

# The Great Apostasy



## **Table of Contents**

Chapter	I: The Great Apostasy
Chapter	II: A Worldly Utopia
Chapter	III: Agents of Apostasy & Schools of Thought
Chapter	IV: Fatima as the Crossroads
Chapter	V: The Triumph of the Church's Enemies
Chapter	VI: Liberals Are Liars
Chapter	VII: Rome Will Lose the Faith
Chapter	VIII: The Priesthood
Chapter	IX: The Mass
Chapter	X: Superior to the Past
Chapter	XI: The Church Will Doubt
Chapter	XII: Christ is Optional
Chapter	XIII: A Man-Centered Religion
Chapter	XIV: The United Nations
Chapter	XV: Return to Fatima
Chapter	XVI: The Restrainer Removed
Chapter	XVII: Love Will Turn to Hate
Chapter	XVIII: I Will Not Lead
Chapter	XIX: Even the Elect Will Be Led Astray
Chapter	XX: Triumph: God's Turn

# Chapter I

## The Great Apostasy

### Part I. Introduction

Before the end of the world, the Church must undergo her final trial, through which many souls will be lost. The word Apostasy itself means the abandonment of the Faith, and the adjective Great refers to the magnitude of this ultimate apostasy, be it in terms of the number of souls lost, the intensity of the persecution for the faithful who remain, or its metaphysical vastness as the culmination of Satan's attacks on the Church. The purpose of this work is to present for the reader's consideration some evidence along with corresponding information, conclusions and hypotheses as to the possibility that this event is taking place in our own time.

#### Is it reasonable to speak of an apostasy occurring?

The very notion of an apostasy taking place may seem far-fetched or perhaps outdated to the contemporary Catholic. Yet, as we will soon explore, this is, in and of itself, a sign of the apostasy. To a vast number of Catholics terms such as heresy and apostasy, actions such as censures and excommunications, seem to belong to the Church's medieval past, relics of a Church which no longer believes, thinks or acts in such a way. Yet, one of the symptoms to be explored is precisely this mentality; a Church regarding itself as modernized, disconnected from a past to which it regards itself as superior and more enlightened. The fact remains, it is entirely reasonable to speak of a current apostasy because, in every age, a falling away from God is taking place. Whether the pervasive evil which led to the Great Flood, the worshipping of the golden calf in the desert, the many episodes of syncretism in ancient Israel, the Christians who sacrificed to idols during the Roman persecutions, Catholics abandoning the Faith for protestant rebellions...in every age the Church, even as she grows, loses great numbers to the errors of the time. Shortly before his death, Pope John Paul II wrote of Europe as being in a state of "silent apostasy."<sup>1</sup> Therefore, it is not only reasonable, but necessary to speak of the errors which, in our own time, are leading souls to eternal ruin.

#### Is there just cause to think that the current apostasy is the "Great" one?

Before answering, it should be understood that it is a secondary question. Whether one lost his faith and his soul as a result of the great apostasy at the end of time, through one of the other sweeping historical movements ravaging the Church, or simply through the commission of a single grave sin for which he never repented, this soul goes to the same Hell. Yet, while the question is secondary, it is still worth considering, as have great leaders in the past. In 1903, Pope St. Pius X wrote, "There is room to fear that we are experiencing the foretaste and beginnings of the evils which are to come at the end of time, and that the Son of Perdition of whom the Apostle speaks, has already arrived on earth."<sup>2</sup> A half a century later, Pope Pius XII warned that "The human race today is involved in a supreme crisis, which will end in its salvation by Christ, or its dire destruction."<sup>3</sup> In fact, in warning about the antichrist, St. John wrote that many such antichrists had already come. In this we see that the Devil is always at work and, while the Great Apostasy is the culmination of his battle against the Church, it was a battle he began the day the Church was born, and from which he has never relented.

## Part II: The Sources

We will now proceed to look at some sources (others will follow in the corresponding chapters) which describe the Great Apostasy, as well as the unprecedented crisis which, at the present time, the Church is enduring.

### Matthew 24: 9ff

“Then they will deliver you up to tribulation, and put you to death; and you will be hated by all nations for My Name’s sake. Then many will fall away, and betray one another, and hate one another. Many false prophets will arise and lead many astray. Because wickedness is multiplied, most men’s love will grow cold. But he who endures to the end will be saved. This gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout the whole world, as a testimony to all the nations; and the end will come. So when you see the abomination of desolation spoken of in the prophet Daniel, standing in the holy place, then let those that are in Judea flee to the mountains...For then there will be great tribulation, such as has not been from the beginning of the world until now, no, and never will be.”

