is chronologically impossible for **this** new religion to have any direct connection with Christ and the religion He founded while on earth. I must therefore reject it, and must deny as well both the authority and the Catholicity of those who would impose it.

Objection—Denunciation as a non-Pope of one who occupies St. Peter’s throne has almost no precedent.

Reply—Almost? Anacletus II? Denounced by Sts. Bernard and Norbert? Why is precedent required? The final apostasy, prophesied infallibly by St. Paul in II Thessalonians, **must** come with no complete precedent. This cannot be the end because the end never came before?

Objection—Your denunciation appears to us as challenging the evidence.

Reply—The evidence proves that Paul VI and nearly all bishops at Vatican II promulgated condemned heresies as Catholic doctrine as publicly as possible.

Objection—One cannot quote canon law or doctrine of the Supreme Magisterium as Protestants manipulate Biblical quotations.

Reply—When we advance proven facts (Vatican II’s heresies) and cite applicable canons (188 & 2314), which in turn depend on incontrovertible fact (a heretic is not a Catholic—by definition) where is the manipulation? We can’t help it if the argument is too simple—too unanswerable.

Objection—There are points in which we neither had a definition endowed with infallibility, nor a single non-infallible text of the Ordinary Magisterium, nor the unanimous consent of the good theologians.

Reply—On what possible undefined subject can one obtain unanimous consent of theologians? What is your concept of canon laws such as 188 and 2314? Or of the earlier law, *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, which they embody and to which they must conform, in whose light they must be read, as the 1918 Code itself states (Canons 6 & 23)? Has canon law no connection with the Magisterium?

Objection—The sedevacantists do not teach from a *cathedra* of Authority. They have the right neither to expect immediate agreement nor to accuse dissenters without profound explanation of their position.

Reply—You have been furnished six foolscap pages of facts. You sidestep with authority and profundity, both irrelevant.

Objection—An heretical pope falls from the Roman See only when his heresy becomes notorious and publicly divulged. How does that apply to JP2

Reply—He was never pope because public heretics are ineligible. He voted for the same heresies which Paul VI promulgated. He played a major part in preparation of one of the council’s modernist documents, *Gaudium et spes*, in which at least three condemned heresies clearly appear. But suppose this were not enough to make him ineligible and there were some real Catholics in the Conclave to elect him, how long could he retain office after proclaiming his adherence and commitment to Vatican II and its reforms? Where are our Mass and sacraments except under his

continued prohibition in favor of heretical, idolatrous substitutes? Who is permitted to ignore Christ's command, "By their fruits you **shall** know them," even taken only as guideline or advice? Our perfect, therefore unchangeable, Creator-Redeemer-Sanctifier revealed **His** salvation on **His** terms. We must accept it whole and entire on **His** authority. He gave it to men to preach and to apply to all times, places, situations, and circumstances—not to modify to suit any of these. Any such modification implies improvement on our perfect, unchangeable God, as well as His lack of knowledge of His own creations, human nature and time itself. Men desert God—cut themselves off from His means of salvation. But it is inconceivable that He change the requirements. He established His Church and its visible head to preserve what He gave us, to explain, expound, and administer the deposit, **not** to change its chief purposes, worship and unity in belief, upon which our salvation depends (Mark xvi, 16). I must belong to, as well as believe in, the Communion of Saints, embracing all times and places. And so must the pope (our standard of belief and unity) and the entire Church. No pope, no council can correct Jesus Christ. When they **try** they leave the Communion of Saints—they no longer believe or worship as all other ages of the Church. Whoever they claim to be, they cannot belong to the Catholic Church, and must be conceded neither influence nor jurisdiction therein. They far exceed the competence of genuine popes and councils. Whoever grants them these excessive powers, or even treats them as genuine where they appear not to have exceeded the legitimate powers of legitimate popes and councils, joins them in heresy, rebellion, apostasy, and idolatry.

Catholics **cannot** be reduced to selecting areas in which they may obey or disobey a pope in spiritual matters. The nature of our religion requires its entire acceptance in faith, on God's authority—which cannot contradict itself. A pope cannot be a heretic, I am told. But only because a heretic cannot be pope; not being a member of the Church he cannot be its head. Should a genuine pope fall into public heresy he would automatically lose all office, right, and jurisdiction, without procedure beyond demonstration of his public heresy. It makes no difference how many priests, bishops, cardinals, and patriarchs continue to adhere to him—they adhere as well to his heresy and exclude themselves also from the Communion of Saints and all its graces. The Church has publicly condemned as heretical almost every tenet and practice introduced during and since Vatican II. No further statement or trial is needed. No consensus need be sought. The bare facts need only recognition.

And they point directly to another fact: No heretic's "official" action can be accepted by the Catholic Church and/or its members—no change in law, doctrine, practice, no appointments or promotions, no demotions, forced retirements, removal of faculties, no novelties—not even those which could be conceivably accepted at the hands of a genuine pope or council.

Like so many traditionalists, both clerical and lay, your organization selects essential areas in which it obeys or disobeys the usurping antipopes and their publicly heretical council, because it will not proceed to rational conclusions from inescapable facts.

Objection—John Paul II occupies St. Peter's throne. If we attack him we promote anarchy and lose most of our support against communism.

Reply—Shall we then ignore the present anarchy in the Church? Would you accept the parallel argument that no Russian should oppose his communist government because it replaces the Czar? Is occupation always legitimate? Do you not demonstrate communism's false principles and point to its fruits? Are such arguments logical against communists but useless against antipopes?

Surely you knew of Montini's collusion with communists dating back to Pius XII's time? And of Wojtyla's major role in Vatican II's incredible failure to examine one of the greatest religious problems of its time, and to reprobate it? And of the successful efforts of both antipopes to destroy legitimate governments particularly in Latin America and southern Africa?

Objection—A Church without the seven sacraments and Holy Mass would not be the Catholic Church. It would be a Protestant sect.

Reply—Deprived of our Mass and sacraments, like most of our generation, we automatically become Protestants? A "Church" which no longer provides Mass and sacraments is not the Catholic Church. But why Protestant? Why not Jewish, masonic, pagan, demonic?

Objection—Where Luther succeeded the Church lost the Holy Mass and five or six sacraments. What would be the difference between Luther’s Church and this new Church with only two sacraments?

Reply—No, the Church lost nothing. The **defectors** lost the Mass and sacraments. In postconciliar times new defectors, in control of the Church’s functions, have deprived nearly all Catholics of the ordinary means of grace. We have not chosen, even under duress, to forsake them. Should some great plague of moths eat all our clothes we might be denuded, but not necessarily nudists. To the great majority of Catholics only two sacraments are available; apostates control use of the other five, and have removed and replaced all seven.

Objection—Laymen have no mission to preach and teach the Gospel in the name of the Church. They may not, under canon law, undertake public disputation or conferences with non-Catholics without permission of the Holy See or, in urgent cases, without permission of the local Ordinary

Reply—Nor should we be required to defend the Church’s known doctrine and practice would our clergy and hierarchy fulfil their obligations. They pressed us, all our lives, to convert our friends, acquaintances, and relatives. We were fed the lay apostolate and such active organizations as the Catholic Evidence Guild and the Legion of Mary. We were made responsible to instruct our children. So far as we can determine, every Catholic **must** spread the faith according to his talents, capabilities, and opportunities. Our Church is a missionary Church; when no one preaches it, it will be dead indeed. Is it your position that when we dispute with **you** we violate the law that governs public disputation with non-Catholics? Is it your position that **we** may not **talk** or **write** without permission from the Holy See or the local Ordinary, but **you** may **celebrate Mass** or **hear confessions** without such permissions, or that Lefebvre or Thuc may operate outside the laws and against the Holy See’s wishes and commands?

To whom shall we apply for permission to defend our faith against our persecuting bishops and priests, who should lead the defense? To whom do you, Lefebvre, and Thuc apply for far more serious dispensations? When so many “traditional” priests tend to go haring off after new bishops(?)—who, if they have a mission from the Church, are singularly unable to prove it—because apparently these priests cannot stand against the postconciliar hot air and bluff aided and supported by only the faith and the canon law, but feel the need of questionable backing, what happens to the Catholic Church if it **cannot** exist without hierarchy or clergy? As the Japanese proved, the Church existed publicly enough **in Japan** without hierarchy or clergy for over two centuries that Theodore Roosevelt took steps to stop its active, traditional, governmental persecution. The Church, then, needs no man and no office as an essential condition of its existence. “Where the pope is,” we are often patronizingly told, “there is the Church.” First we must have a pope. So the Church has been dead since 1958? “Where the **faith** is,” said St. Jerome, “there is the Church.” The Church exists on earth while one live Catholic holds the faith, whether or not he can practise it. He is obliged to hold the faith; he is obliged to practise it **if possible**. He is under no obligation to seek out men or methods that violate canon law, or are in any other way questionable or doubtful. When the risk involved is apostasy, idolatry, schism, or heresy the risk can never be justified.

Had you stated that laymen have no **authority** in the Church, you might have had an argument. Even then, however, nothing prevents or forbids us **quoting** genuine authority.

Objection—You say only faith and Baptism are really necessary.

Reply—Yes, in the absence of the ordinary means. One cannot make his Easter duty, for instance, or receive the last rites, in the complete absence of Catholic priests. When something becomes physically impossible it no longer obliges. We have no control over the loss of our Mass and sacraments. So we fall back on our merciful Authority: “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned” (Mark xvi, 16). One can then be condemned for not believing in the apostasy foretold in II Thess. ii, part of the inspired word of God, which seems to cover such circumstances as ours.

Objection—Although JP2 may not be pope, I pray for him as pope in the Canon of the Mass. I am not empowered to judge the issue. I cannot preach from the pulpit that JP2 is not truly pope. Souls

could be scandalized. [Lefebvre priest(?)]

Reply—On the question whether JP2 is a real or false pope, a priest is not only empowered but obliged to make up his mind. A priest has adequate knowledge of the conditions and qualifications required to make an authentic pope. He is obliged to make a decision, because both he himself and his people need to know, with clarity and certainty, which religion has his allegiance: Catholicism or the new Vatican II/JP2 religion. No one can embrace both.

In inserting “JP2” in the Canon of the Mass, a priest is clearly making a decision about JP2’s status. Souls might be scandalized if he spoke openly of JP2 as the Nope? That possibility does not of itself justify silence in the pulpit. St. Gregory wrote: “Better that scandal be given than that truth be concealed.” We are, however, after the great Vatican II Apostasy, in a frightfully abnormal and bewildering crisis, and a priest might well have to be gentle, gradual, prudently economical, with the truth. If a priest fears alienating souls, let his rule be: Do what is done at Downham Market and its Mass centres. Simply put the facts—doctrinal, scriptural, historical, canonical—to the people, that they may ascertain the truth for themselves. [from Father Oswald Baker, who adds parenthetically: Modesty of course precludes the observation that Downham Market-trained souls are so thoroughly instructed, so fully informed, so firmly kept on the paths of truth and virtue, that they have a decided advantage in being able quickly and unfailingly to form correct conclusions.]

“A priest,” writes Father Baker, “has adequate knowledge.” A **Lefebvre** priest?!

Objection—A friend says: (1) it is a fallacious argument that false popes occupy the Holy See; (2) Paul VI ended the papacy; (3) the end of the papacy effected the end of the Mass. So **what** is JP2? Paul VI ended the papacy before JP2, who therefore cannot be a real pope, but neither can he be a false pope. Is my reason faulty because my friend’s position seems unreasonable? Or is his position really unreasonable? Or have we a mystery beyond reason?

A man **is** or **is not** pope. If there is no papacy can there be an occupant? If there could be an occupant is he pope? True? False? Material?

A cow is with or without calf—pregnant or not. Can it be in between—materially pregnant, let’s call it? Can the material calf be born or aborted? **What is** it?

Reply—The Mass is of the **Church**, not the pope. Abolition of the papacy could have no effect on the Mass, which could continue even in absence of the Church, as is acknowledged in assuming validity of schismatics’ Masses and sacraments. Mass continues even in the postconciliar “Church”—in the various Oriental rites subjected to minimal if any change.

What **is** JP2? We have established (TWIN! #24, pp 11-12) that there can be no merely material pope or anything else. Father Baker may have the solution—a Nope. But you have come close—a cow’s phantom abortion!

Objection—To say that the Vatican II popes were not validly elected implies that, contrary to the divine promise of protection from error, the papal office has become a very fountainhead of error.

Reply—On the contrary, it denies that all this error which appears to come from the papacy is papal in origin. For its originators and promulgators are not popes, even though they appear to be, because they have proven themselves apostates and heretics by their published words and actions. Doctrinal error cannot issue from genuine popes, because they are infallible in matters of faith and morals. The Vatican II “popes” certainly taught error both before and since their “elections,” not only informally but formally in the documents of Vatican II itself, which Paul VI promulgated over his “papal” signature and his successors had signed beforehand. They made further implementation of this heretical council the chief aim of their “papacies.” No genuine pope could fall by accident into such heresy and apostasy. But these men committed these crimes, deliberately severing themselves by law and by absurdity from the Church to which Christ had made His promise.

Objection—The “popes invalid” argument implies that, contrary to the essential message of St. John’s Apocalypse, Christ is not entirely in control.

Reply—This is to say that Christ was not entirely in control during the temporary triumph of Arianism, of Islam, of the Reformation, and of Caiaphas and his Sanhedrin. What God permits is no argument against His control. St. Paul’s predicted operation of error could well include the general belief that apostates and public heretics are or can be popes. Some proceed from facts to

unjustifiable assumptions or usurpations of authority. But no criminal intent attaches to mere recognition of fact. We cannot maintain that we have a pope when the “pope” obviously is not Catholic. This fact cannot excuse Catholics from continuing to believe, and to practise as far as legitimately possible, exactly what the Catholic Church taught them.

PERFECT CONTRITION IN THEORY AND PRACTICE,
Franciscan House of Studies, Killiney, Co. Dublin Feb. 15, 1951 (excerpts)

I love them that love me and they that in the morning early watch for me shall find me. — Proverbs viii, 17

Origen — Lev. hom 2, n 4 lists means to obtain remission of sins: martyrdom, almsgiving, forgiving those who trespass against us, conversion of a sinner (James v,20: he who causeth a sinner to be converted from the error of his way, shall save his soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins.), through abundance of charity (Lk. viii,47: Many sins are forgiven her, because she hath loved much.), and finally “hard laborious remission of sins through penance, when the sinner washes his bed with tears and they become his bread day and night, and when he blushes not to reveal his sin to the priest of the Lord and to beg healing.”

St. Ambrose — (In Ps 118. sermo 15 n. 39): “Charity destroys guilt and all sins.”

St. John Chrysostom — (In 2Tim., hom 7n): “For as fire invading a forest usually burns all; so whithersoever the fervor of love may have arrived, it removes and destroys all things which can damage the divine seed, and cleans the ground for receiving the seeds. Where love is, all evils have been borne.”

Theologians disagree on whether religion, justice, obedience, gratitude constitute motives of perfect contrition. They probably do, according to Suarez, Aversa, Logo, Brancatus, Mastrino, etc. Such contrition is sorrow for sin “for God’s own sake,” hence strictly speaking for God’s own good. It looks to the good that is due God, and evil is hated as not being His due. Contrition, then, from these motives is sorrow because sin is an offence against God and an injury to Him. Whatever be the value of this opinion, it must certainly be granted that if, besides these motives, the reason for detesting sin is the excellence of God Who has been denied obedience, worship, etc., or Who has been injured, then the contrition will be perfect. — (Conc. Trid sess xiv, cap 4 & Canon 5—Denz 898, 915)

Objection—TWIN! #33 mentioned perfect contrition. I deem it rare, and hard to attain, especially for the unemotional.

Reply—Perfect contrition can be hard to achieve in assassination of international bankers, communist dictators, or antipopes—possibly justified as self-defense. But one living in or widowed from an invalid marriage may have no regrets whatsoever. What is required is recognition of the sinful nature of the offense against God, not necessarily great emotional reaction. Sorrow, like love, can be in the mind without seeming to involve the heart. Nor does perfect contrition come naturally. It is a great grace, and, like other graces, must be sought.

Pray for it.

In our increasingly materialistic society it seldom occurs to us that we are not alone, that we can rely on untapped resources to understand and solve our problems. We have forgotten “Without Me you can do nothing” (John xv,5).

God promised that whatever we ask of Him He will grant, if for our good. “Ask, and it shall be given you: seek, and you shall find: knock, and it shall be opened to you. For every one that asketh, receiveth: and he that seeketh, findeth: and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened.” (Matt. vii,7-8) Again I say to you, that if two of you shall consent upon earth, concerning anything whatsoever they shall ask, it shall be done to them by My Father Who is in heaven.” (Matt. xviii,19)

“And all things whatsoever you shall ask in prayer, believing, you shall receive.” (Matt. xxi,22)

“Whatsoever you shall ask the Father in My name, that will I do: that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If you shall ask me anything in My name, that I will do.” (John xiv,13-14)

“Amen, amen, I say to you: if you ask the Father anything in My name, He will give it you.

Hitherto you have not asked anything in My name. Ask, and you shall receive, that your joy may be full.” (John xvi,23-24)

Pray constantly! “For the continual prayer of a just man availeth much.” (James v,16)

In addition to this constant prayer for the graces of perfect contrition, perseverance, and fear of the Lord, I recommend St. Alphonsus Liguori’s Stations of the Cross, and the Fifteen O’s of St. Bridget. These will contribute mightily to the proper frame of mind. At the very least, they will present enough reason for that perfect contrition for which we pray. And we shall need it; who can guarantee us the last rites?

Objection—The Orthodox **can** truly engender a life of grace through Mass and sacraments, the same channels as the Catholic Church; therefore Vatican II may not be charged with error or heresy on the point.

Reply—The Mass and the seven sacraments of the New Law, instituted and operated by Jesus Christ and left in His Church's custody for regulation and administration, operate and channel grace only through the Catholic Church. The Orthodox took along **our** Mass and sacraments when they left. Any life of grace engendered through them cannot be ascribed or credited to the schism or heresy which kidnapped them, but only to the proper owner, the Catholic Church.

The Church was commissioned to preach the Gospel in its entirety, especially to those who have not received the entire message—not to congratulate heresiarchs on how much Catholic they took with them into the outer darkness. The university faculty decorates the flunkers. The police praise the burglars. And their adherents believe not and are condemned. Vatican II most certainly erred, lied, and publicly promulgated heresy on this point.

UKRAINIAN RITE SUBSCRIBER IN NEW JERSEY: 2/2/89

Our liturgy has been changed a bit. We had migrated from Church Slavonic to the vernacular Ukrainian, to a new (?), or more correct, Ukrainian. I truly wish they'd leave the Lord's Prayer alone, but that is the one prayer that has undergone the most change. Like all changes, they have to be gotten used to. At least the liturgy itself is relatively unchanged. It's so beautiful and peaceful a liturgy, I'd be most unhappy if there were ever major changes to it.

Reply—The successful vernacularisation of your rite provided a prime argument for vernacularisation of the Latin rite, deliberately destroyed by the process. Now the innovators turn their baneful attention to other rites, with the same fatal end in view. There seems little difference between “new or more correct” and Montini's stock “new and more authentic.”

Such treatment of the Lord's Prayer is symptomatic: “See how we can correct Christ!” I quote **Robert Browning and the Faith** by Christopher Brennan, in **Blue and Blue**, magazine of Marist Brothers' High School, Darlinghurst, December 1926:..... We hear the pope, as final court of appeal, decide. And that the pope's decision was right, (Browning) claims from the start. This pope is pillar and column, prop and stay of all his work. What kind of pope then?

As a man, sympathetically presented; and we (suppose) the pope had so much time to devote to a matter of purely secular jurisdiction, and, as if they necessarily arose out of it, to muse on general questions of religion and morals. Only we must ask if (this) is a Catholic pope

..... Of Caponsacchi he says: (five lines from **The Ring and the Book**) Pray “Lead us into no such temptations, Lord!” (four more lines) **Fancy a Pope amending the Lord's Prayer!**

“Relatively unchanged?” One small *ektenia* was dropped—to set a precedent, in order to arrogate power to impose further changes.

Dennis D'Amico began in June 1990

to target those who had paved his way rather than our most obvious foe, Vatican II's postconciliar “Church.” In August the complaints started. Two years earlier I had suggested that his **New Horizons** would be “almost sure to interest and encourage fighters for the Church.” But Dennis even then had decided our strategy was wrong. We had little to show for attacks on Vatican II. We should seek out current abuses, keep abreast of the times and their problems, etc. Vatican II was Borinnngggg!

The Narrow Gate (another name change) in September took Bill Strojje to task for heresy in arguing that Montini was The Antichrist—a pressing issue on which salvation surely depends. All Strojje's readers must be warned against his future writings. Most who complained of these attacks on Strojje disagree with Bill's conclusions. Traditional Catholics have enough real enemies. We need not pull rugs from under our allies, even if they **have** died.

I wrote Dennis September 1 that he would surely lose subscribers by trying to sink such stalwart trads as Bill Strojje and **Veritas**. I suggested my method of fighting anonymous **Objections**. I furnished an example, which follows the next paragraph.

He replied in only nine pages, six of which he would publish in his next issue, all proving that he can miss the point of an argument at least as well as the next man. But one can't waste six pages of deathless prose. So he published to show up another stupid heretic without awaiting my reaction, mailed Sept. 26.

Objection—It is *de fide* that there must be a Catholic bishop somewhere because the Church is indefectible. It must last till the end of time as Christ founded it, i.e., with a hierarchy [private interpretation]. If therefore there are no bishops then Christ has failed His promises to be with the Church to the end, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

Reply—The present existence of a Catholic bishop cannot be a matter of divine faith unless we profess the same faith in the existence of a genuine pope. If the Holy See can be vacant (as so long and so often) without the Church losing its indefectibility or Christ having broken His promises, why may not all lesser sees be subject to the same conditions?

The Catholic Encyclopedia, III, 756c: “The society of Jesus Christ remains endowed with all the prerogatives bestowed on it by its Founder. Only to one particular Church is indefectibility assured, viz., to the See of Rome. To Peter, and in him to all his successors in the chief pastorate, Christ committed the task of confirming his brethren in the Faith (Luke xxii, 32)”

The same conditions apply. Christ founded His Church not only with bishops but on a pope. The papacy is more essential than any other see. If it were properly filled none of this current universal confusion could exist. Under the circumstances, to say that we have a pope smacks strongly of heresy. Obviously the See of Rome is vacant. Those in charge even more obviously have no claim on indefectibility, not attributable to apostates. Catherine Emmerick is quoted to the effect that if only one person has kept the faith that person **is** the Church. Does that make him a bishop? What if he's a she? Church-approved private revelations foretell Rome's loss of the faith. We are not required to believe them. But if Rome could not lose the faith these revelations would necessarily have been condemned.

How long is the end—a second or a century? Did not Christ's promise to His Church (not to usurpers or apostates) depend upon its preaching His Gospel? Who preaches it now? Montini killed the missionary effort (a mark of the Church) along with official worship, sacraments, and morals. One might say that he killed its indefectibility. He surely tried. Illegally he pursued his goal—total destruction. But nothing is perfect. A Catholic bishop may even survive somewhere, though not in Rome. If so, he inhabits the realm of fact, not of faith. If in communist territory he is probably a prisoner. **Your** indefectibility requires a **functioning** bishop.

Nor did Christ promise that the gates of hell would not almost prevail, or even appear to prevail—as on Calvary.

The Church is indefectible when and where it exists, even England (no hierarchy from Cardinal Pole to Cardinal Wiseman—nearly three centuries) and Japan (no clergy 1620-1854). The Church is indefectible in its doctrine (He who **believes** ..shall be saved) and in its structure as circumstances permit. When Arianism apparently prevailed, Catholic bishops were exiled. They could not function in their proper sees. Of what use is a non-functional hierarchy—even if it can be found? We must keep the **faith**. No faith in circumstances is required.

Ludwig Ott, **Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma**: “The Church is indefectible, that is, she remains and will remain the institution of Salvation,” [though all apostatize] “founded by Christ, until the end of the world. (*Sent. certa.*)” **not de fide!** But you present a *de fide* corollary of a *sententia certa*.

D.D.—Your **Reply** demonstrates that you are ‘faking it’. Why don't you address my arguments? Instead questions, which you leave unanswered.

Reply—Surely you recognize a rhetorical question admitting only one answer— an accepted device to elicit or clarify fact through the serious reader's own thought processes. I never deem private revelation proof. I used it (Catherine Emmerick) on you because you accept it, as your writings amply attest. And where have you addressed my argument down to that question? **Only to the Roman See is indefectibility assured.** Ott and Denzinger quotations but confirm and corroborate my argument, as developed in replies to your further objections.

D.D.—According to Christ’s ordinance, Peter is to have successors in his Primacy over the whole Church and for all time. (*De fide*)—Ott, page 282.

Reply—From Nov. 29, 1268 to Sept. 5, 1316 the Church accumulated twelve years one month in popeless periods. Peter has had no publicly known genuine successors since Oct. 9, 1958—over 32 years to date. “According to Christ’s ordinance” = “Christ intended or provided that.” But man does not always comply with Christ’s ordinances. The papacy exists but is usurped. The Church exists in its members, but has no visible hierarchy. Christ founded the Church on Peter. Ott comments, “the structure” (hierarchy) “of the Church cannot continue without the foundation which supports it.”

D.D.—The Vatican Council (1870) teaches: “He wishes that there should be pastors and teachers in His Church to the end of time.”

Reply—Compare (Ott, 239) “Despite men’s sins God truly and earnestly desires the salvation of all men.” And (I Timothy II, 4) “He will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.” Are all saved? even of those who have known the truth?

You can define “end of time” as you please. How does the Church define it? This is a legitimate and undetermined question. The original Greek: “to the end of the age.” The final apostasy itself requires time. Jesus Christ Himself asked (Luke xviii, 8): “But yet the Son of Man, when He cometh, shall He find, think you, faith on earth?” Think you that He wasted words? Or that were the answer “yes” He would have asked? Or could faith vanish in presence of a genuine pope, a functioning hierarchy, and available sacraments?

D.D.—I present a *de fide* corollary of numerous *de fide* dogmas, so it is incorrect to say that I present a *de fide* corollary of a *sententia certa*.

Reply—Neither you nor I can present any corollary whatsoever as *de fide*. The Church alone presents *de fide* dogmas.

D.D.—Fatal flaw in your argument. After quoting Ott’s indefectibility definition you said: “*Sententia certa*, **not de fide**.” You appear to imply that only “*de fide*” dogmas command our assent of Faith. Whereas “*sententia certa*” dogmas do not require our assent of Faith.

Reply—No, **Ott** said “*sententia certa*”; **I** appended “**not de fide**.” You appear to fabricate an adversary and to imply and assume that he meant more than I wrote. Never have I suggested either that *sententia certa* is less authoritative or credible than defined dogma, or that the Church’s indefectibility could be questioned. I implied with impeccable logic that a *de fide* corollary cannot be drawn from a *sententia certa*. We can argue probability, we can even prove beyond doubt, but we lack authority to define Catholic doctrine. My attitude to dogma is illustrated in TWIN! #24, page 4: “Davies himself cites as authority Ludwig Ott’s **Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma** five times. These dogmas fall under the previously recorded categories Many are classed as other than *de fide*. They are, nevertheless, included as fundamentals of Catholic dogma.” Indefectibility itself is concluded from various *de fide* dogmas, but has not thereby acquired *de fide* status, any more than have or can your inconsistent, inconsequent “conclusions.” You fill pages with Ott and Denzinger citations to which I subscribed before your birth. You operate by the half-syllogism: one premiss, one leap, one conclusion. You tie nothing together with even a fictional step to bridge or support your fictional conclusions. You appear to have a barely tenuous grasp on the nature of proof.

D.D.—No Catholic would dare deny that Divine Revelation—the object of our Faith—terminated with the Apostles. Yet this is only a *sententia certa*, not a *de fide* dogma. that is your exact argument against what I have said about indefectibility.

Reply—What you have said about indefectibility proves only that you misunderstand it and enlarge its constituents. Naturally this last dogma cannot be *de fide*—i.e., revealed. Until the last Apostle died the revelation could not be termed complete. So who could say it till then? There was even a belief that St. John would live until Christ’s return. No one could say when the revelation would be complete because the Church cannot predict the future. Even the most accurate prognosis is not part of revelation, therefore not *de fide*, not within the infallible prerogative of pope or council. They can expound the purpose or destiny of a divine or ecclesiastical institution. They can

say it has survived, or that it was planned or destined to survive. But the moment they say it **will** survive they exceed their competence to command belief.

D.D.—You appear to say that the Catholic Church can survive, on a worldwide basis, just like Japan and England: with no pope, hierarchy, magisterium, priests, sacraments, but just a few lay people believing the dogmas of the Faith. This amounts to the Protestant doctrine of an invisible Church.

Reply—No. I say that the Catholic Church survives while a single Catholic remains visible. But let me quote you as you quote Ott:

“The Church founded by Christ is an external visible commonwealth. (*Sententia certa*, p. 301). According to the teaching of the Council of Trent, there is in the Church ‘visible sacrifice’ and a ‘visible and external priesthood’ (D957). The Vatican Council teaches that Christ appointed the Apostle Peter to be the ‘visible foundation’ (D1821) of the unity of the Church. Leo XIII, in the Encyclical *Satis Cognitum* (1896), teaches: ‘When one visualizes the ultimate purpose of the Church and the proximate causes effecting sanctity, She is, in fact, spiritual. But when one considers the members of the Church and the means which lead to the spiritual gifts, then **She is externally and necessarily visible.**”

So Christ founded a **visible** Church on a **visible** pope with a **visible** hierarchy. Your entire argument rests then on **visibility** but you ignore it. “It necessarily follows that a Church hierarchy still exists today.” You omit **visible**—seen to function. (“Some rudimentary form” views matters from the wrong end. Rudiments are roots, beginnings, not remnants. Either way they cannot satisfy your own requirements.)

No one can be bound to your opinion that bishops are necessary to the Church but a pope is not. No visible bishops exist. **Invisible** bishops cannot contribute to the Church’s **visibility**. Nor can non-functioning bishops provide visible liturgies or sacraments.

Twice you postulate that anything created “by divine ordinance” (which appears to cover all creation) cannot cease to exist, despite the well-grounded belief that everything on this earth that has not yet ceased to exist **will** cease to exist—that here we have no lasting city. Here you also disagree with Cardinal Newman: “God works by human means” (which, like our apostate hierarchy, can fail). “As He employs individual men, and inspires them, and yet they die,” (or apostatize) “so, doubtless, He might employ a body or society of men, which at length, after its course of two thousand years, might come to an end. It might be withdrawn, as other gifts of God are withdrawn, when abused. Doubtless Christianity might be such; it might be destined to expire; it may be destined to age, to decay, and at length to die;—but we know that when it dies, at least the world will die with it. If the Church dies, the world’s time is run.”

You quote Trent, Leo XIII, Pius XII, and the Vatican Council to the effect that Christ founded Church, papacy, and hierarchy **visible**. So you insist on our belief in an **invisible** hierarchy to equal what Christ founded. How does this follow? And why not insist that we have an invisible pope? The God Who divinely ordained both papacy and hierarchy **visible** has allowed the **prime** foundation to appear vacant for three decades, but guarantees continuous existence to an unidentifiable remnant of the **secondary dependent** foundation?! Try to make sense!

D.D.—Since Christ gave His Church an hierarchical constitution by divine ordinance, it necessarily follows that a true Church hierarchy still exists today, somewhere on the face of this earth, in some rudimentary form, despite the ravages of the Great Apostasy. This is a *De fide* corollary of a *De fide* Dogma. To deny it constitutes an act of formal heresy.

Reply—You fail to realize the gap between Christ’s ordinance and man’s performance. God certainly intended that Adam and Eve obey him. They had their chance to obey. God did not create their disobedience. Christ did not intend or create the Great Apostasy, but He did not prevent it. It happened because men failed to obey His ordinances. Punishment followed, as in the earlier example.

D.D.—As everyone knows, Bill Strojje denied the Catholic Dogma of indefectibility in “Last Days of the Catholic Church.” I demonstrated the heretical nature of this position in my issue of July 1990, which raised a storm of controversy.

Reply—Everyone! Some circulation! But a “storm of controversy” hardly demonstrates unanimous agreement with your conclusions. Ott quotes St. Ignatius of Antioch: “Nobody is supposed to do anything which concerns the Church without the Bishop. Only that Eucharist is regarded as valid and legal, that is consummated under the Bishop or by one authorized by him. There, where Jesus is, the Catholic Church is. It is not permitted to baptize without the Bishop, or to hold the agape. But whatever he finds good, that is also pleasing to God, So that everything that is done is certain and lawful. He that honours the Bishop is honoured by God; he that does anything without consulting the Bishop, serves the devil” (Smyrn. 8, 1-2; 9, 1)—pp. 278-9. Does that not sound like Bill Strojje? Will you condemn St. Ignatius?

Your quarrel with Bill stems from his realization that Christ’s ordinances do not rule out non-compliance. Our army sergeants often said: “We can’t make you do this, but we sure can make you wish you had.” You believe that Bill first agreed with your interpretation but changed his mind. You may be correct in this belief, but he understood from obvious conditions that he had been wrong. He did not call the Dogma of indefectibility a mere opinion; he reserved that horrible epithet for obviously erroneous interpretations applied to the dogma.

You could have consulted others **before** your illogical, ill-considered onslaught. You demonstrate overconfidence in your own comprehension, and then insist that the authorities support you in your insupportable application of their words. You then term this misapprehension “traditional sense.” How does Bill’s statement that “The Church is indefectible in the sense that any imperfection or seeming failure can only be the fault of men; and in this, that very grave fault will come only near the End, as foretold” exceed your own postulations in inaccuracy? Why, for instance, must the End be the Last Second? Can you pick the heresy in the theory I suggested in TWIN! #27 (July 1988) pp. 4-5?

FULFILLED PROPHECY: GENESIS XLIX, 10:

“The sceptre shall not be taken away from Juda ..(see page 282)... at the end.

D.D.—Strojje issued several heretical propositions. In Letter #90: “The Great Apostasy has been declared officially ended the officiating Church destroyed the true Magisterium, etc.”

Reply—To prove him wrong you need only produce them.

Montini simply lacked the power, but accomplished it through fraud, bluff, the general belief that he had the power, through misunderstood “infallibility” and “obedience,” through gradualism and deliberate deception, through general apathy and ignorance. He was not pope, but most thought he was. Those who knew the score had no influence, held their tongues, or actively conspired to accomplish what lay beyond the competence or possible intention of a real pope. Binding and loosing concern different things. They never travel back and forth over the same tracks; what a pope binds or looses is bound or loosed also in heaven—in eternity.

D.D.—Letter #92: “..... priests and other Catholics faithful to the Church’s teachings and discipline simply are not the Church. Members, yes, but without a Catholic hierarchy.”

Reply—Here Bill agrees with you that the Church cannot exist without a hierarchy.

D.D.—Letter #90: “..... we had uncovered the fulfillment of a Biblical prophecy: Daniel predicted a time when the perpetual sacrifice would be taken away.”

Reply—The perpetual sacrifice which Christ ordained “until He come” (ICor. xi, 26) would be taken away, according to the infallible revelation. If the divinely ordained Mass can go, why not those divine ordinances (papacy, hierarchy) which support it?

D.D.—**Divine interdict** does not exist.

Reply—Evidently not. You spent eight pages (**The Narrow Gate**, August 1990) refuting in repetitive zeal a phrase obviously used as a figure of speech, to describe the wretched plight of our desolated Church. Without your pile-driver that gnat could have eaten us all.

Such use of a fictional talking point should not appear too strange to one who in your customary interminable overextension recommended David Bawden that impossible fiction, the Catholic Secret Society. Could that have moved him to convoke a conclave in which he was the only celibate participant?

You exhibit few signs of remorse for attempted assassination of Bill Strojje and *Veritas*. Have you decided that you want the field to yourself? Wisdom would counsel a variety of approaches for a variety of readers.

Veritas proved (September issue) that Vatican II and its postconciliar “Church” lie under a five-century-old papal interdict, issued in words that appear to render the legislation infallible, i.e., divinely backed. Perhaps you can dodge the “inference” by showing that such conclusions cannot be *de fide*. Then come back to me and my sandbag.

D.D.—“Pope” Paul VI was not The Antichrist, as Strojje said.

Reply—You wasted sixteen pages on this because three people in the U.S.A. agreed with Bill’s speculations. He was as entitled as anyone else to speculate on how prophecies might be or have been fulfilled. You may be closer to the truth, but nothing in the future can be proven. On such subjects I don’t agree with him, or with some other fine Catholics of my acquaintance. But his speculation hangs together and is possible. True or not, it is not worth alienation of sincere Catholics.

In all those pages you failed to quote Bill’s Letter #8, page 5:

“But we need not believe that Paul VI is The Antichrist; it is enough that he does the works of Antichrist. As to the False Prophet, it could be Fr. Teilhard de Chardin, whose influence on priests, religious, and Catholic pseudo-intellectuals has been immense, or Pope John XXIII who falsely predicted a Great Renewal.” (The way you read things it is probably necessary to emphasize that Bill did not thereby confine the F.P. to these two.) And from Letter #10:

“I myself have been cautioned about fixing the Antichrist title on any individual —according to ‘a Bull (still in effect) which states that those who name a certain person as the Antichrist are thereby excommunicated.’ That would be a Decree of the Fifth Lateran Council, drawn up under Pope Leo X, which reads as follows: ‘We command all those who exercise the function of preaching or will do so in the future, not to presume, either in their sermons or in their affirmations, to fix a date for future evils, whether for the coming of Antichrist or for the Day of Judgment’ This is a serious matter, for which reason I am taking the trouble to deal with it, supposing as I do that quite a few people might be scandalized or misled by what I have thus far written on The Antichrist in several papers..... Pope St. Pius X in his time said he had reason to fear that the Son of Perdition (Antichrist) had already arrived on earth. Pius X later warned against a universal apostasy and a ‘reforming mania’ to accompany it, predictions which have been verified since Vatican II. This is also in accord with St. Paul’s prediction of a revolt or great apostasy and the coming of the Man of Sin (Antichrist). Secondly, what Leo X prohibited was the fixing of a date for future evils, whereas, following and affirming the predictions of Pope St. Pius X, I speak only of the present. And, of course, how will St. Paul’s Man of Sin be revealed if none may speak of him when all the signs are present?” Then, after discussion of the possibility that the Two Witnesses (Apocalypse) were Popes Pius IX and St. Pius X:

“Please, I am not presenting these things as doctrine. I would suppose that no Catholic would accuse me of such an intention. I am simply trying to illustrate a truth, that St. John’s Apocalypse depicts a spiritual combat. Surely to miss this is to be numbered among those St. Paul spoke of as spiritually blind. St. Jerome wrote that St. John’s Apocalypse contains as many mysteries as words.” (pp. 2-3)

Page 10: “As St. Augustine remarks (*lib. 20, de Civit. C. 30*), ‘the events pertaining to the end of the world will happen in the manner they have been foretold, but as to their accidental circumstances, God alone knows the order in which they will take place. He has revealed nothing explicitly on this point, and consequently, our knowledge of this is confined to mere conjecture, possessing a greater or less degree of probability. Experience alone will put us into possession of the desired information.’”

You could have used Bill’s own words in lieu of your disproportionate, unnecessary onslaught.

Bill often enough interspersed “I believe” or “for years I have believed”— subjective rather than doctrinaire. He also listened to arguments, and could be persuaded. He never claimed infallibility. He never once called me a heretic when we disagreed. Vatican II is the enemy, not *Veritas* or Bill

Strojje. When you destroy them you accomplish nothing for the Church. They carried the ball till at last you arrived to show us how.

Objection—So why did Strojje write so much? Why did he give his opinions?

Reply—People asked for his letters and valued his opinions. Whose opinions would you expect from him? Unlike Dennis D’Amico, he realized that he could not formulate dogma to oblige us all.

Objection—You also took up the subject of whether Montini was The Antichrist.

Reply—Because it was pushed at me. I prefaced the whole treatment:

‘Prophecy often presents difficulties, and these arguments over the Antichrist’s identity appear to waste time and borrow trouble. For in the end it makes little difference to our situation, even as an explanation. If anyone wants to call Paul VI antichrist I won’t argue. He was also anti-Church and anti-civilization. But if he was **the** Antichrist no one has proven it.’

Dennis D’Amico, in receipt of my Sept. 26 letter, reiterated some of his misapprehensions (**The Narrow Gate**, November), as though repetition could somehow bolster an argument. He again leans heavily on private revelation, especially Mary Agreda’s **City of God**, from which he quotes Christ as quoted by the seer, and certain other of the seer’s reports. He would have all note very carefully: (1) Our Lord Himself **explicitly** promised to work the Miracle of Transubstantiation ‘until the end of the coming ages’, remaining with us in the form of Bread and Wine; (2) ‘For after His Death His most holy humanity could not remain in His Church any other way than by His consecrated Body and Blood.’” [With God all things are possible.—Matt. xix, 26. And where was Christ from His Resurrection till His Ascension?] “(3) Therefore, Christ’s infallible Promise contained in Matthew 28:20 must be understood to mean that He will remain with the Catholic Church until the end of the world in the form of Holy Communion! (4) That is the explanation which is given by Mary of Agreda in her famous trilogy, **The City of God**. Moreover, the Catholic Church has given its formal, official approval to these books as being ‘free from error.’” [But the Church cannot guarantee every word, or whether Christ spoke to the seer as quoted. The Church approval says only that nothing in the books conflicts with Church teaching on dogma and morals.]

Eventually he quotes Volume 4, page 38 which attributes to Christ the statement “that the fountain of living water which flowed from Calvary’s mount would at the end of the world appear to be almost entirely poisoned.” [Is it not? But Dennis ignores “almost,” constructs a huge gap between appearance and reality, as though mutually exclusive, and imputes confusion to others. Is it a graver error to advance an opinion that Mass is unavailable because we have arrived at the end of the age than to put us all in heresy for seeing no genuine Catholic bishop?

But of course there’s Ludwig Ott, who states (page 282): “According to Christ’s ordinance, Peter is to have successors in his Primacy over the whole Church and for all time. (*De fide.*)” After quoting the Vatican Council that Peter has (in 1870) perpetual successors, Ott continues: “That the Primacy is to be perpetuated in the successors of Peter is, indeed, **not expressly stated** in the words of the promise and conferring of the Primacy by Our Lord, but it **flows as an inference** from the nature and purpose of the Primacy itself. As the function of the Primacy is to preserve the unity and solidarity of the Church; and as the Church, according to the will of her Divine Founder, is to continue substantially unchanged until the end of time for the perpetuation of the work of salvation, the Primacy also must be perpetuated.” All can see the substantial sameness, so in accord with the Church’s fragmentation. Perpetuated or not, the Primacy has been 32 years vacant. On page 9, §8 Ott lists theological grades of certainty:

Fides divina—the belief due immediately revealed truths based on God revealing;

Fides catholica—based on the Church’s infallible Teaching Authority when the Church teaches that a truth is contained in Revelation;

De fide definita—accorded truths solemnly defined by Pope or Council.

So how has this **not expressly stated inference** attained *de fide* definition? Perhaps Ott is not quite infallible. Perhaps also, he should have defined “end of time.”

No matter; Dennis will define it, perhaps as he defines indefectibility. “For Almighty God,” he says, “created the Dogma of Indefectibility.” This would place the Dogma in the highest theological category, *fides divina*. So why has Ott classified it four grades lower (*sententia certa*) as a theological conclusion? It is certainly to be believed, but it must be understood.