### 2 Thessalonians 2:3ff

“Since the mass apostasy has not yet occurred nor the man of lawlessness been revealed – the son of perdition and adversary who exalts himself above every so-called god proposed for worship, he who seats himself in God’s temple and even declares himself to be God...You know what restrains him until he shall be revealed in his own time. The secret force of lawlessness is already at work, mind you, but there is one who holds him back until that restrainer should be removed.”

### St. Anthony of the Desert, 4<sup>th</sup> Century

“Men will surrender to the spirit of the age. They will say ‘if they had lived in our day, faith would be simple and easy; but, in their day, things would be complex; the Church must be brought up to date and made meaningful to the day’s problems.’ When the Church and the world are one, then those days are at hand, because our Divine Master placed a barrier between His things and the things of the world.”<sup>4</sup>

### “The Didache” or “The Teaching of the Apostles”, c. 95 A.D

“For in those last days the false prophets and corrupters will come in swarms; the sheep will turn into wolves, and love will turn into hate...then mankind will undergo the fiery test, and many will lose their faith and perish; but those who stand firm in their faith will be saved.”<sup>5</sup>

### Our Lady of LaSalette

On Sept. 19, 1846, the Blessed Mother told Melanie, one of the visionaries, that she could make the message known in 1858. It contains prophecies that referred to the ongoing dissolution of the Papal States, and events which were most likely fulfilled in the World Wars. Yet, the same vision explicitly states that its fulfillment extends to the end of time, and so remains relevant and contemporary. Here are excerpts of The Blessed Mother’s message:

- “The chiefs, the leaders of the people of God have neglected prayer and penance, and the Devil has bedimmed their intelligence.”
- “The society of men is on the eve of the most terrible scourges and of the greatest events. Mankind must expect to be ruled with an iron rod and to drink from the chalice of the wrath of God.”
- “Several will abandon the faith, and a great number of priests and members of religious orders will break away from the true religion; among these people there will even be bishops.”
- “In the year 1864, Lucifer together with a large number of demons will be unloosed from Hell; they will put an end to faith little by little, even in those dedicated to God.”
- “Evil books will be abundant on earth and the spirits of darkness will spread everywhere a universal slackening in all that concerns the service of God.”
- “The Vicar of my Son will suffer a great deal, because for a while the Church will yield to a large persecution, a time of darkness, and the Church will witness a frightful crisis.”
- “Rome will lose the faith and become the seat of the Antichrist.”

#### Pope St. Pius X

“Alas! This organization which formerly afforded such promising expectations, this limpid and impetuous stream, has been harnessed in its course by the modern enemies of the Church, and is now no more than a miserable affluent of the great movement of apostasy being organized in every country for the establishment of a One-World-church which shall have neither dogmas, nor hierarchy, neither discipline for the mind, nor curb for the passions...”<sup>6</sup>

“We felt a sort of terror considering the disastrous conditions of humanity at the present hour. Can we ignore such a profound and grave evil, which at this moment much more than in the past is working away at its very marrow and leading it to its ruin?...Truly whoever ponders these things must necessarily and firmly fear whether such a perversion of minds is not the sign of announcing, and the beginning of the last times...”<sup>7</sup>

#### Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli (Pope Pius XII), as Secretary of State

“I am worried by the Blessed Virgin’s messages to Lucy of Fatima. This persistence of Mary about the dangers which menace the Church is a divine warning against the suicide that would be represented by the alteration of the faith, in her liturgy, her theology and her soul...I hear all around me innovators who wish to dismantle the Sacred Chapel, destroy the universal flame of the Church, reject her ornaments and make her feel remorse for her historical past.”

“A day will come when the civilized world will deny its God, when the Church will doubt as Peter doubted. She will be tempted to believe that man has become God. In our own

churches, Christians will search in vain for the red lamp where God awaits them. Like Mary Magdelene, weeping before the empty tomb, they will ask, ‘Where have they taken Him?’”<sup>8</sup>

### Pope Pius XII

“The roots of the modern apostasy lay in scientific atheism, dialectical materialism, rationalism, illuminism, laicism, and Freemasonry which is the mother of them all.”

“We are overwhelmed with sadness and anguish, seeing that the wickedness of perverse men has reached a degree of impiety that is unbelievable and absolutely unknown in other times.”<sup>9</sup>

“Venerable brethren, you are well aware that almost the whole human race is today allowing itself to be driven into two opposing camps, for Christ or against Christ. The human race is involved today in a supreme crisis, which will issue in its salvation by Christ, or in its destruction.”<sup>10</sup>

### Sr. Lucia, Visionary of Fatima

“Father, the Most Holy Virgin did not tell me that we are in the last times of the world, but she made me understand this for three reasons. The first reason is because she told me that the Devil is in the mood for engaging in a decisive battle against the Virgin. And a decisive battle is the final battle where one side will be victorious and the other will suffer defeat. Also from now on we must choose sides. Either we are for God or we are for the Devil. There is no other possibility. The second reason is because she said to my cousins as well as to me that God is giving two last remedies to the world. These are the last two remedies, which signify that there will not be others. The third reason is because in the plans of Divine Providence God always, before He is about to punish the world, exhausts all other remedies.” [To Fr. Fuentes, postulator for the cause for the beatification of the other two visionaries, Francisco and Jacinta]<sup>11</sup>

### The Catechism of The Catholic Church

“Before Christ’s second coming the Church must pass through a trial that will shake the faith of many believers. The persecution that accompanies her pilgrimage on earth will unveil the ‘mystery of iniquity’ in the form of a religious deception offering men an apparent solution to their problems at the price of apostasy from the truth. The supreme religious deception is that of the Antichrist, a pseudo-messianism by which man glorifies himself in place of God and of His Messiah come in the flesh. The Antichrist’s deception already begins to take shape in the world every time the claim is made to realize within history that messianic hope which can only be realized beyond history through the eschatological judgment.”<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Pope John Paul II, *Ecclesia in Europa*, July 20, 2003, p. 671-672.

<sup>2</sup> Pope St. Pius X, Encyclical Letter “*E Supremi*,” Oct. 4, 1903.

<sup>3</sup> Pope Pius XII, *Evangelii Praecones*, June 2, 1951.

<sup>4</sup> St. Anthony of the Desert, *Disquisition CXIV*.

<sup>5</sup> *The Didache*, ch. 16 v. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Pope St. Pius X, *Notre Charge Apostolique*, Aug. 15, 1910.

<sup>7</sup> Pope St. Pius X, *E. Supremi*.

<sup>8</sup> Roche, Msgr., *Pie XII Devant L’Histoire*, Paris: Robert Lafont, 1972, p. 52-53.

<sup>9</sup> Pope Pius XII, Letter of February 11, 1949.

<sup>10</sup> Pope Pius XII, *Evangelii Praecones*.

- 
- <sup>11</sup> Socci, Antonio. *The Fourth Secret of Fatima*, Loreto Publications, Fitzwilliam, NH, 2006, p. 70.
- <sup>12</sup> *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1992, #675-676.



## Chapter II

### The Goal and the Agents of the Apostasy

#### Part I. The Goals:

#### A Worldly “Utopia”

Source: Catechism of the Catholic Church, # 675

“Before Christ’s second coming, the Church must pass through a final trial that will shake the faith of many believers. The persecution that accompanies her pilgrimage on earth will unveil the ‘mystery of iniquity’ in the form of a religious deception offering men an apparent solution to their problems at the price of apostasy from the truth. The supreme religious deception is that of the Antichrist, a pseudo-messianism by which man glorifies himself in the place of God and of His Messiah come in the flesh.”

#### Some key points

- This is not merely a possibility among others. It is put forth as the definite form which the apostasy will take.
- It will be a man-centered enterprise.
- Heaven is no longer the goal, rather, an earthly Utopia.
- Since the goal is global, the scope of the corresponding temptation and deception would need to be as well. Therefore, since it would affect the whole world, it would require...

#### A One World Order

“If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on the human face – forever...” -George Orwell, 1984

While often referred to as the “New World Order,” they amount to the same concept. Individual nations would be absorbed into this greater global entity, thus losing all sovereignty. This would also mean that this global organization would have direct and absolute authority over every person. That this is the goal of powerful forces on earth is not speculation, it is a documented fact.

#### Sources:

- Our Lady of LaSalette foretold this very dimension of the apostasy: “All the civil governments will have one and the same plan, which will be to abolish and do away with every religious principle, to make way for materialism, atheism, spiritualism, and vice of all kinds.”
- Pope Benedict XV (1914-1922) recognized the beginnings of the fulfillment of Mary’s prophesy: “The advent of a Universal Republic, which is longed for by all the worst elements of disorder, and confidently expected by them, is an idea which is now ripe for execution. From this republic, based on the principles of absolute equality of men and community of possessions, would be

banished all national distinctions, nor in it would the authority of the father over his children, or of the public power over the citizens, or of God over human society, be any longer acknowledged. If these ideas are put into practice, there will inevitably follow a reign of unheard-of terror."<sup>1</sup>

- A clarification of concepts would be useful at this point, and will be further delineated in the subsequent chapters. Pope Pius X wrote of the dichotomy between the deceivers and the deceived in this utopian enterprise. The deceived allow themselves to be so in the hopes of an irenic existence on earth; the grand architects are merely exploiting their naïveté and pseudo-intellectual “sophistication” to procure their mindless obedience, concealing from them the ultimate end of such an enterprise. The vast army of “liberal” school teachers, politicians, clerics, and citizens are blithely unaware that they are both following the blueprint of and laying the groundwork for an unprecedented tyranny, as the popes rightly foresaw, and the tyrants have openly admitted.<sup>2</sup> As Adolph Hitler once opined, “what a fortunate thing it is for the leaders of the world that the people do not think.” Our Lady of LaSalette explicitly foretold that it would be the neglecting of prayer and penance which allowed such people to be deceived, hence it is a culpable ignorance.