Enlargement, overextension, exaggeration of indefectibility and papal infallibility contributed greatly to the Church’s fragmentation. Nearly all went along blindly, assuming their leaders’ good will, honesty, and superior knowledge. Somehow popes acquired unlimited power, even to correct and reverse their equally unlimited predecessors. What one pope had bound in heaven another pretended to loose in heaven. When Vatican II set out to re-examine every doctrine except papal infallibility few dreamt that it projected anything more than corroboration and clarification. But how could all those innovations have caught on without mistaken concepts of indefectibility and infallibility? For if our clergy had drawn proper conclusions that a pope or ecumenical council in public heresy cannot be Catholic, more would almost certainly have refused obedience and held to their oaths.

But for Scriptural prophecy we might not believe our plight. But St. Paul predicted a final apostasy, and Daniel predicted as a sign of the end that the sacrifice would be taken away. Neither prophecy requires 100% fulfilment. Daniel’s is likelier of such achievement; unless Judgment Day comes fairly soon, all Catholic priests capable of offering the perpetual sacrifice will have died.

In prophecy we confine ourselves to Scripture. This covers a situation such as ours. We do not insist that ours is the fulfilment of St. Paul’s prophecy of apostasy, though we believe it is. What **will** happen **can** happen, perhaps more than once. We believe this prophecy was meant, among other reasons, to reassure us—to preserve us from scandal—from thinking Christ could desert His Church. He never said that His Church, like the Apostles in the Garden, could never desert Him. He chose Judas an Apostle. He never said His Church could never choose a Judas His vicar. “The disciple is not above his Master.” (Matthew x, 24)

He said (Matthew xxviii, 19-20): “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.” Challoner comments: “..... not one but **all nations**; and instruct them in **all truths**. And that He may assist them effectually in the execution of this commission, He promises to be with them all days, even to the consummation of the world” But what if they fail or refuse this commission? He promises to be with them to fulfil His command, not to forget it. Not since Vatican II has a “pope” or bishop taught all truth. On the contrary, all false religions and heresies have been told there is good in them, despite their explicit opposition to Christ and His truth. Presumption is that sin by which we expect salvation without making use of the proper means to obtain it. We can be sure that Christ will be with us all days only when we are with Him, when we prove we love Him by keeping His Commandments, especially His last.

How is a book such as Ott’s superior to an article in **The Catholic Encyclopedia**? Not only has the latter repeated *imprimatur*s for all its editions, each article is written by an expert and carries its own individual *imprimatur*. The article quoted was written by George Heyward Joyce, S.J. M.A. (Oxon), Professor of Logic, Stonyhurst College, Blackburn, England. You might have argued (incorrectly) that between the authoritative writing in 1913 or earlier and Ott’s authoritative writing in 1952 Pope Pius XI had shed relevant light on the subject.

You devote most of page 2, **The Narrow Gate**, February ’91 to decrying theological wrangling among traditional Catholics—the exact offense for which I tried to correct you, privately first.

You habitually assume too much; to fight Vatican II’s heresies is not to embrace all other heresies (not all of which I’ve encountered), even Leonard Feeny’s. Arianism is a dead horse? It is alive and well in the postconciliar “Church” and its idolatrous worship. So if you fight the live and kicking Feenyism why are **you** not schizophrenic in not fighting the far more serious Arianism?

If you prove me or Bill Strojic wrong you accomplish nothing because we are not the Church authority. But **you** are wrong in your entire attitude. You detect heresies behind such truthful

statements as “This article of faith is not *de fide*.” I argue what I can prove. I can’t prove who is the Antichrist.

So I failed to reply to your “pivotal” quotation from *Mortalium Animos*? But I wrote several paragraphs on the Church’s incompetence in unscriptural prognosis. Can’t you see arguments unless tied physically to the point? Twenty years of rock? Only your own obtuseness has forced you to repeat yourself, twice yet, on page 9 alone.

On page 10 you requote Ott on another “pivotal” issue: “the essential immutability of her teaching, her constitution, and her liturgy.” At the bottom you accept that there are “popeless periods.” But the whole constitution of the Church is founded **on the pope**. What prevents you from accepting bishopless periods? Or liturgyless periods? All three things are immutable, says Ott. But are not all equally invisible? Everything ends, not necessarily simultaneously. Ott is no more infallible on the future than the Church itself. Why must I refute him? I’ve already refuted your understanding of the Church itself on the same grounds. But I’ve answered you so poorly because you can’t recognize answers. **You** certainly never answered “**Only to the Roman See is indefectibility assured.**” Unless you think “My Jesuit is better than yours” some kind of answer.

Page 11: No one frustrates God’s will. But He works through men. Men (and angels), alone in all creation, have free will. Men **can** choose to disobey God’s will. Such aberrations come under God’s permissive will. He has foreseen and not prevented such things. When no man will allow God to work through him God may terminate things. But until He does, there will be a Catholic Church, though no bishop survives, no liturgy is celebrated, no sacraments are available. Immutable they are, which is why we can perceive their absence.

The only thing I have **implied** in this entire controversy is that where we disagree you are wrong. You have no warrant for extending this to all possible disagreements on other subjects. I am not above reproach, but I have spent many more years in the functioning Church than you or anyone in your generation. I always knew **what** I believed and **why**. You have read some books? And I have not?

I have often said: “What I alone can see is immediately suspect.” On Matthew xxviii, 20 I have asserted nothing new. **Please read Challoner’s note.** (We are permitted only annotated Bibles, to protect against private interpretation.)

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Infallibility (last article, Vol. VII), by Patrick J. Toner, S.T.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, St. Patrick’s College, Maynooth, Ireland: “..... it is a puzzle which the Catholic finds hard to solve, how those who deny that the supreme authority of Peter’s successor is an essential factor in the constitution of the Church can consistently maintain the Divine authority of the episcopate. Now, as we have already seen, the doctrinal indefectibility is certainly implied in Christ’s promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church, and cannot be effectively secured without doctrinal infallibility; so that if Christ’s promise means anything—if Peter’s successor is in any true sense the foundation and source of the Church’s indefectibility—he must by virtue of this office be also an organ of ecclesiastical infallibility. The metaphor used clearly implies that it was the rock—foundation which was to give stability to the superstructure, not the superstructure to the rock.”

Doctrinal indefectibility, this theology teacher says, is bound up with infallibility, so it does not attach to the bishops, individually or collectively, but, as my Jesuit Joyce said, to the infallible Roman See alone. But Toner says more:

“... there is question particularly in this passage of doctrinal authority—of authority to teach the Gospel to all men—if Christ’s promise to be with the Apostles and their successors to the end of time **in carrying out this commission**”

Gospels of the Sundays and Festivals, Cornelius J. Ryan, D.D. (first printed 1903), Vol II, Pentecost: “..... He declared that He was to be ever with them **in bringing about the end for which they laboured.**” But you say, without a shadow of justification, that I have invented a new doctrine, just coincidentally published at least three times by recognized authority before I was

born. “The Catholic Church,” you say, “has always understood Matthew xxviii, 20 in an absolute, **unconditional** sense.” Wrong again!

REVOLUTION IN ROME

(David F. Wells, Protestant observer at Vatican II) excerpts:

“..... Some progressives have argued that God’s saving plan is partly identified with secular life and is being realized through it. Redemption is ultimately achieved **in** the world, not **above** it..... Human activity at all levels in our society is providing the raw substance for God’s redemptive work. Secular man, then, is becoming a co-worker with God in redeeming human life..... The object of God’s saving purposes is not merely the souls of Christian people, but rather human life in all its parts. Moreover, in order to achieve this end, God is not extracting people out of the world, but is presently in the world in all of its comprehensive reality. This means, among other things, that heaven is not to be somewhere ‘out there’. Rather, the present physical earth will be transformed into heaven because it is now being prepared for God’s eternal habitation. The home of man is going to become the home of God; the institutions of man likewise will become God’s institutions.”

[How infinitely poor is God? How persistent is evolution! He created this earth and its inhabitants so that eventually He might find some refuge when humanity had worked out His *modus vivendi*, after the miserable failure of His own institutions, especially the ordinary means of salvation.

Human activity has seamy facets. Murderers send people presumably to heaven. Redemption of human life sounds tremendous, but where does human life exist except in individual humans? From their universals these woolgatherers dash to a pedestrian, pragmatic concept of heaven limited to this earth—a Malthusian nightmare—God limited to the capacities and institutions of men. As they become more pragmatic they become less practical. As they imbue the world with Christ’s indwelling they confine His sacramental presence to the “sacrament” of the World! With their new freedom they bind themselves to the earth.]

“Edward Schillebeeckx has argued that there is a deep chasm dividing modern man’s secularity and the religious ideals of traditional Catholicism (**God the Future of Man**). He traces the growth of secularity from the twelfth century onwards and concludes that Christian thought has not kept pace with secular development argue(s) that the meaning of God is internal, and its fullest realization will happen on the horizontal sphere of man’s own history identifies God with an inner sense which he says men have that the future has meaning. Man has an unshakeable confidence that at the end of the road there will be good, not bad. This is God.....

“By removing the frontier that has traditionally divided the natural from the supernatural, contemporary theologians are able to see reality as one composite whole. The whole of the created world is beginning to throb with the hidden life of God. It is this development, more than anything else, which explains the current convergence between Eastern and Western thought. This view has profound implications for the doctrine of man ... and it is these implications which are leading Western theologians towards Eastern pantheism, mysticism, and universalism. The infusion of the supernatural also explains why some of the distinctiveness of the Christian doctrine of God, such as His personality, seems less tenable today than before. When the being of God is identified with secularity and even with trees, rivers, grass, streets, buildings, and atomic bombs, the idea of His personality becomes difficult to maintain. When this occurs, the personality of man also becomes doubtful. He may be nothing more than a chance collation of atoms, in which case the search for meaning in human life will probably end in failure.”

[When young I toyed with the idea that I existed only as the dream of some superior, some really consistent dreamer who could dream my entire environment, heredity, anatomy, and thought processes. He would, of course, dream my starvation if I refused to work, and my eventual damnation if I were dreamed in criminal activities. But I knew I was imagining things. These theologians appear to be serious. They, who believe in evolution and progress, embrace the nihilism that has paralyzed the East for centuries. They progress to Nirvana.]

“..... The universalism implicit in the new view emerges in several important passages in the council documents: ‘The Church will attain her full perfection only in the glory of heaven. Then will come the time of the restoration of all things (Acts 3:21). **Then the human race as well as the entire world will be perfectly re-established in Christ.**’ (Con. Church, 48 Cf. Past. Con. Church World, 22, 32, 42, 55; Decln. Non-Christian, 1).....

“The idea that secular activity is being incorporated into the divine plan of salvation since the dividing wall between God and the world has been partially broken down is taught in : ‘For after we have obeyed the Lord, and in His Spirit nurtured on earth the values of human dignity, brotherhood, and freedom, and indeed all the good fruits of our nature and enterprises, **we will find them again** This will be so when Christ hands over to the Father a kingdom eternal and universal.’ (Past. Con. Church World, 39)

“Christ’s atonement, then, was aimed at restoring earthly institutions no less than broken human natures. Human activity which makes life more genuinely human is bringing us nearer the final consummation because it is making life more genuinely divine. Every technical advance, every adventure into space, every effort to rout crime, and every attempt to give capitalism a conscience, if man is really being served, have become means of God’s salvation of men. The reality of God has become identified with the reality of the earthly city, the sacred is found in the secular, Christ is in the world.”

[What glorious fields for Chesterton, master of paradox! Technical advances prevent human life, or extinguish it, as never before. None need strive to impart communism a conscience; it is already progressive. Christ is in the world so how can it offend Him? Christ is in all His creation so all creation becomes Christ, either through this pantheist osmosis or through His incarnation, which would appear to have worked both ways. Gilbert and Sullivan, please tell us again to music: “When everyone is somebody, then no one’s anybody!”]

Dr. David F. Wells, Associate Professor of Church History and the History of Christian Thought, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois, cannot excite himself too much over the new truths of Vatican II since, he says, they are mostly two centuries out of date in Protestantism. From his aforementioned book:

“..... The pope was not under any great obligation to consult the Church before making authoritative statements. He spoke on his own authority and not necessarily as the representative of the people Papal power has never been entirely arbitrary. The pope could never define doctrines that would go against the natural law or commonly accepted Christian morality or previously defined dogmas..... The idea of consultation, which came to the fore at Vatican II in the form of collegiality, was deliberately eliminated from the constitution at Vatican I, where a proposal much along the lines of Vatican II’s collegiality stated:

“‘The pope, though as an individual person and acting for himself he can err in faith; nevertheless **using the counsel and seeking the help of the universal Church** he cannot err.’

“When we move to Vatican II, it may appear at first sight that the same conception of papal power and authority has survived intact. **Florence** said the pope’s power was ‘full,’ **Trent** ‘supreme,’ **Vatican I** ‘universal.’ **Vatican II** recapitulated ‘full, supreme, and universal power over the Church.’ (Papal) authority after Vatican II seems as absolute and unchallenged as before. But is this the case?

“The council, as we have already seen, was not averse to endorsing mutually exclusive theologies. Sometimes this was the only way the opposing factions would allow a document to see the light of day. progressives would insure that it was neutralized, if not undermined by their own conception. This happened in four discernible ways.

- 1) The order and composition of the Constitution on the Church was designed to emphasize the importance of the people and de-emphasize (that) of the pope.
- 2) Alongside the ‘full, supreme, and universal power’ it says that he ‘can (*valet*) always exercise this power freely,’ i.e., **validly**, only when he consults the Church and speaks on its behalf

independently ... invalidly ... without moral justification. So once again, traditional wording has been turned around to serve liberal ends.

3) Neutralizing by introducing two other forms of infallibility all Catholics in whom the Spirit's light is shed have an infallible perception of truth .. the infallibility which all bishops possess and which is peculiar to their office

4) 'Tradition!' The pope is subservient to the bishops evident in the decision on collegiality. Jesus, it is argued, first gave authority to all the Apostles (the College) before singling Peter out to be their spokesman. The Apostles were members of a committee whose chairman was Peter. It was Peter's role to guide the discussion and then articulate the decision when the vote was taken."

[Small wonder this historian places an exclamation, point behind "Tradition!" After the Council of Jerusalem—circa 50-51 A.D.—which only three Apostles attended, at which according to Scripture—Acts xv, 7—St. Peter settled the point at issue on his own authority, the next general council took place in 325 A.D. at Nicaea, where two Roman priests, Victor and Vincentius, represented the pope. Indeed, the first pope to preside at an ecumenical council was Callistus II, who convoked the First Lateran Council in 1123. Roncalli attended Vatican II in spirit and closed circuit television. He would not inhibit discussion by his august, inspired presence. But he gave three hundred choicest seats to non-Catholic observers like Dr. Wells, whose presence inhibited discussion no end. Unlike Vatican II's participants, the observers had no reason to lie. **AND NOTHING TO HIDE.**]

THOU SHALT NOT KID THYSELF (Eleventh Commandment)

Again and again Paul VI exhorted us to look not to the past (where Christ instituted His Church to preach and preserve His word) but to the future (as the Chosen People awaiting the Messiah). Let us leave certainty and head bravely into the unknown, the unknowable. Courage! Or insanity? Who dared predict what asininity, new or old, our "Holy Father" would inflict upon us the following week?

Most "Catholics" refuse to see the impossibility that Montini and his successors could be popes. Anacletus II (1130-1138), though legally elected, was wiped off the list of popes. History calls him an antipope. Why? His actions tended to destroy the Church. No one asked whether he was in good faith. His private morals, though sufficiently depraved, had no bearing on the case. No one has declared Benedict IX, Alexander VI, Innocent VIII, or Leo X antipopes, despite scandalous behavior and complete lack of principle or scruple.

A destroyer of the Church must be resisted as far as necessary to halt and reverse his destruction. The papacy is our standard of Catholicism, our religious yardstick. The occupant must fit the office. He is not his own man. He belongs to Christ and to us. He cannot try the metric system, or grow another foot.

We cannot take the word of a heretic that he is not a heretic. Paul's whole outlook, adopted by his successors—to the future (expecting what?)—smacks of Judaism. They keep bringing us new light, more than Christ brought us, from the "Holy Council" and from the murky depths of sacred humanity's new insights.

Why must we tolerate these men? Why must bishops and priests hang on their ambiguous and outrightly heretical words, follow their directives, conspire with them to obliterate the Catholic Faith? How much better off we should be if all ignored, shunned, and boycotted these monsters!

Can we do this? Never! The canon lawyers tell us that a heretic is not a heretic until he is brought to trial and condemned. We cannot call a heretic a heretic because we would be "judging" him. We wouldn't want to be judged, would we? I would far rather be judged on my orthodoxy than on my deeds. The Church has always judged, and sometimes burned, heretics. Error has no rights over truth. It is intolerable that a heretic should rule over Catholics. (Even the original Protestants practised this. Every heretic ruler insisted that his subjects join in his heresy.)

While all recognize the heretics' authority (contradiction in terms) how can we try them? We can't expect them to co-operate—place themselves on trial in full knowledge of the inevitable outcome. They hold fast to office for its privileges, not its performance, and forever preach obedience—their sole argument. They apply it to all but themselves as they violate the most solemn laws of the Church under the pretext that Christ's vicar can correct Christ, time's Creator, because times are changing, now as always, which somehow escaped the Creator's notice. The while they refuse to act as vicar and blame the disastrous result of their dereliction on Christ, as, for instance, on June 21, 1972.

But why should a heretic want the job? Back to Anacletus II—to destroy the Church. We can all see their success, by the new light they bring, like the primordial light-bearer, Lucifer.

But many hold that we are saddled with these antipopes because they are legal popes. Various theologians have theorized that Christ sustains the jurisdiction of even a heretical pope. But this theory concerns a supposed secret heretic, or a private, non-teaching heretic, so that Catholics need not worry about popes' private opinions any more than about their morals. It cannot apply to a known heretic, who is by canon law and common sense deprived of all offices in the Church.

What these many hold, then, is that we must obey these non-Catholics where they are right and refuse obedience where they are wrong, because Christ sustains their jurisdiction (which heretics cannot possess) where they are right. Or where they appear correct? How much have they changed, that most would grant could be changed, for the purpose of creating the climate in which all can be changed? We—and Christ—are reduced to the status of heretics—picking and choosing among these antipopes' actions and doctrines with our varying bias, information, and intelligence, with an educated guess at Christ's position, to determine which directives to follow.

We may follow **none** of them. Montini and his successors, not being popes, have no jurisdiction for Christ to sustain. Does that leave a vacuum? Only apparently. This is hardly the first time the Holy See has been vacant. If Catholics refuse to face facts **it may be the last**.

Whether we are members of the Catholic Church cannot depend on the existence of contemporary Catholics, bishops or not. We can answer only for our own adherence to revelation, tradition, genuine authority, and the Communion of Saints. If we can adhere publicly to these, then the Catholic Church is visible—whether or not visibility is essential.

In all history it has never before been suggested that a man has left the Church because his bishop had died, or even apostatized. If the Holy See can be vacant or usurped, what protects all other sees from the same condition? The Church continues to exist on earth as long as it has members on earth, whether or not it functions as the Church should. The Communion of Saints is more essential than an existing hierarchy. And (see Apostles' Creed) more credible!

CREDO in unam sanctam Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam.

Webster defines apostle: 1. **Lit.**: One sent forth; a messenger. Specif.: One of the twelve disciples of Christ, specially chosen as His companions and witnesses, and sent forth to preach the Gospel.

2 a. One who imitates or resembles the apostles. b. The first Christian missionary in any part of the world; one who has extraordinary success as a missionary or reformer.

From **The New Catholic Dictionary**, compiled and edited under the auspices of **The Catholic Encyclopedia** (1929):

Apostles other than the Twelve. The following are popularly known as apostles, of some region where, or of a people among whom, they planted or revived the Faith: (A list of ninety men, including St. Paul, Pope Adrian IV, St. Columba, St. Philip Neri, Fathers Durbin and Las Casas, and at least one layman, St. Olaf Haraldsson, King of Norway.)

Apostolicity, one of the marks by which the Church founded by Christ on His Apostles can always be recognized among the large number of dissident creeds. It implies Apostolicity of mission, that is, Christ's Church is a moral body, possessing the mission entrusted by Him to His Apostles of

baptizing and teaching all men in His name and transmitted through them and their lawful successors in the episcopacy in an unbroken chain to their present representatives. His Church being infallible, there is also implied Apostolicity of doctrine, which means that the deposit of faith entrusted to the Apostles has been preserved intact.

From **The Catholic Encyclopedia** (1913) Vol III, 759d: The Apostolicity of the Church consists in its identity with the body which Christ established on the foundation of the Apostles, and which He commissioned to carry on His work. No other body save this is the Church of Christ. The true Church must be Apostolic in doctrine and Apostolic in mission. Since, however, it has already been shown that the gift of infallibility was promised to the Church, it follows that where there is Apostolicity of mission, there will also be Apostolicity of doctrine. Apostolicity of mission consists in the power of Holy Orders and the power of jurisdiction derived by legitimate transmission from the Apostles. Any religious organization whose ministers do not possess these two powers is not accredited to preach the Gospel of Christ. For “how shall they preach,” asks the Apostle, “unless they be sent?” (Rom., x, 15). It is Apostolicity **of mission** which is reckoned as a **note of the Church**. No historical fact can be more clear than that Apostolicity, if it is found anywhere, is found in the Catholic Church. In it there is the power of Holy Orders received by Apostolic succession. In it, too, there is Apostolicity of jurisdiction; for history shows us that the Roman bishop is the successor of Peter, and as such the centre of jurisdiction. Those prelates who are united to the Roman See receive their jurisdiction from the pope, who alone can bestow it.

From **Gospels of the Sundays and Festivals**, Trinity Sunday (Cornelius J. Ryan, D.D., 1903): “Having commanded His Apostles to make disciples of all mankind by bringing all to the profession of the faith and the reception of baptism, Christ completes His instructions in these words:

‘V. 20. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.’

“It was not sufficient to found the Church and to add to its membership from age to age: the ministers of Christ must be the ever living witnesses, and all must hear and obey these teachers as the authorized exponents of His will. What assurance had the Apostles that they could carry out this mission of instructing the world, and what guarantee had their disciples that this teaching would be without admixture of error? The answer is found in the concluding words of the passage:—

‘And behold, I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world.’

“..... He commanded them to establish His Church and to direct it aright in accordance with the full revelation He had communicated to them; He declared that He was to be ever with them in **bringing about the end for which they laboured.**”

From Bishop Richard Challoner’s Biblical notes, published with the Rheims-Douai Bible since 1752, on Matthew xxviii, 18-20:

“**All power**. See here the warrant and commission of the apostles and their successors, the bishops and pastors of Christ’s church. He received from His Father **all power in heaven and in earth**, and in virtue of **this power He sends them even as His Father sent Him** (John xx,21) to **teach and disciple**, (μαθητευειν), not one, but **all nations**; and instruct them in **all truths**. And **that He may assist them effectually in the execution of this commission**, he promises to be with them, not for three or four hundred years only, but **all days even to the consummation of the world**. How then could the Catholic Church ever go astray, having always with her pastors, as is here promised, Christ Himself, Who is **the way, the truth, and the life** (John xiv)?”

(From **The Catechism Explained**, Spirago-Clarke, page 88: “The Catholic comes to the Church for the explanation of the Bible. This is why only Bibles with explanatory notes are allowed to Catholics.”)

The Catholic Church’s fourth mark, then, is **missionary activity**, the subject matter of which is Christ’s revelation. **He** commanded that **His word** be **preached** and **observed**. The Apostles and their successors, sent forth, preached His Gospel until Vatican II, where doctrine was changed and

missionary effort stifled. The postconciliar “Church” lacks this fourth mark, Apostolicity, and is therefore not Catholic, not One, not Holy. It cannot, therefore, assume that Jesus Christ is with it. Reason excludes that He should be with heretics, schismatics, and apostates.

But, the wail arises, then Christ has failed His promise. Absurdity! He has failed to live up to some one’s idea (private interpretation) of His meaning. He has not left His Church; its leaders, successors of the Apostles, have left Him. In this desertion they have lost the rights and benefits of Apostolic succession, especially jurisdiction, without which their sacramental functions have no application to Catholics, any more than those of Greek Orthodox bishops. No one has any right to preach error, especially in Christ’s name. No one has a right to accept error in this field; he would thereby oppose Jesus Christ. Laymen may let their actions speak for them if they have not the words. Our most effective action (as distinct from prayer) is boycott, as public as possible. But bishops are presumed to have the words, as well as the public duty, to hunt down and combat (*persequar* and *impugnabo* reads their Consecration oath) heretics, schismatics, and rebels. A bishop may hide from those who seek his life, but is not a **silent** preacher of Christ’s truth in the noisy presence of heresy just a bit beyond belief? No one can claim to be secretly Catholic while openly adhering to an openly heretical council and its five antipopes. We can perceive the Vatican II heresies; how can the bishops not?

A bishop so utterly stupid that he cannot discern the conciliar “Church” heresies may be in good faith, but he is wrong. He may be guiltless, but he is not Catholic. He may have the mandate and the Orders, but he has neither jurisdiction nor prospect of recovering it. If Christ were with him he would be orthodox to the core. He has been **in fact** not Catholic for over twenty years. He has been **in law** not a Catholic bishop, archbishop, or cardinal for just as long. His personal guilt concerns no one. One is not allowed to preach heresy because he believes it, especially when he has been taught the truth.

For my conclusion that we have no Catholic bishop I am accused (by one who states that we have no pope) of heresy. I oppose the known doctrine of the Church based solely on Scripture, which says that the Church is (Eph. ii, 20) “built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets,” [a statement, not a reason.] Then, according to Matthew xxviii, 16, “the eleven disciples went into Galilee” and Jesus promised **them**, the bishops, not the whole Church, that He would be with **them** (and their successors) all days. It follows from this that there must be a hierarchy for Him to be with, or He has failed His promise, made to His **hierarchical** Church. This is a matter of **faith**, and if I won’t believe it I cannot be Catholic. Never mind that this hierarchy is invisible; I merely go by **appearances**; I must proceed on faith. In the Holy Eucharist we reject appearances on God’s authority.

These arguments support me as well as my accuser. Between Christ’s Crucifixion and Resurrection the gates of hell appeared to have prevailed, but they had not in fact. In these days when we suffer complete privation of pope and hierarchy, the gates of hell **appear** to prevail against the Church, but we know they cannot because we have Jesus Christ’s word (Matt xvi, 18) that they shall not prevail. We accept His word against what appears sufficiently grave that my accuser insists that the **fact** of this privation would prove Christ’s promise false.

Transubstantiation? It is one thing to believe that a substance is changed despite appearances, quite another to believe that a man openly in schism and/or heresy is substantially orthodox, therefore Catholic. No contradiction is involved in the first, taken on God’s authority, a genuine mystery. But the second is a contradiction in terms—completely unacceptable—not a mystery of any sort.

An Apostle is **essentially** a preacher and teacher. The eleven became Apostles when they were sent. They were already bishops.

“Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church” (Matt. xvi, 18). Christ promised His eleven Apostles and their successors that He would be with them all days. His promise was contingent upon and for the purpose of **preaching**—the Apostolic act and purpose, as Challoner noted. If we have no bishops Christ has failed His promise? Why? The **bishops** have failed, as

have so many throughout history. Why were they not preserved in the faith by His promise? He promised **those eleven—ten bishops in communion with their pope. If** the ten are necessary to the Church **so is the one** with whom they must be in communion.

Using my accuser's argument I can "prove" that there is now a secret, invisible pope—"or Christ has failed His promise." Indeed, this requirement of a pope has usually been the accepted meaning—proven false by events—of the end of St. Matthew's Gospel.

Certainly the present "hierarchy" **appears** in heresy—because it **is** in heresy. A genuine Catholic bishop has necessarily refused Vatican II from the moment it went into public heresy (first promulgated document, Const. Sacred Liturgy). Even bishops have free will, and can choose wrongly, desert God, and therefore oppose Him. The defect is not in Christ's promise or Church, but in men who choose to leave His Church, implicitly or explicitly.

But "until the end of time there will be Catholic bishops; therefore some exist now?" Suppose that we are **at** the end of time. Who can state infallibly that the "consummation of the world" (Greek: "until the end of the age") is one second or one century. Some time should be allowed for St. Paul's infallibly predicted apostasy.

It would indeed be nice to have bishops—nicer to have a pope. In the natural order it seems impossible. But God can do anything—even resurrect one.

Reason and faith never oppose each other. Faith supplies where we cannot reason because of mankind's limitations, where no way of working matters out through reason is possible. But the argument for an invisible hierarchy is the same used by visible apostates: Christ is with them because they "fill" the offices.

APOSTOLIC COLLEGE

(**The Catholic Encyclopedia**, Vol IV, pp. 112-113)—This term designates The Twelve Apostles as the body of men commissioned by Christ to spread the kingdom of God over the whole world and to give it the stability of a well-ordered society: i.e. to be the founders, the foundation, and the pillars of the visible Church on earth. **The name "apostle" connotes their commission. For an Apostle is a missionary, sent by competent authority, to extend the Gospel to new lands: a tradition, beginning with the sending of The Twelve, has consecrated this meaning of the term to the exclusion of all others which it might derive from its etymology.** When we speak of the Apostles as a college we imply that they worked together under one head and for one purpose. After accomplishing His own mission, Jesus Christ, in virtue of His absolute power and authority, sent into the world a body of teachers and preachers presided over by one head. They were His representatives, and had for their mission to publish to the world all revealed truth until the end of time. Their mission was not exclusively personal; it was to extend to their successors. Mankind were bound to receive them as Christ Himself. That their word might be His word, and might be recognized as such, He promised them His presence and the aid of the Holy Ghost to guarantee the infallibility of their doctrine; He promised external and supernatural signs as vouchers of its authenticity; He gave their doctrine an effective sanction by holding out an eternal reward to those who should faithfully adhere to it, and by threatening with eternal punishments those who should reject it. (Differences between Apostles and their succeeding hierarchy):

1) the Apostles received their commission directly from Christ, bishops receive theirs through the channel of other bishops. Immediate commission implies, in the missionary, the power to produce, at first hand, credentials to prove that he is the envoy of God by doing works which God alone can work. Hence the charisma miracles granted to the Apostles, but withheld from the generality of their successors whose commission is sufficiently accredited through their connexion with the original Apostolate.

2) the Apostles were sent to establish the Church wherever men in need of salvation were to be found. Their field of action had no limits but those of their own convenience and choice, at least if we take them collectively; directions by the chief Apostle are not excluded, for on them may have depended the good order of their work.

3) As planters of the Church the Apostles required and possessed the power to speak with full authority in their own name, without appealing to higher authorities; also the power to found and organize local churches, to appoint and consecrate bishops, and to invest them with jurisdiction. The limit to their powers in this respect was: **not to undo the work already done by their colleagues.**

[For to undo their work belongs to a superior. Nor should incumbents of the Apostolic See undo their predecessors' work; this also belongs to their Superior.]....

4) the Apostles received, each personally, the Holy Ghost, Who revealed to them all the truth they had to preach. This Pentecostal gift was necessary in order to establish each particular church on the solid foundation of unshakeable truth.

[Obviously God, Eternal Truth, cannot condemn anyone for refusing to believe a lie. Therefore His entire revelation is infallibly true, and the agency by which He makes it known to men is necessarily infallible in all that pertains to that revelation, which of its nature is not subject to change, even to accommodate modern man.]

(pp. 433-4) All arguments which go to prove the infallibility of the Church apply with their fullest force to the infallible authority of general councils in union with the pope. For conciliary decisions are the ripe fruit of the total life-energy of the teaching Church actuated and directed by the Holy Ghost. Such was the mind of the Apostles when, at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv, 28), they put the seal of supreme authority on their decisions in attributing them to the joint action of the Spirit of God and of themselves: "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us"

From the earliest times they who rejected the decisions of councils were themselves rejected by the Church How the same doctrine was embodied in many professions of faith may be seen in Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum et definitionum*, under the heading (index) "General councils represent the universal Church and demand absolute obedience." [When Paul VI, therefore, promulgated error and heresy in Vatican II's documents he tried to bluff all into accepting these errors and heresies as the action of Catholic bishops and of the Holy Ghost. He tried to involve the Holy Ghost in self-contradiction and heresy.] The Divine constitution of the Church and her promises of Divine assistance made by her Founder guarantee her inerrancy, in matters pertaining to faith and morals, independently of the pope's infallibility: a fallible pope supporting, and supported by, a council would still pronounce infallible decisions. This accounts for the fact that, before the Vatican decree concerning the supreme pontiff's *ex cathedra* judgments, oecumenical councils were generally held to be infallible even by those who denied papal infallibility The infallibility of the council springs from its nature. Christ promised to be in the midst of two or three of His disciples gathered together in His Name; now an oecumenical council is, in fact or in law, a gathering of all Christ's co-workers for the salvation of man through true faith and holy conduct; He is therefore in their midst, fulfilling His promises and leading them into the truth for which they are striving.

[How then assume that He was with heresy-generating Vatican II, which, far from striving for truth, deliberately set out to re-examine every single Catholic doctrine except papal infallibility? This convocation of modern men presumed to pass judgment on Jesus Christ's eternal revelation, including this extrapolated doctrine of conciliar infallibility.]

..... The subject matter of infallibility, or supreme juridical authority, is found in the definitions and decrees of councils, and in them alone, to the exclusion of the theological, scientific, or historical reasons upon which they are built up. These represent too much of the human element, of transient mentalities, of personal interests to claim the promise of infallibility made to the Church as a whole; it is the sense of the unchanging Church that is infallible, not the sense of individual churchmen of any age or excellence, and that sense finds expression only in the conclusions of the council approved by the pope.

The article then details that dogmatic definitions take the forms of both decrees (as in Tridentine and Vatican chapters) and canons (if anyone shall say let him be anathema). From the highly suspicious, innovative absence of canons from Vatican II's documents many conclude that Vatican II never intended to define anything; therefore its promulgated heresies, errors, and irregularities

left it genuine Catholic status as a pastoral council. (?) But it called its own works Dogmatic Constitutions (2), Constitution (1), Pastoral Constitution (1), Decrees (9), and Declarations (3), to the implementation of all of which three popes have dedicated their pontificates. The presumption is that since supposedly nothing was pronounced *ex cathedra* this council and these popes retain their infallibility—therefore their office—intact. So what happened to the infallibility of the ordinary magisterium, also necessary to the Catholic Church? Roncalli, Montini, Luciani, Wojtyla, and their apostate council receive not the love of truth, that they might be saved (II Thess ii, 10). They have cast shadows of doubt over the entire divine revelation, doubt or rejection of which is the surest road to hell.

Objection—Paul VI and Vatican II ended the Mass. Paul, properly elected pope, holding the keys, loosed rather than bound, repealed all laws by abrogation, and ended the papacy. The Great Apostasy, officially declared, has ended the officiating Church.

Reply—No matter how proper his election, an ineligible by reason of public heresy cannot be pope. Nor could any council convoked in violation of the law have the slightest legitimate effect upon the Church, its doctrine, its laws, its worship, its sacraments, none being subject to heretics or apostates. Even granting Montini's legitimate election, his signing and promulgation of Vatican II's documents proved him a public heretic. He introduced new rites for mass and sacraments, in violation of laws he had never abrogated, years after his automatic loss "without any declaration" of all offices in the Church.

Suppose, however, that there had been no Vatican II, and that Montini had never preached heresy before or after election, so that he appeared legitimate in every way. He would still have demonstrated his Arianism and return to Old Testament insufficient sacrifices in introducing his new rite for mass—thus correcting Jesus Christ and denying His divinity—automatically removing himself from the Church and denying the existence of the papacy; he would clearly have implied—just as he actually did—that he himself was vicar of a long dead man (not God) whose eternal sacrifice needed correction and return to its proper orientation.

Suppose further that Montini had brought in a new rite completely free from heresy, error, ambiguity, or split infinitives, and had even retained the Latin, in which few can split an infinitive. He would yet be utterly wrong—in violation of the laws enacted to protect, preserve, and perpetuate the Mass. Loose? St. Peter had the right to loose circumcision, seventh-day sabbaths, and abstinence from pork. St. Paul had the right to loose converts from non-sacramental unions with perverse pagans. And these burdens may not be re-imposed. Once the Church has bound something, that thing is bound also in heaven—not subject to subsequent loosing. Else it makes no sense to bind or loose.

Unfortunately, Montini changed comparatively few laws. He usually by-passed them, by bluff, softening of attitudes, liberal interpretations, or hidden sabotage, such as instructions to episcopal conferences. Had he really changed all the laws more Catholics might have caught on. There would have been little need for JP2's new code of canon law, which **still** left a few hundred laws unchanged.

All this deliberate illegal destruction has supplanted the continual sacrifice with an abomination **in the holy place**. If Daniel's prophecy (ix, 27) "the victim and the sacrifice shall fail: and there shall be in the temple the abomination of desolation" refers to the end of the world as well as to Jerusalem's fall in 70 A.D. (prophecy often finds more than one fulfillment) then a general result or situation suffices for its fulfillment in absence of absolute strictures on the meaning. Even the severest interpretation may apply eventually, as properly ordained priests grow senile, succumb to mental pressure, or die (and as the postconciliar Church imposes invalidating change on Eastern rites).

But nowhere officially (*ultra vires*) or unofficially has the new Church removed priests' power or obligation to celebrate Mass for the faithful. In sacrificing the priest has always acted *in persona Christi*. Christ remains eternally in His resurrected state; His Church is eternal. The priest is ordained not for himself but for the faithful. He sins grievously by omission unless he engages in missionary and sacramental activity in compliance with his Church's divine mandate and his own oaths, **even if he is put out of the holy place**. Should apostate authority withdraw his faculties, he

must recall the ultimate genuine ecclesiastical source of his jurisdiction, according to which all his permissions are taken in their widest sense, and all restrictions in their narrowest. His permanent assignment (priest forever) has not been canceled by his bishop's or pope's apostasy. He continues as through any other interregnum or persecution, invoking at least such authority as found in canon law. Lacking competent authority's specific decree terminating the Church's official worship, a priest can have neither knowledge of nor excuse for acting on such a supposition. He has neither right nor legal power to rob God of His due worship.

Objection—No priest has jurisdiction to hear confessions, because there are no Catholic bishops to grant jurisdiction.

Reply—God's and His Church's intention is that the faithful practise their faith and be saved. Canon Law follows this intention, which may be called, therefore, the intent of the lawgiver, or *epikeia*. The supreme law is the care of souls. Jurisdiction concerns itself with clergy properly trained and authorized to care for souls by administration or withholding of sacramental absolution, a function within the power of the priesthood. The Church, through its hierarchy, regulates use of the sacrament of Penance, and confers jurisdiction within the limits assigned to and by the individual ordinaries. "It is common doctrine that a law ceases to bind without repeal if the circumstances are such that the law has become positively harmful or unreasonable." (Canon Law, Bouscaren & Ellis, page 35)

Sacramental jurisdiction has always continued through vacancies. The argument should take the opposite view: Since we have no bishops no one has authority to withdraw or **limit** sacramental jurisdiction already held. A priest has power to forgive sins through the sacrament of Penance. The Church ordained him partly for this purpose. The faithful have the right to the ordinary means of salvation, and may request them of even an excommunicated priest, who (having no possible jurisdiction) may then accede to their request. Is it sense to deny them the use of a **Catholic** priest, a man who indisputably possesses jurisdiction from a legitimate Catholic bishop before he apostatized or died and was "succeeded" by an apostate?

Objection—Canon 200, §2: He who claims to possess delegated jurisdiction has the burden of proving the delegation.

Reply—The previous **Reply** should suffice for proof. Should anyone disagree, he cannot prove the contrary. This would then throw the matter, where not till now, under Canon 209, a law of the Church made for unusual circumstances for the benefit, not of the priest (who probably has **no** doubts), but of the faithful.

"Canon 209 provides for the common good and public security as well as for the tranquillity of conscience by reaffirming the well-known principle that the **Church supplies the necessary jurisdiction when a common error or a positive doubt arises**. Of course, the **common error**, to have this effect, must be accompanied by a *titulus coloratus* or an apparent title to the office one exercises. An intruder has no such claim." (Apparent title is the fact of the confessor's priesthood plus the absence of limiting power.. Nor can anyone "intrude" on the non-existent jurisdiction of a publicly heretical or apostate bishop.) "But if an Ordinary or confessor were commonly but erroneously supposed to have the necessary faculties, the Church would supply the defect of real jurisdiction. The same effect is produced by a positive and **probable doubt**, i.e., one which for certain reasons and circumstances inclines more to one side than to the other, in this case more to the side of the power being vested in the person whose court is sought. Whether this doubt regards the fact or the law is immaterial. A doubt regarding a fact would be whether a particular Ordinary or priest has a certain faculty; a doubt regarding the law (*ius*), whether the case falls under his jurisdiction. To quiet consciences the Church, out of the fullness of her power, supplies the defective jurisdiction and renders valid acts which would otherwise be invalid." (**A Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law**, Charles Augustine, O.S.B., D.D.)

Objection—Canon 209 validates **past** actions. It cannot be deliberately used, because God does not desire error.

Reply—On the contrary, this canon obliges a true priest to "exceed (what he may consider) his jurisdiction" for the good of souls, especially in such extreme circumstances as ours, where

possibly no other Catholic priest is available, in line with the well-known principle quoted above. The only “common error” seems to be that a Catholic priest’s powers, given him for the care and salvation of souls, can be limited by a theoretician or by bishops publicly in heresy, therefore lacking jurisdiction.

This canon is not merely a *sanatio in radice*, as in marriage legislation, but a prior dispensation, for the benefit not of the priest but of the faithful—like the sacrament of Penance itself. We hear on all sides that Canon Law is practically infallible—that it binds because the Church was infallibly guided in formulating it. But these legal purists, ignoring page 35 (see above) of Bouscaren & Ellis’ Text & Commentary, tell us that we cannot take advantage of Canon 209, which, **according to their argument**, is part of this infallible code, and seems just made for our times. Shall we look this small gift horse in the mouth?

Objection—You keep pounding on properly ordained priests of the Catholic Church. You seem to object to Lefebvre’s priests. Aren’t they Catholic?

Reply—Some of them may be Catholic. Some may even be priests. But they are not Catholic priests, ordained according to the laws and procedures of the Catholic Church for an ordinary who gives each a position, benefice, or title. It is impossible for men ordained(?) in Lefebvre’s postconciliar community to fit even these meager requirements unless Lefebvre declares the Holy See vacant and professes to act for the Church in the ensuing vacuum. This may not suffice, but it is the absolute minimum essential. Under the theory that prophecies can be fulfilled more than once, Lefebvre’s other Christs may just fit the prophetic command (Matt xxiv, 23): If any man shall say to you: Lo, here is Christ, or there: do not believe him.

I see no remedy for Lefebvre’s quandary, except his complete public condemnation of John XXIII, his council, his innovations, and his successors, to be followed by his own conditional re-ordination and re-consecration, and his recall of all his priests(?). If, having returned to the Church and sanity, he still believes he should ordain priests, let him then set up a genuine legal base (including personal assumption of the highest authority) to train and ordain Catholic priests and set them in open opposition to the apostate post-papal Church. He has waited so long and equivocated so blatantly that many would even then refuse to trust him: What is he up to now? What will he do next week?

Obviously he needs a credible Catholic bishop to lead the fight and assume control of the Church—to provide visible authority to which he may loyally adhere. The fact that such a bishop, having retired, lacks jurisdiction is readily relegated to the rubbish: compulsory(?) retirement for age is a deliberately destructive innovation, wholly to be ignored on recognition that non-popes lack jurisdiction, competence, or legislative power proper to the papacy. Such a retired bishop, on declaring Montini not pope, at least at the time of introduction of retirement legislation, could publicly reassume his proper jurisdiction (whether or not his diocese or the Roman *mafiosi* would accept his action) and proceed therefrom on a fairly solid base. At least one diocese would then have returned to the Communion of Saints.

Objection—What guilt you must feel! Why advise the phony opposition?

Reply—Secure in the knowledge that Lefebvre will never accept my advice, I have no qualms of conscience. If we find him belatedly involving some retired bishop(s) in his publicity stunts, perhaps he has taken yet another leaf from the postconciliar Church’s handbook of stratagems. Involvement has proven its effectiveness; everyone hates to be shown in religious error. Even when one appreciates that he has been conned into it he will often balk at self-correction; he feels too idiotic. He can’t admit his own gullibility. (Nor did he, right up to his death.)

Objection—Lefebvre has ordained at least one according to the Montinian rite, which he must, therefore, believe valid. [**or else?**] He accepts men so ordained into his society as priests. Other such men he ordains(?), re-ordains, or conditionally ordains. So he reads the intentions of the ordaining V2 bishops applied to what he believes a valid form. Therefore Marcel believes that sacraments do not operate of themselves but according to the indeterminable intentions of those conferring the sacraments. How sure can he be of the intention of the high-degree, Satan-worshipping Freemason who ordained him? Why is Lienart’s intention not at least as suspect as

that of the V2 men that Marcel has second-guessed?

Reply—You have some nerve bringing up unanswerable questions.

Objection—I don't care what Lefebvre says; only what his two local priests say.

Reply—Please don't risk idolatry to discover probably non-existent differences. They belong to his Society. Laisney, at least, was forced to concur in Lefebvre's heresies as the price of his ordination ceremony. Whether or not it made him a priest, it proved him a heretic. You may as well say that you don't care what JP2 says as long as Lefebvre says different. But Lefebvre supports JP2 as pope, and these two priests(?) support Lefebvre as head of their ecclesiastical organization. Retired? He still controls his ordinands' attitudes through his conditions for ordination. Catholics may (Canon 2261, 2) for any just reason ask the Sacraments and sacramentals from an excommunicated person especially if there is no other minister available, and the excommunicated person at their request may minister to them without any obligation to inquire into the reason for the request. but we may not approach a heretic for Sacraments except *in extremis*. These two young men will not take you on as excommunicated persons; they insist they are Catholic. How **else** will they attract support? Is it really worth the risk of idolatry to support heretics? We need not attend Mass, even if we are sure it **is** Mass, under difficulties of time and distance. But we **must** keep the faith.

Objection—Father Gerard Hogan's mass was genuine. I felt it in my bones.

Reply—So he learned the ceremonies. He behaves devoutly. You could say the same of Francis Schuckhardt, the Idaho phoney. Had you never met me I could don a black suit and a Roman collar and provide you the best fake mass ever seen. Believe what you want to believe instead of what you must believe to be saved. Feelings are responsible for nearly all our troubles. We would all love Mass every Sunday. But if the slightest chance exists that it is **not** Mass or the Mass of a schismatic or heretic, we are all far better off without it. We have all come through so much trouble for our faith. Why throw it away now? We could in better faith have gone along with the **main** apostasy.

* * * * *

UNMARRIAGE LEGISLATION

We are indebted to ON TARGET, Jan 16, 1987 for this not really incredible tale. A Queensland station owner advertized for a married overseer, for any number of reasons that leap readily to the mind. But the newspaper deleted the word married from his ad, so that it could conform to some federal legislation. He could, however, advertize for a young overseer and friend. The law, then, discriminates against the station owner, who is not permitted to state his requirements for those who will share his life and home, and against married people who demonstrate and need stability (a requirement for the job), in order not to discriminate against homosexuals, de factos, and other perverts to whom the station owner would not give space to pitch a tent. Obviously a government which perverts the law in such a manner has forgotten its purpose—to protect the **rights** of the individual. Legislation like this surely constitutes reason to abolish the legislature.

Indeed gay rights should have been more than enough to demonstrate this. The supportive bill, introduced by the N.S.W. premier, was voted for by the leader of the opposition. In this case, as in most, the citizen received no choice, no candidate who would support ordinary morals or the public's wish.

Lepers, even when in a majority, are segregated, confined, quarantined for the benefit of the community, which has the right, generally and individually, not to be subject to unnecessary risk, contagion, or infection. The individual leper, consumptive, or smallpox victim, by reason of his abnormalcy and threat to public health, has no rights over the community. When will governments which confine **these** threats to the community's rights recognize their obligation to defend the general public against AIDS? Can it be that the parliamentarians place their own interests above the community's? Is perversion a parliamentary privilege?

A NEW DAWN? ANOTHER CHANCE TO BE REASONABLE?

The Remnant, Sept. 30, 1976, reports fair treatment of traditionalists in the English press. Surely it is reasonable to let us have our Mass. In Leeds, where sympathy has always been shown us, “schismatic” intrusions are minimal. Father Adrian Hastings and other new breed “Catholics” favor our accommodation in frequent, widespread use of the Tridentine Mass. It is, after all, legitimate, valid worship.

In the letters column Michael Davies writes: “Fr. Most has evaded facing (similarity between Cranmer’s and Paul VI’s reforms) by concentration on two points which have no bearing on the mainstream complaint against the new mass, i.e., that it is invalid or illicit. I quite accept that the new mass is both valid and licit, but this in no way alters my conclusion that it has compromised the integrity of the Catholic Eucharistic teaching”

He writes (Cranmer’s Godly Order, p. 91): “Very few men have the courage to be martyrs and even those with strong convictions are liable to seek a compromise where one is possible. once the process of compromising has been entered into it tends to be self-perpetuating. A man who has been making continual concessions is liable to lack the will to make a stand and to feel that ‘in any case it is too late now.’” It will certainly be too late if the traditionalist falls for partial concessions.

Where the traditionalist is conceded nothing, where he is hounded and persecuted, where he is accused of schism for continuing in his traditions—in the Communion of Saints, where he is told he has been deprived because of his reaction to privation, there he can realize the issue. Attitudes like Davies’ are possible only in the rarefied atmosphere of compromise.

How is the traditionalist to maintain his religion when he gratuitously “admits” that Paul VI or Vatican II has power to effect such changes as we have seen in the Church? Whose word have we that these changes can be made? Only the changers’ word—if we can find it among endless torrents of meaningless verbiage! Why this first concession? What authority can guarantee absurdity? How, for instance, can a service that has compromised the integrity of Catholic Eucharistic teaching be a Mass at all, never mind its validity or liceity?

But now we may have our Latin back! A vernacular sacrilege becomes holy in Latin! “Well, if you’re used to this old form of words, maybe we can let you have it back, alongside the new. We’ve trained the young folks, and you’ll die off. You can have your Mass.” A typical communist compromise! They steal from you and offer to return part of the loot if you will concede something else in return. They steal your Mass, sacraments, dogmas, morals, traditions, and children, and then offer the Mass back if you won’t revolt.

But where **is** the Mass? No priest ordained since Easter 1969 can celebrate Mass no matter what rite he attempts. He is no more than a president, an elder, a modernist minister. I have seen the Tridentine Mass said after long intervals by properly ordained priests who have inadvertently omitted prayers or rubrics, or placed them in the wrong order. How shall I know when this amnesia extends to the offertory or consecration? There is no room in our worship for doubt—only for certainty, whose only alternative is idolatry.

Nor is there room for compromise, even could we traffic in the sacred, or even basis for discussion. This postconciliar Pauline religion must be wiped out, root and branch, “mass” and “sacraments,” doctrine and discipline; it promotes schism and purveys heresy from the very stronghold of the Faith.

Most traditional groups have become halfway houses; they pacify the indignant; they refuse to fight the battle before them. They beg crumbs from a “pope” who has repeatedly proven that he would rather burn the crumbs. They try to dialogue with a proven heretic who has shown that he will dialogue with everyone in the world but them. They seem to think that they must maintain union with him who has destroyed unity. They seem not to realize that they can win the war by shunning him, by ignoring his rules, his decrees, his orders, his recommendations, as well as his hopes and wishes. Worse, by their straddling and temporizing, by their pretence of fighting, they keep the man who will fight for the faith from the forefront of the battle. They are to be numbered

among the illegitimate offspring of the Church's "adulterous marriage with revolution and subversion."

IN "POPE JOHN'S COUNCIL"

Michael Davies mainly avoids conclusions; facts speak for themselves. In Chapter XIV, "The Status of the Documents," he abandons objectivity with the oddest results. The Second Vatican Council has status, he says, because properly convoked. So were the Robber Council of Ephesus, the twin Councils of Seleucia and Rimini, and the Council of Basel. Even the Synod of Pistoia was convoked (31 July 1786) by competent authority (Bp Scipio de' Ricci) invoking the authority of Pius VI, who had recommended a synod as the normal means of diocesan reform.

Vatican II, says Davies, was at all times recognized by the reigning pontiff. Its documents were passed by a majority of Council Fathers and were "validly promulgated by the pope." He demonstrates elsewhere that most of the Council Fathers were gulled into approving "time bombs" and that they lacked time to discuss or even read some of the matters requiring their votes. "In many respects," he says, "the documents were a dead letter from the day they were promulgated." He labors the point that this pastoral Council gave us no new doctrine—that it said nothing infallibly except what had previously been said infallibly, as the Council itself made clear (Theological Commission Declaration, 6 March 1964). It can, therefore, bind us only to that to which we were previously bound.

Davies asks (page 214): "What, then, must our attitude be to the documents of Vatican II? It must, above all, be a Catholic attitude and as such must exclude such simplistic responses as a 'rejection' or 'refusal' of the Council—whatever such terms may mean. Do those who use them mean that the Council was not convoked regularly, that its documents were not passed by the necessary majority, that they were not validly promulgated by the pope, that they contain formal heresy?" [3 out of 4 ain't bad.] "I have yet to see one word of solid evidence produced to substantiate such allegations. It has been a characteristic of Protestant sects to decide which General Council they will or will not accept and it is a cause for very deep regret to find some Catholics who claim to be traditionalists adopting a similar position."

Davies would reduce us to Protestantism, have us select what is true from this monstrous Council (all true **before** the Council) and reject only the Council's obviously deleterious results. He denies that these horrors grew from the Council, rather from its faulty interpretation. What grew from **Trent's** faulty interpretation? Who promoted and applied the "faulty" interpretations of the documents but the bishops who had voted them? Why is every change in worship and sacraments supported by citation of Council documents? If Davies has "yet to see one word of solid evidence" it is only for refusal to see hundreds.

He quotes, for instance, the obvious heresy that the Church could have erred in formulating doctrine (Ecumenism 6), but deplures only the boomerang effect of the **doubtless possibility**. He insists that the abuses in worship are not authorized by the Constitution on the Liturgy, itself honeycombed with tremendous, anarchy-breeding lies.

But Michael says we must not refuse or reject these documents; we must take instead a Catholic attitude. The classic Catholic attitude, the *sine qua non* which imparts its Catholicity, is rejection of heresy, of stultification, of self-contradiction. This Catholic attitude resulted in rejection of the Robber Council of Ephesus, of the twin Councils of Seleucia and Rimini, of much of the Council of Basel, and of the Synod of Pistoia. The Catholic Church—to continue in the Communion of Saints, even to recover the credibility and esteem of modern man—will necessarily condemn in its entirety—not the Barque of Peter—the **Ship of Fools**, Vatican II.

How condemn Vatican II? Appeal to the future? Another council? Some new papal statement? No; history has provided all we need. Pope St. Pius V (*Quo primum*) forbade all these liturgical innovations. Pope Pius II (*Exsecrabilis*) annulled Vatican II beforehand for its appeal from papal definitions and decrees.

But Michael ignored our documentation of Vatican II's most blatant heresies, and continued to stray (**The Remnant**, June 18, 1979): "While I hope I always gave Pope Paul VI the respect due his office, I was unable to feel any personal warmth towards him or to feel that he was anything but a disaster for the Church. As I have watched Pope John-Paul's triumphant visit to Poland, I have felt the same feeling of enthusiasm and loyalty that I felt for Pope Pius XII. Time and again as he appeared on the screen I felt glad that I am a Catholic and he is my Pope, I feel every traditionalist should welcome and support every positive statement Pope John Paul II makes and every positive initiative which he takes My optimism may prove to be unfounded."

Optimism, merely another feeling, should be based on fact. Usurpers do not merit respect due offices they have usurped. Personal warmth, enthusiasm, feelings of loyalty, possibly helpful, are not our surest guides. Pius XII was the last visible Catholic pope. No Catholic should welcome positive statements or initiatives of his supposed successors except public confession of errors (including Vatican II, all its reforms, all reforms in its name) and of the illegitimacy of their own elections.

Mr. Davies continues not to recognize central issues. He stands rather against the "immobilism" he expounds in **The Remnant**, May 31, 1979: "It would not be wise for traditionalists to regard the present situation as permanent. The attitude of the Vatican might change, the New Mass itself could be changed, and this would require us to reassess our position." [Change to the "New Mass" would concern tradition or the Apostolic Church less than the *novus ordo* itself, which needs only killing.] "..... imagine, for example, that some traditional prayers were restored to the New Mass, e.g., the *Suscipe Sancte Pater* during the Offertory, and the *Placeat Tibi* after the Communion," [Restored? When were **they** in the "New Mass?"] "and that the Roman Canon were made mandatory on Sundays." [The Roman (English) Canon, Eucharistic Prayer I, deletes or mistranslates about 350 words.]

"Providing (sic) that this could be combined with an accurate and dignified translation (no more 'for all men'), kneeling for Communion, no more Communion in the hand, lay ministers, and similar abuses, then although we would be faced with a New Mass, it would not be **the** New Mass we have rightly opposed." [All new "masses" **must** be opposed!] "The situation would be changed even more dramatically if permission were granted for the Tridentine Mass to be celebrated alongside the improved New Mass—not as a special privilege but as a matter of course. In such a situation, a refusal of traditionalists to revise their attitude in any way would constitute immobilism and it would be hard to justify it with a convincing defense."

On us is imposed a false religion featuring false, sacrilegious worship. Davies recognizes the imposers, and would compromise divine rights, rites, and honor on the supposition that he will be offered this communist compromise (confiscates your automobile, then returns your muffler for your garage). The Catholic Church has been one integrated whole in worship, body, and doctrine since its foundation. It is accepted or rejected *in toto*. No one will talk a genuine Catholic out of tradition for innovation. Neither necessity for nor possibility of compromise can exist. We were sure of what we had. No authority can guarantee novelty. Every true priest (ordained by proper authority in the traditional rite) can celebrate the Tridentine Mass without permission. Any Catholic can demand this from his parish priest on Sundays and Holy Days, to fulfil his obligation to assist **at Mass—not** at some novelty. If he settles for less he will follow his cowardly priest into hell.

This immobilism is the same quality that has kept Catholics in the Church through many other types of persecution. But this persecution—for mulishness, bigotry, unreasonableness, and refusal to entertain specious arguments based on gratuitous surrender of doctrinal and legal safeguards—is most insidious and dishonest of all. We need construct no justifications for defending our Church—*in toto*!

Michael has put forth a book which appears to prove that our vital sacrament of Holy Orders has been supplanted, but professes his faith in the supplanters. **The Order Of Melchisedech** sports a foreword in which Dr. J. P. M. van der Ploeg, O.P., S.T.D., etc., permits no doubt of the validity of

the new Bugnini rite of Order [despite *Apostolicae Curae*, 31, see Appendix VI]. Mr. Davies cites this authority on the Dead Sea Scrolls as an expert who has helped eliminate his own mistakes.

But suppose some one reads the book anyway, and becomes convinced that our disappearing priesthood and episcopacy are doomed. The “authority” which has convinced him has stated beforehand that he himself does not believe what he has proved. Why should the reader stultify himself and fight for suggestions? As soon as he enters the lists his opponents will gleefully quote his own “authority.”

So why the book? To prove the best (if they are the best) arguments avail nothing against the power and infallibility of Cardinal Knox and Archbishop Bugnini? Davies’ arguments should inspire at least his own belief. His audience hangs on his every word, but he appears unwilling to lead it to a conclusion. He would rather keep it subscribing to his books and fears to offend any of its faint little hearts. He shows no respect for its intelligence, acumen, or courage, but he’ll sell it his pusillanimous, though scholarly, books and lectures. This may account for his attitude. What respect is owed people who must wait for him to tell them what to believe?

It is said that we would hate to see anything go right, because then we’d have no excuse to fight. No worry—nothing has gone right for years. The moment things return to normal, Mr. Davies’ audience (like ours) will disappear. Grieve not for his loss of income; he can always apply his system to the races—backing every horse.

DR. JULES LAVOIE to MICHAEL DAVIES, Aug. 5, 1982 (excerpts):

“This conciliar church is a schismatic church. It has its new dogmas, its new priesthood, its new institutions, its new worship, all of which have been already condemned by the Church in an official and definitive way. Consequently this conciliar church is not Catholic.”

If these words were false, Mgr. Lefebvre had no right to utter them nor to act as if they were true. If true they must still be true—nothing has changed except for the worse since 1976—and their consequences must be accepted. You won’t accept the consequences, so you deny the words. Deliberately or not, you deceive your readers; among the writers of English you have probably harmed the traditional Church the most. Yet you have the cheek to accuse others of playing Satan’s game.

You defend Vatican II, even declaring that no one has proved its Declaration on Religious Freedom erroneous or heretical, and that if such were established this Declaration could be amended. [Not only has no one attempted to amend this Declaration, but had anyone done so his action could never have rehabilitated the promulgator of its original heretical form, a matter of historical record. It would be of extreme interest to discover your precedent, a putative occasion on which the Catholic Church promulgated, or even taught, obvious heresy and subsequently corrected it. Infallibility?!] But this Declaration’s provisions have been often and infallibly condemned. Popes Gregory XVI, Pius IX, Leo XIII, Pius XI, and Pius XII have all recalled the incompatibility between divine law and the alleged right to religious freedom.

Feb. 6, 1978 Lefebvre wrote to the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith: “The church of Vatican II recognizes in all religions without distinction the power of honoring God, a power which however can belong only to the Catholic religion. In short, the Vatican II church merges Buddha, the God of Mohamet, and Our Savior Jesus Christ into a single Supreme Divinity Paragraph 4 is absolutely scandalous, and contradicts all the teaching of the Church No Catholic worthy of the name can subscribe to such infamy To admit that this religious liberty is based on natural law is absolutely contrary to the necessity of eternal salvation based on the Catholic faith.”

You reach your peak on the *novus ordo*. Against all odds, after six hundred pages you confirm its validity and liceity. BRAVO! For refutation I enclose an analysis of the new rite. Unlike you, its author gives reasons and proofs to support her statements. The conciliar church’s hatred for the true Mass is simply diabolical. One must return to Luther for its equal.

To prove the *novus ordo*'s liceity and validity you consult theologians of high repute—and higher anonymity. Since you say that competent theologians are not found among traditionalists it follows necessarily that your consultants belong to the conciliar church, which removes all value from your argument. The Mass is Catholic. Lefebvre often says the *novus ordo* endangers the Catholic faith. Mass endangers faith?! Self-evident absurdity!

Theologians trained in and committed to the Catholic Church of the ages aver (as does your Lefebvre) that, matrimony possibly excepted, the new sacraments are more certainly than doubtfully invalid. But you intervene in favor of the man-made novelties, particularly the impossible “ordinations,” Dr. Coomaraswamy has shown beyond doubt that Extreme Unction has nothing in common with the new blessing of the sick.

You admit Paul VI's reign a disaster, but you obstinately write as if nothing he said or did can be considered heretical. Can you render orthodox his promulgation of Vatican II's doctrine on religious freedom? You must conclude that either (1) the Church teaching under Paul VI has failed or (2) the Church under Paul VI teaching at Vatican II is not the Catholic Church.

The first? Impossible! God, Who can neither deceive nor be deceived, promised to be with His Church [wherever it is, however many its adherents] all days. But men can deceive, so the second conclusion is inescapable; Vatican II has attempted to deceive us, and cannot, therefore, be a true council of the Catholic Church. Paul VI, having promulgated its specified, condemned heresies, cannot have been a true pope. His error was voluntary and obstinate. He could not plead ignorance [only obedience to non-existent authority]. He brushed aside all episcopal interventions which reminded him at the “council” that religious freedom as promulgated opposes the rule of faith. A voluntary and obstinate heretic cannot belong to the Church, therefore cannot be pope. It follows that Paul VI's every official action, at least from the date of this promulgation, was null and void.

According to you, John Paul II is clearly orthodox in every respect. He supports the *novus ordo* and continues to forbid true worship. He professes to follow the letter of Vatican II and proposes to continue its implementation. He embarks further and further into false ecumenism, the heretical definitions of which one can no longer count. What of his recent statement to the Moslems: “We adore the same God that you do?” Can JP2 not know that Moslems deny the Holy Trinity and the divinity of Christ?

You have not (or carelessly) read JP2's encyclicals, or (if carefully) obstinately refuse to see that they contradict Catholic doctrine. JP2 affirms that “Jesus Christ is united to everyone forever through” (redemption).—*Redemptor hominis*

Then personal conversion plays no part in this unique union. “The Incarnation confers forever on man his extraordinary, unique, unutterable dignity.” (*Dives in misericordia*) A radical change of outlook!

In the Church's liturgy the Redeemer came to overcome man's abject unworthiness due to sin. In *Dives in misericordia* the Redeemer came to consecrate man's worthiness and died to testify to it. Here again is Peter Abelard's error condemned by the Council of Sens (1140). From this principle that all, through the Incarnation, have acquired this new dignity flows inevitably: Every man is saved. JP2, 27 April 1980: “Christ obtained once for all the salvation of man, and every man and all men The Church preaches the Paschal certitude of the Resurrection, the certitude of salvation.” (*L'Osservatore Romano*, 6 May 1980) Certitude of salvation was condemned by the Council of Trent (Sess VI, *De Justificatione*). We are forced to conclude that JP2, teaching doctrine already condemned by the Church, publicly professes heresy.

This should satisfy your request (The Remnant, June 15, 1982) for information on formal and obstinate contradiction of the Church's defined doctrine on the part of John XXIII and his successors. Please note well, and stop affirming the contrary. [French is truly the language of diplomacy.]

MICHAEL DAVIES AGAIN PROVES (“CATHOLIC” Aug. 1984)
that he can’t understand the plainest public translations.

“Where the postconciliar popes are concerned,” he writes (page 8, last column), “just as Pope Liberius endorsed an ambiguous doctrinal statement, they have endorsed a liturgical reform which presents Catholic eucharistic teaching far less explicitly than the rites it has replaced.” [Just as? Davies had devoted half the first column to the pressure and coercion to which the emperor had subjected Liberius. What pressure has coerced the postconciliar “popes” into suppressing true worship of the true God and replacing it with heretical idolatrous rites? Why should Davies hide behind the ambiguous doctrinal statement that the liturgical reform presents Catholic eucharistic teaching? Who coerces him? “Far less explicitly?” How can such a phrase describe contrary definition, contraindication of intention, and correction of Jesus Christ Who instituted the Mass?]

“Pope Paul VI and John Paul II have not wavered in their adherence to all the fundamental dogmas of the faith, but they, like Liberius, have not removed from their sees, bishops who undermine these dogmas. And it is here that we see most clearly how closely the present crisis corresponds with the period of the Arian heresy” [to which the emperor subscribed while he protected heretical hierarchies from papal interference]. “The faith is being destroyed by bishops, or with the connivance of bishops, who are in *de facto* communion with the Pope.”

[Of course they are! The manager shoved the stool under his gory, staggering middleweight. “We got ’im, kid! He ain’t laid a glove on ya!”

“Keep yer eye on the ref! Some one’s beatin’ ’ell outa me!”

Who appointed these bishops? Who controls and prepares agenda for episcopal conferences? Who introduced the reforms, especially in doctrine, promulgated over whose signature in Vatican II’s documents? Who but these bishops—most convenient whipping boys—who fear to stand up for Catholic doctrine (in the face of what threat from whom?) have all and everywhere conspired to defeat the noble aims of the postconciliar “popes,” two of whom had been highly vocal bishops?

But then Davies has stated often enough that he can see no heresies in Vatican II’s at best unnecessary documents. This is possibly why “**Catholic**” donates him all that space. Page 2 lists as “Consultant” the same Gerard Hogan (soutanes by Omar) who confessed to a group in Toowoomba how difficult it has become to determine what **is** heresy these days. We recommend “**CatholicS**” by Bryan Moore: “We all know what heresy is—yesterday’s orthodoxy!”]

“We can be sure that, as was the case in the fourth century, orthodoxy will eventually triumph.” [Certainly, just possibly in no time at all, at the Last Judgment.]

“Each of us has a duty to do all in his power to ensure that what has been entrusted to the Church from the beginning” [goals, doctrine, Mass, sacraments?] “is not abandoned, and our most effective means of achieving this objective will be to get down on our knees and pray.” [Possibly, but a bit of common sense, a bit of adherence to, or even distant recognition of, truth might help.

Catholics have no corner on the prayer market. The Jansenists were known for their fervor. Moslems pray five times daily. The bare fact that one prays is no guarantee that he knows the truth, or even for what to pray, such as courage to face facts.]

Hamish Fraser’s APPROACHES #93 came with Supplements galore.
The Divine Constitution and Indefectibility of the Catholic Church

by another convert, Michael Davies, “is essential reading,” wrote Fraser, “for all those who are perturbed by allegations that John Paul II is a heretic and/or that the Apostolic See is vacant.” To describe my brand of allegator he could have omitted **/or**. Davies supports his argument with 93 quotations and citations, seven times of himself and/or Lefebvre, five times of Vatican II documents, five times of the new code of “Canon Law,” and once of John Paul II himself—all to support his argument that JP2 is really, truly pope. The vicious cycle lives. The sedevacantist position depends largely on JP2’s public heresy, which in turn depends largely on Vatican II’s officially published heresies, and which precludes legitimacy of a new code of canon law, in

absence of a legitimate promulgating authority. This new code was necessary to legitimize and support (in another vicious cycle) its own basis and “authority.” The Renewal, based on and productive of heresy and bluff, produced its own code to justify its own wholesale fracture of the 1918 Code undoubtedly in force during the Renewal’s own arbitrary imposition.

Davies quotes extensively from a document prepared, but neither voted nor promulgated, at the Vatican Council in 1870. This, he says, shows the general belief and attitude at the time, specifically that “Christ’s Church can never lose its sacred teaching authority, the priestly office, and governing body” Is it not possible that God permitted this council’s abrupt termination to prevent official endorsement or definition of this prognostication? Pope Pius XII stated that the Church would always retain its visible hierarchical structure. But this is not, nor can it be, a *de fide* definition. No part of the Revelation, it does not necessarily follow logically, theologically, or in any other way therefrom. Prediction is no part of the papal office, charge, or competence. Not even meteorologists profess infallibility in their chosen field. Papal infallibility is confined to the Deposit of Faith, to Christ’s Revelation, to faith and morals.

We can easily understand such attitudes—even convictions. Few read the signs. No Catholic of my vast acquaintance, nor I myself, would in 1950 have believed what has since befallen our Church. It could not happen! Had we not the Holy Ghost? Did not Christ promise to be with us to the end? Reading St. Paul’s infallible prognostication in II Thessalonians ii, nearly all envisioned a great lapse of the laity, not the hierarchy. Successful large-scale apostasy requires credible leadership. The laity might fall from grace; apostasy needs higher authority. The Holy Ghost will never desert His Church; its members—no matter how high—can desert Him, or free will is a myth.

Christ’s promise begins with “**and**,” denoting a continuation of or dependence upon His previous sentence, the promise’s condition—While you carry out My orders I shall be with you for that purpose. Who can expect Me to be with those who neglect or refuse My commands—those who have terminated My missionary activity and polluted My worship, sacraments, and doctrine? With apostate heretics? With non-Catholic popes, bishops, and priests?

According to Davies, despite Canons 2314 and 188 these apostates have not lost office in the Church, because they have not denied a defined dogma. The Church has seldom defined a truth as a dogma until some one denied it. There is no need to define the unquestioned, nor to legislate against unthought-of crimes.

Was Arius a Catholic for seven years before Nicaea condemned his heresy? Can a heresy be condemned as such unless it **is** a heresy? Is it any less a heresy before its condemnation? Was pollution of the Mass less criminal before *Quo primum*?

But most current heretics will never draw official censure because (1) they are modernists, and many cannot identify this heresy—through unfamiliarity with St. Pius X’s *Lamentabili sane* and *Pascendi dominici gregis*; (2) no competent authority exists to condemn them. Were JP2 and his cohorts to condemn them they would thereby condemn themselves. Yet lack of such suicidal condemnation is argued as evidence of orthodoxy.

Davies himself cites as authority Ludwig Ott’s **Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma** five times. Many dogmas included therein are classed as other than *de fide*. They are nonetheless included as fundamentals of Catholic dogma.

Davies (page 26): “In the Old Code of Canon Law,” [undeniably in effect during and after Vatican II] “it was forbidden for Catholics to take part in the divine worship of non-Catholics. This is an ecclesiastical and not a divine law.” But Bouscaren & Ellis, whom Davies cited five times in this strange document, designate such actions “formal co-operation in an evil act, and forbidden by the natural law.” Since Canon 2316 penalizes violation of Canon 1258 with suspicion of heresy, thus declaring it the action of a heretic, Davies appears to imply that heresy itself is a matter for only ecclesiastical law, despite Jesus Christ’s “He who believes not shall be condemned.”

Often enough we have catalogued blatant, obvious, previously condemned errors promulgated as Catholic truth by Vatican II and its “popes.” But Davies would have us look at these heretics’ entire output—not merely “suspect or ambiguous” statements or actions—most of which is orthodox. How can we perceive its orthodoxy? Previously recorded. How many heresies make a heretic? ONE.

But Jesus Christ, say Fraser and Davies, is with these men because He promised to be with His Church. History records seven occasions when popes have condoned or supported one single heresy, usually under terrible pressure. In each case the matter was resolved and rectified. In our time four men claiming to be popes are so habitually in error that they can be defended only on grounds that they never speak *ex cathedra*, or never quite deny *de fide* definitions. Where is their infallibility? The Holy Ghost would not permit them to err by accident—if they were popes. But God permits man’s free will to govern his own actions. It follows that they err deliberately. We can forget that they err through ignorance, or hardening of the arteries; we have had old, sick, and ignorant popes before. The Holy Ghost is not subject to these conditions. Even genuine popes have no license to preach error. Such preachment is clear evidence that they are not Catholic, therefore not popes.

Davies: “The *novus ordo Missae* would appear at first to be a very strong argument against the doctrine of indefectibility” [if it were a true Mass] “..... I have devoted countless articles, pamphlets, and, above all, my book **Pope Paul’s New Mass**, to documenting the manner in which the Catholicism of millions has been destroyed by the liturgical revolution that has followed Vatican II. These practices” [“abuses” of the *novus ordo*] “are certainly harmful, and would appear to undermine the doctrine of the Church’s indefectibility. But this cannot be the case as the Church is and must be indefectible or it ceases to be the Church founded by Our Lord, which would mean that Our Lord had never founded a Church.” Or else that “pope,” hierarchy, and clergy had defected. **The Church** is indefectible, **not** those who have defected from it, even should they constitute the whole Catholic population. The introduction or continuation of false worship, heretical and defective, cannot be the act of a Catholic, especially a genuine pope under the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

Davies: “Although the Ordinary and Proper of the Mass as found in the New Latin Missal are manifestly inferior to the Missal of St. Pius V as an expression of Catholic Eucharistic teaching,” [How is inferior other than incorrect?] “they do not contain heresy” [outside of Judaism, Islam, Arianism, and correction of Jesus Christ in what He offered] “or mandate” [carefully avoided in form] “any practice that is in itself contrary or harmful to the faith. There is nothing in this Latin Missal which could be described as intrinsically bad in strict theological terms.” [“the Catholicism of millions has been destroyed by the liturgical revolution”—Davies above] “..... the fact that the Latin Missal of Paul VI is free from doctrinal error and mandates no intrinsically harmful practices will not surprise any Catholic acquainted with the indefectible character of the Church.”

All these terrible effects and defects, then, result from the faulty vernacular translations? Who authorized and approved these faith-destroying translations, which are used to the almost entire exclusion of the “official” Latin? Why the Ottaviani Intervention, which preceded all vernacular translations? After nearly twenty years of the *novus bogus missae*, Rome is blithely ignorant of the vernaculars’ faults? These are intentional and deliberate, as any unbiased observer would agree. They have for their purpose the dilution, defilement, and destruction of the Catholic faith.

Davies finishes with a trumpet: Let’s arise in our might, wipe out Paul VI’s New Missal (even in Latin!), and restore the Missal of St. Pius V in its 1962(!) version to all altars, which we must, of course, rebuild. How will all this be done while he and his ilk acknowledge the *novus ordo*’s impossible validity? If it **is** a Mass, if Paul VI, JP1, and JP2 **are** real popes, and, forsaking their purpose, enjoy some shadow of power to impose it (to the exclusion of what all Catholics must believe is a true Mass), who are these men to disobey legitimate authority and reject a properly promulgated, valid Mass? They are clearly rebels, and have no right to be considered.

If they believe the new rite merely inferior, let them swallow their patrician tastes and submit like the common herd. Or let them admit that:

- 1) the papacy's purpose is preservation; it may never innovate doctrine.
- 2) it is nineteen centuries late to institute a sacrament or a Mass.
- 3) a genuine pope could and would condemn Vatican II and all subsequent innovations within half an hour of his election.
- 4) we must apply Jesus Christ's criterion: "By their fruits you shall know them."
- 5) John XXIII's 1962 Mass innovations also violated *Quo primum tempore*, and were intended to set the precedent to break down that law completely.
- 6) the freemasons have taken over total control, as they foretold more than a century ago.
- 7) Davies and Fraser by their pusillanimous attitudes have contributed greatly to the Renewal's overwhelming success.
- 8) the Renewal is probably St. Paul's predicted great apostasy.
- 9) to acknowledge the authority of the Renewal's leaders is to join them in this apostasy.
- 10) it is utterly useless to reason with those leaders.
- 11) complete boycott is probably our last weapon—except for prayer.

SUMMING IT UP (Michael Davies in *Christian Order*)

Beautiful title! Michael must have decided the time has come to organize his position, draw his conclusions, and flee the religious scene. No one should assume authority in a field in which he is uninformed and totally incompetent.

The headline misled me; he has **not** quit misinforming the public—he continues to ignore demonstrations of his own egregious errors and refutations of his strange logic. He can't even stick to facts, which would severely limit his output. "A lawfully elected Pope could never become an antipope." But Anacletus II was, to all appearances, lawfully elected pope. He now rejoices in the designation **antipope** because he acted in much the same manner as Paul VI. Anacletus, however, was judged on his fruits.

I cannot understand those who insist that Paul VI was pope. Their insistence creates them problems in justifying his destructive activities and explaining away his obvious heresies, many of them notorious —making him ineligible—long before his "lawful" election. He derived his "eligibility," the cardinalate, from another heretic, John XXIII. He perverted the papacy's purpose. Supposedly Christ's vicar, he assumed Christ's own power to institute new sacraments and a new "mass" in the form of an old meal. Supposedly infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost, he promulgated lies, errors, and previously condemned heresies over his official seal and signature. These lies, errors, and heresies, repeatedly drawn to Michael's attention, he blandly ignores. He continues to "reason" in circles and mazes, from which truth could liberate him. A Catholic cannot be required to practise or believe anything new, especially new papal purposes and powers.

"Sedevacantism," writes Michael, "has made very little impact upon the traditionalist movement within the Church, let alone on the Church as a whole, as few if any of its proponents can be taken seriously by any Catholic with a modicum of theological knowledge."

How does theology affect Michael's case? Canon law defines **heretic**, and declares the heretic outside the Church. A proponent proposes. A Catholic recognizes facts, even notorious heresies. I belong to the Catholic Church to which I have always belonged since my baptism in 1918. The Church is well-known in every way, but especially by its four marks. It is ONE in all times and places. It is not a movement, not even a traditionalist movement; it is an unchangeable Church, necessarily traditional, preserved in its entirety by the Holy Ghost. It preceded theology, even by the modicum. Any Catholic who grew up in and knows his religion can recognize the fact that his postconciliar "Church" is unrecognizable, and can appreciate the fact that this unrecognizability stems directly from Vatican II and its four claimants to the papacy. A false claimant to the papacy has traditionally been termed an antipope. The Church has no such official.

But Michael Davies, who did **not** grow up in the Church and never really knew the religion, says you must pity and pray for the Catholic—the man who knows his religion and knows it is unchangeable—rather than answer him—by refuting facts? Innovation, not tradition, requires proof. Executive *fiat* is not proof. Nor is it of divine and Catholic faith, so defined by the Church, that any particular antipope is or was pope because elected.

“There has never been a case,” writes Michael, “of a pope who was undoubtedly a formal heretic” Of course not; a contradiction in terms, like a square circle. But four notorious, formal, automatically excommunicated heretics have with malice aforethought usurped the papacy. We have had no visible pope since Pius XII.

Davies quotes Bouscaren & Ellis [with which authority he disagrees on Canon 1258] on legal definition of a heretic. In Volume V, page 688, **The Catholic Encyclopedia** (1913), he will find that one is automatically excommunicated for holding certain condemned propositions, whether or not these fit Canon 1323’s definition of heresy. An excommunicated man, heretic or not, cannot be pope— head of an organization to which he does not belong. When we see a “pope” teaching error, even if not heresy under Canon 1323, we are faced with the fact that he is not infallible in matters of faith and morals. We must conclude that lacking infallibility he is not pope. We cannot be forced to choose between popes. We know the doctrine and we know that a genuine pope knows it. We know that a genuine pope enjoys the Holy Ghost’s guidance and protection, which the teacher of error obviously lacks. But this argument is all unnecessary. Paul VI convicted himself of notorious heresy, even under Davies’ conditions, again and again.

Davies, however, persists in the falsehood: “There is not one instance which comes remotely within this category” (a pope rejecting doctrine classed as of divine and Catholic faith). He clings to his belief that we must judge a man’s orthodoxy “by the totality of his published opinions.” Nearly all the Church’s condemned heretics were condemned each for his one heresy, usually within a huge framework of orthodoxy which disguised his heresy sufficiently to attract adherents. Each heresy preceded its condemnation. Doctrine is seldom defined till some heresy forces its definition. But it is still, as always, Catholic doctrine, belief in which is necessary for salvation. Few heretics had the consummate gall to change everything; that was left for Vatican II and its antipopes. If you steal ten dollars from a bank you will very likely go to prison; but not if you steal the bank.

Davies can neither deny nor explain away the overt Arianism in the “official worship” instituted [beyond papal competence] by Paul VI. What kind of vicar officially denies his Principal? What kind of Catholic denies Christ’s divinity? Why would we believe anything else He taught? How can we accept three “vicars” who have imposed and continue to impose this idolatrous *novus ordo missae*, even should they permit the true Mass occasionally, now that they appear to have outlasted all “serious” demand for it?

“The faithful have no right to judge the Pope,” says Davies. First you need a pope. Who needs a right to judge what does not exist?

Then Davies superficially explores the Church’s indefectibility. He may be trying to beg a question: that to be indefectible it must have a head. It **has** a Head, Jesus Christ. It has remained indefectible not only through reigns of unworthy vicars but through extended popeless periods as well.

But Davies is Catholic to the core; look how he drags in Our Lady of Fatima to persuade JP2 to restore order. A real pope would, persuasion aside, clear up the whole mess in half an hour. (“The difficult at once.”) To straighten out Michael Davies (“The impossible”) will take a little longer.

Has he never noticed that under Canon 2314 not only heretics and schismatics incur *ipso facto* excommunication; the first category so expelled is “all apostates from the Christian faith?” If one abandons the Christian faith entirely (Canon 1325) he is called an apostate. Abandonment is an action, not necessarily verbalized as heresy. It can be, as in Paul VI’s or Emperor Julian’s cases, a whole series of anti-Catholic actions, in which correctness of doctrine need never arise. Could Michael have excluded Henry VIII for heresy? But something excommunicated him. Michael will

probably allow that Henry put himself out of the Church by his anti-Catholic actions. But Paul VI in effect put all his predecessors but one out of the Church—for Catholic actions. The current antipope even put them all legally in the wrong. He excused changes to the laws just as Paul VI excused changes to worship, by pretending that the previous code of canon laws was a set of new laws rather than a largely better arrangement of several unwieldy codes. Paul pretended that he only followed St. Pius V in instituting a new rite. He knew he needed a precedent, so he invented one; he could hardly point to his real precedents, introduced by Cranmer, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, and several more, which had necessitated St. Pius V's codification of divine law seldom if ever violated before the reformation. Paul made pikers of them all. No one in all history has made such a successful assault on Catholic worship or doctrine.

According to Liddell & Scott's Greek-English Lexicon, ἀποστασία is a later form for ἀποστασις = a standing away from, and so 1. a defection, revolt 2. departure or removal from 3. distance, interval. The Douai version New Testament translates its use in St. Paul's II Thessalonians ii, **revolt**. The Vulgate uses *discessio*, which Lewis & Short's Latin Dictionary translates **separation, schism**, citing this particular Scriptural passage in support.

The papacy's purpose is preservation. It provides our standard of unity in belief. Its chief task is to preserve and propagate the Deposit of Faith consigned to the Church's care by Jesus Christ Himself, Who established the Church and instituted its Mass and sacraments as a major part of the Deposit of Faith entrusted to the Catholic Church and its head, His vicar, for preaching and preservation *in toto*.

When a man separates himself from his official duties to preserve and propagate the unchangeable, unaugmentable Deposit of Faith, and assumes divine power to institute new mass and new sacraments, when this man continually expresses dissatisfaction with Jesus Christ's message and looks forward to its completion, clearly this man has revolted—as surely as Lucifer. He just as surely exceeds his competence, which is confined in a genuine pope to the Deposit of Faith, complete as handed down from Jesus Christ and His Apostles through His unchangeable Catholic Church. Included in this unchangeable Deposit is St. Paul's prophecy of a revolt (*discessio*,) before the end. Paul VI, like Henry VIII, Julian the Apostate, and Lucifer, could not bear to stand alone in his apostasy; he apparently thought he could prove himself correct by forcing agreement from everyone else, again like his three prototypes, thus fulfilling St. Paul's infallible prophecy.

Michael Davies (**The Angelus**, Nov. 1980): Lefebvre's "crime is that he insists upon the validity of the New Mass and the fact that John Paul II is truly pope, and will not allow any priest to remain within the Society who contests either of these positions." No, Michael, that is the tip of the iceberg. He has attracted and betrayed the support of the true Catholic, who thought this hypocritical conspirator actually fought for the Faith, and now he tries to lead that Catholic into the Apostasy.

And you have helped him immensely to impede the fight. You glibly and loftily instruct us ignorant Catholics with untenable opinions of Dr. Francis Clark. You tell us that objections—all three—to validity of the *novus ordo* based on defective intention have been sufficiently refuted in one of your books. Have you explained away the fact that the *novus ordo* is simply not a Mass by definition of its architects, be they Catholic, Protestant, Jew, Moslem, or atheist? Can you explain how it satisfies the requirements (*Quo primum*, Canon 817) of the Church? Can you deny your own Francis Clark: "When the sufficiency or insufficiency of a rite is in question" [not that it is] "the decisive norm is the acceptance or rejection of it by the Catholic Church?" This rite and all then current similar rites [validity aside] were so rejected by *Quo primum* which enshrined the teaching of the Council of Trent. Whoever stated quite unequivocally, as you say, that the new "mass" was intended to enshrine that teaching quite unequivocally lied. Don't say that contemporary Catholics have accepted the *novus ordo*; even when less vocal than we, they stay away in millions, and not merely the poorly instructed younger generation. Can you show that Clark's "practical infallibility" of the Church's determining decrees, which in the sacramental sphere, he says, guarantee what they declare, can be withheld from *Quo primum*, which cannot be

excluded from that sphere? The ultimate authority for deciding whether or not rites are valid is, you say in apparent contradiction of your Francis Clark, the pope. How, then, can you ignore St. Pius V's exercised authority to prefer a known heretic's wish and hope that his experiment will be accepted?