#### Secular testimony

- Congressman Larry McDonald: “The drive of the Rockefellers and their allies is to create a one-world government, combining super-capitalism and communism under the same tent, all under their control. Do I mean conspiracy? Yes, I do. I am convinced there is such a plot, international in scope, generations old in planning, and incredibly evil in intent.” Congressman McDonald died when a passenger plane he was on was shot down in the Sea of Japan by Russian fighter jets.
- Congressman Louis T. McFadden likewise warned of “a superstate controlled by international bankers and international industrialists acting together to enslave the world for their own pleasure.” Two attempts were made on his life.
- On February 17, 1950, Council on Foreign Affairs member James Warberg, also one of the architects of the Federal Reserve System, stated before a Senate Foreign Relations Committee, “We shall have one world government whether you like it or not, by conquest or consent.”

#### Secular admission of this goal

- Nelson Mandela: “The New World Order that is in the making must focus on the creation of a world democracy.”<sup>3</sup>
- Henry Kissinger: “So we say to all peoples and governments; let us fashion together a new world order.” In 1974, he voiced his vision for the process of arriving at this new world order: “Depopulation should be the highest priority of foreign policy towards the third world.”

- Albert Einstein: “There is no salvation for civilization or even the human race, other than the creation of a world government.”
- Winston Churchill: “The creation of an authoritative world order is the ultimate aim towards which we must strive.”<sup>4</sup>
- DeGaulle: “Nations must unite in a world government or perish.”<sup>5</sup>
- David Rockefeller, Founder of the Trilateral Commission: “We are grateful to The Washington Post, The New York Times, Time Magazine and other great publications whose directors have attended our meetings and respected their promises of discretion for almost forty years. It would have been impossible for us to develop our plan for the world if we had been subject to the bright light of publicity during those years. But, the world is now more sophisticated and prepared to march towards a world government. The supranational sovereignty of an intellectual elite and world bankers is surely preferable to the national autodetermination practiced in past centuries.”
- Strobe Talbott, Deputy Secretary of State under Clinton: “In the next century, nations as we know it will be obsolete; all states will recognize a single global authority.”
- Robert Kennedy: “All of us will ultimately be judged on the effort we have contributed to building a new world order.”
- The 1976 “Declaration of Interdependence” signed by thirty-two U.S. Senators and ninety-two Representatives stated: “Two centuries ago, our forefathers brought forth a new nation. Now, we must join others to bring forth a new world order.”

## Part II: The Agents of This Movement:

### Freemasonry

*“The Kingdom of Satan” – Pope Leo XIII*

Modern Masonry was founded in London in 1717 when four small Masonic lodges united to become the Grand Lodge of England. Subsequently, in 1736, the first Masonic Lodge in Europe, the Grand Orient Lodge in Paris, was founded. Since 1738 Popes have been condemning the Freemasons because of their intrinsic deceitfulness, malicious agenda, rejection of Christ, and hatred of the Church. Pope Pius VIII wrote in 1829, “Lying is their rule, Satan is their god, and shameful deeds their sacrifice.” In his 1884 encyclical “*Humanum Genus*,” Pope Leo XIII called them the “Kingdom of Satan.” Through the pontificate of Pius XII, more than two hundred magisterial documents had condemned it.

### Freemasons and the Great Apostasy

- Our Lady of Quito, Ecuador (approved apparition): warned of the “evil sect of Masonry,” predicting the 20<sup>th</sup> century apostasy in the Church and “a total corruption of customs [morals], for Satan will reign almost completely by means of the Masonic sects.”
- Pope Pius XII: “The roots of modern apostasy lay in scientific atheism, dialectical materialism, rationalism, illuminism, laicism, and Freemasonry which is the mother of them all.”<sup>6</sup>

### The goals of Freemasonry (As summarized by Pope Leo XIII)<sup>7</sup>

- “The whole purpose is to make war against God and against His Church.”
- “The ruin of all forms of religion, and especially the Catholic religion...”
- The accuracy of Pope Leo’s assessment was conceded by a freemason in a letter to a French Jesuit priest, Pere Berteloot: “One outsider has understood freemasonry, namely Leo XIII. His condemnation of Freemasonry is, of course, logical, necessary and justified from the Catholic viewpoint. The Sovereign Pontiff went to the very root of Freemasonry. He found it harmful, wants it extirpated, and he has good reasons for it.”<sup>8</sup>