The Mass is a divine institution. Can you explain how the *novus ordo*, invented only these few years, rejected immediately by the 1967 Roman Synod, acquired divine institution? Even proper papal authority properly exercised cannot validate a new rite of Mass. Certainly Montini, a known heretic before his election, an even more widely known heretic after promulgating Vatican II's condemned heresies, had no possible authority to introduce a rite for a May Day procession. Why so freely accord theoretical validity to that which even Lefebvre admits is seldom valid in practice? Are we not sufficiently divided?

According to Adrian Fortescue (**The Mass, A Study of the Roman Liturgy**): "The whole consecration-prayer is one thing, ..(see earlier article, **Traditional Worship**)... *totius orationis*."

Yet you grant a valid consecration to a priest using Cranmer's communion service. Could a priest more clearly show lack of the Church's intention than in a service of a sect which declares our Mass "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits?"

The new rite lacks the Church's traditional—therefore necessary—intention. How can a priest manifest intention to do what the Church intends in a rite which (1) the Church forbade centuries ago; (2) clearly expresses incompatible intentions?

A new rite, defined as not a Mass, flaunting condemned heresy, perverting Christ's own most solemn Consecratory Prayer in both word and form, contradicting Christ's and His Church's identical sacrificial intention, is fraudulently introduced as an experiment in flagrant violation of laws made to protect our Holy Mass and in deliberate fracture of two most solemn oaths required of and sworn by every priest at ordination and every bishop at consecration, all nineteen centuries too late for Revelation! Valid? Are you, too, a plant?

BLINDNESS PALPABLE

"I am firmly convinced that for a Christian to pledge himself to a religious (or quasi-religious) organization which offers prayer and worship to God which deliberately exclude the name of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in Whose name only is salvation found, is apostatic." — DARKNESS VISIBLE (1952 by Walton Hannah, disturbed by Freemasonry's prevalence among Anglican clergy)

"Looking at the nature of vows in general, it does seem very difficult for a Churchman to undertake them without being guilty of either vain or rash swearing. He seems to be initiated into an alien cult. If it is not taken seriously—or taken very symbolically (in contravention of the oath's words: without evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation of any kind) then the oath comes under the heading of vain swearing or profanity. If it is taken seriously then it must be put down as rash swearing, for there is no certainty that the Christian initiate will not find out afterwards that he has joined an alien cult." — V. A. Demant, Regius Professor, Moral & Pastoral Theology, Oxford U.

"The following syllogism is typical: religion exists to help people live good lives. Masonry helps people to lead good lives. Therefore Masonry is religion. There are in Masonic workings distinct elements of religion a religion that is entirely non-Christian." — Hannah

"The question whether Masonry is a religion appears merely a war of words. Perhaps the best way ..(to).. conclusion would be to enumerate the points common to most religions and then to enquire in what respect Masonry differs from them. Religion deals with the relationship between man and his Maker and instils a reverence for the Creator as first cause. Religions abound in worship by prayer and praise. They inculcate rules of conduct by holding up a God or a Hero as a pattern for imitation It would be difficult to say in which of these characteristics Freemasonry is lacking. Surely it abounds in all." — Sir John Cockburn, Past Grand Deacon of England, Past Deputy Grand Master of Australia.

Masonry claims, says Hannah, to impart a spiritual and esoteric light. In the third degree this light shows utterly pagan incompatibility with the light Our Lord shed upon the grave, for “the light of a Master Mason is darkness visible, serving only to express the gloom which rests on the prospect of futurity.” Yet Masonry believes in immortality, not through Christ, but through the example, dramatically re-enacted by the candidate, of a semi-mythical Phoenician brass-founder, Hiram Abiff, who died rather than betray the secrets of Masonry. This re-enactment is presented as a religious rite, not only as a moral example but as a quasi-sacramental experience with an *ex opere operato* significance, raising the candidate “from a dead level to a living perpendicular.” The ceremony begins with prayer for “Thy servant who offers himself a candidate to partake with us the mysterious secrets of a Master Mason”: “Endue him with such fortitude that in the hour of trial he fail not, but that, passing safely under Thy protection through the valley of the shadow of death, he may finally rise from the tomb of transgression, to shine as the stars forever and ever.” This indicates that “the mysterious secrets of a Master Mason” have robbed the grave of victory.

That most Masons don't see the third degree ceremonies in this light may exonerate them from the sin of wilfully partaking in what the early Fathers stigmatized in contemporary mystery-religions as satanic parodies of Christian worship. But it cannot exonerate Masonry, which claims that its usages approximate to those of ancient Egypt. Unawareness of an obvious and logical interpretation does not *ipso facto* make the interpretation false.

The Royal Arch Mason knows the “sacred and mysterious name of the true and living God most High,” which is JAH-BUL-ON, a compound of Jahweh (Hebrew), Baal (Assyrian), and On or Osiris (Egyptian). This degree breaks down the claim that the Masonic deity is a common denominator. The Greater Lights are the creative, preservative, and annihilative powers, exactly matching the Hindu trinity, Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva. Ceremonies are concerned almost entirely with quest and discovery of the lost Word—a pagan and syncretistic name of God. Signs are fully explained as religious signs, exemplifying the relationship of man to his Maker. The full title of this degree is the Holy Royal Arch, and the Chapters set up altars. The Officers represent the functions of “prophet, priest, and king.” Anointing with oil and the use of incense, recognized religious symbols, (at least occasionally) accompany this degree which claims to teach on the nature of God.

Is there a religion behind all religions in which all men agree? Is it lawful for a Christian to join in common worship with a Moslem of a common-denominator God of neither faith, whom each in his heart worships as his own God? “This issue is fundamental, and no amount of eloquence on the non-controversial benefits of meeting together to promote charity and good works should be allowed to obscure it. the issue in practice arises but seldom, but Masonry stands four-square on the principle that it can and should happen. Many Anglicans have tender consciences over joint services with Nonconformists on the ground that where different bodies mean different things by what they say in their worship, that worship becomes unreal. And yet the differences between separated Christian bodies are trifling compared with the difference between those who do and those who do not accept Christ as the Son of God, their only Mediator and Saviour. Christianity is an exclusive faith. To offer worship to God in forms which reject Christ with the specific intention of including people who likewise reject Christ is an act of apostasy for which no amount of mental reservation can altogether atone. To argue that as there is undoubtedly some measure of truth in all faiths the Christian is at liberty temporarily to set aside what he knows to be the full revealed truth in order to come down to the level of what the non-Christian happens to have in common with him is again apostasy, however charitable the motive.”

Masonry presents itself as “a complete and self-sufficient system of moral and spiritual guidance through this world and the next. It teaches one's whole duty to God and to man, and a way of justification by works which if followed will lead to salvation. Nowhere does it give the slightest hint that anything further is necessary to the religious life. The religious outlook of Masonry strongly echoes the Deism of the eighteenth century in stressing the light of nature as a moral guide, in beginning and ending with man's aspirations to God, with man's justifying himself in the eyes of God by his own good works. Masonry disdains any conception of God reaching down from Heaven to save and heal mankind.

“For the Christian who accepts this revelation to revert to pre-Christian types and shadows for spiritual and moral light, and in so doing to ignore Our Lord altogether and exclude all mention of Him in an unofficial and man-made system of worship and moral betterment is to dishonour the Incarnation by ignoring it and by going behind Christ’s back. ‘Idolatry,’ said Archbishop William Temple, ‘..... consists in worshiping God under any other conception of Him than that which is set before us in the Gospels.’

“..... initiation into Masonry is not merely ‘meeting’ people It is **joining** them — identifying oneself by solemn oath with those people and with their sub-Christian beliefs. Masonry claims to impart a light, spiritual and moral, which shines nowhere else. It claims to have secrets which add to a man’s sense of spiritual values, and improve his character. It claims the exclusive possession of certain truths to have found the worship of God. in Masonry is an inescapable and moral dilemma. **If Freemasonry claims to possess secrets the knowledge of which would benefit all mankind in enabling a man to lead a higher and more moral life, it is immoral to keep that knowledge to itself. If Freemasonry does not possess such secrets, it is equally immoral for it to claim that it does possess them.**”

Hannah goes on to list the objections of many religious groups, from the Catholic Church to the Salvation Army, and finishes: **“No Church that has seriously investigated the religious teachings and implications of Freemasonry has ever yet failed to condemn it.”**

This approaches ecumenical action. All these differing Churches agree at least here. And each condemns the Masonry it knows, in most cases the English or Scottish “religious” or “conservative” types, not the frankly atheistic continental plotters.

Albert Pike, greatest Masonic authority of the last century, the ‘Masonic Pope,’ wrote: “When the journal in London which speaks of the Freemasonry of the Grand Lodge of England, deprecatingly protested that the English Freemasonry was innocent of the charges preferred by the Papal Bull against Freemasonry, when it declared that English Freemasonry had no opinions political or religious, and that it did not in the least degree sympathize with the loose opinions and extravagant utterances of part of the Continental Freemasonry, it was very justly and very conclusively checkmated by the Romish organs with the reply, ‘It is idle for you to protest. You are Freemasons and you recognize them as Freemasons. You give them countenance, encouragement and support and you are jointly responsible with them and cannot shirk that responsibility.’”

And for what are they jointly responsible? Back to Pike: “To the crowd we must say: we worship a God but it is the God one adores without superstition. To you, Sovereign Grand Inspectors General, we say this, that you may repeat it to the brethren of the 32nd, 31st and 30th degrees: all of us initiates of the high degrees should maintain the Masonic religion in the purity of the Luciferian doctrine. If Lucifer were not God, would Adonay, the God of the Christians, whose deeds prove his cruelty, perfidy, and hatred of man, his barbarism and repulsion of science, would Adonay and his priests calumniate him? Yes, Lucifer is God, and unfortunately Adonay is also God religious philosophy in its purity and truth consists in the belief in Lucifer, the equal of Adonay.”

Another great Masonic light, J. D. Buck, mentions (**The Genius of Freemasonry**) “a tendency to ‘Christianize’ certain Masonic degrees. Any sectarian or religious bias is wholly un-Masonic and wholly opposed to the real genius of Freemasonry.” (page 34) “The Mason everywhere is an enemy of Popery, because Popery seeks to deny, control, or abrogate every right of citizenship. It denies man’s right to Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. It is necessary that the basis, the real Genius of these two Institutions, should be clearly understood and accurately distinguished; for they are exact opposites and are antagonistic to the last degree.”

Leo XIII, after outlining the political errors of the Naturalists and stating that the Freemasons agree with these errors to the extent that they have long worked to set up states and governments to fit these errors, continues: “In this mad and wicked design, the implacable thirst for vengeance with which Satan is animated against Our Lord Jesus Christ becomes almost visible to our bodily eyes A complete change and upheaval is being carefully prepared by numerous associations of

Communists and Socialists, in fact it is their openly avowed aim; and Freemasonry is not only not opposed to their plans, but looks upon them with the greatest favor, as its leading principles are identical with theirs.” (*Humanum Genus*)

Pius XII (23 May 1958) ascribed the roots of modern apostasy to scientific atheism, dialectical materialism, rationalism, illuminism, laicism, and Freemasonry—the mother of them all.

La Massoneria, an official Masonic document published in 1945 for circulation among the lodges: “Freemasonry alone possesses the true religion, which is Gnosticism. All the other religions, and especially Catholicism, have taken what is true in their doctrines from Freemasonry. They possess only absurd or false theories.” Given such a source?

Freemasonry then is an actively anti-Catholic false religion, condemned by pope after pope, legislated against by the Church, which properly excommunicates its members for joining the Freemasons. But in Paul VI’s halcyon days we may violate divine law by joining our enemies in false worship to God—or Lucifer. In this, at least, the postconciliar “Church” is consistent, for it tries to involve us all in the *novus ordo* service, the best example of false worship since the Reformation. Should we doubt such an intention in the *novus ordo*’s lawless imposition when this intention is so clearly manifest in permission—nay, encouragement!—to join the Freemasons? What are we to think of “authority” irrational enough to place us in the company of Albert Pike, the devil-worshipper, and Hannibal Bugnini, the great architect of the *novus ordo*? Surely there is an end to blindness as well as blind obedience.

The bulk of the Bible, the inspired word of God, is Hebrew in human origin. The Old Testament prepares for and prophesies the Messiah, Jesus Christ. The New Testament, humanly speaking, originated from those who welcomed Him. Opposed were the traditions of those who refused Him, and set up the first heresy, the “Jewish” religion based on denial of fulfillment of the Old Testament. The laws, customs, doctrines, and “wisdom” of these scorners of God’s promise are embodied in the Talmud.

In Sydney’s Mitchell Library is a book donated by a Jew who had joined the freemasons and repented almost immediately. They believe fairy tales, he complained; they know not their own origin and spew forth infantile fantasies. But certain familiarities induced deeper research. Freemasonry, he maintains at length in minute detail, makes sense only as an outgrowth of the Talmud. Read **Freemasonry from the Talmud?** by A. Posman.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913, Vol. XII, p. 775a: “In 881-2 Pope John VIII prescribed the reordination of Bishop Joseph of Vercelli, who had been ordained by the Archbishop of Milan, then under the ban of excommunication.”

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Supplement, Q. 39, Art 2: “For the higher orders, however, the use of reason is required both out of respect for, and for the lawfulness of the sacrament, not only on account of the vow of continency annexed thereto, but also because the handling of the sacraments is entrusted to them. But **for the episcopate** whereby a man receives power also over the mystical body, **the act of accepting the pastoral care of souls is required; wherefore the use of reason is necessary for the validity of episcopal consecration.**”

The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1913, Vol. XIII, p. 304a: “(1) *Conditions for Valid Reception.*—(a) The previous reception of baptism (by water) is an essential condition for the valid reception of any other sacrament. **Only citizens and members of the Church can come under her influence as such; baptism is the door by which we enter the Church and thereby become members of a mystical body united to Christ our head** (Catech. Trid., de bapt., nn. 5, 52). (b) In adults, for the valid reception of any sacrament except the Eucharist, it is necessary that they have the intention of receiving it. The sacraments impose obligations and confer grace: Christ does not wish to impose those obligations or confer grace without the consent of man. The Eucharist is excepted because, in whatever state the recipient may be, it is always the body and blood of Christ.”

Moral Theology, Heribert Jone & Urban Adelman, 1946, pp. 334-5: “**460. Requirements for Valid Reception.** 1. The recipient of a Sacrament must be **in the wayfaring state** and (except in case of Baptism) validly baptized. 2. The required *intention* must be present. **461.** a) *The implicit habitual intention* is in itself sufficient for the valid reception of a Sacrament. b) *The implicit habitual intention* is required in order that ordination be certainly valid, since the intention to assume a new state and new burdens is not readily included in another act of volition.” p. 468: “**638. I. Validity** requires that the candidate for ordination be a baptized male who, if an adult, must have at least the habitual explicit intention to receive the Sacrament of Holy Orders.”

Canon Law, A Text and Commentary, Bouscaren & Ellis, 1953, p. 422, Canon 968: “Only a person of the male sex who has been baptized can validly receive the sacrament of orders. (1) *the male sex*—the constant practice of the Church from the earliest days as well as the unanimous teaching of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church have excluded women from the reception of orders; (2) *baptism by water*—it is only by baptism that a man can become a member of Christ’s Church and thus receive the right to the other sacraments (c. 87). **A third requisite is supposed in the case of an adult: the intention to receive the sacrament**—this is required for validity in adults; an habitual, express intention suffices, that is, a positive act of the will once formed and never retracted before the reception of orders.”

Cursus Theologicus, Carolus Bozzola, S.J., 1948, Vol. IV, *De Sacramentis*, p. 296, under *De subjecto sacramenti ordinis*: “But in adults, as we have already seen also for other sacraments, is required at least habitual intention of receiving the sacrament.”

Sacramental Theology, A Textbook for Advanced Students,

Clarence McAuliff, S.J., 1958, pp. 64-5: “The recipient’s intention must be both external and internal. He must intend not only to receive the sacred rite (external intention), but also to receive it **as an act of Christian worship.**”

Summa Theologiae Moralis iuxta codicem iuris canonici, Noldin & Schmitt, 1938 (25th edition), III *De Sacramentis*, p. 476: “**465.** for **valid** reception of orders it is required and it suffices (α) that the ordinand be a male; (β) that he be baptized; (γ) that he have at least habitual intention of receiving the order, if he be adult.”

Obviously the baptism required is Catholic Baptism, the only baptism which provides entry into the Catholic Church. To receive Orders, we are told again and again, is the right of Catholic Church members only. Certainly the Church has no intention of conferring priesthood or episcopate upon non-members, especially ex-members. “Only citizens and members of the Church can come under her influence as such; baptism is the door by which we enter the Church.” Apostasy and excommunication are doors by which we leave the Church, and lose all rights of members, especially title to the episcopate. The bishop, says St. Thomas, **must** have the use of reason because he **must intend** to fulfil the duties of his office. “**But for the episcopate** whereby a man receives power also over the mystical body, **the act of accepting the pastoral care of souls is required; wherefore the use of reason is necessary for the validity of episcopal consecration.**”

In use of our own reason we can readily appreciate the utter lack of reason involved in accepting that a man who has both apostatized by, and been excommunicated for, joining the masons, having attained a lofty devil-worshipping degree, can intend to accept the pastoral care of Catholic souls. Here is a prime example of a man with a four-square head attempting the absurd task of fitting it into a (roughly) circular mitre. As Hugo Maria Kellner pointed out (Letter No. 75, April 1979), Achille Lienart was utterly ineligible for the episcopacy by reason of apostasy and excommunication, and was by reason of 30° Freemasonry utterly incapable of forming the correct intention to receive a sacrament for its proper purpose “as an act of Christian worship.” Indeed, Vatican II’s only benefit that comes to mind is that Achille Lienart there proved his diabolical orientation (grand?)—which Lefebvre and his unordained crew impiously hope never interfered with his ecclesiastical actions. Perhaps they can bemuse themselves about his intention, but they cannot gainsay his perfect ineligibility—which made his intention irrelevant.

As Mr. Kellner demonstrated, Canon 968 falsified Church doctrine by listing apostasy and excommunication as “irregularities”—thus preserving non-existent Catholic rights of ex-Catholics.

The 1917 Code was a **codification** of the many overlapping sources of the law, not intended as a **correction**. It removed laws for which no purpose remained, but freemasonry remains a major foe, entitled to no benefit from our laws. Only treachery could have introduced this “loophole.”

Canon law, unless divine, is not dogmatic. Divine law in cases like Lienart’s: **“He that is not with Me is against Me : and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth.”** — Matt xii, 30; Luke xi, 23

We see the Lefebvrites continue to scatter. Unfortunately, they continue also to drag along traditional Catholics, to whom the priest’s word, despite our sad experience, remains law.

Objection—There seems only one lone authority, though widely quoted, for the fact of Cardinal Lienart’s membership in the Freemasons. It seems highly unlikely that such evidence as his signature on a masonic register would exist. An infiltrator would have been more careful than to leave evidence which could trip him up—destroy his usefulness to the craft.

Reply—I see no reason why a Freemason would not sign a secret register, never intended for the general public. One must allow for arrogance (and even occasional stupidity) among those too proud to serve God. It could be taken as an indication of their care of secrecy that only one man discovered the primary evidence. A fact is not less true because known to only one man. Our daily newspapers thrive on beats and scoops. When a man discovers such a fact he is conscience-bound to publish it. There is no time for corroboration from others, who, if they exist, either fear for their lives or share the plot. This lone authority appears to have been correct in certain other cases, notably Bugnini’s.

Lienart, Freemason or not, certainly proved at Vatican II and since that he was not Catholic. With Suenens, Koenig, Lercaro, Dopfner, and many others he worked ceaselessly in the interests of the modernists and Freemasons. Which constitute the greater danger? (possibly to sacraments as well as Church?)

I stated publicly that I believed Lefebvre a properly ordained a priest, but I refused to bet my salvation on this unnecessary belief. Additional information and deeper analysis have convinced me that Lienart never ordained anyone. No Catholic is required to believe in the validity of Lefebvre’s orders. Even were validity possible, his public heresy insures that his conferred orders are not licit. No one is permitted to use illicitly obtained orders (Canon 2372). Laisney, like any priest “ordained” since Lefebvre refused to ordain men who differed from his two theological opinions that the *novus ordo missae* is not *per se* invalid and that notorious heretics are or can be popes, is by this refusal proven to have held the same two heresies, as well as to have been responsible, like Lefebvre, for all heresies promulgated by Paul VI and his successors. This applies to any priest who retains membership in Lefebvre’s organization.

If Lefebvre ordained priests, they are not **Catholic** priests—ordained according to Church regulations, at the Church’s orders, to positions in the Church—even should they be both priests and Catholic. All Catholics are bound to shun his “priests”—who are not even excommunicated priests with a proper background to whom we may repair *in extremis*. They have never been legitimately trained or ordained Catholic priests; they have no status to which they can return.

When a prominent, reputable historian reports a fact which is by its nature difficult for the man in the street to check, you may believe him because of the consequences to himself. High Grand Orient Freemasonry is, to say the least, treacherous, devious, and dangerous. Fortunately Lienart’s behavior at and since Vatican II confirms the report, which, in turn, provides all the “reason” behind the behavior.

Could this God-hater have himself intended to receive the fullness of Holy Orders? One may reasonably doubt it. Doubt is not permitted in our sacraments. Even could this “doubt” be resolved, there remain two more, either of which must be avoided: 1) whether an apostate freemason can intend to act in any way for the Church which 2) he certainly tried to destroy subsequently in its unity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity. Why should he neglect holiness, especially Mass and

sacraments, holiest of all? Freemasons often attack the Church in different sectors, but never limit hostilities thereto; **their** war is total.

One of freemasonry's best-known policies, that which initially attracts members, is promotion of the brothers, each in his own field. This may very well account for Marcel Lefebvre's rise to the episcopacy in the first place. He certainly acted and thought like a freemason. But the experience which solidified my own suspicion, being a matter not of action but rather of omission or inertia, is more difficult to demonstrate. It remains possible, and contributes unnecessarily to the huge doubt clouding all Lienart's "sacramental" activities. But this is all overkill; Lefebvre had every right to be shunned by all over his proven public heresies.

LEFEBVRE ORDAINED(?) BY A HIGH-DEGREE FREEMASON

We thought this legitimate because apparently supported by St. Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* III, 64, cited by Econe's Laudenschlager. However good the other arguments pro or con, further pursuit of III, 64 clearly convicts Econe of dishonesty in claiming its approval. St. Thomas presents the Laudenschlager selective citations as opinions—not Church dogma. Fuller quotation of the same III, 64 places St. Thomas in the opposite camp.

"An inanimate instrument has no intention respecting effects. But in intention's place is the motion by which it is impelled by the principal agent. But an animate instrument, as is a minister, not only is moved, but also moves himself inasmuch as he by his own will moves his limbs to perform the necessary actions. Therefore is required his intention, by which he subjects himself to the principal agent: that he evidently intends to do what Christ and the Church do."—*S.T.* III, 64, 8, ad 1

Question (64, 8, 2): "One man cannot know another's intention. If therefore the minister's intention is required for completion of a sacrament, the man approaching the sacrament could not know that he has received the sacrament. And so he could not have certitude of salvation, especially since certain sacraments are necessary for salvation, as will be explained below."

Answer: "About this there are two opinions. For some say mental intention is required in the minister, which if lacking no sacrament is conferred. But in children, who have no intention of approaching the sacrament, Christ Who baptizes interiorly, supplies for this defect. But in adults, because they intend to receive sacraments, their faith and devotion supply this defect.

"Now while this might be said to be adequate so far as the ultimate effect is concerned, namely, justification from sins, still, so far as that effect which is reality and sacrament is concerned, in other words so far as character is concerned, it seems that the defect cannot be made good merely through devotion of him who approaches the sacraments; because the character is never imprinted except through the sacrament.

"Therefore others say better that the minister of a sacrament acts in the person of the whole Church, whose minister he is. But in the words which are uttered the Church's intention is expressed. This suffices for completion of the sacrament unless the contrary be expressed on the part of the minister or the recipient of the sacrament."

Laudenschlager's statement that the Church has recognized validity of orders of certain schismatic heretics cannot extend to cover validity of orders conferred by apostates.

"Apostasy from the faith separates a man from God altogether, as we have seen, which is not the case with other sins."—*S.T.* II-IIae, 12, ad 3

"One can deviate from the rightness of Christian faith doubly. In one way because he will not assent to Christ Himself: and this has as if an evil will concerning the end itself. And this pertains to the type of infidelity of pagans and Jews. In the other way though he intends to assent to Christ he fails in choosing those things by which he may assent to Christ, because he chooses not what was truly given by Christ but what his own mind suggests to him. Therefore heresy is a type of infidelity pertaining to those who profess the faith of Christ but corrupt His teachings."—*S.T.* II-IIae, 11, 1, reply

Laudenschlager by quoting St. Thomas out of context tries to show that a masonic impostor pretending to be Catholic, practising perfect visible-audible valid external intentions, can validly ordain. So he pursues quotation no further:

“The intention of the minister can be perverted in two ways. One way, with respect to the sacrament itself: for instance when some one does not intend to confer a sacrament but to do something deceptively (*delusorie*). And such perverseness takes away the truth of a sacrament: especially when he manifests his intention outwardly.”—*S.T.* III, 64, 10 reply

Especially rules out **exclusively**. Nor does St. Thomas place a time limit on outward manifestation. Probably most of us heard from some nun the unlikely fable of the old black slave at an episcopal consecration. She told the new bishop how proud she was, since it was she who had baptized him. “Oh? And how did you do it?” “Why, you was so cute I couldn’t use plain water—I used milk!” So the new bishop was forced to be baptized properly, to be confirmed, to make his First Communion, to undergo conferral of minor and major orders, to be ordained priest and consecrated bishop. It makes no difference, as this fable was meant to illustrate, however much later the defect is manifested.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol VIII, page 69d: “The Church teaches very unequivocally that for the valid conferring of the sacraments, the minister must have the intention of doing at least what the Church does. This is laid down with great emphasis by the Council of Trent. (Sess. VII). The opinion once defended by such theologians as Catharinus and Salmeron (theologians at Trent) that there need only be the intention to perform deliberately the external rite proper to each sacrament, and that, as long as this was true, the interior dissent of the minister from the mind of the Church would not invalidate the sacrament, no longer finds adherents. The common doctrine now is that a real internal intention to act as a minister of Christ, or to do what Christ instituted the sacraments to effect, in other words, to truly baptize, absolve, etc., is required. The intention need not necessarily be of the sort called actual. That would often be practically impossible. It is enough that it be virtual. Neither habitual nor interpretive intention in the minister will suffice for the validity of the sacrament. The truth is that here and now, when the sacrament is being conferred, neither of these intentions exists and they can therefore exercise no determining influence upon what is done. Whatever may be said speculatively about the opinion of Ambrosius Catharinus who advocated the sufficiency of an external intention in the minister, it may not be followed in practise, because, outside of cases of necessity, no one may follow a probable opinion against one that is safer, when there is question of something required for the validity of a sacrament.”

Overwhelming evidence of Achille Lienart’s apostasy was capped by his behavior at Vatican II, where Paul VI appointed him a Moderator on the strength of his “liberal” record. Joining the freemasons itself constitutes apostasy. It is quite likely that Lienart never in his life validly ordained a priest. All his ordinations lie under a cloud of legitimate doubt, which must attach to Lefebvre’s orders. Lienart made him a priest(?). Lefebvre was, therefore, at best, doubtfully eligible for the episcopacy, for which true priesthood is pre-required. All his own conferred ordinations share the same doubt. Anyone, therefore, who—ignoring Lefebvre’s heresies, to which he obliges his ordinands—attends a Mass(?) celebrated by him or any necessarily heretical priests(?) in good standing with his Fraternity of St. Pius X (or its breakaway Society of St. Peter), if aware of the doubt, unnecessarily risks mortal sin. If unaware of the doubt he runs the risk of idolatry. This applies with greater force to the doubtful priests themselves who dare celebrate Mass(?) or administer sacraments(?) under this cloud.

FREEMASONRY’S EFFECT ON ORDINATION

Dr. Rama Coomaraswamy (**Roman Catholic**, June 1982): “Let us then look to discover a historical precedent about a Masonic bishop.” He then devoted three long paragraphs to the biography of Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Perigord, Bishop of Autun, forced into the clerical state by his family, assuming his bought diocese only as his ticket into the Estates General.

“After most of the traditional and loyal bishops fled France, it fell his lot to consecrate (together with the infamous apostate, Bishop Gobel) all the ‘Constitutional Bishops’ that replaced them. He was a bad priest, an apostate bishop, a Freemason, a Christian barred from communion and an individual who for forty-nine years could not receive the sacraments of the Church.” [A Christian? A priest? Whoever can show that he was forced into marriage could in normal times be almost sure of an annulment—a declaration that he had not received the sacrament of matrimony for lack of interior consent, no matter how impressive the ceremony. What are we to believe of Talleyrand’s consent to his enforced ordination?]

“Now the point of all this is that most of the bishops of France derived their Apostolic Succession through Talleyrand and his two associates (also supporters of the Revolution). Not only were all Talleyrand’s episcopal consecrations recognized, but when the Concordat between Napoleon and Pius VII was signed, the exiled bishops who had remained loyal to Pope Pius VI were asked to resign. Rome allowed the bishops of the Constitutional Church, all of whom derived their orders from the Mason Talleyrand, to remain in their positions, as diocesan ordinaries. The fact that Talleyrand was a Mason and a revolutionary made no difference.

“To sum up (1) There is no real evidence that Cardinal Lienart was a Freemason. (2) If he had been a Freemason, it would not have invalidated the sacraments he conferred. (3) The case of Talleyrand demonstrates in the practical order that the Church does not regard ordinations performed by Freemasons as invalid.” [Talleyrand consecrated two (2!) bishops in 1791. He was quickly excommunicated, and ceased all ecclesiastical activity.]

Pius VII was not necessarily a free agent in his dealings with Napoleon. Nor did he thereby rule on Talleyrand’s orders; he had two other bishops on whom he could rely for validity and Apostolic Succession, as provided by Church law to overcome one or two of the participating bishops’ ineligibility. “Supporters of the Revolution,” most probably in error, could not lose their sacramental powers through that support. We can cite priests and bishops of almost all political persuasions, including supporters of the masonic American Revolution.

If, despite reams of logical evidence, no one can prove Lienart a Freemason, at least no one can prove he was not. Lefebvre accepted the public disclosure as factual, concerning himself only with the “fact” that an apostate enemy of God can still confer valid orders. Lefebvre himself acts in a most peculiar manner, due possibly to his own masonic entanglement—which obviously I cannot prove. But it is characteristic of the masonic plotters that they set up their own phony opposition, so that they need not deal with genuine opposition. Naturally its leader’s record varies from that of the ordinary apostate. If Lefebvre is not the phony opposition, where is this vital part of the plot? Who else keeps traditionalists out of the real fight? Many try, but he succeeds, despite his blatant “strategic” procrastination and inconsistency. Undeniably, people who should fight follow him instead, and let him conduct the compromises.

St. Gregory Nazianzen (325-389) in 379 heard the call of the downtrodden Catholics of Constantinople, and there gave five sermons on the Creed of Nicaea, which earned him, alone of all Christian teachers except the Apostle St. John, the special title of *Theologus* or the Divine. In these discourses Gregory “summed up and closed the controversy of a whole century.” The best evidence of their value and power lies in the fact that for over fourteen centuries they have been a mine whence the greatest theologians of Christendom have drawn treasures of wisdom to illustrate and support their own teaching on the deepest mysteries of the Catholic Faith.

It almost seems that the closer a man is to God, the easier it is to take advantage of him. He refuses to think ill of others. So Gregory lost influence with his fellow bishops through another’s abuse of his hospitality and trust.

St. Gregory received at face value one Maximus the Cynic, and surrounded him with honors. Maximus conspired to supplant Gregory in the see of Constantinople. Having previously won the confidence of Peter, Patriarch of Alexandria, he had seven chosen men who were to guarantee his claims sent from Egypt. He gathered about him a large number of sailors from the Imperial fleet, bribed some intimate acquaintances of Gregory, and, during the latter’s sickness, entered with his followers into the Anastasis church. Some bishops then started to consecrate him bishop. Word spread and the people came running. Maximus and his friends fled to the house of a flute-player and there the ordination continued.

The Council of Constantinople (May-July 381) took up first the question of the see of Constantinople. The scandalous ordination of Maximus the Cynic was pronounced **null as contrary to canon law**. The first consequence of this decision was a declaration of **invalidity of all ordinations performed by him**.

“If anyone say that those who have not been rightly ordained by ecclesiastical and canonical power and have not been sent, but come from some other source, are lawful ministers of the word and of the sacraments: let him be anathema.”

Council of Trent, Session XXIII, 15/7/1563

The Faith is not defended from nothing or nobody

but from aggression and aggressors, heresies and heretics. To insist that public heretics are popes is to join them in heresy.

This statement can be refuted only in: (1) proving Vatican II completely orthodox, that it promulgated no error whatsoever, and that the new “mass” contains no Arianism, no Judaism, no Lutheranism, no apocatastasis, no variation from Catholic tradition or doctrine. For who promulgated these monstrosities? And who continues to support and impose them? On whose authority does **anyone** accept them? Or (2) in declaring tradition false—in anathematizing Pius XII and all his predecessors back to St. Peter as heretics.

THE LEFEBVRE SYNDROME

St. Eusebius, bishop of Samosata, is claimed as a precedent. **The Catholic Encyclopedia**, Vol V, p. 615: “Eusebius displayed his greatest activity during the persecution of the Catholics by the Arian Emperor Valens. Disguised as a military officer he visited the persecuted churches of Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine, exhorting the afflicted Catholics to remain loyal to their faith, ordaining orthodox priests where they were needed, and in many other ways assisting the Catholic bishops in the difficult exercise of their duties during those troublous times. Incensed at the great success of Eusebius, the Arians prevailed upon the Emperor Valens to banish him into Thrace. After the death of Valens, in 378, he was allowed to return to his see. he resumed his former activity against the Arians, both in his own diocese and in the neighboring churches.”

His jurisdiction, then, expanded to fill the vacuum. But Eusebius said quite openly that the bishops he undercut were Arians, that he ordained Catholics to keep the faith alive in his area. Lefebvre’s failure to condemn heresies and those who hold them publicly leaves him without basis for his extra-legal activities. His practical recognition of Vatican II and the postconciliar “Church” leaves his St. Pius X Society in practical heresy. When he ordains members of his own Society he is not ordaining Catholics, but men committed by his own public actions to the support of those

who propagate heresy, right in the heart of the new rites to which he gratuitously accords validity, rites for which he asks only a parallel rite while a Catholic would demand abolition.

Lefebvre to *Una Voce*'s Eric de Saventem 17 December 1976: "*For the Universal Church I foresee, as you do, the peaceful coexistence of the preconciliar and the postconciliar rites. Accordingly, it should be left to the priests and to the believers to select the 'family of rites' to which they prefer to adhere. Then, one should wait until the course of time makes known God's judgment on the respective values of truth and salvific effects for the Catholic Church and for total Christianity.*"

This "orthodoxy," particularly the ecumenical last phrase, outdoes Vatican II's own ambiguity. **But it is not compromise.** For Lefebvre will **never** compromise. Did he not write JP2 (March 19, 1979): "A solution could not be found in any compromise?" He kept us from the fight. He stood out, attracting the support of the hopeful. But he disclaimed leadership, so that he could shirk responsibility to lead the fight. He talked a good fight, leading to belief that he would eventually live up to the Faith. Day by day we expected; year by year we waited. He temporized enough to set the next stage in our destruction. The exiled traditionalist is to believe he has returned to the oasis when he takes his place in the mirage. We shall all be permitted our traditional rite (according to John XXIII) celebrated in desecrated churches long dedicated to sacrilege and idolatry, by laymen "ordained" according to the new "sacrament of order," men trained in ignorance of the Church's propitiatory intention. To secure this great benefit all we need do is profess to believe that nothing ails the *novus ordo missae*! So why were we not granted this great privilege in 1976? Lefebvre and **Una Voce** had agreed to the conditions beforehand.

Williamson, Econe's official spokesman to the antipodes, left little to be desired in his presentation. His enthusiasm was undeniable. He gave straight answers. His message was clear—but clearly unacceptable. Even Montini and Bugnini supported one system only, consistently, though sinfully, proscribing the other.

Clearly, in supporting heretics, Lefebvre supported their heresy. That he supported less heresy than official Rome or that out of charity he supported it reluctantly made him that much more dangerous. Nearly everyone can (if he will) detect open heresy (though Vatican II somehow fools those who have not read its documents). The closer to truth, the more easily the heretic deceives more people. Most dangerous is he who varies least. Religion is no game of horseshoes to be scored by proximity. No points for a leaner—the ringer or nothing!

Lefebvre's contribution, questionable and minuscule, necessarily aroused hostility among the hierarchy. He could have provoked at least as hostile reaction by broadcasting the whole truth. But this course is less profitable, we assure you.

Catholics have the right to straight talk, honest argument, and complete, unadulterated orthodoxy from clergy, bishops, and popes. Vital issues may not be put off. Refusal to rule on a current issue earned (genuine) Pope Honorius I the Church's condemnation for heresy. Lefebvre needed look no further for precedent than the Temple money-changers fleeing the whip. Between pleas for the course of time to resolve matters, it would have behoved him to ask what Christ would have done had he found not money-changers but open idolaters. Lefebvre would have complained to Caiphas, if, in charity, he had deemed Caiphas capable of digesting strong but kosher meat.

In The Latin Mass Society of Australia Quarterly Newsletter, Sept. 1979, General President Michael J. Foley stated in one 129-word sentence that a Catholic may meritoriously embrace heresy. He continued: "In the public addresses by Fr. Williamson, it was made clear that Mgr. Lefebvre always steers the middle course in the present crisis situation. Precisely because there is no dependable and reliable means of disclaiming the validity of the present or immediate past Pontificates, such a suggestion cannot be advanced as the reason for the breakdown in the Church's mission on earth. The man whom the clergy of Rome accept as Bishop of Rome and the whole Catholic world accepts as Pope, deserves the acceptance and loyalty of Catholics who claim a faithful adherence to the totality of Catholic teaching and tradition and liturgical expression."

[“Breakdown in the **Church's** mission”—not of some section of the Church. Who carries responsibility for the whole Church? This absurd “logic” and inaccuracy, “the whole Catholic

world accepts,” would have left the Church defenseless against—among others—antipope Anacletus II. With hardly a bleat it could stretch to cover the genuine hierarchy of England’s acceptance of Henry VIII, and subsequently of the Cranmerian destruction foisted upon us who survived it four centuries later by men whom “the clergy of Rome” accept.]

“It was made abundantly clear that the Holy Father, and he alone, is capable of solving the crisis in the Church” [but he won’t solve it; is a message here for Foley, Williamson, or Lefebvre?] “..... It is categorically stated that no person can claim to be a faithful Catholic and at the same time refuse to recognize Pope John Paul II as the Vicar of Christ on earth and thus the head of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church and all that is enshrined in that most sublime office. we pray for the unity of God’s Church and we strive to work towards its realization by, at the very least, not doing or saying anything that could harm the integrity of the cause for which all shades of opinion are striving. That cause is the preservation of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in its ancient form, but not, at the same time, disclaiming the sacramental validity of the other Rites, including that of Paul VI of 1969, when these are celebrated according to the lawfully-established norms, and proper discipline and rubrics are duly observed” —M. J. Foley, Melbourne, August 29th, 1979.

Could we ask for better evidence of Econe’s corrosive effect on principle and resolve? What Catholic can recognize the authority behind the *novus ordo*? Or the possible validity of an idolatrous, heretical rite introduced in violation of all Church law and custom to supplant the true Mass? Edmund Archer and I sat beside Foley at the Oak Hill LMSA Annual General Meeting. He said (and we both have him on tape) that *Quo primum* is an all but infallible pronouncement, whereupon one of our “cranks and hard-liners” called him a champion. He later referred to such facts as “various malicious rumours still in evidence in some quarters.”

THE ANGELUS, January 1980, carried Lefebvre’s statement of Nov. 8, 1979. He listed five fundamental and pertinent dogmas violated (“Not clearly represented even contradicted”) by the *novus ordo missae*. “These New Masses,” he said, “are not only incapable of fulfilling our Sunday obligation, but are such that we must apply to them the canonical rules which the Church customarily applies to *communicatio in sacris* with Orthodox Churches and Protestant sects.” True! The *novus ordo* is not mass; it has been imposed by non-Catholics, heretics, apostates.

But where is **his** reason? He acknowledges as legitimate the authority that imposed and continues to guarantee these sacrileges. He will not even say that this authority has exceeded its competence, or that these sacrileges must be wiped out. He will settle for equal rights for the traditional Mass in the same churches with these sacrileges. You may not attend, but neither may you conclude under penalty of exclusion from his Society invalidity. He who will volunteer priests to local ordinaries, who will allow validity to a non-Mass, will excommunicate you for failure to adhere to his own unnecessary theological opinion exactly as represented by Williamson: “As long as” [equivocation?] “the essential conditions for validity are present,” [never mind where] “matter, form, intention, and a validly ordained priest, I do not see how one can affirm this” (invalidity). He seems unable to see that neither form nor intention are present in the whole damnable rite.

Then he waltzes into the eight-ballroom: The essentials of our traditional Mass are necessary not to validity but to integrity. He presents this emotionally charged picture of Cardinal Mindszenty celebrating this disintegrated Mass for his own benefit, pronouncing solely the words of consecration [unspecified] over “a little bread and wine,” and maintains that “he most certainly accomplished the Sacrifice and the Sacrament.” **Hogwash!** Unwarranted theological opinion! Lefebvre [and Mindszenty?] would have it so.

Mindszenty would also have it that vernacular is good in the Mass because it **promotes nationalism**, as he pointed out in broken English to three of us.

Consider the circumstances of this “bare formula” celebration. Firstly, Mindszenty in prison, unable to control his movements, lay under no obligation to say or assist at Mass. Secondly, he expected interruption or not. Interrupted he would not yet have consecrated [in which case what harm?] or he would have consecrated, and left the Sacred Species open to accidental or deliberate desecration. So if he expected interruption he had no right whatsoever to attempt Mass. He had no one else to whom he could administer the sacrament. He alone could benefit. If we may insert

emotional opinion, Lefebvre-style, who can doubt that he would have received equal benefit from a merciful and understanding God through what we must often settle for, a spiritual communion? If he expected no interruption why confine himself to the bare formula [whatever] in violation of Canon 817, the codification of divine law that forbids consecration of one species without the other or of both outside Mass? (“Bare formula” is further treated in **Is The Pope Catholic?**, pp. 57-60)

Lefebvre next presumes lack of proper intention in all the younger clergy. “Nevertheless (in so judging) we (priests of the Society) must always act as doctors of the soul and not as judges and hangmen.” [What is his point?] “Those who are **tempted** to this latter course(?) are animated by a bitter spirit [temptation = sin?] and not true zeal for souls.” [We find in the LMSA Newsletter, Sept. 1979, that Lefebvre’s official representative, Fr. Williamson, says that Australia has enough priests for its traditionalists, and will receive none from Econe. True zeal for souls would have discerned a tremendous field: returning *novus ordo* Catholics and Catholics driven from their churches by the *novus ordo* to the true Mass.]

Lefebvre now tackles the “serious problem of conscience for the faithful,” whether we have a pope. “One can fairly ask oneself how it was possible that a successor of Peter can in so little time have caused more damage to the Church than the French Revolution.” [One could also ask: **Who else could?** Or how could he do it by accident? Or who would try unless allied to the same group that promoted the French Revolution? The freemasons boasted for more than a century that they would eventually set their own man upon our papal throne and accomplish our destruction. Lefebvre looks at the accomplishment and pretends that it happened by accident. He cites fact: that Paul VI signed heretical documents, then expects agreement that this makes Paul not a heretic but only a liberal. What’s the difference? Either way he wasn’t Catholic.]

“A good number of theologians” (again!) “teach that a pope can be heretical as a private doctor or theologian, but not as a teacher of the Universal Church. One must then examine in what measure Pope Paul VI wished to engage his infallibility in the diverse cases where he signed texts close to heresy if not formally heretical.” [Have you ever read such nonsense? Conciliar documents? Popes may teach what they please if they cross their fingers? But wait—there’s more!]

“Does not the exclusion of the cardinals over eighty years of age, and the secret meetings which preceded and prepared the last two conclaves render them invalid?” [He had earlier raised the question of ineligibility to participate of “cardinals” created by public heretics posing as pope, and left the issue in the air, presumably unworthy of settlement.] “Invalid: no, that is saying too much. Doubtful at the time: perhaps. But in any case the subsequent unanimous acceptance by the Cardinals and the Roman clergy suffices to validate it. That is the teaching of the theologians.” [A doubtful election becomes valid when the electors accept their own doubtful vote! Who cares what theologians think? Where are the canonists? Have **either** ruled on rigged elections in which nearly all electors (as fine a gaggle of liberals, modernists, freemasons, communists, and other non-Catholics as ever assembled—an oversize college packed by two of the same type to ensure completion of the destruction so well begun) had no right to participate? Would either hold, with Lefebvre, that a “pope” who did so much damage to the Church would never use his usurped powers to appoint others of his own ilk? Would they insist on a public heretic’s papal prerogatives? Theologians, at and since Vatican II, have put us in this mess.]

“The Truth must be affirmed at Rome above all other places. It is of God,” says Lefebvre, “and He will assure its ultimate triumph.” [But when Father Noel Barbara went to Rome in 1976 and proved publicly that Paul VI was a heretic and therefore not possibly pope, where was Lefebvre? Backing the Truth? Or proving that it was not the Truth? He may have been able to settle the entire issue had he taken either side. His media coverage could have brought the matter sufficiently before the public that it might have been resolved. Oh, we don’t know that, we are told, as though he had a choice. It was his place to try. His prominence assured that few others could or would.]

FATHER LUCIAN’S LEFEBVRE (Excerpts, letter of Sept. 6, 1979)

Archbp. Lefebvre is subject to John Paul II (but he has a difficulty). Since he is subject to John Paul II he is in the one-world religion which John Paul II heads. Hence, all who are served by the Society of St. Pius X are in reality *Novus Ordo* Catholics the right wing of the apostate Church.

..... the church ruled from Rome since the death of Pope Pius XII is an apostate church, even worse than the Church of England and the Lutheran Church more evil in doctrines and rites than any protestant church I ever came upon. Hence, anyone connected with it is in bad shape not in the true Church that Christ founded. To be a Catholic one must believe what Christ taught, what the Catholic Church believed during two thousand years, and which it believes today (as the true Remnant).

..... if Lefebvre calls John Paul II the Pope we have to be on our guard. Well, he does that, and all his men that I know do the same. One time I told some people in the presence of a Lefebvre priest that Paul VI is not the pope, and he insisted that he is the pope. Do not live in a dream world. Those men are playing a great game. They are to get the opposition under the authority of the false pope—attached to and in the apostate church. Do not give in one inch. Live your Faith without a priest rather than (as a) “nut” that will have the true Mass at any price—ending in hell. A true Catholic will have no union with people of other religions. The Catholic Church is exclusive. It is one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. The church of John Paul II has not one of those marks.

CHRISTENDOM’S LEFEBVRE

We once asked an Econe seminarian about traditional publications. Gerard Hogan recommended Father Nugent’s **Christendom**. We paraphrase its August 1978 issue—it forbids direct copy.

Father Nugent has written against Lefebvre’s defamers, but never unreservedly endorsed man or organization. He waited and watched to determine their nature. Now that their direction is clear he must warn us.

He visited Econe mid-September 1972. Some English-speaking students failed to enchant him: “too intensely political.” One or two reminded him of Mencken’s man who could strut while seated.

Econe’s very air was French. Courses were not in Latin, and students other than French-speaking must spend time on that language [cutting into vital philosophy and theology time, already too short, and giving them these exacting, demanding subjects in the “language of diplomacy” and circumlocution].

He spent two afternoon hours (Sept. 18) conversing with Lefebvre, who asked him to superintend in Kentucky his next American ordinands through their first years as priests. But Lefebvre hardly knew him. And his canonically erected community had very different traditions and customs. And Father had already concluded that some of these young men were unlikely and improper candidates.

Father quotes Hamish Fraser: “Many who act in the name of the St. Pius X Society would not seem particularly inclined to show obedience even to Mgr. Lefebvre.” [Father(?) Richard Williamson said, during his 31 July 1979 slide lecture, that the St. Pius X Society house at Albano would now be used for a novitiate. Originally planned for a post-ordination year of study to steep the new priests(?) in the Roman tradition—**these** days?—it lay idle; the priests(?), once ordained(?), simply would not go there. The archbp.(?) has **no authority or control** over them. What kind of religious society is **this**?] Father Nugent asks why Lefebvre should not expect strife and “scandalous dissension” among his followers.

Christendom (same issue) deals with a question on co-existence of St. Pius V’s Mass with the *novus ordo*, as Lefebvre requests. Referring to the same suggestion from Heenan’s Westminster replacement, Basil Hume, and Father’s reply (Christmas 1976 issue) Father reaffirms that Catholics can settle for nothing less than universal restoration of the complete Faith and true Mass. We cannot leave others to the ambiguous, counterfeit, Protestant, while left ourselves in quiet possession of the certain, real, Catholic, and claim to love Our Lord and our fellow men.

COMPROMISE OR BUST!

Lefebvre wrote JP2 (Dec. 24, 1978): “Most Holy Father, for the honor of Jesus Christ, for the greater good of the Church and for the salvation of souls, we entreat you to say one word, a single word, as the Successor of St. Peter and as Pastor of the Universal Church, to the bishops of the

entire world: *'Laissez faire*—let them be. We authorize the free practice of what many centuries' Tradition has made use of for the sanctification of souls.'

"What difficulty would such an attitude create? None. The bishops would decide the places, the times reserved for this Tradition." [Exactly as they have in England under the indult!] "Unity would immediately be restored at the level of the local bishop." [Obviously a schizophrenic of the highest order. *Cujus regio ejus religio?*] "On the other hand, how advantageous it would be for the Church: the renewal of seminaries and monasteries; great fervor in the parishes—the bishops would be amazed" [so would I!] "to rediscover in a few years an outburst of holiness and devotion they thought had disappeared forever."

This man is having himself on. He will leave the return of Tradition to the tender mercies of the individual bishops, who decide only by majority vote at their conferences, who are all in heresy and apostasy. And all will flock back to their old Mass and display fervor—in a pig's eye!

We can secure the return of our Mass and sacraments in one way alone: through the same exercise of authority under (this time *true*) obedience by which we lost them. Tradition must be made exclusive, just as the renewal was made exclusive. No Church can live part old and part new, part true and part false. The Catholic religion is an integrated whole, to be accepted or rejected on divine authority.

No reasonable man can expect the younger clergy, many of whom never learned Latin, to elect the old Mass when it is so much easier to use the vernacular, which they may understand and probably will not garble. Nor, supposing that they can be persuaded or ordered to celebrate the true Mass rite in Latin or any other language, can we be sure they are properly trained in the Church's intention. If, additionally, they have been "ordained" in the new rite imposed with the *novus ordo missae*, their attempts to celebrate a true Mass will produce the same idolatry as the *novus ordo missae* itself, for they are no more priests than I am.

Lefebvre continues: "(Econe's) priories would serve the dioceses by helping in the parishes, in complete submission to the local ordinary." [But his priests(?), says his official representative, won't obey **him**. What will happen the day the local ordinary tells the Econe priest(?) to celebrate the *novus ordo missae* in the sudden absence of the parish priest? It will never happen? Bring back that pig—we need his other eye!]

Lefebvre never takes time to justify his compromising attitude. Why should he explain to us? But into the vacuum steps a seminarian to prove there is no compromise (**The Angelus**, September 1979). If the dualistic decree he discusses really leaves the rumor stage and is promulgated, "some fanatical traditionalists, already entrenched in a rather bizarre analysis of the crisis in the Church and desperate lest any improvement(?) diminish their mailing list, will probably cry 'Compromise!' all the louder and pour abuse with renewed violence on Abp. Lefebvre, **who would welcome such a decree**, and the many Catholics who would profit from such a decree.

"This 'compromise' scruple develops from an inaccurate notion of the Church and membership in the Church elaborated by a few ill-instructed" [this from a boy enduring a shortened seminary course in French!] "newsletter-publishers according to which the teaching of unorthodox doctrine by a pope automatically makes the organization of which he is the head a non-Catholic sect, the errors of our parish priest do not mean we have to leave our parish; the errors of our bishop do not mean we have to abjure membership in the diocese; the errors of a Pope do not mean we have to separate ourselves from the Church!"

That notorious generation gap! Formerly the younger generation associated with its elders. Association bred a healthy respect for these elders' mental capacity; we had more sense than to try to con them. Had Pius XI or Pius XII promulgated condemned heresy we would hardly have insisted that they were merely unorthodox, not condemned heretics automatically excluded from the Catholic Church and consequently from any and all authority and jurisdiction therein. In recognizing such facts I would not leave my parish, my diocese, or my Church. But in failure to realize such conditions my parish, diocese, or "pope" and his government can leave me and all other Catholics, past, present, and future. To lapse into heresy no method is quicker or less trouble than to accept religious authority and jurisdiction of known heretics.

“It would be difficult to prove,” this innocent waffles on, “that the *novus ordo* constitutes the ‘impious or sordid use’ which desecrates a church and makes worship there illicit.”

Our Mass, defined as the Sacrifice of Calvary, is efficacious because the Victim is divine—of infinite value, the only sacrifice, as the Church has always taught, of any propitiatory value. In the new rite, defined as other than the Sacrifice of Calvary, containing a “Preparation of the Gifts” correcting Christ in offering the insufficient sacrifices of the Old Law, containing a Cranmerian “narrative of institution” instead of Christ’s prayerful Action, telescoping the people’s communion into the essential priest’s Communion, a number of “Eucharistic Prayers” replace the essential Canon of the Mass. In the Preface of the fourth Eucharistic Prayer you may read, if you don’t mind blasphemy, “Father in heaven, it is right that we should give you thanks and glory. **You alone are God**, living and true.”—classic Arianism, denial of the Blessed Trinity, denial of the divinity of the Second and Third Persons.

What effect has this heresy on the consecration, supposing it were real in any version of the *novus ordo*? Is this, then, the Body and Blood in Sacrifice of an infinitely valuable Divine Person? Or is it now the body and blood (**How?**) of a mere man, of no eternal value whatsoever? Is it not even less—the useless corpse of all time’s greatest liar and impostor, who has claimed divinity? And (presuming anyone can believe in him and his “consecration”) when he is raised and adored **is this not idolatry?**

What must be said of the man who promulgated this most hateful heresy? (Not even a new heresy in which he might conceivably be honestly deceived!) What can be adduced in defense of the clergy and hierarchy who must know this as well as he? Or what were they doing all those years in the seminary? What are these people if not heretics? Where, then, is their jurisdiction? Removed by Canon Law! They are obeyed only at the risk of weekly idolatry, the worst crime on the calendar.

It would be difficult to prove that idolatry desecrates a church?

MORE UNANSWERED LETTERS TO LEFEBVRE

Benjamin F. Dryden was asked to furnish an English translation of his letter to Lefebvre, July 18, 1978. Conscience obliged him to warn that parts of the “Conclusion” had been made obsolete by a subsequent proclamation: “..... the Society of St. Pius X cannot tolerate among its members those who refuse to pray for the Pope or affirm that the *novus ordo missae* is *per se* invalid.” Lefebvre and all his Society are now, therefore, clearly members of John Paul II’s Conciliar Anti-Church; and Canon 1258 forbids Catholics to attend their Masses, receive the Sacraments from them, or in any active way participate in religious services with them.

“Since July, 1975 I have been receiving, with my family, the sacraments administered by priests of your Society. Out of gratitude and to give a bit of assistance to your work, I have translated into English the Constitutions of the Sisters, the Statutes of the Society, your admirable Reflections on Suspension *a Divinis*, and several of your sermons.

“..... not the detractions of your enemies—..... meditation on your own words aroused in my mind disquiet, doubts as to your intentions regarding the three principal weapons used now against the Catholic Church: 1) the pretended authority of Antipope Paul VI, 2) that of his Conciliar Anti-Church, and 3) his Anti-Mass, the *novus ordo missae*. It would almost seem that under the appearances of fidelity to the Church of the Ages you are sowing confusion and inability to resist these three weapons.

“..... the pope’s personal attitude, which is **more difficult to discover.**” (Your Declaration to the Press, Aug 2, 1976)

“How can a pope, a true successor of Peter, assured of the assistance of the Holy Ghost, preside over the Church’s destruction, the most profound and extensive in her history? (*Ibidem*)

“In all this work, what has been the pope’s role? His **responsibility?** Truly, it seems overwhelming despite the desire to exonerate him of this frightful betrayal of the Church. (*J’accuse le Concile*, p. 10) Paul VI’s attitude, then, is not at all difficult to discover. Not only have you discovered it; the whole world has discovered it, and obliges you to agree ‘despite the desire to exonerate him.’ This desire led you to utter publicly the untruth about his attitude, which is ‘difficult to discover.’ It

also inspired you with the idea, immoral and deadly for the Church, of 'leaving this problem to theologians and historians' or else 'to God and future true successors of Peter'; that is, you will combat the serpent's tail, the Anti-Church prelates, without crushing the head, the antipope.....

"..... that immoral wish led you to conjure away, under the words **problem** and **eventuality**, the Catholic Church's legislation, prepared and promulgated for the present crisis, no longer an eventuality. In pronouncing their anathema against Pope Honorius I the Sixth Ecumenical Council and Pope St. Leo II added to heresy another motive **simple negligence** of his duty to combat heresy.

"For Paul VI to be an antipope it suffices to recall the name of any stubborn, notorious heretic, still loaded with honors and quite confident that he will be neither excommunicated nor otherwise combated Hans Küng, Karl Rahner, Raymond Brown, Charles Curran, Helder Camara, Mendez Arceo only difficulty is to choose from this litany of instances in which Paul VI has neglected to combat heresy, thereby laying upon all Catholics the obligation to combat him—him personally, as an antipope, under the same excommunication as Honorius I."

Mr. Dryden then quotes and applies Canons 2314 and 188 (4). He continues: "Far from being 'difficult to discover,' Paul VI's heresies are found almost anywhere. In the United Nations it was the religion of man and the denial of original sin. Among the decrees of Vatican II, which Paul VI approved and has imposed on you as a condition for lifting your suspension *a divinis*, we read that non-Catholic religions are means of salvation, and that it is good for Catholics to participate in worship with their 'separated brethren.' even published catalogues of these heresies, e.g., de Nantes Fr. Noel Barbara The heretic has been admonished and remains impenitent and pertinacious.

"Paul VI's schism he himself has been at pains to advertize publicly and scandalously by imposing the *novus ordo missae*, in contempt of the decree *Quo primum*. He advertized it anew on May 24, 1976, in the Consistory, by opposing yesterday's authority to 'today's authority,' and by arrogating to himself the right 'to define, among **the numberless traditions**, those which must be considered norms of faith,' without concern for the definitions already made by true popes.

"We see, then, that Paul VI is quite clearly excommunicated and deprived of all authority and has become an antipope through heresy and schism, in virtue of Canons 2314.1 and 188.4. That is why these canons remain hidden from the public view, buried not only in the sepulchral silence of Paul VI and his Conciliar clergy, but even in the silence of the clergy supposedly traditional but really in collusion with the antipope. If the faithful could read these canons, the whole comedy would be at an end. People would laugh on hearing Paul VI speak of 'Our authority, willed by Christ.'

"..... your Declaration of Aug. 2, 1977: 'In the same measure that a pope should withdraw from this tradition, he would become schismatic, would withdraw from the Church. Theologians like St. Bellarmine, Cajetan, Cardinal Journet, and many others have studied this eventuality. It is not, therefore, something inconceivable. it seems to us much more certain that the Faith taught by the Church for twenty centuries can contain no errors than it is absolutely certain that the pope is truly pope. Heresy, schism, *ipso facto* excommunication, invalidity of his election are all causes from which it may sometimes result that a pope has never been or is now no longer pope. the Church would be in the situation she experiences after the death of a Sovereign Pontiff.'

"Comparison of your words with the text itself of the canons shows inaccuracies that seem intentional, to conceal from the public that these are laws, quite precise and obligatory, and give the impression that they are only the subtle, impractical speculations of some theologians.

"Why do not you and priests of the Society explain thoroughly and clearly these canons, which strip all authority from the invaders of our buildings? Why employ so much eloquence in a case entirely theoretical, of a legitimate pope who might abuse his authority without losing it? Is this not complicity? confirming the error sown by Antipope Paul VI, that his authority exists and is willed by Christ?"

Mr. Dryden's and our condemnations of Lefebvre, his Society of St. Pius X, and all who hold similar views carry additional weight; we supported Lefebvre before we knew his true intentions.

Lefebvre adds weight to his views and actions by demonstrating that he has considered their opposites and, presumably, found them wanting. Meanwhile he kept the ball from those who would have carried it. All too well choreographed for accident. Mr. Dryden continued with quotations from Lefebvre's "Reflections on Suspension *a Divinis*," July 29, 1976:

"We are suspended *a divinis* by the Conciliar Church and for the Conciliar Church, **to which we have no wish to belong.** That Conciliar Church is a schismatic Church, because it breaks with the Catholic Church that has always been. It has its new dogmas, its new priesthood, its new institutions, its new worship, **all already condemned** by the Church in many a document, official and definitive. This Conciliar Church is, therefore, not Catholic. To whatever extent **Pope, bishops, priests, or faithful** adhere to this new Church, **they separate themselves from the Catholic Church.**" and followed this with the conclusion to Lefebvre's sermon at Lille, Aug. 29, 1976:

"It would be so simple, if each bishop in his diocese placed one church at our disposal, at the disposal of faithful Catholics, telling them, "There is the church that is yours." And here, when we think that the Bishop of Lille has given **a church to the Moslems**, I do not see why there should not be a church for faithful Catholics. After all, **the whole question would be settled.** That is what I shall ask of the **Holy Father**, if **the Holy Father** will receive me: "**Holy Father**, let us give tradition a try."

"So simple? this makes my head swim. In just one month! You now find it quite natural, quite simple to celebrate the Mass of Jesus Christ on a footing of equality, if not of inferiority, and in sweet amity with Moslem worship and Conciliar worship, in the bosom of that schismatic Church to which you had no wish to belong, by authorization of that antipope, of those bishops who, by adhering to the new Church, have separated themselves from the Catholic Church! The whole question would be settled! Must we not rather say that the whole question **is** settled? That you have settled it by this act of adherence to the antipope and his anti-Church? (Canon 2314, §3: If they have joined a non-Catholic sect or have publicly adhered to it, they incur infamy *ipso facto*.)

".... Lefebvre has committed the infamy of adhering to a non-Catholic sect thereby separated himself from the Catholic Church, outside of which there is no salvation. Even while affecting fear that the antipope might excommunicate you invalidly, even while claiming the right to appear before a tribunal made up exclusively of apostates, you have drawn upon yourself a real and valid anathema. that infamy still weighs on you, on your work, and on thousands of souls whose ideas it turns topsy-turvy and who are tempted to follow so execrable an example of adherence to the anti-Church. This is a scandal which you must undo, first by a public abjuration and then by combating, with all the life and strength that remain to you, the false authority of the antipope and his Anti-Church."

Mr. Dryden then quotes Lefebvre five times running—in opposing directions. March 29, 1973 he "will never say this *novus ordo missae* is heretical." Feb. 15, 1975 an old priest's intentions left over from the true Mass can somehow validate his particular *novus ordo*. June 6, 1977 he does "not say that the new mass is heretical" nor that it "is not valid in itself." But July 29, 1976 he called the Conciliar Church schismatic for "principles opposed to the Catholic Church, such as the new concept of the Mass which gives the assembly a priestly role that it cannot exercise." And Aug. 29, 1976: "The new mass is a hybrid mass, which is no longer hierarchical but democratic, where the assembly has a greater place than the priest; **it is therefore no longer a real Mass** which affirms the Kingship of Our Lord Jesus Christ."

Yet Michael Davies has the consummate gall to write (**The Angelus**, Nov. 1980): "The Archbp., of course, has never questioned the validity of the New Mass. Some of those who are attacking him now once supported him; they must have known of his position regarding the New Mass when they gave him their support. Clearly, they have changed their views, not the Archbp." Mr. Davies has received every issue of **The War Is Now!** gratis (till Aug. 1983). Therefore he knows as well as Lefebvre himself from my voluminous one-way correspondence that we have changed views on neither new "mass" nor antipopes, and that our support for Lefebvre was contingent on his adherence to the Catholic Faith, which both Davies and Lefebvre have deserted since Vatican II.

Mr. Dryden then quotes from *De defectibus* and from St. Thomas Aquinas, to the effect that the celebrant's intention is unaffected by his belief; he is Christ's instrument acting for the Church. "Is St. Thomas wrong? Or is your talk of intention and faith simply so much dust in our eyes, to make us forget that the new rite is invalid through defect in form and illicit in virtue of the decree *Quo primum*? that good old priest, with his good intention in the new rite, does not exist. On the contrary, there is an excom-municated man, celebrating a non-Catholic rite, as minister of the Anti-Church. In the absence of proof to the contrary, his intention will be that promulgated by the Anti-Church, to celebrate a commemorative meal, without Sacrifice, without Transubstantiation, and therefore without sacramental validity. If proof to the contrary existed, the Anti-Church's bishop would straightway expel the good old priest."

Father Brian Buckley Wrote (6 Oct 81), had translated, and registered this letter to Lefebvre, who neither replied nor acknowledged it, even indirectly.

Monseigneur,

Since you propose to visit Australia in November, it is well for you to know beforehand that many Catholics here are very concerned about your attitude towards the validity of the New Order of Mass, and your acceptance as popes of the recent and present occupants of the papal chair.

It is not right that traditional Catholics in this country should be left further confused after your visit; so I write on behalf of many to ask you to state your true position on the above matters. As the most publicized bishop in the world today apparently taking a stand for the true Catholic Faith, you, Monseigneur, have a strict duty before God publicly to profess Catholic truth, so that the world media will report that truth and vindicate the true and traditional Catholic Faith. If you do not publicly profess the truth, then it will be clear that you betray the Catholic Faith even more than Paul VI and other notorious heretics; because to many Catholics who recognize Paul's errors you have appeared to be (and profess to be) completely orthodox, ready to lead us all away from error. You must now prove it.

You have stated that you will never say that the New Mass is *per se* invalid. But the Catholic Church has stated quite clearly that the Mass is the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, the same Sacrifice as that of Calvary; whereas the New Mass, as you know, was officially defined by the Conciliar Church which accepted it as "The sacred assembly or gathering together of the people of God, with a priest presiding, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord." The New Mass then is defined in the same terms as any other protestant worship-service—a gathering of people to recall and commemorate the once-only death of Christ which happened at a certain time in the first century. The New Mass was not intended to be the same Sacrifice repeated here and now, Calvary-over-again. The definition tells us so.

A valid Catholic Mass is one which is Calvary-over-again, which brings about necessarily the Real Presence of Our Lord on the altar to be sacrificed in an unbloody manner. The New Mass performs no sacrificial action, it simply gives a narrative of an action once performed. It does not intend to be or profess to be at any time the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass—not even when celebrated "fittingly and worthily" by a "holy" priest with his possibly correct intention, which intention of course does not and cannot change the intention of the rite, which is to celebrate in the protestant sense of "To commemorate," "to be thankful for" as the definition officially indicates.

Why must Catholics read into a definition by a protestant sect (as the heretical conciliar church shows itself to be) a forced Catholic meaning where a protestant meaning is clearly indicated? Catholic and protestant theologians all agree, if they are honest, that the New Mass involves no sacrifice—which is why Mass-hating protestants can and do use it for their memorial service. A memorial service has no intention or power to bring about Transubstantiation, so Catholics adoring as God the prayed-over bread and wine are involved in idolatry.

I am sure that you do not think, Monseigneur, that God will join in the deception and bring about the Real Presence in a service that was intended by its protestant composers to be only a memorial without any Real Presence—and really a mockery of the here-and-now Sacrifice, concocted to deceive simple Catholics. Surely not!

Your advice then to Catholics that it is permissible to attend a New Mass “occasionally” cannot be accepted. You are publicly inviting Catholics to become idolaters—or, at the very least, to risk idolatry, which is surely just as grave an insult to God. And when you permit “occasional” attendance at the New Mass— how many times, say, a year? Three? Seven? What then of the eighth attendance? How can this be wrong when the other seven were right? What is the magic number beyond which right becomes wrong?

There can be no doubt that if a work of adoration of God is perfect and is right in itself and declared right by the Church, then it is always right. If it is sometimes wrong in itself it is always wrong. If it is not the Mass it is wrong for Catholics, always, in itself, if it pretends to be the Catholic Mass.

Catholic theology does not recognize the New Mass as the Holy Sacrifice, nor does protestant theology; even if it were only doubtfully or questionably valid, Catholic principles seriously forbid a Catholic to attend it, ever. What circumstances could possibly justify risking sacrilege—even if the New Mass were not in itself demonstrably sacrilegious?

And must we not presume that a priest who belongs to the conciliar church and who uses a bread-and-wine service which is described by the protestant term “memorial of the Lord” intends to do what the conciliar church intended in designing that service? If it is, as you have said, an ambiguous service, how can Catholics know for certain what the priests of the conciliar church consider it to be? How can they presume (let alone know for certain) the present right intention of even validly ordained older priests who are now loyal to the conciliar church with its errors and heresies? Priests have been trained to forget about the word “transubstantiation”—it never occurs in modern Eucharistic literature in the conciliar church. Do they still believe in it, or intend it in their New Mass? How could any layman possibly know? But the rite itself does not intend it.

And after all, it is not a question of whether the New Mass is valid—it’s a question of its being acceptable to God. Is there any reason whatever why God would accept or validate a rite whose background is so dishonest and un-Catholic, a service with such obvious and demonstrable errors, and in addition to the deliberate forgery, the lie, in at least some vernacular versions, including the English, which is always used in this country?

You consider Paul VI, John Paul I, and now John Paul II to be truly popes and to be regarded as such. Do you not think that it is a strange situation to have a Vicar of Christ whom every Catholic in the world is bound under pain of mortal sin to disobey in the matter of the New Mass? Catholic principles strictly forbid what these supposed Vicars of Christ command. By their adherence to heresy, specifically to a non-Catholic worship service replacing the Mass and to an heretical Vatican II council, these men have put themselves outside the Catholic Church according to the traditionally accepted rules of the Church. This is fact. Why try to argue against the fact and the Church’s judgment on it?

Certainly we can all pray for John Paul II with the intention that he will recognize his heresies and become a Catholic. But while he remains a heretic he is not a Catholic; he is in fact an apostate. Pope Leo XIII stated in *Satis cognitum* “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 the Catholic communion and alien to the Church whoever would recede in the least degree from any point proposed by the authoritative Magisterium.” How can one who is alien to the Church be its earthly head? How can anyone who disputes the accepted teaching of the Church be accepted by Jesus Christ as His Vicar, teaching in His place?

Msgr, until you make your position quite clear on these matters, Catholics cannot be blamed for suspecting that you too are a heretic and are working to promote the programme of the Conciliar Church among traditionalists as an *agent provocateur*. No one wants to think this, but it would seem that it is your job to neutralize those traditionalists who would protest and make trouble by yourself setting up an apparent “Right Wing” movement which you will keep loyal to the popes of the Conciliar Church and lead eventually to its New Mass with which the Old Mass will be conceded “parity!”—until its followers die out. Is that it? Have people pinned their faith in you as the only human hope while all the time you are really persuading them to accept the important “changes”—an apostate papacy and a protestant worship-service?

To sum up: it seems clear that you support the New Mass, because you want it and the Catholic Mass to be given an impossible parity. You want the old rite to be allowed along with the new in every diocese, so that the option is there for Catholics to choose the “family of rites” (your term) to which they wish to belong. You advise Catholics that it is allowable for them to attend the New Mass “occasionally.” You declare your respect and obedience-when-you-choose to popes who are clearly and openly and publicly heretics, and to an heretical Council “when understood” (*per impossibile*) “in an orthodox light.” It does not make sense.

It may be that your line of thinking is your own way of trying to rationalize what cannot be rationalized except by saying that it is wrong. You are refusing to face facts, either deliberately or through misplaced respect for men who have disgraced and betrayed the papacy. Your attitude is mistaken in the view of Catholics all over the world. Please write to me in French and explain your position, because an explanation is certainly going to be demanded of you when you come to Australia.

Lefebvre Interview, Alan Gill, Sydney Morning Herald, Nov. 7, 1981—Extracts:

Q. You stress loyalty to the early Councils of the Church and also to the first Vatican Council. Why not to Vatican II?

A. I support all the dogmatic Councils from Nicaea to Vatican I. Vatican II was pastoral, not dogmatic, and was under the influence of the Modernists. You can see this by its fruits—very bad, and very sad for the Church.

[Again he refrains from accusing Vatican II of explicit, previously condemned heresies. Canon 1325 obliges him, and every bishop in the world, to condemn heresy. Vatican II, he says, was under a modernist influence, but not the pope who signed and promulgated its modernism, nor his successors who have committed themselves to its further implementation.]

Q. Can a loyal Catholic disobey the Pope?

A. Yes, it is possible. I can say to the Pope, “In such and such a thing you have done, you were wrong.” Saints have defied Popes. Paul VI was lax and now we have the fruits. These fruits are catastrophic.

[Paul VI was selective in his laxity. Lax in permitting heresy, he manifested downright zeal in its promulgation, as well as in suppression of tradition.]

Q. Some questioners are often less interested in whether what you are doing is right or wrong than in whether you are “against the Pope.”

A. I know. But I am not “against the Pope.” I am against some acts of the papacy.

[The papacy does not act; popes act. The acts which Lefebvre opposes are acts of men whom he deems popes—whom he is not against. Which way to the carousel?]

Q. There is talk of a rapprochement between you and John Paul II. It is said that you have had several private meetings.

A. I have had one meeting, a month after his election. But I have had regular contact, through an intermediary, Cardinal Seper.

Q. Do you think there will be a settlement soon?

A. Pope John Paul II is not against us. He is a good, warm man, sentimental, but not very strong. There are cardinals in the Curia—Knox, Baggio, Casaroli—who care nothing for tradition, and they influence the Pope.

Q. Your objections centre principally on the Mass. Do you believe the new rite is merely “ambiguous,” the moderate position, or do you share the hard-line view that it is totally defective and therefore invalid as a sacrament?

A. The new rite is ambiguous but not invalid. I have never said this. Some individual Masses may be invalid, through defect of intention or other reasons. I am sure this applies in many cases.

[Defect of whose intention? If the priest's why would this not affect validity of Mass in the old rite? No proper intention exists in the new rite itself, which Lefebvre quite clearly and unequivocally states is **not** invalid.]

Q. It is said that you would accept a compromise in which the old Mass is accepted along with the new.

A. I ask only for liberty to say the old Tridentine Mass. I have said many times that I will not personally say the new Mass. Ratzinger (Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, Archbp. of Munich) and others have told me many times: "Say the new Mass just once, and your problems will be finished." They say: "How can the Holy Father give you liberty to say the old Mass if you refuse to say the new?" It is difficult for Rome to accept my position.

Q. Some of your fellow-traditionalists claim that your "compromise" is not victory but a defeat, a sell-out.

A. They want the impossible.

[This "impossible" is not specified. Is what we had for nineteen centuries now impossible? Or was it impossible that Lefebvre condemn heretics and heresies? No wonder we made no headway—our "leader" wouldn't fight for the right because he couldn't win! How could he know till he tried? Victory is God's, and He may not grant it to our efforts. But all our martyrs testify to their lack of concern with this point. When Christians were thrown to lions the lions usually won, but few were canonized. Whether we can achieve complete recovery of our religion is completely irrelevant. This is not our responsibility. We are all obliged to defend our Faith from **all** enemies, especially when they tell us they are Catholic.]

Lefebvre was interviewed on arrival at Sydney International Airport for "11.00 A.M." television program. According to our tape, Laurie Brennan said: "By clinging to something which is dead you're being divisive and contributing further to that decline." Gerard Hogan put the silly remark into French. Lefebvre replied: "You know, as St. Paul said in his letter, you have the *depositum fidei* that we must continue in the Church. The Faith is come from Jesus Christ, but by the Apostle, by the generation and generation. But we cannot change it, cannot change it, cannot change Our Lord. Let us say the council, let us say the pope during transition period—but this cannot change—impossible!"

What is impossible to change is impossible to recover!

MICHAEL DAVIES TO THE RESCUE

In a book review in **The Remnant**, May 31, 1982: "Archbp. Lefebvre is quite happy to accept the services of priests ordained under the new rite, and I would be surprised if theologians of repute could be found to endorse the thesis that the new ordination rite was probably or even possibly invalid." **[So what is Econe's purpose? (Fund raising!)]** "..... I obtained the advice of a Canon lawyer, four theologians of the highest repute, and one of the world's greatest authorities on Christian Latin. Their opinions, each submitted individually, without consulting the others, were unanimous: that God would not allow a [genuine] pope to promulgate an invalid sacramental rite and that although an invalid vernacular version is theoretically possible, the various English translations of the new rite have all been adequate for validity. I have since consulted two more theologians who have expressed exactly the same opinion." [One of **our** arguments: **If a man in exercise of his free will promulgates an invalid sacramental rite, how is he pope?**]

Paul VI did not merely introduce such rites; he removed, supplanted, and claimed credit for having forbidden undoubtedly true worship and sacraments, thereby predictably alienating millions of Catholics (whom Davies and his ilk ignore in their interminable "majority" calculations) from their (not **his**) Church. His successor JP2, who has apostatized as publicly as possible as often as possible, has for years continued to suppress true worship and sacraments, and continues the policies and reforms of three immediate antipope predecessors in implementation of Vatican II.

But, it is seriously argued, the best theological opinion holds that the new rite of ordination contains the essentials of *Sacramentum ordinis*. Lefebvre takes each applicant ordained in the new rite on

the merits of the case. Some he accepts; others he conditionally ordains. Fr. Schmidberger would prefer all redone, but not all are of that mind.

It seems, then, that it is up to the “priest” as much as to Lefebvre or Schmidberger. If he refuses conditional ordination they accept him anyway. But what are the “merits of the case?” How does Lefebvre determine whether the applicant is properly ordained? They have all undergone the same new rite, whose various vernacular versions have received “ecclesiastical” approval. The difference must lie in the ordaining bishop: Is he properly consecrated? What is his intention? If the rite contains the essentials why would Lefebvre “re-ordain” or conditionally ordain anyone? The rite is either sufficient every time or insufficient every time. Lefebvre should never entertain the least suspicion of the ordaining bishop’s intention. Sacraments operate of themselves, and the bishop’s intention cannot affect validity so long as he adheres strictly to the Church’s prescribed rite. The moment Lefebvre admits the relevance of the bishop’s intention he casts suspicion upon his own priestly ordination by a subsequently known enemy of the Church, who, it is often argued, never had the slightest intention of doing anything for the Church. He may even have lacked the intention of being consecrated bishop in the first place, and have taken the job purposely to vitiate and invalidate what he could. If, therefore, Lefebvre was not validly ordained priest he lacked the qualification for consecration to the episcopacy, and none of his sacraments would have been validly conferred. So he cannot consistently hold this position.

Is the ordaining bishop’s orthodoxy in doubt? Not applicable! The Church recognizes ordinations, consecrations, baptisms, confirmations, etc. of various schismatic sects. We can even call their priests in absence of our own for the last rites.

Perhaps the ordaining bishop is not a bishop! Why not? Is he an apostate? Not good enough; like the schismatics, he retains his sacramental powers. Is he a freemason? What of Lefebvre’s own ordaining bishop? Perish the thought!

What’s left? The ordaining bishop was invalidly consecrated. How? All three men who consecrated him were not bishops either. Or a defective rite was employed. Of our old rite no one entertains the slightest doubt. So the new rite must have been used. If the new rite “ordination” of a bishop is invalid, why is not the new rite priestly ordination introduced by the same incompetent authority on the same day likewise invalid? So we have gone all the way around the vicious cycle and returned to arc one. The new rite ordination “contains the essentials.”

If you (like Montini and Bugnini) intended to destroy a sacrament secretly, would you not retain the words described in *Sacramentum ordinis* as “essential, therefore required for validity?” But the whole rite is necessary to contain what Pius XII called essential. It is nearly all missing from the new rite, despite Pius XII’s order that nothing be changed or omitted. He said that the **form** of the sacrament is the Preface, beginning with its first word and ending with its last. The new rite retains the Preface to include the “essential” words, and then replaces the rest with new words conveying new ideas. This constitutes a change in the **form!**—clear cause for doubt (at least). Doubt is not permitted in administration of our sacraments.

As long as the rite of Ordination continued unchanged, the entire rite being administered according to the Roman Pontifical, it made no real difference what was essential, therefore required for validity. But to retain these words and to omit or replace others in profusion will not guarantee validity—guaranteed only the traditional rite. The intention has been removed from the (new) rite itself, and may not be presumed (as though it could affect the matter) in a man attempting to ordain priests in a rite which the Church (as in *Sacramentum ordinis*) has forbidden. He shows his intention to do what the Church intends exactly as in his use of the *novus ordo* or the Book of Common Prayer service. In all cases the intention must be in the rite. If it *is* in the rite then the intention of the minister is ordinarily presumed, and validity is equally presumed **every time**. If some one must evaluate each bishop’s intention, judging each ordination on its individual merits, the rite is defective and **never** works.

Even were the new rite of ordination valid, no reason exists why anyone must, or even should, accept it. There was no necessity to introduce it, except to replace the unquestionable sacrament, to downgrade the clergy, and to service the new “mass” introduced with it. Knowing this, Lefebvre

has imposed phony priests “ordained” according to this new rite on traditional Catholics foolish enough to support his crusade for equal toleration of old and new. He has volunteered them the clear risk (dead certainty, rather) of participation in idolatry. He *had* a choice; he could have refused this problem. He chose wrongly, as so often at and since Vatican II. If the new rites of “mass” and “ordination” are valid, why did he presume to open a seminary supposedly to perpetuate the old rites?

Clarence Kelly Made Seven Charges, March 25, 1983, signed, 9 Econe priests

1) “At the beginning of the school year Your Grace imposed reforms in the Mass at the seminary in Ridgefield, i.e., liturgical reforms imposed by John XXIII. this caused great scandal among professors and students. it is contrary to right reason to counter the disorder of the liturgical revolution by imposing an important phase of that revolution as the liturgical norm. Why impose reforms which contributed to an attack on tradition? Unity cannot be based on disorder and novelty.” [Nevertheless the reforms **were** introduced—though Sanborn, one of the signers, was rector of the seminary.]

2) “Over the past few years, the Fraternity has accepted the service of priests ordained by vernacular versions of the New Rite of Ordination of 1968. On Nov. 30, 1947 Pope Pius XII issued his Apostolic Constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis* it was his intention ‘to put an end to all controversy,’ as he said. He did this by, among other things, decreeing and determining which words in the form for the ordination of a priest ‘are essential and therefore requisite for validity.’ The English words of the form in the New Rite of Ordination so differ from the ones Pius XII said were essential for validity that they introduce a positive doubt as to its validity. In fact, the doubt is not negative, but positive enough even in your own mind, Your Grace, so as to justify the conditional ordination of priests ordained in the New Rite. And so you have in fact conditionally ordained at least two priests in America: Father Sullivan and Father [omitted ordinand’s request]. Indeed, you even asked Rev. Philip Stark to accept conditional ordination and he, as you yourself told us, adamantly refused. And yet, after his refusal, you nevertheless allowed and continue to allow him to work with the Fraternity; and he is not the only doubtfully ordained priest that you permit to do so—he is one of many.

“Thus under the aegis of the Fraternity doubtful Masses are being offered, doubtful absolutions are being given and dying people are being anointed with an ‘Extreme Unction’ that may be invalid and of no more value than the anointing with oil done by a Protestant minister. How, one must ask before God, can the Fraternity reject the doubtful sacraments of the new Church only to replace them with doubtful priests? How grave a sin is this! How false a pretense! Furthermore the Fraternity in the South West District has begun to import to the United States priests whose theological training and manner of ordination are under a similar cloud. As Your Grace knows, this has been a source of scandal.

“The employment of such priests strikes at the heart of one of the reasons for the Fraternity’s existence: to provide unquestionably valid sacraments for the faithful—for if a positive doubt exists as to the validity of a priest’s ordination, not only are the sacraments he administers doubtful, but the faithful are put into a position by the Fraternity of choosing between the doubtful sacraments of the new Church and the doubtful priests of the Fraternity. From the standpoint of Catholic morality this is inadmissible.”

[This proves that Lefebvre cared nothing whether his Fraternity provides true Mass or sacraments, any more than he cared for orthodoxy. If he subjected his own congregations to the undoubted risks cited, who can be sure of his honesty, proper intention, or good faith in his own already suspect ordinations? For use of these “doubtfully ordained” what other motive may be imagined than greater, speedier financial returns? Doubtfully? **Impossibly** ordained—swindled by the new rite! He thus procured idolatry! In what else can he be trusted? In his intention to confirm or ordain? In his (disinterested?) assessment of the validity of his own ordination? The signers of this letter should immediately apply this argument to the validity (there is no liceity—no legitimacy) of their own orders—and refrain from their further use. “Doubtful pope, no pope,” says Canon Law *de Personis*. Doubtful priest, doubtful Mass—to be avoided completely. These abuses, too, obviously

known, remained unpublished and uncondemned, lived with, condoned by these nine priests(?) until **they** were ejected from the Fraternity. This casts suspicion on their own motives. They have warned the faithful rather late. Morally, this too is inadmissible.]

3) “..... we have always followed the Missal, Breviary, Calendar and Rubrics of our holy patron, Pope St. Pius X, which practice was sanctioned by the First General Chapter. Of late, however, an attempt has been made to force all the priests and seminarians in the United States to accept the liturgical reforms of Pope John XXIII on the grounds of uniformity and loyalty to the Fraternity, thereby implying that adherence to non-reformed traditional Rites of St. Pius X constitutes disloyalty. Can it be that the Fraternity has come to look upon loyalty to tradition as disloyalty to the Fraternity? Most recently, to our shock and dismay, a newly-ordained priest was given an ultimatum—either to accept the reforms of John XXIII and to begin saying Mass according to the John XXIII missal or leave the Fraternity. Is it possible that the Fraternity which has been persecuted because of its loyalty to tradition now persecutes priests for their loyalty to tradition?”