### The scope of Freemasonry

- “You Christians have not yet realized the full depth of our guilt. We are intruders. We are the destroyers. We have taken possession of your world, your ideals, your destiny. We were the first cause not only of the last world war, but nearly all wars; not only of the Russian revolution, but of all the great revolutions in your history. We have caused the discord and disorder of your private and public life. We do so today.”<sup>9</sup>
- Pope Leo XIII: “The sect of Freemasons grew with a rapidity beyond conception in the course of a century and a half, until it came to be able, by means of fraud or of audacity, to gain such entrance into every rank of the State as to seem to be almost its ruling power. This swift and formidable advance has brought upon the Church, upon the power of princes, upon the public well-being, precisely that grievous harm which Our predecessors had long before foreseen.”<sup>10</sup>

### From an American perspective

- When the Lodge of Nine Muses inducted Voltaire (who was bitterly anti-Catholic) into freemasonry in 1778, Benjamin Franklin, also a mason, was present.
- Fifty two of the fifty six signers of the Declaration of Independence were Masons, as were many of the lesser politicians.
- Professor Bullock describes the consecration ceremony of the Capitol building thus: “If, as Thomas Jefferson argued, the Capitol represented ‘the first temple dedicated to the sovereignty

of the people,' then the [Masonic] brothers of 1793 ceremony served as its first high priests. Clothed in ritual vestments, Washington and his brothers consecrated the building by the literal baptism of corn oil and wine – symbols of nourishment, refreshment and joy, or, as some versions interpreted them, Masonry, science and virtue, and universal benevolence.”<sup>11</sup>

- George Washington took the oath of office wearing his Masonic apron.

#### Freemasonry and the dissolution of Catholic nations

- The Masonic lodges, together with the Jacobins and the Illuminati masterminded the savage French Revolution to overthrow the Catholic monarchy and the Catholic Church so as to install a Masonic republic. Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette were beheaded, while the Catholic clergy were either murdered or forced into hiding. A Masonic black mass desecrated the high altar of Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris, and Masonic governments have ruled France for most of the past two centuries.
- In 1873, the truly Catholic President of Ecuador, Gabriel Garcia Moreno, made a public consecration of the country to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Infuriated, the German Grand Lodge gave an order for his death. He was killed on August 6, 1874, next to the convent in Quito where the Blessed Mother foretold Freemasonry's satanic rise (Our Lady of Good Success).
- Gavrilo Princep, one of the assassins of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, testified that the Serbian Masonic Lodge had ordered the assassination to destroy both the Hapsburg dynasty and the Austro-Hungarian Empire.
- Kaiser Wilhelm II stated in his autobiography that the Masonic Grand Masters of Europe intended to destroy the Catholic Hapsburg dynasty, eliminate the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and destroy the Catholic Church.
- In the wake of Protestantism and the dissolution of Catholic Europe, the Jesuits were “The Pope's Army” and were a powerful force in teaching and preserving the faith in the nations where it was threatened. Their suppression in 1773 was a great victory for the enemies of the Church, and Pope John Paul II attributed this to the doings of Freemasonry.<sup>12</sup> It was the Rothschild empire that financed Masonic schools which filled the void under the direction of Freemason Sigmund Geisenheimer, head clerk in Meyer Rothschild's Frankfurt bank.

#### Freemasonry's plan to infiltrate the Church

The Freemason Lafargue spoke at a congress in Liegi in 1865 thus: “It has been four hundred years since we undermined Catholicism, the strongest machine that has been invented as regards spiritualism. Unfortunately, it is still solid; the Revolution is the triumph of man over God!” It was at this time when the next phase of the planned destruction of the Church was delineated.

The secret papers of the “Alta Vendita” of the Carbonari fell into the hands of Pope Gregory XVI, and were published at the request of Bl. Pius IX, who guaranteed the authenticity of these documents. (Pope Leo XIII likewise ordered their publication, at his own expense). Some key elements of their plan:<sup>13</sup>