[Possible? Obvious! What can be expected of compromisers? How long have these nine signatories maintained membership in the Fraternity in full knowledge of, among other things, Lefebvre’s public refusal in 1979 to ordain(?) a man who disagreed with his erroneous theological opinion that the *novus ordo* is not *per se* invalid as a Mass, and—despite his contention that, outside of certain conditions seldom met, it is no Mass at all—his willingness to allow its continued use alongside use of the true Mass. Additionally, Lefebvre made it clear that no one who disagreed with his theological misconception could remain in his Fraternity. So nearly four years later, why were these nine men still **in** his Fraternity? They accuse him correctly but tardily. They hope they have no grounds to sue for false ordination. But they know they have no legal ecclesiastical standing, because Lefebvre cannot invoke Canon 209 for his extra-legal activities unless the Holy See is vacant—another “opinion” he will not tolerate in his Fraternity.]

4) legitimate complaint over dismissals from the Fraternity on grounds which don’t hold water. Canon Law provides that no one may be ordained priest or consecrated bishop without a title or benefice—a job. Lefebvre has no authority to provide a job, parish, benefice, or the like. But he remains responsible for his priests’(?) support.

5) Lefebvre’s unwarranted assumption of the Church’s magisterial authority. “Now while in theory the Fraternity may deny any claim to such teaching authority, in practice it has acted as though it did have such an authority. For it has proposed solutions to speculative theological questions and has threatened with expulsion or has actually expelled priests and seminarians who disagree with its teaching. The Catholic thing to do would be for the Fraternity to refrain from attempting to bind the consciences of its members on speculative theological questions which are, in fact, open to discussion, and which can only be settled definitively by legitimate authority when the traditions have been restored.”

[More gutless appeals to the future! How will the “restored” tradition see the imposition of a new “mass” or a heretic atop the Holy See as anything but violation of divine law as codified in *Quo primum* and Canons 188 and 2314? No reason exists to suppose these matters “open to discussion.”]

6) “The fundamental reason for the Fraternity’s existence is to promote loyalty to the Church and her teachings. Priests, seminarians, and the faithful associate themselves with the Fraternity to the extent that the Fraternity is loyal to Tradition; they associate with it because they want the traditional Mass, the traditional sacraments and the traditional teaching of the Church. We priests cannot propose loyalty to the Fraternity as equal in value to loyalty to the traditional rites and doctrines. Therefore, the primary motive of everything we do is loyalty to the Church. To the extent that any organization, including the Fraternity, would do things which conflict with the traditions and immemorial practices of the Church, to that extent we reject these things without hesitation or reservation.”

[No hesitation at all, beyond nearly four years.]

7) “The Fraternity has recently enunciated a general policy whereby it would presume the validity of the new Church annulments without investigation. presumption is to be given in favor of the Conciliar Church’s annulments until the contrary is proved. This is a tragic error, for the Conciliar Church has proved its contempt for the sacrament of Matrimony by its actions. Before the world the Church is held up to ridicule because of the annulment practices of the Conciliar Church, which are more contemptible than the actions taken against marriage by secular tribunals.” [A case obviously scandalous in Kelly’s eyes in its solution by Lefebvre is cited, though why it should have been referred to Lefebvre for solution is not made clear. When and under what authority did Lefebvre assume the duties of the Roman Rota? The more we hear of this Fraternity, the closer to absolute zero it approaches.]

Five weeks later Kelly wrote “We regret that until now our repeated attempts at communication with you were to no avail.” [Kelly’s team is either too slow to catch on or has kidded itself too long. Lefebvre’s long-standing commitment to public heresy should long since have forced its attention and some consequent action. Like divorce! But no—they stuck to the income till they were thrown out.]

NOEL BARBARA’S LEFEBVRE

Have we the right to recognize John Paul II as a legitimate Catholic pope and at the same time to disobey him publicly on the new mass, ecumenism, religious liberty, and all the conciliar orientations? The answer is fundamental, since submission to the pope distinguishes a Catholic, who cannot be saved if not in submission to the pope.

What is essential to salvation is necessarily available to all.

Resistance to Vatican II was spontaneous. Because they were shocked in their Catholic instinct and wished to keep their religion the faithful fled their parishes and grouped around faithful priests, to ensure themselves their traditional worship. It became necessary to justify this resistance. In July 1969 we explained why we could not accept the new mass. In 1976 we established the treason of Paul VI and Vatican II. Though the matter became increasingly urgent, Lefebvre always refused to join us in a study of these questions to reach agreement on their Catholic answer. Still, for years, while he hesitantly advised assisting at the new mass, Econe’s founder maintained friendly relations with those who recognized neither the validity of the new mass nor the legitimacy of the postconciliar popes. His change of attitude dates from John Paul II’s accession. After renewal of negotiations with the directors of the postconciliar church (May or June 1979) Lefebvre distanced himself from those who accept neither the new mass nor the illegitimate authority (conciliar popes) behind it. In November 1979, though he had always declined leadership of the traditionalists, he emerged from his habitual reserve, publicly took a stand “on the two problems which worry the consciences of Catholics faithful to Tradition: the validity of the *novus ordo missae* and the present existence of a pope.” (*Fideliter* No. 13, p. 65), and made an announcement on the subject. Taking full advantage of his episcopal status, he attempted to impose his position on everyone by discrediting all who thought differently, accusing them of animation by “a schismatic spirit.”

Remember: Lefebvre has always rejected meeting to study these problems. He made his decision alone and tried to impose it on all, even outside his Fraternity. His decision was given wide circulation. His announcement had all the assurance of the supreme, sovereign Magisterium with none of the supporting arguments which always accompany such decisions.

Recall some absolutely certain Catholic truths:

1. All are responsible before God for actions according to conscience.
2. We are all obliged to know the laws of God and His Church. Culpable ignorance renders us responsible for transgression.
3. The pope is infallible when teaching on faith and morals to the universal Church.
4. No Catholic can be saved if, knowingly, he shows himself rebellious to the authority of the pope.
5. Refusal to believe, with obstinacy, one or more truths of faith is to commit the mortal sin of heresy.
6. Public and obstinate refusal to submit to the authority of the pope is to commit the mortal sin of schism.

7. The formal sins of heresy and schism cause the loss of the state of grace, and separate those who commit them from the Church.

Lefebvre separates himself from Catholic doctrine:

In practice he denies the dogma of papal infallibility. By imposing the new mass, ecumenism, and religious liberty, Paul VI and John Paul II erred; they taught doctrines previously condemned by the Church. Upon this fact Lefebvre and we agree.

The Catholic response is both simple and obligatory: A pope cannot err in such matters. Since these men have erred, it is proven that they are not popes.

Lefebvre rejects this response of faith. He persists in recognizing John Paul II as legitimate true pope but considers him in error when he commands and teaches the whole Church the new mass, ecumenism, and religious liberty; indeed for this cause he disobeys him. But to say that he who errs in teaching the whole Church is the pope is equal to saying that the pope can err in teaching the whole Church. What is this if not denial of the dogma of papal infallibility? Thus in affirming that the pope errs in his official teaching on faith and morals to the whole Church Lefebvre renders himself in practice responsible for the sin of heresy. Moreover, since he pays no attention to protests, but persists in his errors with foolish obstinacy, Catholic morality requires him to be considered a formal heretic.

Lefebvre's behavior is also schismatic. Everywhere he publicly proclaims John Paul II the legitimate true Catholic pope, but publicly and obstinately refuses to submit to him: He refuses the new mass, ecumenism, religious liberty, and his own suspension *a divinis*. What, asks the catechism, is this obstinate refusal to submit to the jurisdiction of the man **he says he conscientiously believes to be the pope**, if not separation from the pope and the making of schism? Paul VI, whom Lefebvre recognized as pope, did not let slip the chance to emphasize (24 May 1976): "But how can we not see in such an attitude the fact that Mgr. Lefebvre has placed himself outside obedience to the successor of Peter, and outside communion with him, and thus outside the Church?"

"If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house nor say to him: God speed you. For he that saith unto him: God speed you communicateth with his wicked works." (II John 10-11)

If the mere greeting of one bringing non-Catholic doctrine causes participation in his heresy, how can we not see that to take the part of Mgr. Lefebvre and the priests of his Fraternity, to support them and to assist at their masses, while they reject the Catholic doctrine on papal infallibility (heresy), and on the submission owed the pope (schism), is to participate in their heresy and their schism?

Ecône Full Stop, by Father Noel Barbara (edited excerpts)

[Lefebvre is quoted extensively. The book abounds in footnotes citing occasions and sources, for which we refer you to the book.]

One day Mgr Lefebvre castigates Vatican II: "..... we refuse and always have refused to follow the Rome of neo-modernist and neo-protestant tendency clearly manifested in Vatican II and after the Council in every reform issuing therefrom." "It is an error to say that the reforms did not have their principle in the Council." "The official postconciliar reforms and orientations show, with more evidence than any writing, the official and intended interpretation of the Council." "It is therefore impossible for any alert and faithful Catholic to adopt this Reform and to submit to it in any manner whatever."

On another day Lefebvre is ready "to sign a declaration accepting the Second Vatican Council interpreted according to tradition."

One day he fulminates against "the mass of Luther" which "presupposes a different conception of the Catholic religion, a different religion." "Let there be no mistake, it is not a matter of difference between Mgr. Lefebvre and Paul VI" (but) "of the radical incompatibility between the Catholic Church and the conciliar church, the mass of Paul VI representing the symbol and program of the

conciliar church.” “The Catholico-protestant mass, a spring henceforth poisoned which produces incalculable ravages The ecumenical mass leads logically to apostasy

Another day Lefebvre does not blush to consider the cohabitation of the two rites. He distinguishes between “good” and bad new masses. “I think they should not abandon every public religious act and in consequence if the mass is celebrated in a respectful manner and not sacrilegious, I think it right to assist at this” (new) “Sunday Mass in order to fulfil the obligation.” For the obsequies of a family member, Lefebvre, accompanied by Father Simoulin, assisted (30 June 1980) “actively” at “Luther’s mass.”

One day: “All who cooperate in the action of this upheaval, accept and adhere to this new conciliar church enter into schism.” Another day he begs recognition from these same schismatics.

29 July 1976: “This conciliar church is a schismatic church because it breaks with the Catholic Church of the centuries” “Because it has taken, as the basis for its updating, principles opposed to those of the Catholic Church.” “The church which affirms errors like these is both schismatic and heretical. This conciliar church is thus not Catholic.”

4 August 1976: “I do not reject it altogether. I accept the council in so far as it conforms to Tradition.”

Angers, 23 November 1980: “We must hope that matters will be settled with John Paul II, I have not at all given up hope that matters will be settled with him. We simply ask, perhaps, not to discuss theoretical problems, to leave the questions which divide us, like religious liberty. We are not obliged to resolve all these problems now, time will bring its clarity, its solution” Lefebvre, who has so often proclaimed that to accept Vatican II’s religious liberty would amount to denying the rights of Christ over the world, himself proposes nothing other than putting the Royalty of Our Lord under a bushel, if that would permit him to enter the good graces of the conciliar church. But does he not understand that to bring his vain bargaining to a satisfactory conclusion he thus subordinates the Catholic faith to the success of his own (illicit) work?

Lefebvre wanted all elements of his confrontation with the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith publicized in a special number (233, May 1979) of *Itinéraires*, from which come all the following quotations. Lefebvre quoted his reply to the ex-Holy Office, which accused him of dividing the Church:

“When I think that we are in the buildings of the Holy Office, which is the exceptional witness of Tradition and of the defense of the Catholic Faith, I cannot help thinking that I am at home and that it is I whom you call ‘the traditionalist’ who should be judging you. Tradition represents a past as unshakeable as this house; liberalism has no foundation and will pass away. One day truth will resume her rights.” On Lefebvre’s own admission, that was a fine occasion to judge—to condemn the conciliar church and cause Truth to triumph.

To Cardinal Seper’s first letter (28 January 1978) was appended a questionnaire, to which Lefebvre replied (26 February). His reply was considered incomplete. 16 March he received the further demand:

“1. Concerning the ‘Ordo Missae’: (a) A Catholic cannot cast doubt on the conformity with the doctrine of the faith of a sacramental rite promulgated by the Supreme Pastor; (b) (c)

“2. Your general declarations (on the authority of the Second Vatican Council and of Pope Paul VI) combine together into a praxis which leads to the question: are we not confronted by a schismatic movement? In fact, you ordain priests against the formal will of the pope and without the ‘*litterae dimissoriae*’ required by Canon Law—and you have continued after your suspension ‘*a divinis*’—you send these priests into priories where they exercise their ministry without the authorization of the Ordinary in place; you give addresses calculated to spread your ideas in dioceses in which the bishop refuses you his consent; with priests whom you have ordained, you are beginning, whether you wish to or not, to form a group calculated to become a dissident ecclesial community.

“3. You consider that the priests ordained by you have the jurisdiction provided for by Canon Law in cases of necessity. Is this not to argue as though the legitimate hierarchy had ceased to exist?”

“4. The pope has the supreme power of jurisdiction not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world (Vatican I, ‘*Pastor Aeternus*’), thus the obedience due him is not limited to doctrinal matters.

“5. By your statements on submission to the Council and to the postconciliar reforms of Paul VI—statements in conformity with the whole pattern of behavior and particularly illicit ordinations to the priesthood—you have fallen into grave disobedience which in strict logic leads to schism.”

Whatever the quality and intentions of the new church hirelings, they ask the right questions. Can we cast doubt on a sacramental rite promulgated by the pope? If this rite is objectively doubtful, can its promulgator be pope? To act as Lefebvre acts, still recognizing the conciliar heads as legitimate, is this not the road to schism? Does this action not assume the death of legitimate authority? Can a Catholic limit obedience to doctrinal matters?

Lefebvre sidestepped. He sent some “general reflections on the situation of the Church since the Second Vatican Council” and some “particular thoughts,” neither of which replied to the questions. The “thoughts” quoted Leo XIII to justify disobedience to the pope at the cost of confusing the Church with any natural society.

On this foundation the colloquy of 11 and 12 January 1979 opened. We reproduce here only the modernists’ first two questions and Lefebvre’s most revealing replies.

Question: Must we conclude from these (Lefebvre’s) statements (just read) that, according to you, the Pope, by promulgating and imposing the new Ordo Missae, and the totality of the bishops who accepted it, founded and gathered round them visibly a new “conciliar” Church radically incompatible with the Catholic Church?

Lefebvre: I observe first of all that the expression “conciliar Church” is not mine but Mgr. Benelli’s, who, in an official letter, demanded that our priests and seminarians submit to “the conciliar Church.”

I consider that a spirit of modernist and protestant tendency manifests itself in the conception of the new Mass and furthermore in the whole Liturgical Reform. The protestants themselves say so and Mgr. Bugnini himself recognized it implicitly when he said that this Liturgical Reform was conceived in an ecumenical spirit. (I can prepare a study to show how this protestant mentality is to be found in the Ordo Missae.)

Question: Do you contend that a faithful Catholic could think and affirm that a sacramental rite, in particular that of the Mass, approved and promulgated by the Sovereign Pontiff, could be not conformable with the Catholic Faith or “*favens haeresim*?”

Lefebvre: This rite in itself does not profess the Catholic Faith in as clear a manner as the former Ordo Missae, and in consequence it could favor heresy. But I do not know to whom to attribute it, neither do I know whether the Pope is responsible for it. What is stupefying is that an Ordo Missae of a protestant flavor, and thus “*favens haeresim*,” could have been issued by the Roman Curia.

Contrast the pitiful replies with the grave questions! The new church hirelings normally confine themselves to inconsistent arguments, but that day they asked questions of extreme precision. A mistake? Or were they sure from Lefebvre’s feeble letters that he would give way? Whatever the reason, Providence willed that these questions should be asked; and we must see that Lefebvre refused to answer. He was called upon to state whether a new church was born with Vatican II, and whether this church is incompatible with the Catholic Church. The answer is easy; he said himself he should be judging them. With a pirouette, a few vague observations on the spirit of reform, he collapsed. A second time the new church asked a self-condemnatory question: Could a reasonable Catholic contend that the Sovereign Pontiff of the Holy Church could promulgate what Lefebvre himself had so often called “Luther’s mass?” Again he collapsed, feigning ignorance regarding the “pope’s” responsibility for the new “*ordo missae*.” This question could not have surprised him; it was put to him for the third time in less than a year—a year to prepare the only possible answer. Lefebvre failed in his duty, condemned himself to be no longer able to judge his adversaries(?) in the name of the faith, and placed himself outside the Church in the sight of all. He refused what

Providence asked of him: to confess the faith, to bear witness that the conciliar church is not the church and that its heads are impostors.

Lefebvre has himself said that the Church now lives through an exceptional crisis, undoubtedly its gravest yet. He also knows that the major problem concerns the legitimacy of the heads of the conciliar church. He had a particular responsibility to solve it, in order to act in whatever manner and to bear witness before the world that the conciliar church is not the Church of Christ, that its heads are impostors. He **understood** this. From his letter (6 Oct. 1978) to forty cardinals (including Wojtyla):

“A pope worthy of the name and a true successor of Peter cannot say that he will give himself to the application of the Council and its Reforms. In so doing he places himself in rupture with all his predecessors and with the Council of Trent in particular.”

LEONARD HURST’S LEFEBVRE (The Catholic Cross, Feb. 1986)

..... Lefebvre has U-turned back to the Conciliar Church, causing unrest and unhappiness among those attending some thirty Mass Centres which we established and for which we recruited priests. Lefebvre tells people, especially his priests, they **must now accept** what he has proved unacceptable or doubtful, therefore to be avoided. He **compels** Econe students [who seek true Orders to celebrate the true Mass] to declare that they accept the Head of the Conciliar Church [imposer of the new “mass”] as Pope. He sacked nine Americans for wishing to continue to use St. Pius X’s Missal in preference to John XXIII’s changed (*ergo* illicit) Missal. His changed attitudes, his willingness to violate the law upon which he bases his own right to celebrate the true Mass, are extremely serious in effect and implication.

He has, moreover, introduced to service the Mass Centres, with full permission to officiate as though Catholic priests, men **who have not been ordained in the Catholic Church to offer Mass. This is an act of apostasy and entails blatant sacrilege [and idolatry]** Lefebvre himself has declared such men “bastard priests.” Pope Leo XIII has **decreed** that such men, not ordained within the rules laid down by the Catholic Church, are **not** Catholic priests; therefore, though they follow the Missal exactly, word for word, rubric for rubric, the “Mass” they offer is no Mass at all, but an act of sacrilege and blasphemy to be avoided under pain of mortal sin by every Catholic.

These men’s guilt is shared by all who “command it, counsel it, conceal it, partake in it, **are silent about it**, or defend it.” **This** is the law and teaching of the Catholic Church. It is our **duty** to present Catholics these facts; failing in this we are also condemned. We begged the men concerned to seek conditional ordination, and were ignored. Yet in performing our duty to warn Catholics of the utterly unnecessary danger arising from the utterly unnecessary use of false priests, we are once again charged with divisiveness. The **false** traditionalists have likened us to Communist infiltrators. How does one infiltrate his own house?

**THE CRUX OF THE MATTER, D. J. Sanborn
The Catholic Cross, Oct. 1986 (Edited excerpts)**

In times like our own, when liturgical norms are manifestly contrary to the Catholic Faith, we are not permitted to make up our own rules, or to consider the crisis a form of free-for-all in which we can take the reforms we like and reject others. We are obliged to choose, to the best of our ability, that point when the liturgy was entirely pure and free from any stain of modernism, an element totally alien to the Catholic religion. While it is possible that there could be differences of opinion concerning the correct date to choose, the principle remains that we must follow a determined set of rules used by the Church at some time before the Council, and regard them as binding. To concoct a mish-mash is to depart from the liturgical unity of the Roman Catholic Church.

Abp. Lefebvre complained that a priest in France insisted on omitting the *Confiteor* before Communion; this was against the “rules of the Fraternity.” (This rule had been decreed at the very same meeting of the Abp.’s council at which the John XXIII rubrics were imposed on all, January 1982.)

John XXIII suppressed the *Confiteor* before Communion in his new rubrics; the priest’s point was that, if we follow John XXIII, let us follow John XXIII. It is impossible to affirm in the same breath

that it is necessary and obligatory to follow his rubrics and that it is licit to continue to use a rubric which he suppressed. The French priest holding to this principle was considered disobedient to the Abp. and outside the “spirit of the Fraternity,” etc.

Lefebvre has condemned the “nine” as schismatic and disobedient to papal authority because we refuse the John XXIII rubrics. nothing to do with papal authority, since Lefebvre continues to impose the *Confiteor* before Communion, apparently even with the threat of expulsion. John XXIII suppressed it; would it not flout the same papal authority to retain it as to retain any other pre-John rubric? This fact reveals clearly that the crux of the matter is not obedience to John XXIII’s rubrics but to Abp. Lefebvre’s rubrics. Priests who work with the Society priests [not the Society priests themselves?] in Australia have an “indult” (special permission) from Fr. Schmidberger to continue using the pre-John XXIII rubrics, the very same rubrics declared “schismatic” and “disobedient to papal authority” in April. [What consideration coaxed this “indult” from Schmidberger? Who needs it? Is *Quo primum* abolished? Why would these co-workers, necessarily older than the Society, crave or accept the Society’s permission to celebrate Mass as forbidden by those whom they, independently of the Society, have always inexplicably recognized as true popes?] Although such accusations sounded good in the Spring, it is evident that Lefebvre does not really think the use of these rubrics unlawful. If permitted for priests in Australia, why illegal for priests in America? Why was the whole house burned down, if nothing is wrong with this form of liturgy?

In the midst of all the April fulminations, Lefebvre said in one of his conferences: “In the instruction in the new Canon Law they talk about ‘eucharistic hospitality.’ What is this? It means that when a Protestant comes to receive Holy Communion and he says, ‘I have the true Catholic Faith in the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist,’ then you must give him Communion. That is incredible! It is impossible, impossible! He has no other Catholic Faith, only in the Real Presence, and so we must give him Communion. He may have no faith in the Sacrifice of the Mass, he has no faith in the papacy, he has no faith in sanctifying grace, and we must still give him Communion? Impossible! It is in the new Canon Law! We cannot use this Canon Law. It is the same as all the other books that come from this reform of the Council of Vatican II.”

The November 1983 ANGELUS, official English-language publisher and editor for Abp. Lefebvre and the International Society: “The old Code will be abrogated. We are hoping to publish a commentary on the New Code by Fr. Thomas Glover, JCD, in a forthcoming issue. Fr. Glover is Professor of Canon Law at the Society of St. Pius X seminaries in Europe. Father has pointed out that whatever our personal feelings about the new Code, it comes to us with the full authority of the Pope and that we have no alternative but to accept it as the official Canon Law of the Church.”

In December we see a totally opposite position. Letter jointly signed by Bp. Antonio de Castro-Mayer and Abp. Marcel Lefebvre: “..... we utter this cry of alarm, rendered all the more urgent by the errors, not to say the heresies, of the New Code of Canon Law.”

This represents a major shift from the spirit of reconciliation with the modernists which Abp. Lefebvre has followed since the election of John Paul II in 1978. It states implicitly that John Paul II is a heretic, since it says clearly that the New Code of Canon Law, which he signed and promulgated, contains heresies.

I fear that those who dare point out that this new attitude is a departure from the one he adhered to for the past five or six years, will be told that they are “against the Archbishop.”

Will they continue to say that, in order to be a Catholic, it is necessary to be united to this modernist hierarchy, even after they have accused it of having publicly pro-mulgated heresy? But what Catholic would ever want to be united with a heretic?

The theological hopscotch that is evident with regard to the New Code is perfectly representative of the Society’s procedure from the beginning. The inconsistency of the fundamental position of the International Society towards Vatican II changes causes Abp. Lefebvre to vacillate theologically and liturgically. His followers are then forced to act either consistently with principles or inconsistently with him.

Major Leonard Hurst's Letter (2) to an Econe Priest (paraphrase): Silence in the face of well-grounded challenge surely constitutes admission of indefensibility. The only important issues concern the Church and my Faith; on these my opinions remain unchanged since the day of my Baptism, well over your twenty years ago.

From the day of Roncalli's election I suspected him. Events justified my suspicion. His attitude, conduct, and remarks, widely reported, were most unedifying. Having accepted that the Church is unchangeable, I immediately mistrusted his seemingly pointless changes.

Your illogical, untenable stand appears based on belief that Lefebvre is the wisest, most learned, sole reliable authority within the Catholic Church. Complete truthfulness and consistency are essential to reliability. Is Lefebvre truthful? In his "Reflections on Suspension" he asserts, in effect, that he has refused the *novus ordo* since its institution. But Father Guerard des Lauriers (who names other witnesses) testifies that Lefebvre habitually celebrated the *novus ordo* right up to 24 December 1971 (about two years after I had set up the first Mass Centre. In Bogota in 1973 he concelebrated the same illicit innovation with Father Aulagnier. Either Lefebvre's veracity or his memory falls short of reliability.

Is Lefebvre consistent? Your letter admits that "his thought has developed over the years" (euphemism for "he changes his mind now and then"). Why **must** one accept his rulings when his opinions today differ from those he held yesterday? Your extract from his speeches indicates that he is again changing his mind; he may be tottering towards recognition of the blatantly obvious fact that the Church has no pope. He expelled nine priests because they would not accept JP2's legitimacy. Three years later he prepares to accept their view. If so, will he recall them? If not, why not? Because, as your letter continues, the nine were expelled because "fanatically" attached to the Missal of St. Pius V? But Lefebvre himself (Letter No. 24) asserted that the use of this Missal was the **only** thing which could avert the "destruction of the Church." He subsequently ordered all his priests to use John XXIII's "Missal," and expelled priests because they followed his own teaching—undeniable, scandalous inconsistency!

He then visits your chapel, sees you using a 1909 Missal, possibly uses it himself, and says and does nothing about it. This evidence, some provided by yourself, shows that Lefebvre is not a reliable leader to be followed at all costs. By insisting on adoption of his own often irrational standards, instead of the Church's norms, he has lost almost one third of his Econe-trained priests, alienated many traditionalist priests and laymen around the world, and so confused many that they have now ceased to know or care about the Catholic Faith.

I am astonished to see you unwilling to admit the demolition of your challenge to point out "one word" of difference between the Ordinaries of St. Pius V's and Roncalli's Missals. Surely the insertion of St. Joseph into the Canon is sufficient? The omitted Collects, Secrets, and Postcommunions are part of the Ordinary because it specifies that they must be used.

You have several Roncalli missals, some with, some without St. Joseph. John XXIII missals have themselves differing Ordinaries. Your own words prove my case! But you go on to ask whether I really think any Catholic will have his faith weakened by the fact that the priest says one Collect instead of three. **At least one Catholic, the priest, will have had his faith weakened** if "false teachers" and "wolves in sheep's clothing" have persuaded him that he and others can **disobey a Church law**—properly promoted by a Pope-Saint four centuries ago—accepted and scrupulously obeyed by every pope since.

Catholics **must** obey papal decrees. We disobey at our peril; we reject Our Lord's words, "He that heareth you heareth Me." Sedevacantists obey the decrees of all popes, from St. Peter to our latest, Pius XII. Lefebvre undeniably obeys no pope whomsoever concerning the Mass. He recognizes the founders and leaders of the "heretical and schismatic" Conciliar Church, Roncalli, Montini, Luciani, and Wojtyla as popes, but illogically refuses to obey them.

Compliance with *Quo primum* **alone** insures continuation and integrity of the Holy Sacrifice, the Cornerstone of our Faith. You seem to believe that it need not (or should not!) be obeyed because some French bishops failed to obey it for many years. America has laws forbidding many actions

from murder to speeding. Are such laws invalid—not to be obeyed—because thousands disregard them daily?

You tell me that consistently I must refuse feasts of such as St. Pius X or St. Therese of Lisieux, canonized long after the Missal was declared unchangeable. The Missal provides for celebration of feasts according to category—bishop, martyr, doctor, virgin, etc. Obviously the saints you mention fall within such categories; therefore their inclusion changes nothing. [The long established custom to compose Propers for new feasts continues. No one **heedlessly** altered it.]

Bringing cases concerning ownership of Mass Centres to civil court directly breaches Canon Law; such disputes must be decided by the Church. Lefebvre characteristically disregards the Law. He spends tens of thousands of other people's money—given to God—to secure possession of property to which he has no right. The money he squanders, like the Centres themselves, came mainly from the savings and pensions of poor old people who gave it to secure the continued celebration of the traditional Mass of the Catholic Church. By imposing a 1962 “Mass rite” in its place Lefebvre has betrayed all these contributors, the true owners! He certainly has no legal, territorial, or ecclesiastical authority over these people, nor has he contributed money toward the acquisition of the Mass Centres.

Lefebvre's dictatorial style and outlook shows itself when, as Fr. Williamson admits, he attempts to barter the Centres, etc.—other people's property!—against recognition of the Society by the men in Rome who, he himself tells us, head a “schismatical and heretical Church.”

Men not ordained for the Catholic Church—**not priests**—preside at British Mass Centres. Agents of the Conciliar Church, “ordained” therein to service the *novus ordo*, operate with Lefebvre's full consent, approval, and encouragement. He has aptly called that Church “schismatical and heretical,” spawning “bastard priests” through “bastard sacraments” (Reflections on Suspension & 1976 Lille speech).

You challenge me (again) to “produce a statement by any recognized Catholic theologian to the effect that *Quo primum* means that no pope can change anything at all in the Roman Missal.” **Any sane, honest, literate person capable of reading and understanding must admit that *Quo primum* itself is just such a statement, by a recognized Catholic theologian, Pope St. Pius V.** Its binding power has been conceded by **every pope** since. His authority, you say, is no greater than that of any other pope—nor is it less! In keeping with Church tradition and practice, popes continue to observe decrees of their predecessors. Changing the unchangeable Missal involves faith and morals; besides interfering with our highest moral obligation, it rejects the *de fide* dogma of papal infallibility. Furthermore, Roncalli and his successors all swore an installation oath “to change nothing.”

Against all the evidence you insist that 1) *Quo primum* is not binding, 2) it does not concern faith and morals, 3) any pope may change the Roman Missal. (Can he supplant it?) 4) we **must** follow the directives and (changeable) opinions of Lefebvre. He has maintained for years that Roncalli, Montini, Luciani, and Wojtyla are popes of the Church.

Why do YOU not follow these men?

Why do you and Lefebvre not use their *novus ordo*?

Is Lefebvre above the pope?

Declaration (edited excerpts) **following JP2's Visits to the Synagogue and to the Congress of all Religions, Assisi**

..... it is truly evident that since the Second Vatican Council the Pope and the Bishops' Conferences have distanced themselves from their predecessors with an even greater clarity. [**than during the council?**]

All past defense of the Faith and missionary effort is now considered error for which the Church must seek pardon.

Since 1789 until 1958 eleven popes have condemned the liberal Revolution. Their attitude is now held “lack of understanding of the Christian influence which inspired the Revolution.” In adopting the liberal Religion of Protestantism and the Revolution, Rousseau's naturalist principles,

atheistic freedoms of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the principle of human dignity no longer connected with truth and moral dignity, the Roman authorities reverse their predecessors and break with the Catholic Church; they place themselves at the service of the destroyers of Christianity and the Universal Reign of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

The acts of JP2 and the National Bishops' Conferences show from year to year this radical change in the conception of the Faith, the Church, the Priesthood, the world, and salvation by grace.

The summit of this rupture with the former Magisterium (teaching) of the Church has been fulfilled at Assisi after the visit to the Synagogue. The public sin against the Word made flesh and His Church makes one shudder with horror: John Paul II encourages false religions to pray to their false gods—a scandal without measure and without precedent. **[JP2 set his own precedent in 1982 at Canterbury.]**

..... we are obliged to declare that this modernist and liberal Religion of the modern and conciliar Rome distances itself more and more from us, who profess the Catholic Faith of the eleven Popes who have condemned this false religion.

The break comes not from us, but from Paul VI and from John Paul II who have broken with their predecessors. **[How does Lefebvre class John XXIII and JP1?]**

This denial of all the Church's past by these two Popes and the Bishops who imitate them is an inconceivable godlessness or impiety and an unbearable humiliation for those who remain Catholic in faithfulness to twenty centuries of the same Faith.

Therefore we consider as null all that has been inspired by this spirit of denial: all the Post Conciliar Reforms **[but not the council itself! nor Roncalli's violations of *Quo primum!*]**, and all the acts of Rome which have been accomplished in this impious spirit. **[Why the qualifying phrase? Why not simply "all acts of these public heretics—not possibly popes or bishops?" Was the *novus ordo missae* imposed in "this impious spirit?" Is it therefore null? If so, why has Lefebvre maintained for so long that it is not *per se* invalid? Are the invalidating changes in sacramental forms "accomplished in this impious spirit"]**

Buenos Aires, 2 December 1986

(signed) MARCEL LEFEBVRE (&)

ANTONIO DE CASTRO-MAYER (who is in perfect agreement.)

SEMINARY TRAINING? WHERE?

To win at professional tennis you take lessons, hire a coach, hone your skills on stiff competition. To sharpen chess skills you play those who can beat you; you learn little from your victims. To win souls for Christ you underwent a long, strict, weighty course of study and religious training. When you had absorbed two years' philosophy and four years' theology you *might* be found short spiritually, and still rejected. But with good teachers, sufficient library, and durable eyesight you could be ordained priest. After years as a curate you might run a parish, then perhaps a diocese. After many years' practise you might excel at your job, if you had been led along slowly, steadily, through the usual channels.

Vatican II and its aftermath changed all that. Vernacularization made Latin and Greek elective (dropped). This simplified and shortened the seminary course. The candidate never understood the languages in which his philosophy, theology, apologetics, encyclicals, canon laws, and Scripture were written. Seminary education became a joke.

Into the breach leapt the Society of St. Pius X, which began to turn out priests(?) as half-educated as any, who, without long years of drudgery and training, became instant parish priests, seminary rectors, school principals, provincial superiors, professors of theology, philosophy, and canon law, editors of "Catholic" magazines, infallible guides to the traditional Catholic community. They all undergo the same brief, inadequate schooling, under the auspices of a heretical fraternity established in the postconciliar "Church," then emerge and go their various ways. All claim to be Catholic priests, though some will admit being illicitly ordained. They may or may not be priests, depending on the validity of Lefebvre's own priestly ordination, but not **Catholic** priests, ordained as they are(?) without title, ordinary, authority, jurisdiction, nor way to procure them. Several, indeed, victims of Paul VI's new ordination rite, lack even **this** questionable priesthood, yet they celebrate "mass" in the name of their fraternity, bringing certain idolatry to traditional Catholics willing to risk only probable idolatry with traditionally ordained(?) priests(?). And these appear to be not only men accepted by Lefebvre despite refusal of conditional re-ordination, but one or more whom Lefebvre himself "ordained" with the new rite.

The Catholic Cross, July 1985: "Mgr. (Lefebvre) has never been the unswerving defender of the Mass of Trent which we had believed him to be. We also have evidence that, in August '73 he 'ordained' an 'Econe priest' using the New Rite of the Conciliar Church, after telling people that it is **invalid**."

Father Noel Barbara in **Econe Full Stop**: "The muddle over the new rite reaches the level of a joke. Thus the seminarians are unsure of the validity of the ordination of Fr. Cottard. We know for a fact that he was ordained by *Mgr. Lefebvre* according to the *new rite*. After that, opinions differ." (Re-ordination?) "..... Mgr Lefebvre is unwilling to shed further light on the affair some seminarians carefully avoid assisting at masses of this doubtful priest: to the extent, for example, that a certain functionary at Econe arranged that his friends should not have to assist at the community mass when it was said by Fr. Cottard."

Why will Lefebvre not clear away this cloud on his orthodoxy—on his good faith? No defense necessary? What **can** be certain about the sacramental intention of a bishop who "ordains" in the new rite, even when subsequently using the proper rite? One rite is as good as the other; **he** has made no distinction. And what kind of seminary training leaves its recipients only doubting, not condemning, such an "ordination?"

An old priest told me that he had left Econe partly because of its defective curriculum. Gerard Hogan, one of Lefebvre's priests(?), exposed the deficiency of his own education by telling Toowoomba's traditionalists how difficult it is to identify heresy these days. Surprising? Not if we appreciate that the trainee is unlikely to exceed his trainer. Lefebvre excused Paul VI's public heresies on grounds that Paul was a liberal! Patrice Laroche absolved JP2 of teaching heresy because it was only error.

Let us return to **Econe Full Stop**. Econe, says Fr. Barbara, claims to form "true and holy priests," but succeeds, rather, in graduating complacent men who cover inordinate pride with counterfeit humility. They preach in platitudes. Their inaccurate language barely hides ignorance if not

downright heresy. (He includes citations and examples.) But varied are their talents; some enshrine their throttled thought in print, even taking to task traditional writers (Strojje, Kellner, etc.) who knew the Faith before **these** innocents were born.

Listen, for instance, to Simoulin: “We would like to express the bitterness of many of the young priests coming out of Econe. Pious and learned lay people have been occupied for too long in criticizing them because they are young and inexperienced, without taking heed that they are perhaps fragile. Some cast doubt on the doctrinal purity of the teaching at Econe, while others question the intelligence or competence of the priests who emerge.”

What an attitude among those expected to reconquer the world for true religion! It stems from Lefebvre’s excuse that **first** we must have the sacraments everywhere, so quantity of priests takes precedence over quality. Econe takes anybody. Some have found themselves listed as seminarians on their first visit. There is practically no examination of personal worth, doctrine, or vocation. Far from testing these in the seminary itself, Lefebvre often advances ordination dates when the filling of new posts or areas requires. Possibly these defects could be justified were his seminary training adequate. But it stacks up poorly against even this century’s earlier seminaries, which produced “pious but by no means learned” priests “who allowed themselves to be swept away by the gale of Vatican II.”

“The fact is made still worse by the wish to keep the seminarians, and the priests, in ignorance of those points which ought to be their reason for existence. At Econe they defy the authority of the ‘pope’ and cast doubt on the new sacraments without giving reasons. they refuse explanations to inquirers, the very fact of daring to ask deemed a sign of the wrong attitude.” Practically no instruction is given on Vatican II, new rites, or canonical reforms, and only enough on doctrine to keep up appearances. The mediocrity of the course is reinforced by that of the professorial staff. The criterion is agreement with Lefebvre. Spiritual and doctrinal emptiness is largely disguised with “lefebvrism,” the blind tortuous following of a blind guide.

But the patrons of Lefebvre’s illicit, heretical, schismatic fraternity pass lightly over Major Hurst’s and Father Barbara’s serious charges because the fraternity provides “mass” and “sacraments.” They demand **proof of the charges** instead of **justification from Lefebvre**. They consider Lefebvre innocent till proven guilty, not recognizing that 1) he is a proven heretic, and 2) we are not trying a court case but trying to keep our Faith, without which we cannot be saved.

Meanwhile the postconciliar “Church” rejoices to see traditionalists pacified by Lefebvre’s fraternity. The local “authorities” say in effect: “Better they should have their heretical celebrants of their doubtful mass than that they should bother us!” **No Catholic can settle for this.**

Logically, if we **must** have the Mass we **should** prefer to assist at an Orthodox liturgy (forbidden to Catholics); at least the celebrant refrains from the further heresy of praying for “Pope John Paul.”

Lefebvre or Thuc ordinands have no possible jurisdiction, even when (if ever) their orders are valid. No Catholic has the slightest obligation to seek out or support these illicit clerics(?), especially when such actions almost surely involve him in schism, heresy, and idolatry.

No Catholic can be obliged to assist at Mass in absence of an undoubtedly Catholic Mass under undoubtedly Catholic auspices.

LEFEBVRE IMPOSED ON CATHOLICS FOR YEARS,

because the appearance of Mass attracts our strongest support. But we trek through a veritable religious Sahara, and we must not veer off toward the mirage. Lefebvre was a schismatic heretic whose episcopal status depended on whether his priestly ordination at the hands of a high-degree mason (an apostate servant of the devil) was valid—whether he was eligible for episcopal consecration—whether apostate Achille Lienart could have himself received the episcopal order intended only for Catholic priests. Even in the hardly possible eventuality that such problems could be resolved to favor Lefebvre’s legitimacy, how can we grant the Church’s sacramental intentions to the Lienart who conspired to vitiate its doctrine and discipline, before, during, and after Vatican II. Dying, he congratulated himself: “Humanly speaking, the Catholic Church is dead.”

In assisting at mass(?) celebrated by Lefebvre or anyone whom he ordained(?) we risk idolatry. We have, therefore, no choice; we **must** avoid it, and any other sacrament(?) administered by the same doubtful priests and bishops. Doubtful sacrament, no sacrament!

But let us suppose that competent authority has ruled in Lefebvre's favor, and that he could without question ordain priests and consecrate bishops. What jurisdiction had he? Was he a diocesan bishop? **No.** Could he legitimately ordain subjects of diocesan bishops without their approval, their dimissorial letters? **No.** Could he run seminaries in their territories without their approval? Could he found a religious society with approval of a postconciliar bishop and continue it in existence against orders of a postconciliar pope? He could assume such powers only in utter default of competent authority—no pope, no Catholic bishops in the dioceses concerned. This is, of course, the exact situation, but Lefebvre never put this case. He provided insufficient basis for his actions. He continued to recognize legitimacy of antipopes and jurisdiction of an apostate hierarchy. He signed most of Vatican II's documents—including the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. He would accept all these documents “read in the light of the Council of Trent”—an absurdity advanced seriously—in order to avoid calling antipopes and their followers public heretics and schismatics. But he ever maintained his good standing among these heretical schismatic followers. He has treated with heretical antipopes as though they, ineligible through public heresy, held office legitimately. He even excluded his own priests(?) from his *novus ordo* “Church” fraternity for disagreeing with his inconsistent, untenable position. He founded a society and its seminaries to train and properly to ordain true priests to celebrate the true Mass, but apparently as an option. For he refused to condemn the *novus ordo* “mass,” but avowedly sought mere parallel status for the true Mass.

He even accepted “priests” “ordained” according to Paul VI's new, invalid “ordination” into his society without re-ordaining(?) them with the proper rite, and then imposed these **laymen** on misled Catholics who wish to remain truly Catholic, without informing the people concerned that their “confessions, communions, and mass” were lay-administered—thus making idolatry certain!

Lefebvre made no essential distinction between traditional and *novus ordo* mass and sacraments. He therefore subscribed to heresies (Arianism, Judaism, apocatastasis) built into these latter by heretics to whom he adhered as popes. He was not Catholic, and no Catholic could approach him for Mass or sacraments, even if undoubted, except on his deathbed. The doubt, of course, rules out even the deathbed. If he really was a bishop, his priests are not Catholic priests, having been ordained in defiance of Church law and of what Lefebvre wrongly supported for years as legitimate authority. When these priests(?) rebelled against him they could not thereby **recover** a status never attained.

Lefebvre had for twenty years pretended to fight for traditionalism, even repeatedly conveying the message that he knew best and would strike at the proper time. The proper time to fight heresy and apostasy is always NOW! He distracted and undercut genuine traditionalists and kept them from the front lines. At last gone too far for Rome, he still keeps us off the point. He enticed a genuine bishop (illicitly retired—without jurisdiction) into co-consecrating some of his priests(?). If not priests, they cannot be bishops, any more than Lefebvre himself. If priests, then they are bishops, but not Catholic. Either way, they cannot help us to salvation, and they must be shunned.

Lefebvre allowed a whole generation of possible supporters to die out while he temporized with Rome. He could no longer take the required stand. He had changed direction so often that no one could know his stance next month, next week, or next minute.

Lefebvre's book, AN OPEN LETTER TO CONFUSED CATHOLICS, first calls as witnesses to the great confusion those themselves indispensably involved in its creation and protraction, Their Holinesses Popes Paul VI and John Paul II. On page 10 “we have the Pope himself attending religious ceremonies in false religions, praying and preaching in the churches of heretical sects The faithful no longer understand.” [Nor does Lefebvre; he still calls these blatant apostates “Holiness” and “Pope.”]

On page 14 he disavows leadership. But he traveled the world, raised funds, enticed his followers into accepting and disobeying apostate antipopes. For years he undermined and opposed action.

“Wait for the opportune moment. I have an earth-shaking plan. When it counts, I’ll act.” This message came even to me by at least four routes. Even had he acted properly in 1991 he would have outlived most support and all effectiveness. His disavowal matches Roncalli’s “I don’t like to claim special inspiration” to convoke Vatican II.

Page 24: “Why make hosts that are grey or brown? trying to make us forget *hanc immaculatam hostiam*?” [But the Mass offers the Spotless **Victim**—**not** the pure white piece of **bread**. Small wonder Lefebvre considered the *novus ordo missae* not *per se* invalid!]

Page 35 raises questions about validity of individual *novus ordo* services just after nailing down the lid on them all for offering the wrong things and replacing the consecratory **action** with a **narrative** of institution. “The prayers of the offertory, the Canon and the priest’s communion are necessary for the integrity of the sacrifice and the sacrament but not for its validity.” [A disintegrated but valid Mass! He illustrates his point with]

“Cardinal Mindszenty pronouncing in secret in his prison the words of Consecration over a little bread and wine was certainly accomplishing the sacrifice and the sacrament.” [Supposing this romance factual, or that an isolated consecration can equal Mass, one presumes that Mindszenty, while needlessly violating canon law, intended to consecrate. This vital intention is completely absent, even actively thwarted, in the new rite itself, which no **priest’s** intention can validate.]

Page 36 discusses assisting at a sacrilegious though valid *novus ordo* to satisfy our Sunday obligation. “These masses cannot be the object of an obligation.” [Naturally not! Our obligation existed centuries before the *novus ordo*.]

Page 51 consults *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* to cite against the abuses of confession the very antipopes who introduced and promoted them. Others should obey (selectively) while Lefebvre ignores direct orders on ordinations. Each individual is to judge a pope’s prescriptions to decide whether to obey. [Private interpretation!]

Page 58: Lefebvre purports to demonstrate proper form and matter insufficient for a valid ordination in absence of proper intention. But he declared his own ordination unaffected by the intention of the apostate, devil-worshipping, God-hating freemason who performed it.

Pp. 65-6 describe some of the Dutch Catechism’s damning shortcomings and heresies specified by a commission of cardinals in 1967. “A few years earlier they would have been forthrightly condemned and the Dutch Catechism put on the index. Yet without waiting for the commission’s report the promoters had the book published in several languages.” (Ukrainian translation by Miroslav Lubachivsky, since “ordained” patriarch by JP2.) [Forget the commission; **where was the pope?** How could a genuine pope not have forbidden this outrageous compendium of heresies?—not an academic theological dispute, but an “authority” published for the “liberation” of Catholics and used in schools to turn our “children into little Protestants.” Montini, as with contraception, set up a commission, as though these matters were in doubt.]

Pp. 71-2 refer to “contemptible” catechisms retained despite parental protest because approved by the Catechetical Commission, and printed with permission of Quebec’s President of the Episcopal Commission for Religious Teaching. “How can one accept the idea so contrary to the Catholic religion on the pretext that it is covered by episcopal authority?” [Again, **where is the pope**—our standard of unity and belief—charged with the preservation of our religion? To postulate the current incumbent a genuine vicar of Christ is heretical (at least by implication) and blasphemous.]

Page 73: “The Church has always considered the university chairs of theology, canon law, liturgy and Church law as organs of her magisterium or at least of her preaching. Now it is quite certain that at present in all, or nearly all the Catholic universities, the orthodox Catholic faith is no longer being taught. I have not found one doing so, either in free Europe, or in the United States, or in South America.” [The rot is universal; responsibility lies at the top. On the hierarchy in conspiracy behind the “pope’s” back? So whence the last four “popes?” Would all those conspirators have elected an outsider? And who (as Lefebvre complains) abolished the Holy Office?]

Pp. 78-88 detail horrors of ecumenism and religious liberty. Lefebvre’s highly publicized attitudes in these fields have caused many to wonder at his professed willingness to sign Vatican II

documents interpreted in the light of the Council of Trent. Was he establishing a “reason” against the day of discovery for already having signed most?

In the next chapter, on communism and freemasonry, Casaroli and Wojtyla are charged with saddling Czechoslovakia and Hungary with communist bishops. Bugnini is again unmasked as a freemason. Yet, said Lefebvre, his *novus ordo* remains valid, just like Lienart’s ordinations.

In the next two chapters (pp. 97-113) Lefebvre amassed proofs that the 1789 revolution has taken over the Church, especially since Vatican II. He quotes Montini as he so often promoted the cult of man. Then, astonishingly, without regard for all that has continued to happen, he avers that all this is compensated for and corrected (or at least sanitized) by Montini’s **Creed of the People of God!** “This Credo, drawn up by the successor of Peter to affirm the faith of Peter, was an event of quite exceptional solemnity. he has made an act which pledges the faith of the Church” [to gratitude for Islam and Judaism, among other choice bits]. “We have thereby the consolation and the confidence of **feeling** that the Holy Spirit has not abandoned us. the Arch of faith that sprang from the first Vatican Council” [not Christ and His Apostles?] “has found its other resting point in the profession of faith of Paul VI.” [An arch supported 98 years at one end awaiting a base for its loose end!]

Lefebvre’s next chapter documents the Church’s marriage with the Revolution, “an adulterous union and from such a union only bastards can come. The rite of the new mass is a bastard” [but valid] “rite, the sacraments are bastard sacraments. We no longer know if they are sacraments which give grace or do not give it. The priests coming out of the seminaries are bastard priests, who do not know what they are.” [Presidents?] Bastard priests to bastardize the laity? How? We must first accept change. Secondly our reactions to change are registered because opposition to change is more spontaneous than reasoned. [Really?] Two typical attitudes: Acceptance of (1) novelties one by one, (2) total renewal of faith entering a new cultural era but closeness to the Apostolic faith [Close counts in horseshoes; we are bound to the Apostolic faith itself.] Vanishing faith must be bolstered with some fundamental assurance. What? The Holy Spirit! No hierarchy, magisterium, dogma (but yes, Virginia, there **is** a pope!); Christians are inspired directly by the Holy Spirit. [That’s why Montini joined the charismatics at their Roman holiday!]

On page 129 we read that Montini gave away “his” tiara under pressure from the modernists, who also prevailed upon the bishops to give up their rings. According to (at the time) retired Melbourne auxiliary bishop John N. Cullinane, Montini called in all rings and replaced them with rings of his own design, just as he replaced his papal pectoral cross with the ephod worn by Caiphas.

Page 134 features Lefebvre’s usual claptrap about his loyalty to “the present reigning successor of St. Peter as long as he echoes the apostolic traditions and the teachings of all his predecessors. It is the very definition of the successor of Peter that he is the keeper of this deposit. we are submissive and ready to accept everything that is in conformity with our Catholic faith, as it has been taught for two thousand years, but we reject everything that is opposed to it. a grave problem confronted the conscience and faith of all Catholics during the Pontificate of Paul VI.” [But no longer?] “How could a pope, a true successor of Peter, assured of the assistance of the Holy Spirit, preside over the most vast and extensive destruction of the Church..... something that no heresiarch has ever succeeded in doing? One day this question will have to be answered.”

[Lefebvre simply refused to see the only possible answer, and reduced himself, and those to whom he brought his own confusion, to choosing among public pronouncements and actions of a supposedly infallible “keeper of the deposit.” Montini perverted and destroyed this deposit, and is therefore by definition not a true successor of Peter. We must declare this fact and act accordingly.]

On pp. 153-4 Lefebvre was not in schism because he did not and would not leave the “pope,” himself in schism. Nor is he among those who insist that Montini was a heretic [so often proven] and therefore, by that very fact, impossibly pope [as canon law provides]. “John Paul I and John Paul II would then not have been legitimately elected.” [Perfectly true, but he omitted a major reason: that they had—like himself—adhered to Montini as true pope, thereby condoning his public heresies.] “This is the” [misstated] “position of those called ‘sedevacantists.’”

“Paul VI has done more harm to the Church than the French Revolution.” [All by mistake?] “Some of his acts—signatures on Article 7, *Institutio Generalis* of the new mass and Vatican II’s **Religious Freedom**—are scandalous” [and heretical]. “But it is not a simple problem to know whether a pope can be a heretic.” [If he signs and promulgates heresy he is obviously a heretic.] “We have to consider the degree to which the pope intended to involve his infallibility

[When he promulgates doctrine in his “papal” capacity he necessarily involves both his office and its attributes. When he errs he proves that he lacks infallibility—a papal essential. Since he had publicly embraced heresy before he “became infallible” he lacked eligibility, his election was null and void, and he could never have acquired either the office or its infallibility.] If Montini’s liberalism suffices (as Lefebvre said) “to explain the disasters of his pontificate” then obviously his liberalism was a major error to which we must apply “By their fruits you shall know them.”

“Another argument put forth by the sedevacantists is that the exclusion of Cardinals of eighty years and over, and the secret meetings which preceded and organized the last two conclaves render those two popes invalid. going too far; doubtful, perhaps.” [Doubtful pope, no pope!] “Nevertheless, the subsequent unanimous acceptance of the elections by the Cardinals and the Roman clergy suffices to validate them. That is the opinion of the theologians.” [After how he abused the *periti*, all theologians, at Vatican II. Let canon lawyers rule whether cardinals’ acceptance of their own void election validates its result, especially when all the electors had at least condoned Vatican II’s heresy-laden promulgations and most had signed them. All had come under automatic expulsion of Canons 2314 and 188, as had Lefebvre himself. That contributed greatly to his wilful blindness.]

Page 155: “The visibility of the Church is too necessary for its existence for it to be possible that God would allow it to disappear for decades.” [Visibility of public heretics contributes nothing to that of the Church, which has always been visible enough to persecute, even when (often enough) it had no pope.]

“While rejecting Paul VI’s liberalism, we wish to remain attached to Rome and the Successor of St. Peter out of fidelity to his predecessors.” [How have the last four “successors” demonstrated fidelity? If we could discern it we would have no problem. We have at least one problem less than Lefebvre: we feel no need to palliate or misconstrue facts.]

Lefebvre continued with a long list of matters which must be rectified, but which could not exist in the same Church with a genuine, functioning pope. His solution (“there is no other”—page 159) is for Catholics to enter politics, or at least to vote.

Lefebvre’s book has deepened the fog. But it helps explain the inconsistency and confusion of his Society’s spokesmen. Anyone confused enough to be guided by this **Open Letter** will finish it more confused than ever.

**CATHOLICA, N.7, Fall 1988, THE LEFEBVRIST SCHISM:
Cardinal Ratzinger’s Analysis** (from *Il Sabato*, 30 July 1988) (excerpts):

..... The myth of Vatican harshness towards the deviations of the progressives has emerged as senseless imaginings. Until now, it has uttered only admonishments and in no case canonical sentences in the proper sense. [As expected from phony authority.] simply a matter of the Catholic Church with the whole of Tradition, to which Vatican II also belongs. [Ratzinger was a *peritus* at Vatican II.] One of the fundamental discoveries of the theology of ecumenism is that schisms can only occur in the Church when one ceases to live and to love certain truths and certain values The discarded truth becomes autonomous, it remains disregarded by the whole ecclesiastical structure, and then around it a new movement is formed. [Ingenious! The “Catholic Church” discards truths, and those who adhere to them form **not** the Church which propounded and preserved these truths but rather a **new movement!**] a large number outside the restricted circle of Lefebvre’s Fraternity, see it as a sort of guide or at least a useful ally. one could not imagine a phenomenon of this magnitude if it did not bring into play positive elements which do not find a sufficient outlet within the Church of today. We must question ourselves seriously on the deficiencies of our pastoral activities as these events call them into question. [Better late than never?] In this way we shall be able to give a role to those who want and ask for

one within the Church, and we shall succeed in removing every reason to be in schism by rendering it superfluous within the Church itself. [Wasn't it always?]

A number of reasons could have induced many people to seek refuge in the ancient liturgy. The chief one is that in it they find that the dignity of the sacred is preserved. [How understanding and sympathetic! Ratzinger refuses to recognize our main objections: loss of the four marks of the Church and of the ordinary means of grace (Mass and sacraments), and massive denial of Catholic truths. Ratzinger **must** have had these called to his attention, but he grants us insufficient memory or intelligence to advance them, and restricts us to an uninformed sense of the fitness of things.] After the Council, many people consciously raised “desacralization” to the rank of a program of action, by explaining that the New Testament had abolished worship in the Temple

The death of Jesus outside the walls, that is to say in a public place, such now is the authentic worship. Worship, to the extent that it is due, must express itself in the non-sacred surroundings of daily life, in love being lived. Driven by such arguments, they abandoned the sacred vestments; they stripped the churches

of the splendor which recalls the sacred; and they reduced the liturgy to the language and gestures of ordinary life, by means of greetings, of common gestures of friendship and similar things.

..... with such theories and such practices they have entirely lost sight of the real connection between the Old and New Testament. They have forgotten that this world is not the Kingdom of God and that the Holy One of God continues to be in contradiction with the world; that we must purify ourselves in order to approach Him; that the profane, even after the death and resurrection of Jesus, has not succeeded in becoming the sacred. The Risen Christ appeared to those whose hearts had been opened by Him

not to everyone. In this way a new place of worship was opened, and to this we must refer ourselves today; to that worship which consists in approaching the community of the Risen Christ [**not** the *novus ordo*, then!]

we must give back to the liturgy its sacred dimension. The liturgy is not a festival, nor a gathering for relaxation. What matters is not that the priest should produce some striking ideas or flights of fancy of his own. The liturgy consists in rendering present among us the thrice-holy God, it is the burning bush, and it is the alliance(?) of God with man in Jesus Christ. The grandeur of the liturgy is not based on the fact that it offers an interesting pastime, but that it consists in rendering tangible the Totally Other [Jesus Christ, true God and true man?] whom of ourselves we are in no position to cause to come. He comes because He wants to come.

the essential thing in the liturgy is the mystery, which is realized in the common rite of the Church [**not** in the multitude of somewhat similar vernaculars, then?]; everything else reduces it. The people strongly resent it, and feel[?!] cheated, when the mystery is transformed into distraction, when the principal author in the liturgy is not the Living God [nor even Hannibal Bugnini and Paul VI] but the priest or the liturgical organizer.

The Second Vatican Council is not approached as a part of the whole living Tradition of the Church, but as the end of Tradition and a fresh start from zero.

The Council defined no dogma and consciously wished to express itself at a more modest level, simply as a pastoral council. However, many people interpret it as if it were almost the superdogma which removes the importance of all the rest.

This impression is particularly strengthened by current practices. What was once considered the most sacred of all—the form transmitted through the liturgy— appears at a stroke to be no longer protected and the only thing that can be rejected in complete safety. Criticisms of the options of the post-conciliar period are not tolerated; but where the ancient rules are in force, or even the great truths of the faith—for example, the corporal virginity of Mary, the bodily resurrection of Jesus, the immortality of the soul, etc., they [those in “authority?”] do not even react, or only with extreme moderation. I have myself seen, when I was a professor, how the bishop himself, who before the Council had sent away a teacher who was sound but had a somewhat rough turn of speech, found himself, after the Council, unable to dismiss a teacher who openly denied some of the fundamental truths of the faith.

All that leads numerous people to ask themselves if the Church today is really the Church of former times, or if it has been replaced by a different one without their being informed. [Benelli informed

us!] The only way to make Vatican II credible is to present it clearly [?!] for what it is; a **[new]** part of the entire and unique Tradition of the Church and of her faith.

.....in the spiritual movement of the post-conciliar period, a forgetfulness, even a suppression of the question of the truth were often adopted

The “truth” appeared as too lofty a claim, an impermissible “triumphalism.” This process is clearly confirmed in the crisis affecting the missionary ideal and practice. If we do not place the accent on truth in the announcement of our faith, and if this truth is not essential to man’s salvation, missions lose their meaning. In fact, the conclusion was drawn and is still being drawn that in future we must only seek that Christians be good Christians, Muslims good Muslims, Hindus good Hindus, etc. But how can we know when some one is a “good” Christian or a “good” Muslim? [If, foaming at the mouth, he charges at us brandishing a bolo?]

The idea that all religions are, properly speaking, only symbols of what, in the last analysis, is the Incomprehensible, is rapidly gaining ground in theology and has already penetrated liturgical practice. Wherever that has happened the faith as such is abandoned, because it consists in the fact that I yield to the truth insofar as I recognize it. Thus we have every reason to return to a correct conception in those ideas also. [So where are they **now**? From the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith as clear an admission of heresy, schism, and apostasy as anyone could wish.]

So Ratzki knows a bishop who couldn’t fire his own priest for teaching heresy in his own seminary. The Ordinary’s authority is now obviously overborne, by either another innovation, his episcopal conference, or a Roman congregation, probably Ratzinger’s. Incredible? The Sydney Morning Herald, Sept. 5, 1988, reports a similar situation at Sydney’s archdiocesan seminary. Local (*novus ordo*) priests who accept apocatastasis, Arianism, Judaism, and Lutheranism in their official worship have united to point frantic fingers at several of the faculty. The article names Dr. David Coffey, whose heresies are defended rather than denied by his students—defended, moreover, in such wise that the case against Coffey is proven: He infects others with heresy.

SMH quotes a seminarian: “The Church has always said the bread and wine remain bread and wine **scientifically**. But metaphysically, by our faith, it becomes the body and blood of Christ. That’s nothing new in the Church. It’s just that it’s been suppressed.”

Who suppressed this nonsense? **When**? When was it **taught** or **believed**? What pope or council declared it? The Church has always said that the accidents, the **appearances**, remain, but that the **substance** is totally changed, by the **Action** of Jesus Christ, **not** by anyone’s faith.

Back to the seminarian: “Dr. Coffey has never questioned the resurrection. I know. He has taught me.” [*Non sequitur.*] “He just says” [gratuitously] “that the resurrection has nothing to do with bodies in holes.”

In a 1980 article in **Faith & Culture** Coffey argued that the absence of a body in Christ’s tomb had “nothing to do with the resurrection as such.” [What would he have said to a bodily **presence**?] He suggested that the lack of a body could be attributable to the Disciples having gone to the wrong tomb or to the practice of removing bodies to make way for another burial. [In two days, under the eyes of a Roman guard set to prevent just this removal?] Ratzinger’s congregation had investigated Coffey for two years without result. Any fool can spot Coffey’s heretical bias except the fool whose job it is.

The Gospels record that Jesus was buried, after proof of His death, in a new tomb close by, belonging to Joseph of Arimathea, that a huge rock was rolled up to the entrance, that it was sealed, that a guard was set over it. Mary Magdalene and “the other Mary” kept watch till dark, then returned at daybreak the second day after to anoint the Body. When Mary told the Disciples that Jesus had risen, St. John, present at His death and burial, led Peter to the tomb, where they encountered an angel. The guard had been stationed by the chief priests and the Pharisees, for “That seducer said, while He was yet alive : After three days I will rise again.” (Matt xxvii, 63) St. Matthew continues (xxviii, 11-14): Now when they were departed, behold some of the guards came into the city, and told the chief priests all the things that had been done. And they being assembled together with the ancients, having taken counsel, gave a great sum of money to the

soldiers; Saying: Say you, that his disciples came by night and stole him away, while we were asleep. And if the governor shall hear of this, we will persuade him, and secure you.

Great pay for great risk! What would happen to a guard asleep on duty under Rome's iron discipline? "And this word was spread abroad among the Jews even unto this day." Who believes sleeping witnesses? But the chief priests, who had insisted that the bodies come down before dark, when the Sabbath began, who made sure the "seducer" was dead, buried, and guarded against removal, never contended that their guard stood over the wrong tomb, or that the body was still there. And they could hardly smuggle in another crucified cadaver in broad daylight.

After such a public physical death, nothing would suffice for fulfillment of prophecy or proof of divinity but a physical resurrection. No one was dealing in abstruse equivalents. As St. Paul said (I Cor xv, 14): "If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain."

I Cor xv, 8: "And last of all, He was seen also by me, as one born out of due time." The other five hundred odd witness had seen the risen Christ between His resurrection and ascension. But St. Paul later, "out of due time." The Church guarantees all this. So who is Coffey to speculate? A Catholic bishop would have silenced and fired him years ago. But Freeman, Clancy, or Ratzinger?

Marcel Lefebvre acted more or less like a Catholic bishop. In a sense his performance excelled JP2's; he fooled more traditionalists. Many who **act** as though JP2 is not pope refuse to **say** he is not pope (torturing their consciences into absurdity) because that holy Lefebvre also contradicted himself. All Vatican II bishops and cardinals could go wrong, but **not** Lefebvre. When they all condoned liturgical and doctrinal change they proved themselves heretics. They contradict their own former positions, so they must be wrong. But when Lefebvre contradicted both his former and his current positions, **he** was obviously sincere—therefore correct.

So send your sons to become Janissaries and your money to war against your Catholic Faith. Lefebvre would have us believe that those with whom he quarreled (respectfully) because they preserve nothing (except infallibility & obedience) of the Catholic Faith and replace it with new, protestantizing doctrine and worship are undoubtedly successors of St. Peter, who would have carved the ears off them sooner than off another servant of the high priests. He refused not only to condemn their idolatrous *novus ordo* as invalid but also to ordain or keep in his community anyone who condemns it or its preposterous imposing authority.

Consistency and logic starve in his community—as in the entire Renewal. Think not that Lefebvre fought for the Faith. He led the mock war. He occupied positions to which genuine warriors are entitled. While the Roman usurper apostates can compromise with him or his survivors they need not deal with the true Catholic.

Lefebvre's fractured survivors will lead us into apostasy as surely as will the rest of the hierarchy. He can't fool you? He fooled me for several years. He created a fine impression, but for too long personality has weighed too much in the selection of bishops. He would settle everything peaceably, so we need not stand on our own hind legs.

But there is a time for war—when our Faith is threatened—and a time for peace—when we die.

ECONE'S ENVOY, Sydney, Tuesday 31 July 1979

Roughly a hundred traditionalists of various stripes attended Father(?) Richard Williamson's slide lecture, which dealt also with Lefebvre's Roman troubles. Slides, darkness, no notes, few direct quotations. Lecturers remarks italicized throughout.

The archbp.'s convictions are clearly set forth in his book, A BISHOP SPEAKS.

Why does he not point out in Rome that Rome backs and preaches heresy?

He is trying to convert them in charity. You don't spit in a man's face when trying to get something from him.

Why not? It might wake him up!

No, these people cannot take strong meat. In charity they must be fed milk first. (St. Paul) Behold these weak men in Rome: Paul VI imposed his wishes, his new "mass" and "sacraments" upon unwilling hundreds of millions. John Paul II survived war, communism, and ecclesiastical politics

to adhere to the renewal. These, not the lambs they have shorn, are to benefit from our charity. When King David fell from grace God's prophet, Nathan, told him—brutally, if you will—: “Thou art the man!” And David repented. Genuine charity owes the same approach to those who almost fill an office far greater than David's—who influence many times David's subjects far more vitally. *But we hard-liners and cranks* (charitable designation for those who see no excuse for bargaining away God's property) *fail in charity. We give strong meat to those who can stand only milk*—those raised in our same faith and traditions, not the converts from generations of idolatry and paganism with whom St. Paul dealt. Our approach won't work, say those without the stomach for it. **And** it's uncharitable.

Why must we deal with heretics? How can heretics be popes?

We must assume that when the Roman clergy (cardinals) elect their bishop they know what they are about. They elect the bishop of Rome, who is automatically pope.

Isn't this like saying fifty million Frenchmen can't be wrong?

A man unknown to me asked about transubstantiation in the new rite of “mass” and validity of the new ordinations. *On the mass there was no yes or no— sometimes transubstantiation takes place, sometimes not. It becomes less frequent as younger priests not properly instructed in the Church's intention replace the older. (To be construed as a reply to part two of the question?) The new mass was to be shunned for its Protestantizing tendencies and for its uncertain validity.*

“You do know what doubt involves? Idolatry, the worst possible evil.” *But I could not accuse people of the sin of idolatry.* “I didn't say sin. I said idolatry.” Even uncharitable cranks understand that sin requires evil intent. But idolatry is objective. Worshipping unconsecrated bread is in itself idolatry.

Father(?) would not discuss the fact (oversimplification?) that we are nineteen centuries late with a new rite. *All we need for transubstantiation is form, matter, and intention. Matter is there. Form is there: This is My Body, This is the chalice of My Blood.* (We let this go. Time was shorter than his form.) *And if the priest has the Church's intention that is all that is necessary.* “No, the intention must be in the rite.” *The words are there.* “Cranmer kept the words. The Book of Common Prayer has the words.” Then Father(?) Williamson shocked me twice in quick succession. He repeated the first shock when, not believing I had heard correctly, I failed to reply. *A properly ordained Catholic priest can transubstantiate in the Book of Common Prayer service.*

“Not on your life!”

Will you go against all theological opinion Here a charitable soul injected thanks for a lovely lecture, and Mr. Foley adjourned to the refreshments.

But imagine appealing to theological opinion these days! What has put us in this mess? When has it ever bound us?

How much more clearly could a Catholic priest show lack of the Church's intention than in celebrating a non-Catholic service, particularly a rite belonging to an organization which officially (39 Articles, 31) declares our Mass “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits?” Father(?) Williamson's “theological opinion” contradicts both Canon Law and the Church's universal practice.

Some Canon Law is Divine Law. We may safely place in this category laws that treat divine matters. Canon 817 says that neither species may be consecrated without the other nor both outside Mass. Mass, the Sacrifice of Calvary, has three principal parts at which we are required to assist on Sundays and Holy Days under pain of mortal sin. The parish priest is equally bound to provide his parishioners the Mass—all of it, including the three principal parts—not a novelty nor a non-Catholic service in the very provision of which he would violate the Natural Law as codified in Canon 1258 (It is unlawful for the faithful to assist in any active manner, or to take part in the sacred services of non-Catholics).

No one can show that transubstantiation takes place outside its proper and entire environment. Priests are forbidden to attempt it. Any such attempt *per se* excludes the Church's clearly

expressed, legislated intention. Williamson's "theological opinion" is only another classroom exercise in useless hair-splitting, a free and unnecessary gift to the enemy, a misplacement of charity, a gallows on which to hang the Mystical Body before drawing and quartering it into dead sections that will accept the *novus ordo* or the new sacraments even if only for other sections.

Caged in a classroom such opinions merely provide mental gymnastics for seminarians. But let them escape into the practical sphere and they support heresies, thus demonstrating their absurdity. If this type of claptrap is taken seriously in theology courses, no wonder our priests have almost universally accepted the *novus ordo missae*—which is, let us again oversimplify, nineteen centuries too late to pretend any connection whatsoever with our Apostolic Faith.

JP2 welcomed Lefebvre effusively, even as he had a communist mayor a week earlier. Cardinal Seper asked the questions while JP2 preserved his genial neutrality. Lefebvre returned in January to answer eighteen or so trick questions. His replies were drawn up for him to sign. He refused because a press secretary blurted out the plan to hale him before a commission or court to defend them. We can have no idea how vicious ecclesiastics can become; the corruption of the best is the worst. To the query whether JP2 was involved in the vicious plot Williamson replied Lefebvre avoids answering this question to keep from scandalizing.

Cardinal Seper had asked delay for last June's ordinations(?). Lefebvre had then suggested that if after delay Rome's approval were not forthcoming Rome would lay itself open to suspicion of false promises and shady dealing. If approval followed the delay Rome could be charged with yielding to pressure from Econe. To avoid this (fictitious) choice, let the ordinations(?) proceed on schedule. Rome withheld action.

Who choreographed the skit? What other excuse could Rome need than the canonical requirement for dimissorial letters from the candidates' proper bishops? Supposing a candidate could produce a proper bishop who had not lost jurisdiction by public lapse into heresy, this law would oblige Lefebvre. To exempt himself from this law, made to keep responsible control of the priesthood, he must at the very least demonstrate loss of jurisdiction: he must condemn for specified heresies the bishops whose apparent rights he violates.

LUNACY LANE: From a letter of Richard Williamson:

"As Fr. Schmidberger says, the conditions attached to this permission for the Tridentine rite are unacceptable to priests of the Society of St. Pius X, notably Condition 'A'" (That it be made publicly clear beyond all ambiguity that such priests and their respective faithful in no way share the positions of those who call in question the legitimacy and doctrinal exactitude of the Roman Missal promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1970.), "for while acknowledging that a Pope may legitimately introduce a new rite of Mass, (and Pope Paul VI was Pope), we can never admit that a rite departing so far from Tradition as the *Novus Ordo Missae*, is, as such, legitimate, or doctrinally sound. Hence some people would even see in the Decree" (Vatican, 3 Oct. indult for use of 1962 Missal) "a trap to divide Traditionalists or isolate the Society of St. Pius X. However we must beware of getting our minds into a closed circuit whereby Christ's Vicar is damned if he helps us and damned if he doesn't."

[Whom has he helped but himself? He gains credit for benevolence while confusing more souls. He grants permission no one needs for a Mass no one wants—dating all the way back to 1962—under conditions no genuine traditionalist can accept. He has tried to fool us again, to split our opposition. He permits this phony near-return of our Mass now that the purpose of its removal is almost entirely accomplished. We can now have the ceremonies garbled by those who (1) are no longer sufficiently conversant with Latin, meaning or pronunciation, (2) no longer remember the theology of the Mass, (3) have been painstakingly brainwashed of the Church's intention, (4) have accepted the nonsensical legitimacy of a papal introduction of a new rite for Mass, and (5) have accepted public heretics—Paul VI and JP2—as Catholic popes.]

Williamson: "Let us suppose that he sincerely wishes to liberate Tradition—what other first step would we realistically expect him to take, to set about reversing the whole direction of a massive organization like the Catholic Church?"

[What an odd goal—“to liberate Tradition!” Why not “to restore all things in Christ?” Or would that exceed hope from a man who publicly dedicated his “pontificate” to full implementation of Vatican II, that heretical council to whose heresies he contributed so fully? Literally thousands of traditional Catholics could draft an encyclical for his signature that would solve every problem except where to imprison the hierarchy. What is this “first step” syndrome as though genuine faith and morals must return by easy stages, having been stolen so gradually? A genuine pope could—and **would**—straighten everything out in half an hour. Can anyone imagine St. Pius V, St. Pius X, or even Melbourne Archbishop Daniel Mannix suffering the current Renewal more than ten minutes?]

Williamson: “For in no way will the Devil quietly let the Tridentine Mass be officially reinstated! His master-stroke against Mother Church, climaxing centuries of effort, was, with the promulgation of the Novus Ordo in 1970, so to split Catholic Pope from Catholic Mass that seemingly no Catholic could cleave to both, ... every Catholic was split in two, ... Mother Church was rent from top to bottom.”

[Typical Econe logic! This promulgation (Easter 1969, incidentally) by **Paul VI** was the **Devil’s** master-stroke. But Paul VI, who, says Williamson, was a Catholic pope, infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost in faith and morals, lyingly and illegally introduced a Judaistic, Arian, Lutheran, Cranmerian idolatry, deliberately to replace undoubtedly true worship so successfully that it requires “papal” intervention for its occasional return. A Catholic pope promulgates Satan’s master-stroke! —thereby splitting himself from the Catholic Mass! But there are obviously some —contributors to Econe and its horribly misnamed Society of St. Pius X—who can torture logic enough to believe it.]

Williamson: “With this Decree, or, at any rate with the next and the next that it foreshadows, Almighty God is visibly, even through poor men, steering His Church out of the difficulties into which they had brought it, and the manner and timing of the Church’s rescue we shall watch Him perfectly synchronising, for the salvation of souls, with the onset of the Third World War.”

Then he has the nerve to quote Romans xi, 33 to back up his prophecy. Rather: How incomprehensible are **Williamson’s** judgments!

July 1 brought forth from Bishop(?) Richard Williamson at the Lefebvre seminary in Winona, Minnesota a four-page “refutation” of “the main sedevacantist argument,” defined: “Recent popes say and do heretical things. Heretics are outside the Church. Therefore these popes are not even members of the Church, let alone true popes.” But a Catholic voicing heresies or performing heretically is only a material heretic, still a Catholic unless pertinacity makes him a formal heretic. [This miracle is neatly accomplished through the magic word, **liberalism**—approximating self induced culpable, malicious, phony ignorance. But Williamson amplifies and labors this incredible, simplistic “solution” to the point where he proves his own version of **pertinacious** against the antipopes he defends.]

How can Williamson send out such pathetic drivel? Can he have read it over? Wojtyla entered the seminary not to learn from St. Thomas but to accommodate him to modern thinking. For the rest of the page and most of the next, Williamson anathematizes the results of this accommodation. Then—surprise!—on election Wojtyla discovers the successful takeover of what he himself has pushed, even through Vatican II. But the poor slob had no idea of Catholic truth or that he had himself opposed it for forty years. Despite papal infallibility he cannot teach correct doctrine because of this invincible ignorance. No one is above, alongside, or beneath him to keep him on track. Are we talking corporation or the Holy Ghost? **He** will not confer infallibility on a heretic, formal or material. Can anyone but a religious illiterate **not** know that ecumenism contradicts true religion? Popes teach! No one need allow for their doctrinal variations and shortcomings, existence of which proves conclusively that beneficiaries of such allowances cannot be popes. If Williamson thinks his nonsense has caused any sedevacantist argument to collapse, he might consider enrolling in a course in logic.

Williamson’s article, “In Defence of the Pope”, appeared in Melbourne’s September **Catholic**, to which Peter Weaver replied: “If I understood (Williamson) correctly, John Paul II is blameless for

all his scandalous actions and erroneous teaching because his upbringing in life and in the Faith has led to something called ‘mind-rot’, which condition makes him believe that there are no Catholic truths that he is refusing, so that he therefore believes that what he is doing is right.

“Every type of criminal from mass-murderer to pickpocket pleads in extenuation deprived childhood, ignorance, or diminished responsibility. But can these excuse the man who fills the most responsible position on earth? Such a man, preserved in the faith by the Holy Ghost, cannot wander innocently into public error. Either he errs deliberately out of malice or the Holy Ghost is not preserving him from heresy. Either alternative leads inevitably to the conclusion that he cannot be pope. Why argue over **what kind** of heretic cannot be pope?”

“Catholics are bound to know their faith, and culpable ignorance will be no excuse at the Bar of Judgment. If such applies to the ordinary faithful, how much more must it apply to a Pope, to whom the Holy Ghost would give very special graces?”

Williamson “admits that John Paul II is falling into errors and damaging the Church (para 3). How does he answer St. Paul: ‘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.’ (Gal. I, 7-9)? And what of St. John: ‘If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house nor say to him: God speed you.’ (John ii, 10)?

‘Finally, ‘pertinacious’ (para 4) is erroneously defined: ‘fully aware that he is denying Catholic dogma.’ My Oxford English Dictionary says the word means: ‘stubborn, persistent, obstinate (in a course of action, etc.)’ which definition seems far more apt.” (edited)

It appears to have escaped all these defenders of the “pope” that a genuine pope, properly ruling the Catholic Church, teaching (and permitting the teaching of) only Catholic doctrine, participating in only Catholic worship, would need no defense. But Wojtyla travels thousands of miles in most extravagant fashion to join publicly in every kind of false worship and doctrine, even apologizing, in complete reversal of the missionary spirit—the manifestation of Apostolicity, the fourth mark of the Church—to aboriginal peoples for depriving them of their depraved, often murderous and/or cannibal, “cultures.” He keeps his defenders inordinately busy.

Williamson’s theology contains a few holes, not least of which is his insistence that episcopal consecration will automatically turn a layman (or even a deacon) into a priest. Leo XIII set forth the ancient principle that sacraments convey what they signify and signify what they convey. At no point in the consecration of a bishop are conferred the powers to celebrate Mass or to forgive sins. Unless already a priest no man can become a bishop through this third stage of the Sacrament of Holy Orders, often termed the **filling up** of the sacrament, or the adult stage which can pass on the properties of its present and former stages. But when a glass is empty you **fill** it; if it is partially full you **fill** it **up**.

Then, to demonstrate another of his shortcomings, history, Williamson invents the notion that St. Cyprian was made bishop without having been a priest. I find several St. Cyprians treated with their own articles in **The Catholic Encyclopedia**, Vol IV, pp 582 sqq. One, the Bishop of Toulon who died 3 Oct. 546 “was the favourite pupil of St. Caesarius of Arles, by whom he was trained, and who, in 506, ordained him to the diaconate, and, in 516, consecrated him Bishop of Toulon.” So St. Caesarius never ordained him priest, or that would have been mentioned. But no point is made of this. There were ten years between in which any number of bishops were available to ordain him to the priesthood. One of them undoubtedly did so, probably later in 506, or even in 507. St. Caesarius was himself ordained deacon and priest before being consecrated bishop. He would have been extremely unlikely to have skipped an order for some one else. Such skipping, even of minor orders, has always contravened canon law.

Another was martyred at Nicomedia 26 Sept. 304 in Diocletian’s persecution. “He became in succession deacon, priest, and finally bishop.”

But the first, after whom the others were probably named, “was certainly only a recent convert when he became Bishop of Carthage c. 248 or the beginning of 249, but **he passed through all the**

grades of the ministry.” If Williamson wishes to argue that at that remote time no distinction was made between priests and bishops, the article mentions five priests hostile to St. Cyprian, possibly because they were passed over by his promotion. But we are not confined to the above. In Dom Gueranger’s **The Liturgical Year**, Vol XIV, p 227: “Cyprian was a native of Africa, and at first taught rhetoric there with great applause. The priest, Caecilius, from whom he adopted his surname, having persuaded him to become a Christian, he thereupon distributed all his goods among the poor. Not long afterwards, **having been made priest**, he was chosen bishop of Carthage.”

So is St. Cyprian’s lack of priesthood the basis for Michael Davies’ learned argument that the traditional position “is having to be abandoned?” Michael believes that another newer rite can repair the *novus ordo* to an acceptable point on which traditional Catholics must compromise, or else convict themselves of that horrible crime, **immobilism**. Michael can find no Arianism in the *novus ordo* and no heresy in Vatican II’s documents. So what worth has his argument that Lefebvre would have been made priest by a ceremony intended to make him a bishop? He concedes its unlawfulness. Behind every Church law was a reason. Why not the obvious invalidity? Even doubtfulness is sufficient.

Lefebvre himself never argued against the Marquis de la Franquerie’s revelation of Lienart’s high-degree freemasonry. Could it be that he knew both men, and that he knew he could not disprove the truth? He certainly knew the dedicated historian’s reputation for responsibility, and the risk he took in revealing what he must, therefore, have regarded as fact.

Was Lefebvre more aware than Williamson and Davies that St. Pius X removed at least three French bishops from their sees (Tarentaise, Laval, Dijon) and had their ordinations redone? The removal of Le Nordez in 1904 is given in **The Catholic Encyclopedia** as the cause of the break in diplomatic relations (1905-20) between the masonic French government and the Vatican. Why would France fight the Church over dismissal of a non-masonic bishop?

Lienart, incidentally, clearly demonstrated his hostility to everything Catholic at Vatican II and thereafter. Why would a thirtieth degree (God-hating, devil-worshipping) freemason intend anything that the Church intends?

Williamson’s citation of the fruits of Lefebvre’s work in Central Africa should depend somewhat on whether all those Central Africans have kept the faith or followed the *novus bogus*. May I suggest a parallel? Father John A. O’Brien, noted American Catholic writer and polemicist (**The Faith of Millions**), had a string of converts and an influential syndication in the Catholic press. But when the changes had taken a tenuous hold he approved them in a disgraceful book, **Catching Up With The Church**. There were hundreds of these “prominent” priests building up “authority” and influence that they might better mislead the faithful when the opportunity inevitably arose. Lefebvre “led” the opposition at Vatican II, but caved in at the end and signed the documents, when his leadership could have had a strong effect. His great “effort” came years too late, and its fruits can now be seen. His priests(?) are nearly as split as the conciliar “Church” itself. In this they only follow him on different days, as the record clearly proves. I would not dream of arguing from only these points that he was or was not a priest; for they show merely that we cannot accept him as Catholic.

Neither Williamson nor Davies had a Catholic education. Nor do they necessarily appreciate the meanings of Catholic teachings, especially on intention. Nor could they have imbibed such from Lefebvre, who held, or at least stated, that a properly ordained priest could consecrate (transubstantiate) in the *novus ordo missae* if he had the proper intention. Williamson, at our only meeting, tried to secure my agreement that a properly ordained priest with a correct intention could transubstantiate in an Anglican “mass.” How does this hypothetical properly ordained priest demonstrate correct intention in his incorrect use of rites clearly forbidden by the Catholic Church?

Williamson wrote (March 5, 1992):

“But the Society insists that for instance the Mass of the *Novus Ordo* is not automatically invalid, and yet it **refuses** to let people attend it.....” If so, this is one more inconsistency. In 1975 or 1976 Gerard Hogan, then a seminarian at Ecône, returned home for a funeral in Melbourne. He then

came to Sydney, and I drove him here and there. He said that seminarians away from Econe were let satisfy their Sunday obligation at either traditional or *novus ordo* mass.

Lefebvre himself used the “mass” of Paul VI in St. Peter’s Basilica at the altar-tomb of his “patron,” Pope St. Pius X, because, he said, by celebrating the traditional Mass he would give scandal. He used the “mass” of Paul VI even at Econe, and was finally persuaded by his staff priests that it was inconsistent with his “aim” to train priests for the traditional Mass.

I have always used **novus ordo** and “**mass**” of Paul VI interchangeably, so I read others the same way. But Bugnini during Paul VI’s early years, put out in both Latin and vernacular a “mass” which omitted the prayers at the foot of the altar and the Last Gospel. In vernaculars it changed Christ’s words of Consecration. It was a stage on the road to the new rite (*novus ordo*) and deliberately created the chaos to be “corrected” by introduction of the new rite. Both introductions violated Church law as codified in St. Pius V’s *Quo primum*. This “**mass**” of Paul VI, a wanton step toward the *novus ordo*, was imposed with the *novus ordo* intention: **replacement and abolition of the traditional Mass**. It was, therefore, no good either.

So this “mass” of Paul VI, they tell me, is what Lefebvre celebrated at the tomb of St. Pius X, at Econe until talked out of it, and when in hospital at Bogota (concelebration with Aulagnier). Whether he used Latin or the vernacular is beyond my ken. But either way it was not the traditional Mass for which he supposedly opened his seminaries, **after the *novus ordo*’s introduction**, when clearly it had led to that *novus ordo*, which he would never call invalid.

Williamson’s paragraph 13: “Thirdly, from the very beginning of the Novus Ordo Mass, a handful of wholly competent canon lawyers pointed out that Paul VI **never**, while **instituting** the New Mass, at the same time strictly **abrogated or prohibited** the continuation of the Old Mass.” Jesus Christ instituted our Mass. No human, not even as exalted as Paul VI, can **institute a Mass or a sacrament**. In my book, **Is the Pope Catholic?**, pp. 29-32, I mentioned correspondence with Cardinal Freeman over our projected Tridentine Mass at Santa Sabina School, Strathfield. He wrote “that the Tridentine Mass cannot be celebrated. Neither I, nor any other Bishop, except the Pope himself, has authority to authorize the celebration of Mass according to the old Order.”