- A “dupe” Pope: “The Pope, whoever he is, will never come to the secret societies: it is up to the secret societies to take the first step towards the Church, with the aim of conquering both of them...What we must ask for, what we should look for and wait for, as the Jews wait for the Messiah, is a Pope according to our needs...Now then, to assure ourselves a Pope of the required dimensions, it is a question first of shaping for him, for this Pope, a generation worthy of the reign we are dreaming of.”
- A period of infiltration and preparation: “Leave old people and those of a mature age aside; go to the youth, and if it is possible, even to the children...You will contrive for yourselves, at little cost, a reputation as good Catholics and as pure patriots. This reputation will put access to our doctrines into the midst of the young clergy, as well as deeply into the monasteries. In a few years, by the force of things, this young clergy will have overrun all the functions. They will govern, they will administer, they will judge, they will form the sovereign’s council, they will be called to choose the Pontiff who should reign.”
- A deceived, counterfeit Church: “Let the clergy march under your standard, believing that they are marching under the banner of the apostolic Keys...You will bring friends around the apostolic Chair. You will have preached a revolution in tiara and cope, marching with the cross and the banner, a revolution that will need to be only a little bit urged on to set fire to the four corners of the world.”
- The excommunicated canon Roca, a mason who wrote feely about the plan to destroy the Church, as summarized by Bishop Graber: “The new church, which might not be able to retain anything of the Scholastic doctrine in the original form of the former church, will nevertheless receive consecration and canon jurisdiction from Rome..[T]he divine cult, in the form directed by the liturgy, ceremonial, ritual and regulations of the Roman Church, will shortly undergo a transformation *at an ecumenical council*...”.

This following excerpt is taken from the Feb. 1936 edition of “The Catholic Gazette,” the official magazine of the “Catholic Mission Society of England.” It repeats statements made in a meeting of the “B’nai B’rith,” the Jewish arm of the Masonic Order:

“As long as there remains among the Gentiles any conception of moral social order, until every religion, every patriotism and all dignity are liquidated, our reign over the world cannot come...We still have a long way to go before being able to destroy our main opponent: the Catholic Church. For this reason, we set ourselves to effectively attack the Church in its own foundations. We have spread the spirit of the [French] Revolution and false liberalism in all nations of the Gentiles, in order to convince them to distance themselves from their Faith and to be ashamed of professing the precepts of their religion, and to obey the commandments of their Church. We have conducted a good number of these to turn into atheists and, more importantly, to glorify himself to be descended from the monkey (Darwinism). We have inculcated in them new theories, *impossible to realize*, like communism, socialism, anarchism, which now serve in our projects...We followed the advice of our leader of the Jews, who wisely says: let some of our children become cardinals and bishops to destroy the Church...We are the fathers of all revolutions, even of those

which turn against us...We can boast of being the creators of the Reform. Calvin was one of our children; he came from Jewish origin, empowered by Jewish authority, and stimulated with finance to fulfill his role in the Reform. Martin Luther was influenced by his Jewish friends, and his plot against the Church was crowned with success thanks to Jewish funding...We are grateful to the Protestants...for the admirable support they give to our combat against the power of Christian civilization and our preparations for the future of our supremacy over the entire world and the kingdoms of the Gentiles...We managed to destroy most of the thrones of Europe. The rest will follow in the near future. Russia has already accepted our kingdom. France, with its Masonic Government, is in our power. England, dependent on our finances, is under our heels, and our hope for the destruction of the Catholic Church is in Protestantism. Spain and Mexico are two tools in our hands. Many other countries, including the United States of America are already submitted to our plans...the majority of the world press is under our control. We do all because it excites violent hatred of the world against the Catholic Church.”

#### It is not confined to the past

- “A certain cultural hostility is being spread against religions, especially Christianity and Catholicism in particular, notably through the means of social communication, and is promoted by Masonic sources active in different organizations.” - The Pontifical Council for Culture, March 13, 2004
- In a 1991 interview, Cardinal Edward Gagnon said he knew from personal experience in Canada that Masons stole consecrated hosts to use in Masonic black masses.
- In July 1992, Mexico’s Masonic Grand Master Francisco Valle Guzman condemned the Catholic Church as “the most powerful and ruthless enemy of science, civilization, fraternity and love. Any reconciliation between us is impossible.” He stated that it was Masonry’s duty to be the “gravediggers” of the Catholic Church.
- In 1983, The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith reiterated that those who join the Masons “are in a state of grave sin and may not receive Holy Communion.”

#### Communism

*“A satanic scourge” –Pope Pius XI*

That Communism is an enemy of the Catholic Church is a matter of the historical record. (Less known is that Communism/Socialism are merely constructions of the Freemasons to enslave humanity. Karl Marx was paid by freemasons to publish “The Communist Manifest” under his name to deceive the general population. It was actually written seventy years earlier by Adam Weishaupt, the founder of the Order of the Illuminati in Bavaria.)<sup>14</sup> We will briefly look at some data which demonstrates Communism’s hostility to the Church, the Church’s repeated warnings about the intrinsic evil of Communism, and the fact that communists had sought to infiltrate the Church in order to undermine her from within.

### Communism & the dissolution of Catholic states

- Eastern Europe: The Russian occupation of Eastern Europe after World War II led to a decades-long persecution of the Church and the martyrdom of millions.
- In Communist China, faithful Catholics are persecuted and imprisoned, as membership in the true Church is illegal, while the Communists have set up a counterfeit “Chinese Catholic Church.”
- In Spain and Latin America the Church has been persecuted by Communist regimes for decades. Mexico’s anti-Catholic constitution of 1917 led to the martyrdom of thousands of Catholics. Some of these deaths were in battle, as the Catholic Cristeros united and fought back (with the United States fully backing the Communists), but thousands of defenseless citizens were murdered outright.

### Condemnations by the Church

- Bl. Pope Pius IX called it “A fatal doctrine most opposed to the very natural law.”
- Pope Pius XI condemned it as “intrinsically perverted,” adding that, “no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever.”<sup>15</sup>
- The Holy Office, on June 28, 1949, excommunicated anyone who “professes atheist and materialist communism,” and condemned supporting the Communist party.
- On March 25, 1959, The Holy Office made an addendum to the previous statement which condemned anybody who voted for the Communist party.
- Pope John XXIII, in May of 1961, spoke of a “fundamental opposition between Communism and Christianity,” a curious statement in light of the facts to be presented.

### Infiltration of the Church by Communists

- Pope Pius XI: “In the beginning, Communism showed itself for what it was in all its perversity, but very soon it realized that it was thus alienating people. It has, therefore, changed its tactics by hiding its real designs behind ideas that are in themselves good and attractive...Under various names that do not suggest Communism...they perfidiously try to worm their way even into professedly Catholic and religious organizations....See to it, faithful brethren, that the Faithful do not allow themselves to be deceived.”<sup>16</sup>
- Fr. Luigi Villa was asked by Padre Pio to write a book detailing his knowledge of the infiltration of the Church by her enemies. He wrote, “It is a well-documented fact that Montini [the future Pope Paul VI], against the express orders of Pius [XII], had a relationship with communists. When Pius received proof, he had him removed.”<sup>17</sup> [Montini was the Secretary of State]



- Declassified documents in the “Washington National Archives” demonstrate that Montini was enlisted as an informant for the American Government, and held secret meetings with Italian Communists to help them secure future elections, thus betraying Pope Pius XII and his own homeland.<sup>18</sup>
- Fr. Villa also wrote that Alghiero Tondi, S.J., a close advisor of Montini, identified to the Soviets clandestine priests Pius XII had sent into Russia, after which the priests were arrested, tortured, executed, or sent to the gulag. Fr. Villa sent this report to every bishop in Italy, and none tried to refute it.
- Bella Dodd, a former communist, told Dr. Alice Von Hildebrand that there were four Cardinals within the Vatican working for the communists (This was in the 1940’s). After being converted by Bishop Fulton Sheen she testified to the House Un-American Activities Committee that she was personally responsible for planting one thousand communists in Catholic seminaries. Over a decade before Vatican II she stated: “Right now they are in the highest places in the Church.” She added that, they changes they were working to bring about would be so drastic that, “you will not recognize the Catholic Church.”<sup>19</sup>

### The Globalist “Elite”

Many Americans are unaware that the governance of their nation was largely surrendered to globalist organizations long ago. Congress has no control over them, while they have virtually total control over America, its president, and its economy. Among these groups is the highly powerful “Council on Foreign Relations” which endorsed World Government in 1922. Likewise, the Federal Reserve, which has total control of the American economy but no loyalty to America, openly stating to Congress that they answer to no one, and did not have to render an accounting as to where 23.7 trillion American dollars went (to foreign banks). Only three years after signing the Federal Reserve Act, President Woodrow conceded, “I am a most unhappy man. I have unwittingly ruined my country. A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men. We have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated governments in the civilized world. No longer a government by free opinion, no longer a government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men.”<sup>20</sup> However, F.D.R. wrote on Nov. 21, 1933 to Col. Edward House that the state of affairs predated Wilson’s act: “The real truth of the matter is, as you and I know, that a financial element in the larger centers has owned the government since the days of Andrew Jackson.”

Woodrow Wilson testified, “Since I entered politics, I have chiefly had men’s views confided to me privately. Some of the biggest men in the United States, in the field of commerce and manufacturing, are afraid of something. They know that there is a power somewhere so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it.”<sup>21</sup> And what does this elite cadre wish to do with this power?

A founding member of “The Council on Foreign Relations” was also the director of “The Federal Reserve.” He was William Boyce Thompson, who stated in 1918 that, “Russia is pointing the way to great and sweeping world changes. It is not in Russia alone that the old order is passing. There is a lot

of the old order in America, and that is going too...I'm glad it is so. When I sat and watched those democratic conclaves in Russia, I felt I would welcome a similar scene in the United States." For this reason, this man with total control of the U.S. economy transferred money from the U.S. to communist revolutionaries.