So we wrote Paul VI, and you can read “his” answer. Furthermore, in that famous 1976 Consistory which dealt so roughly with Lefebvre, Paul VI expressly stated that he **had** forbidden the Tridentine Mass. Those canon lawyers were correct; he never **legally** killed the Mass, but kill it he did. Is this a typically sneaky act of a genuine pope? He made the *novus ordo* obligatory and permitted no option except for retired priests celebrating privately. According to him, no Catholic could assist at Mass. That supposedly provoked the foundation of the Society of St. Pius X.

In imposing the *novus ordo* Paul violated the infallible **moral** law of the Catholic Church, while claiming to have done the same thing as the genuine pope who had codified it to defend the Mass against just such attacks as Paul’s. If Paul was pope, and had power to institute a new mass against the law and to impose it as a valid substitute for traditional worship, what possible excuse had Lefebvre to set up an organization to disobey him? Especially **in** Paul’s postconciliar “Church?”

In paragraph 14 Williamson, like any other Protestant, sifts and assays parts of the *Novus Ordo* religion, which he rejects as a whole. Lefebvre, now a yardstick of tradition, signed most of the documents of Vatican II, and often said that he would sign them, read in the light of the Council of Trent, to which they are publicly and, of course, heretically opposed. In signing them he split off, like the rest of those conciliar apostates, from the Catholic Church as eternally constituted. “And then, were he so indispensable, how could the Society have lasted” (but well split) “already **one year** without him?”

“Our Lord said that if all human voices were silenced in His defence, the very stones of the street would cry out in protest.” It’s convenient to interpret Scripture as needed. St. Luke (xix, 35-40): “the multitude began with joy to praise God saying: Blessed be the king who cometh in the name of the Lord, Pharisees said Master, rebuke thy disciples. To whom He said: I say to you, that if these shall hold their peace, the stones will cry out.” [In protest—or in praise?] But if we accept Williamson’s interpretation, we note that the stones are silent; therefore some one still

adheres publicly to the whole truth. Can it be Williamson, who sifts through the refuse, which he refuses, for what he can swallow?

Sedevacantists, however, having no patented sifters the more readily to discern Church destroyers' benign motivations, never distinguish, he says, between the abstract and the concrete. How easy to attribute us this nebulous, undemonstrable fault, if one cannot fault our abstract logic applied to our concrete facts!

On to Williamson's letter of April 1, 1990, largely an ad for a new book by another Econe graduate, which makes all those telling abstract points never as recently made by concrete sedevacantists. "..... when, as in this book, the quotations are all put together, one after another," [the usual method] "so that a coherent pattern emerges, and when this pattern is confirmed by a series of photographs of the man acting in accordance with that thought pattern, then something emerges with devastating clarity: this man does not have a Catholic mind." He refers, correctly, to JP2. But the same criteria apply to Lefebvre and Williamson.

Williamson now introduces an unfamiliar word, **hereticize**, which he defines as **say or do things which are heretical**, and repeats it five times. The Oxford Dictionary carries one only definition, **to pronounce heretical**. Williamson's concrete error is somewhat mitigated by abstraction from Webster's New International Dictionary, under the line among the rare, archaic, and obsolete words, of the definition, **to make, declare, or be heretical**.

"The position of the Society is that despite many hereticizing words and deeds of Popes Paul VI and John Paul II in particular, nevertheless the Society holds them to have been or to be Popes unless and until clear proof emerges to the contrary." But the Society never admits that Paul VI promulgated more than a dozen previously condemned heresies, despite Lefebvre's protestations that he could sign the promulgated documents read only in the light of the Council of Trent. If they agreed with Trent there would be no such problem. If they disagreed doctrinally with Trent in any particular they were obviously heretical. It later transpired that Lefebvre had signed most of them anyway, thus approving many of the same heresies which Paul VI publicly promulgated. But Paul VI, Williamson argued in his July 1, 1990 letter, didn't know these were heresies, because he was a Liberal. But Lefebvre, **not** a Liberal, knew, or he would not have objected. Why was he not a heretic?

But the Society (and many Traditional Catholics) **instinctively** reject sedevacantism. "How could the Catholic Church, designed by Our Lord to be a visible structure, long survive without a visible head?" [Not an argument! We sedevacantists fear the same. Only the facts are relevant.] "..... if the Popes since 1958 or 1963 have been invalid Popes, how can they have appointed valid Cardinals?" [Obviously, they can't!] "And if there are few valid Cardinals, how can another valid Pope ever be elected?" [Good question! Who guarantees that there will ever be another **elected**?] "Again, if there is no Pope, who will consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart? It will be done, said Our Lord in 1931, but it has not yet been done." [In 1931? Is it part of the Deposit of the Faith, complete at the death of the last Apostle? Sounds like a private revelation, which can prove nothing, and is therefore no argument. Anyway, some Fatima devotees will tell you that the aforesaid consecration was done by Pius XII.]

Then Williamson begs the question several more times in the same paragraph in even sillier drivel: One may **think** that only the divine promise to Peter has preserved the Church from complete destruction by the recent popes, by means of that famous Note to *Lumen gentium* and by *Humanae vitae* [both dodges of a heretic antipope]. Nor are we to forget that Montini and Wojtyla are still Catholic enough to be hated by ultra-liberals [who hate nearly everyone]. With worthwhile arguments who would trot out these feeble inanities?

The next words to strike the eye are so ridiculous that their very statement refutes them: "To say that the Novus Ordo Mass can be valid is to explain how its poison avoids being rejected outright by Catholics and so how it succeeds in doing so much harm; similarly to say that these liberal Popes are still Popes is to explain precisely how they retain so much power to damage the Church." [Please consult **The Catholic Encyclopedia**, Vol. IX, 212 on Liberalism, condemned by three genuine popes in terms which excommunicate the Liberal for heresy.]

Williamson then demonstrates how we become sedevacantists: “Step One: the recent occupants of the See of Peter hereticize, i.e. they say and do things which are heretical.” (Step One, he says in the next paragraph, is incontestable—clearly demonstrated by this book he promotes.) “Step Two: He who hereticizes is a heretic.” [Unless we use a definition from the dictionaries.] “Step Three: Every heretic is cut off from the Mystical Body of Christ, or the Church. Step Four: Whoever is cut off from the Body cannot possibly be its head. Conclusion: These hereticizing ‘Popes’ cannot still be Popes.”

“True, whoever hereticizes is at least a **material** heretic who speaks or acts against Catholic truth without realizing it or without meaning to do so; but he is not yet a **formal** heretic who consciously and pertinaciously denies what he knows to be revealed Catholic truth. However, to be cut off by heresy from the Mystical Body, or excommunicated one has to be **at least** a formal heretic. From which it follows that by no means everyone who hereticizes is thereby excommunicated. So both Paul VI and John Paul II may well hereticize” [At Step One this was incontestable.] “but that does not as such cut them out of the Church.” [But the Holy Ghost keeps a genuine pope doctrinally correct in matters of faith and morals. These men obviously lack infallibility.] Williamson then applies Christ’s promise to Peter to these heretics. [A heretic, no matter what **kind**, cannot be pope.]

Williamson’s letter of July 1, 1990 lists “wild explanations” each of which have “a grain of truth,” but he never considers that they may be true. But he continues to tell us that these recent papal heretics retain a grain or two of Catholic truth, which keep them Catholic. [On the contrary, one heresy makes a heretic, no matter how orthodox all his other tenets.]

How, asks Williamson, can intelligent, capable Church leaders, apparently of good will, trained before Vatican II, remain unaware that they flout eternal Catholic truth, without, as he tries to show, becoming **formal** heretics? His answer is **Liberalism** [for which the Church excommunicates. Whether or not these Church leaders (of good will and traditional training) are formal heretics, they are excommunicated *latae sententiae* in holding and teaching Liberal and Modernist views, the public condemnation of which was stressed in their training. And they surely knew enough to hide such views until the time was ripe.] “Pope Pius X did his best to root it out, but it so grew back” [unawares] “that now his successors” [not proven] “are destroying the Church **while convinced they are saving it.**” [certainly not proven, even by this genius at begging questions.]

Wojtyla, it seems, is a compromiser of Church doctrine, a victim of mind-rot, and an active partisan of a five hundred-year-old Apostasy. But being Polish he believes profoundly in the goodness of what the Church does. [So he works sedulously in Poland, at Vatican II, and through the papacy to change it.] He seeks a new synthesis because there must be one, and none of the older syntheses have worked. He entered the seminary not to learn but to modify. [One is not to be satisfied with God’s revealed religion, but must insist on man’s rights and independence—as though God had never thought of free will.]

Williamson next describes Liberalism in terms suited to Satanic pride and rebellion, and easily sees that it “completely unhinges the Catholic Faith” but allows its devotees to remain in the Catholic Church to teach us all our Catholic truth with damning variations, because somehow we cannot discern their public heresy.

The neo-modernism of the 1960’s, more deadly than the turn of the century modernism condemned by Pope Pius X, enjoys the support of current and recent popes. [Is there no contradiction here? Why is this advanced to excuse current and recent popes, when it rather proves that these cannot belong to the Catholic Church?] Williamson even proves the sedevacantist point in the very sentence in which he thinks to refute it: “Thus by the time Karol Wojtyla emerges from the Second Conclave of 1978 as the Conclave’s elected choice and is acclaimed as Pope by the Universal Church, he finds neo-modernism firmly established in the upper ranks of the Church. And so what can he know ‘Catholicism’ to be but this ‘improved’ version which he himself strove with conviction to promote at Vatican II?” [Two years older than Wojtyla, I was raised in a much more modernist climate than Poland. Had I been elected pope in 1978, would I have known that Catholicism was neo-modernism? What about Williamson himself? Is he not much younger

and raised in Protestantism? But then, of course, he had further training by Lefebvre and his *novus ordo* Society.] But let him hang himself even higher:

“..... from 1978 on, whom does he find that can get through to him” [what he knows well] “that his ‘Catholicism’ is way off track?” [But still on the railroad, no?] No one above, beside, or beneath him can protest that his thinking [as distinct from his status?] is heretical, because Paul VI has wiped up all opposition to neo-modernism. “Who or what remains to tell him his thinking is not Catholic?” [Only the entire well-known tradition! Only popes from Gregory XVI to St. Pius X, speaking infallibly and excommunicating for precisely that thinking!]

[And who has heard of a genuine pope about to define a doctrine who never consulted all tradition, many theologians, and the Catholic consensus? Even I wrote to the man who I thought was pope with a perfectly legal, reasonable, traditional request. His method of handling this request, made for the welfare of souls, his chief province, helped me to realize his bias against spiritual welfare and his illegitimacy in office. Further observation and investigation have proven both.]

But Williamson writes that all persuade Wojtyla, a deliberate liberal who strove to promote heresy and compromise at Vatican II, that his stand is not Liberal but altogether Catholic. “How can he know that his ecumenism is flouting Catholic dogma?” [Everyone knows that Catholics have always been forbidden to worship with non-Catholics!] “It takes mind-rot to believe all he teaches” [heresy?] “and to believe it is Catholic, but that mind-rot is in him and all round him, so one may well believe” [or **not** believe] “he is basically unaware of how he is wholly undermining Catholic dogma. But just as a man who unawares tells an untruth is not properly a liar, so a man who unawares flouts Catholic dogma is not properly (formally) a heretic.”

[But if we ask a policeman for directions, follow them to the letter, and consistently arrive on the wrong side of town, we conclude that he doesn’t know his territory. Who would call him a liar? He thinks he’s right. But if we follow his directions we could drive into a reservoir. A policeman is, after all, not guaranteed infallibility.]

But a pope **is** guaranteed infallibility, to the extent that his teaching of erroneous faith or morals proves him not pope. He is guided by the Holy Ghost, Who is not subject to mind-rot or any other failing.

After fantasizing a bit longer, Williamson congratulates himself that: “Hence the main sedevacantist argument falls to the ground.” [No, the fog is too thick.] “John Paul II’s faith, one may argue, has massively but not totally failed”; but through it all, Williamson argues, JP2, like Paul VI, remains triumphantly our Pope, our guide, our standard of unity, the Vicar of Christ.

But **if we must decide for ourselves when and where to follow him, why do we need him?** How can we unite with “the recent occupants of the See of Peter” who incontestably “say and do things which are heretical?” If we do, how are we not also heretics?

At St. Mary’s, Techny, Illinois in the early thirties, every Lenten Sunday saw a public performance of Calderon de Barca’s play, **The Mystery of the Mass**, with Frater LeFrois as Wisdom, Frater Werez as Ignorance, and Frater John Cohill, future “Bishop” (“ordained” 1969) of Goroka, New Guinea, as the Christus. Behind a transparent curtain a deacon simulated a Mass, exactly as he would celebrate Mass after ordination to the priesthood. This play ran for years, so a new deacon was required each year. This presented no problem; all deacons practised this “dry mass” at least six months—an integral part of the seminary course.

Some one asked Daniel L. Dolan whether Econe seminarians were not trained and ordained in John XXIII’s liturgy. His reply:

“We received no appreciable liturgical training whatever at Econe, and until September of 1976 the Mass was that of the early years of Paul VI. (Indeed, concelebration was permitted in our first statutes.) The celebrant sat on the side and listened to readings, or himself performed them at lecterns facing the people. The only reason that the readings were done in Latin and not French, we were told, is that the seminary is an international one! (Interestingly enough, the Ordinances of the Society, signed by Abp. Lefebvre and currently in force, allow for the reading of the Epistle and the Gospel in the vernacular—**without reading them first in Latin.**)

“It would be difficult to say what liturgy was followed at Ecône, because the rubrics were a mishmash of different elements, one priest saying Mass somewhat differently from the next. No one set of rubrics was systematically observed or taught. As a matter of fact, no rubrics were taught at all. The best I can say is that over the years a certain eclectic blend of rubrics developed based on the double principle of (a) what the Archbishop liked, and (b) what one did in France. These rubrics range rather freely from the Liturgy of St. Pius X to that of Paul VI in 1968. It is simply the ‘Rite of Ecône,’ a law unto itself. To this day it would be impossible to study a rubrical textbook and then function, say, in a Pontifical Mass at Ecône.

There is no uniformity because there is no principle of uniformity—certainly **not** the ‘Liturgy of John XXIII.’

“As for our seminary training, **we were never taught how to celebrate Mass.** Preparation for this rather important part of the priestly life was to be seen to in our spare time and on our own. The majority of the seminarians there seem never to have applied themselves to a rigid or systematic study of the rubrics, as may be seen from the way in which they celebrate Mass today.”

Dolan goes on to ask whether, with the example of older priests subjected to twenty years of constant confusing changes, anything else could have been expected. Perhaps the confused older priests should bear the blame also for the general theological incompetence of the average Ecône graduate. Ecône seems to have been slipshod all around. It may have bombed out even as a “school for holiness,” so called by Gerard Hogan, who has apparently left the group rather than accept a new assignment. We keep asking what kind of religious society this can be.

Fear not; it is in the best possible hands, which frequently send out letters to benefactors. Many of these wend their unsteady way to me, fortunately, for I can use the entertainment.

Nor does the entertainment stop there. A Canberra friend, in recent conversation with Father(?) Peek, Rector of the St. Pius X Society seminary at Goulburn, N.S.W., secured the good “Father’s” admission that St. Pius X Society “priests” are not required to swear St. Pius X’s oath against modernism. Why is he their patron? Were we to attribute them orthodoxy for their title?

* * * * *

June 27, 1991 Dear Father Welsh:

In your letter to Mr. John Cooke, dated June 4th, you raise two questions, designated as points 1) and 2). The first makes no sense, for no one has ever claimed what you seem to be refuting. The second manifests your ignorance of a rudimentary point of sacramental theology. Hence these two questions merit no further comment; there are more important matters at hand. you **state as a fact** that “Pat Omlor wants us to go against the mind of our founder.” Now, not being privy to the inner workings and politics of the Society of St. Pius X, I had not the slightest idea until you revealed it in your letter that **the Archbishop actually willed** that the Society priests refrain from openly stating that the English “masses” are definitely always invalid. As you are aware, I have for a long time unwaveringly held the opposite view, namely, that all the vernacularized “masses” using the corrupt and mutilated form of Consecration, without exception, must be *per se* invalid, and I base this view on the fundamental principle of sacramental theology known as invalidity through defect of form. But my main point here is that I cannot be faulted for wanting anyone to “go against the mind” of Lefebvre, whose “mind” was not (and still is not) clear to me.....

Twenty-three years ago (in March of 1968), before the Society of St. Pius X came into existence and Abp. Lefebvre gained notoriety, I published my first attempt to demonstrate the probable invalidity of the English “Mass,” which had just been introduced in October of 1967. Five years after my monograph, **Questioning The Validity of the Masses Using The New All-English Canon**, first appeared I received a personal letter from Abp. Marcel Lefebvre, written in his own hand from Ecône and dated June 21, 1973, expressing his approval of my work in these words: “In regard to the opinion of Bishop Stewart for your book. I am very happy to know that he is very interested. It is a good thing.” (In February of that year the Archbishop and I had discussed the possible benefits of my approaching the late Bishop Stewart of Sandhurst)

As further evidence that the Archbishop originally agreed with our views I submit the following excerpt from a letter I received from an ex-seminarian: “While speaking at his American seminary years ago, Archbishop Lefebvre said that the vernacular Masses with the mistranslation of the consecration were ‘probably invalid’.” Consequently from your statement regarding the “mind” of Lefebvre it is evident that somewhere along the line he changed his mind. In any case you cannot accuse me of wanting you to go against this latest mind of Lefebvre. Never have I “wanted” or asked any Society priest, or anyone else for that matter, to espouse our views on this invalidity issue. Where a person chooses to stand on it is his own business; and whether or not he wishes to stand up and defend his convictions, whatever they may happen to be, is also up to him. However I do feel most strongly that on such an important matter his stand should be based on solid knowledge of **all** the facts and a clear understanding of the Catholic theology involved. That is to say, rather than his being neutralized by the superficial arguments and “advice” of trusted priests whose theological grasp of the issue is not only incomplete, but erroneous.

Therefore I do disapprove of the subtle attempts to undermine our efforts by means of “private priestly advice.” I want those priests within the Society who disagree with our position to present their case openly in an “above board” manner (which openness is what you actually criticize me for later in your letter!), rather than clandestinely. This is the long and short of my invitation (which you call a “challenge”) that I made on page 112 of my recently published book entitled, **The Necessary Signification in The Sacramental Form of The Holy Eucharist**.

..... within this 115-page book you will find adequate replies to the two arguments you raised (which is why I remarked above that they “merit no further comment”). Although you apparently have not read the book, you are making great efforts to suppress its circulation, all because of the one page that we are certain that you did read. page 112 (less than 1% of the entire book), which has obviously distressed you to the extent of causing you to try to suppress its circulation, at least in Hampton. Mr. McLean, the Editor of **Catholic**, who seems to follow the Society line somewhat rigorously, also read page 112 and wrote to me saying, “I will not sell your new book, nor will I help in its promotion.” And you, of course, in the final paragraph of your letter put pressure on Mr. Cooke not to sell it “for reasons of prudence”! Trying to keep people in the dark is hardly being prudent, and it certainly does not serve the interests of truth.

But here is my main objection to your remarks. You state, “As a matter of integrity, I must object to Pat’s waiting until after the Archbishop’s death to make the challenge” Are you implying that I am lacking in integrity, or that it is your own integrity you are hereby displaying, or both? Also it has been reported to me that in conversation you have expressed yourself in these demeaning terms: “Pat Omlor came up out of the woodwork only after Archbishop Lefebvre was dead.” Hence we must assume that it is my integrity that is at stake when you say, “As a matter of integrity.” Your accusation portrays me as a somewhat dishonourable, underhanded, devious scoundrel who was just waiting to challenge the Society, but didn’t dare do so until its founder was dead.....

Whether or not you used this colourful “woodwork” phraseology as is claimed (..... only hearsay though the source is extremely reliable), your basic accusation stands. What you claim is categorically untrue. It is a rash judgment. Moreover, since it is a falsehood that impugns my motives and my integrity and therefore assails my good name, it is what in moral theology is termed “calumny.” I hope you are not spreading this canard widely. **But now let me prove to you that your accusation is false and that you know it is false.**

In the May 1990 issue of **Catholic**, on page 3, Mr. McLean, the Editor, wrote one of his editorial comments below a letter from a reader from Merseyside, U.K. I wrote Mr. McLean a letter refuting some of his remarks. Now in this letter of mine I raised **exactly the same two points** that I, coming out of the woodwork, mentioned on page 112 of my recent book. Namely, 1) requesting a clarification of Lefebvre’s alleged statement that the New Mass is not *per se* invalid (which conflicts with what he had earlier indicated to me and to others) and 2) the Society’s claim that the New Mass is “increasingly” invalid because of “lack of intention on the part of the priest” and that “this lack of intention is becoming more and more common.” I pointed out that such statements are

not only unprovable, but irrelevant if “Mass” is already **necessarily invalid through defect of its sacramental consecration form**, which is what I maintain.

Now why do I bring this up? Well, my letter to Mr. McLean is dated May 18, 1990, **more than ten months before Lefebvre’s death. As you will recall, I mailed you a copy of this particular letter, inviting your comments.** At that time you chose to treat the matter with silence. Now, knowing full well that I raised these very same two issues concerning the Society’s reported stance **and actually brought my misgivings to your attention as far back as May of 1990**, inviting public airing in **Catholic**, you have the temerity to write to Mr. Cooke, falsely and ridiculously accusing me of waiting to “come out of the woodwork” until after Lefebvre’s death, which as we both know occurred **more than ten months after you yourself had become aware of my aforesaid letter questioning the Society’s positions!** Patrick Henry Omlor

Father Noel Barbara has said goodbye. The end of an era has come. Few traditionalists can remember when we had no Fr. Barbara to fight with or against. In his first and last 1993 issue (#12) of *Fortes in Fide*, he preserves ambivalence. He has presented much to applaud and enough to controvert. Who can resist the open slather his retirement guarantees? He’ll take no notice?

Page 11, pgh 4: “After offering the bread and the wine which are about to be consecrated” How often must a man read these words from the altar card before he understands them? The priest offers the same sacrifice from beginning to end. At the offertory he prays that God will accept this spotless Victim for his sins, offenses, and negligences, for all present, and for all faithful Christians living and dead: that It may obtain for him and those mentioned salvation unto life eternal. Bread and wine render the sacrifice visible, but are not themselves offered. Nor would such an offering either satisfy the craved effect or qualify as a principal part of our Mass. The offertory determines the intent of the entire procedure.

Page 13 enters the field of episcopal consecrations lacking papal mandate. June 30, 1988, at Ecône, Switzerland, Abp(?) Marcel Lefebvre, assisted by Bp. Antonio de Castro Mayer, consecrated(?) four of his priests(?) without Apostolic Mandate. Three of these did the same for another July 28, 1991 at Sao Fidelis, Brazil.

Pp. 14-15 quote Church law; Canon 953 requires written mandate to precede consecration; Canon 2370 suspends all participants till dispensed by the Holy See; Holy Office decree of April 1951 **excommunicates all participants.** But we live in a crisis, so we may appeal to a future pope for authority to violate Church law with impunity. What guarantees a future pope? Who guarantees his reaction?

Reasons for invocation of epikeia (page 16): (1) Impossibility of obtaining mandate due to non-existence of **formal** popes; only **material** popes, deprived (by whom?) of all papal authority, are available. So why not procure a material mandate and materially consecrate a material bishop or two? For a time it appeared that Lefebvre could worry a mandate out of Old Krakus, to whom he publicly adhered as genuine pope. He had at least sense enough not to swallow the *Cassiciacum* thesis which splits our standard of unity into two unequal parts, neither functional. Fr. Barbara in a footnote refers to this absurd imposture as explained in *Fortes in Fide* #8 as The Solution to the Problem [He must have a different problem.] which he holds not as doctrine but as strong theological opinion.

(2) From our human point of view, without divine intervention, we can’t see an end to this crisis. Criteria necessary to justify resorting to epikeia in order to violate the law’s clear provisions: grave and urgent need to proceed and consecrate; moral certitude based on precise fact(?): should a true pope appear [fact?] he would [fact?] unquestionably grant a mandate. New rites are [only?] doubtful; therefore an urgent need exists to consecrate bishops to assure continued priesthood and mass.

We are now to imagine a prison camp cut off from all the world. Let us imagine also a “last living bishop” prisoner who somehow overcomes his complete isolation to appreciate both our crisis and the fact [supposition?] that he is the “last living bishop.” He has taken along to prison his Pontifical and a generous supply of cash with which to bribe the guards to grant him time and place to

consecrate another bishop or two. Would not an imaginary future genuine pope welcome imaginary bishops consecrated against all odds without that essential mandate? [Fact?]

Lefebvre's consecrations were scandalous in lacking doctrinal justification and in total violation of Church law. "The very first condition, the *sine qua non* for interpreting the intention of the lawgiver, never existed for them. Not only did they recognize but they continue to recognize John Paul II as a true Pope; not only have they offered, but they continue on a daily basis to offer Mass *una cum famulo tuo papa nostro Joanne Paulo*, not only have they excluded, but they continue to exclude from their Fraternity, priests, brothers, religious, and oblates who refuse to recognize him, but they have petitioned and presented their requests to him and have received a formal refusal from him." (Footnote quotes Schmidberger letter 5/28/91 in support.) "..... Abp. Lefebvre is fully justified in presuming that '**John Paul II, the catholic pope**' would provide them with the mandate which '**John Paul II, the antichrist pope**' refuses to give them."

Barbara absolves Lefebvre and his Fraternity from consequent excommunication because they were too stupid to realize that JP2 is an antipope lacking authority to excommunicate them for actions for which they knowingly drew *ipso facto* excommunication decreed under a genuine pope. Barbara nevertheless accuses them all of scandal in that they teach that one can recognize some one as authentic Vicar of Christ while knowingly disobeying his most specific commands. But they somehow avoid the stigma of heresy, though they recognize an ineligible public heretic as Christ's vicar.

On page 27 Fr. Barbara decries the rumor that he had denounced Abp. Thuc's consecrations (Des Laurieres, Carmona, Zamora) in revenge for being himself denied consecration. Why would Thuc have refused **him**? He consecrated almost anyone who asked. Now, however, Barbara insists on the validity and liceity of Thuc's more recent consecrations—because Thuc invoked epikeia. **Sure** he did—the following year!

Page 44—"This Declaration" (2/25/82) "is of the greatest possible importance with regard to what we are discussing. It manifests the primary condition which would allow Abp. Ngo to presume an Apostolic Mandate, a condition without which he could not use the principle of Epikeia. The consecrations performed under such circumstances are not only perfectly valid, but also perfectly licit."

So why was this primary condition withheld until long after the consecrations? Will an afterthought eliminate the basic flaw? Well, yes, according to the postconciliar "Church" which "justified" its existence by replacing the Code of Canon Law which had outlawed it. Unless Thuc had placed himself above the law by some such declaration **before** he went beyond the law, he was subject to the law and its penalties—as also were those whom he consecrated—**all were excommunicated**.

BARBARA'S OPEN LETTER TO LEFEBVRE'S FRATERNITY fills 47 pp. He appears to approve Lefebvre's fourfold consecration of 6/30/88, even though Lefebvre had ignored requests (Barbara's & others') to precede the consecrations with "sufficient reason"—a statement denying connection with the "antichrist" JP2. "But such a declaration," said Lefebvre, "would turn too many of the faithful away from us cause harm in my priories and seminaries." What has public opinion to do with objective truth? But it could have cost Lefebvre **money**.

Pere Barbara devotes a paragraph (p. 53) to an evaluation-summation of his "original study" (*Fortes in Fide* #8) to foster unity among "those who resist the popes of Vat II" by reducing the issue of the Holy See's vacancy to the realm of personal opinion (this rules out the possibility of epikeia) while making it clear that the Vat II popes lack all Pontifical Authority. No takers.

Edited quotations:

I have never encountered anything among you but arrogant indifference to all things unconnected with the Society of St. Pius X.

If JP2 is Christ's vicar, and despite your bishops, seminaries, and university, you avow that you can't prove he's not, you can't resist him as you openly do without mortally offending Christ. (p. 56)

You are obliged to resolve this matter. You are so sure that the popes of Vat II are true popes. If so, they truly possess Christ's authority. And Paul VI ordered you to close your seminaries and disband. (p. 57)

For you infallibility clothes a pope only when correct; at other times he can err. So you recognize the Vat II popes as true Vicars of Christ despite their having publicly —officially—professed the worst possible errors for over twenty years, even joining them in matters of faith—to the degree that you expel members who fail to celebrate mass *una cum famulo tuo Papa nostra Joanne Paulo*. (p. 67)

Those for whom religion is only a collection of practices demand only mass, sacraments, and doctrinal instruction. Those who live their faith intelligently demand also doctrinal justifications of our stand, consistent behavior, and above all a confession of faith on disputed points. Despite your seminaries, convents, Parisian university, five bishops, and several hundred priests, your organization has never published a single doctrinal work to confound protagonists of the new Church and their formal heresies and to justify resistance. (p. 72)

You pretend to recognize the authority of JP2 and his bishops while exercising your ministry against their express wishes. Logical? You then try to convince those scandalized by such behavior that it conforms with Catholic practice, and is even recommended by Doctors and Saints of the Church. (pp. 72-3)

Of Lefebvre's many declarations let me cite his letter (Oct. 6, 1978) to forty cardinals including Wojtyla of Cracow: "A pope worthy of the name and a true successor of Peter cannot declare that he will dedicate himself to the application of the Council and its reforms. By so doing, he makes it clear that he has broken with all his predecessors and especially with the Council of Trent." Do you not realize how foolish you look since Wojtyla's election? From his first encyclical he made clear that he would completely apply Vat II's decisions. (pp. 77-8)

Lefebvre never drew the conclusions which honor and the faith demanded, but, against all justice, expelled those of his children who believed him sincere, and who had concluded from his aforesaid letter that JP2 is not a true pope. (pp. 78-9)

Why are you not ashamed? you who persist in undermining the Catholic resistance? You betray the Church. You act in a manner which can profit only those who openly aim at her destruction. You lack all judgment in not seeing that to affirm and insist everywhere on the Vat II popes' legitimacy plays into the enemy's hands. You undercut and defame the true resister, who adheres to the entire Catholic faith, and brand him an "extremist." (p. 79)

Without warning Lefebvre made his fratricidal declaration of Nov. 8, 79, and stabbed the Catholic resistance in the back. (p. 86)

Like Lefebvre you refuse to declare that these popes who have for well over 20 yrs. officially taught heretical doctrines are not and cannot be real vicars of Christ. Like him you lack courage to declare that they have themselves provided proof that they are not invested with Pontifical Authority. Whether the issue is religious liberty, or total inversion of Church teaching on liturgy, the Mystical Body of Christ, ecumenism, communism, or a host of other novelties, each of these errors was condemned in pre-existing Pontifical documents. (Footnote cites partial list: Religious Liberty condemned by Gregory XVI in *Mirari vos* & by Pius IX in *Quanta cura*. Ecumenism by an Apostolic Letter of Pius VIII, by Gregory XVI in *Summo iugiter*, & by Pius XI in *Mortalium animos*. The new ecclesiology by Pius XII in *Mystici corporis Christi*, etc. (p. 88)

Apart from Paul VI who destroyed everything in the Church, and apart from his successors who have codified his "October Revolution," no one has done more harm to the Church than Lefebvre by his dividing, liberalizing, and sterilizing the Catholic resistance. (pp. 93-4)

Lefebvre's contempt for those who disagreed with his thinking was a principal trait of his character—possibly the basic cause of his failure to bear witness to the faith. He never accepted advice from those whose thinking varied from his. He never tolerated or heard objections, even in the gravest issues. In 1970 when I organized the first conference to study doctrinal problems at

Tours, he announced that he would not participate if I **invited** Fr. Raymond Dulac. This same mentality governed his behavior toward his ex-members: No more contact—finis! (p. 94)

He picked his advisers only from among his admirers: he could not bear to be contradicted. Who then can be surprised that the final result is not Catholic?

He was convinced that I erred. An error in matters of faith must hazard one's salvation. Thus duty obliged him to correct me, especially since I asked for correction, repeatedly citing Ezechiel iii, 17-21. Nor was I alone excluded from his charity, but also all Catholics misled by the new Church. What did he so often request of his "pope?" Not to ban the new rites which would cost them their faith—merely to retain the ancient ways for his Society. [**How else could he retain his near-monopoly on the traditional rites?**] How could he tolerate soul-destroying novelties for his fellow members in the Mystical Body—millions to whom he was bound in charity? Had he received some divine dispensation from loving those outside his Society?

To grant legitimacy to Vat II's "popes" is to affirm that Christ has appointed them His vicars and supported their authority. [Such a course denies papal infallibility, involves one in numerous proven public heresies, and obliges obedience to **all** commands and directives from these "popes."]

Our differences are not mere divergence but direct contradiction. If you are on the right path to salvation, then I am not. If I am correct, you are headed for Gehenna. You have toward me, as I toward you, a grave obligation in charity. This letter fulfils my obligation to you. Can you do the same for me?

One cannot believe in the sincerity of your convictions unless you hold that I am necessarily en route to damnation.

[I doubt that any of Lefebvre's crew will take up this challenge. Like their founder, they lack the requisite charity, as they have demonstrated again, again, and again wherever they settle. Charity is listed first among the fruits of the Holy Ghost. "By their fruits you shall know them."

Lefebvre feared that if he finally took a consistent position his support would evaporate. He had attracted worldwide backing because he was an archbishop and could deal with Rome. Dealers work better from strength. He had "the only game in town" for a good twenty years, and botched it so badly that he must have botched it purposely. We have seen all too often how poorly educated are his priests(?), how feeble their logic, their apologetics, their theology. Is it possible that he would not have recognized or realized his seminary courses' inadequacy? He had years to rectify such matters, but let his people down at every opportunity.

Would he have lost support had he educated the laity over those twenty years? or given dogma priority over cash?]

The Politics of Faith, paraphrase from **The Keys of This Blood**, Malachi Martin

The anti-Church stayed within the Church governing system to alter it. It called itself Catholic, and insisted that the new ecclesiology ("people of God") was a truly Catholic concept. It constantly undermined papal authority as inconsistent with human rights. The papacy prevented "the people of God" in the Church from joining "the people of God" in all other religions, so to achieve full human unity for "the people of God." Distinctions between clergy and laity must go. Vatican II documents referred to the Church 18 times as the "Kingdom of God" and 80 times as "the people of God," thus promoting democracy, the masonic liberty that has Moses taking the Tablets of the law up the mountain for divine approval.

The anti-Church barely survived at the 1963 Conclave at which it favored Montini or his complete agreement. He could be trusted not to exercise the papal office and, suffering all the way, to render it useless.

The traditional cardinals backed no-nonsense Churchman Siri. ("Tolerance is not a virtue. It's a mere expedient when you cannot do otherwise.") He would never tolerate the anti-Church, which, knowing this, reacted violently against his candidacy.

"It is certain that within the 1963 Conclave Siri had garnered the required number of votes to make him Pope-elect."

[We skip 25 lines of rationalization of the “free” non-acceptance, “also certain.”]

“The Siri nomination and election were set aside by what has been called the ‘little brutality.’ What is firmly stated is that at least one Cardinal Elector did have a conversation—however short—with some one not participating in the Conclave; that the someone was an emissary of an internationally based organization; the conversation did concern the Siri candidacy. What is certain is that the Siri candidacy was laid aside and most probably in connection with that conversation—this, in sum, is the ‘little brutality’ firmly rumored in Roman circles at the time of the June 1963 Conclave and ever since.”

[We skip 68 pp. to **The Triple Weakness**]

The Church structure has deteriorated so far, and JP2 & Co. fled into such impotent isolation, that three outcomes are possible. Whenever a goodly group of Catholics discover—correctly or not—that the man in the Chair is not a validly elected pope, the continuous piecemeal attrition of the structure will rush into collapse of the whole mess. The schism-split, heresy-ridden, body will be a headless thing exploding into fragments. [**will be?**]

Our only tangible guarantee of a true pope is valid election in a legal Conclave of legal cardinals. A papal election’s validity depends on the witnessed strict compliance with visible, controllable procedures established in the election rules.

[Now he attempts to show that Rampolla was elected in 1903, forced out, that Pius X emerged eventually from the same Conclave, showing that what happened to Siri had a respectable precedent, or that St. Pius X was not validly elected.]

The Conclave of 1903 produced as Pope Pius X Giuseppe Melchiorre Cardinal Sarto. “But Sarto was not the prime choice of those **sixty-two** Cardinal Electors. After one voting session and scrutiny it was clear that the required majority (**twenty-nine** in this instance; Sarto got only five) went to Mariano Cardinal Rampolla Del Tindaro. Rampolla, if allowed, would have pronounced the required *accepto*, would have become Pope automatically.”

[Without a majority? Half 62 = 31. For the needed 42 Rampolla was 13 short]

“Rampolla and the other Cardinal Electors bowed to the Austrian veto. In that sense Rampolla’s *Non accepto* was free.” [It could have been, had he ever received enough votes; no one ever asked him.]

“But an entirely different situation would arise if a pope-elect were prevented from accepting the papacy by someone who had no right to do so, who threatened ruin and death to a pope-elect’s reputation and family and person if he accepted Such a threat would be unjust, an undue limitation on the freedom of the Cardinal Electors. In that instance, the Pope-Elect would be in no way free. Unjust force and pressure would rob him of his freedom and would rob the Church of its validly elected Pope.”

These days cardinals know which outside party objects to which candidate. Not a formal veto, yet it has influence. In theory, therefore, a duly elected pope can be vetoed. “In such a case—and it is not as theoretical as it would sound—very puzzling questions concerning election of a second pope in the same Conclave..... could blossom into a persuasion that the second election was invalid, that indeed the freedom of the Electors had been unduly manacled, and that the Church had been hoodwinked, and that the valid Pope-Elect had been sidetracked.” [1958 Conclave?]

Second possible outcome: An identical headlessness should enough Catholics conclude that, though the man had validly assumed the papacy, he had gradually lapsed into heresy, and contributed to the piecemeal destruction. “For a pope who became a heretic would cease to be pope.” [He then goes into the usual dance that no one can pass judgment on a pope, ignoring his just mentioned fact that a heretic would cease to be pope.]

He then describes such a situation, when Paul VI proposed change of “the ceremony of the Roman Mass. His first version of a new Mass ceremony” would have destroyed essential elements. Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci prepared to denounce his new Mass “ceremony” as reeking of heresy. Paul backed off, saving the Church a harrowing experience. He modified his first version, eliminating the worst heresies. [Pure fiction! He left the “ceremonies” in their original form; all the

heresies remain to this day. The Ottaviani and Bacci objections to the 1969 *novus ordo missae* were published, chapter and verse.]

Third possibility: A Conclave could elect one who would deliberately dissolve unity and change structure by failure to fulfil his office [John XXIII? Impossible now, but next week?] and by freeing bishops from collegial submission. Now in the Church we find all elements—already working hard everywhere—required to bring this about. Among all levels from diocese down, we find unshakeable belief that before Vatican II there was one Catholic Church—now replaced by the “Conciliar Church,” animated by the “spirit of Vatican II.”

The Catholic Dictionary of Theology, H. Davis, I. Thomas, OP, J. Crehan, SJ, Nelson 1971. Vol. III, p. 134, **Intention**:

“But on the side of the minister, is it enough to hold that what is called an external intention is all that is required? This external intention (which some theologians defended as adequate) may be defined as the willing and serious performance of the sacramental rite. An inner mental act of willing to perform the rite is included in this ‘external intention’ by its proponents, but it is thought to be compatible with a contrary intention of not willing the rite to be a sacrament. Philibert Lavardin, bishop of Le Mans, confessed on his deathbed in 1671 that he had in fact conferred holy orders while withholding his intention. The Sorbonne drew up a statement of opinion that nothing need be done to make good this crime, but Rome thought otherwise, and the eventual condemnation (D1318) in 1690 of the proposition that a baptism is valid if the minister forms a mental intention of not willing to do what the Church does was a public correction of the French errors of the time.”

December 7, 1690 the Holy Office condemned thirty-one propositions. No. 28 (Denzinger 1318): “Baptism is valid when conferred by a minister who observes all the external rite and form of baptizing, but within his heart resolves, I do not intend what the Church does.”

Can such an intention be determined in the absence of the minister’s disclosure? If the minister is shown involved in devil-worship at the time of the ceremony, such an intention must be presumed a virtual certainty, especially if the minister’s actions, prior or subsequent, are consistent with his presumed intention.

Pope Benedict XIV condemns the opinion that the neutral will (which is neither agreeable nor hostile to reception of the sacrament) suffices in one receiving Baptism. He declares that Baptism has its effect when its subject either wills or has willed to be baptized; if he neither agree nor disagree, unless he had the intention beforehand, he cannot be baptized. Having established the necessity of the subject’s intention, the pontiff concludes a greater necessity of the **minister’s** intention, and teaches that should it be established that some one has administered Baptism or another unrepeatable sacrament, having applied all external rite, but withholding his intention, or deliberately willing not to do what the Church does, by pressing necessity the sacrament should be administered again conditionally.

“In concluding the article on causality of the sacraments it was said that Christ baptizes in the Church ‘by the invisible operation of His majesty’. If the human minister is to be associated with Christ, this association must be one of both body and mind, as befits a human instrument. For canonical purposes and the good government of the Church it may be required that this association of mind betray itself in outward form, by such a declaration of intent as: ‘I will go unto the altar of God’ or by the question: ‘Do you wish to be baptized?’ In the nature of things the Church can only judge of these external declarations of intent, but she can legitimately require that an internal association with Christ be present also.”

It would seem, then, that to uphold the validity of Achille Lienart’s confirmations and ordinations we must believe in a thirtieth degree Freemason’s internal association with Christ, despite his apostasy and long-term habitual enmity toward Christ’s Church. The lack of this internal association is obvious—“established” as required by Benedict XIV, who bound this matter on earth. So it is bound also in heaven, where all intentions are known.

What an insane gamble we take, then, in approaching anyone “ordained” by Lienart or his own “ordinands” (as, for instance, Marcel Lefebvre) for sacramental functions. Let us consider another aspect of association with Lefebvre’s “priests”—an aspect which removes the gamble; no possible chance exists.

For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved. How then shall they call upon 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?** – Romans x, 13-15

Who sent the Society of St. Pius X and its offshoots? Who sent Ngo Dinh Thuc? What is their authority?

Back Cover

Throughout its existence the Catholic Church has had four marks by which it is known. It is **one**, **holy**, **Catholic**, and **Apostolic**.

We have always been **one** in doctrine. We all believed the entire revelation on divine authority. Whoever wished to choose his doctrine based his choice on his own private judgment and not on faith in God. So he left us, and our unity was preserved.

Since the death of Pope Pius XII, however, those who choose their own beliefs remain, and are allowed to remain, in what is mis-called the Catholic Church, and unity is shattered. In most religious discussions each participant is convinced that all others are heretics. All too often, he is correct. Often enough he, too, is a heretic.

Catholic has always signified **universal**. Episcopal Conferences and vernacular rites have split universality into lingual, national, and racial separatism.

Through nineteen centuries our Church has held to the doctrine and practise of the Apostles. Our entire approach to the world was **Apostolic**. Our mission and mandate from Jesus Christ was to convert all nations to His divine message. Now His doctrine is diluted and caricatured to take in those who have refused it.

But we can't lose them all. Our postconciliar "Church" is **holy**, in the homophonic sense: It is shot full of holes.

In 1958 I had spent forty interested years in the Catholic Church. I know exactly what it is. If I could see it anywhere I would recognize it. — Hutton Gibson