Some of the people already cited give further testimony as to precisely what type of "New World Order" they envision and towards which are actively working. The Rockefeller's have been the financiers of virtually every entity which has worked towards dissolving the United States into a mere sliver of a single globalist fiefdom, and it has always been a promoter and financier of the "Culture of Death" which is the bedrock of all "liberalism." The Rockefellers financed both Margaret Sanger and the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute in Germany, which soon came to be a vital arm of Hitler's third reich. Hitler cited the United States as the inspiration for his own eugenics campaign, and the Rockefellers would later send American eugenicists to directly counsel Hitler and the Nazi party on their own extermination program. While this may be news to most Americans, it was not new to the American globalists or the American government. Twenty seven states had enacted forced sterilization laws, a fact used by Hitler in his own propaganda films. After World War II, the allies protected Nazi eugenicists from prosecution, and recruited them to work for their own governments. Declassified government documents offer proof that both the U.S. and British governments have conducted lethal experiments upon their own citizens (further proof are the court settlements paid to those who could later prove it). However, I do not want to drift too far afield; the facts are readily available elsewhere.

Returning to the prominent role of the Rockefeller family and the global vision they pursue via their massive wealth and political influence, the New York Times (Aug. 10, 1973) cited David Rockefeller as believing, "The social experiment in China under Chairman Mao's leadership is one of the most important and successful in history." Mao's genocide was responsible for the murder of sixty million people. On Sept. 23, 1994, he felt that his drive towards a Chinese-totalitarian modeled global tyranny was only one step away: "We are on the verge of a global transformation. All we need is the right major crisis and the nations will accept the New World Order." He made this observation to his fellow NWO architects at a dinner for the ambassadors of...

### **The United Nations**

Its specific role in trying to dissolve the Church and how its success is symptomatic of the Great Apostasy comes into play a bit later in historical terms, and will be discussed later in this book. As a common sense observation, however, it stands to reason that just such an institution would be the necessary means for a final assault on the Church and the establishment of a one-world order. First, all of the formerly Catholic nations are assembled under the auspices of a single organization, this larger organization gradually dissolves the sovereignty of each nation, and eventually gains legislative control over the citizens of all these nations to one day transfer that control to the antichrist. Even though it is directly related to The Great Apostasy, I don't want to dwell too long on the political dimension of the reality. Here are but a few items to demonstrate the historical trajectory:

- Virtually at the same time as the U.N.'s founding, President Harry Truman already began the initial phase of conditioning Americans to sacrifice their freedom and sovereignty in the name of

globalism: “It will be just as easy for nations to get along in a republic of the world as it is for us to get along in a republic of the United States” (June 28, 1945).

- Congress would soon follow suit. The Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, in Senate Concurrent Resolution #66 dated Feb. 9, 1950, stated, “Whereas, in order to achieve universal peace and justice, the present Charter of the United Nations should be changed to provide a true world government constitution.”
- The United Nations has been the force behind programming of American children through its “educational” directives, using Pavlovian conditioning and Soviet style education models, along with demoralization and desensitization through sex education. The UNESCO booklet V, p. 9 (“Toward World Understanding”) instructs teachers that “The kindergarten or infant school has a significant part to play in the child’s education. Not only can it correct many of the errors of home training, but it can also prepare the child for membership, at about the age of seven, in a group of his own age and habits – the first of many such social identifications that he must achieve on his way to membership in the world society.”

The afore-mentioned Bella Dodd also testified to Congress, during hearings named “Subversive Influence in the Educational Process” that, as a legislative representative for the Teachers’ Union, she could say that the majority of the leaders were either expressly communist, or adhered to the communist model of “progressive education.” These techniques and programs are directly related to U.N. initiatives. In 1985 the “subversive” dimension was dropped, as Reagan and Gorbachov openly signed the “U.S. – Soviet Education Agreement.” The United States Senate concluded, “For the past fifty years, American classrooms have been used by psychologists, sociologists, educationists and politicians as a giant laboratory for unproven, untried theories of learning, resulting in a near collapse of public education.”<sup>22</sup>

- The U.N. already controls vast regions of American territory, specifically “national” parks. However, this control extends even to our military. On May 3, 1994, President Bill Clinton signed Presidential Decision Directive 25, declaring it classified so as to conceal its contents from the American public. However, the summary issued to Congress states that it authorizes the President to turn over control of U.S. military units to U.N. command.
- Also in 1994, a Clinton appointee to the U.N., James Gustave Speth, wrote in the U.N. Development Program report, in a section entitled “Global Governance in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century:” “Mankind’s problems can no longer be solved by national government. What is needed is a world government. This can best be achieved by strengthening the United Nations system.”
- Henry Kissinger is a powerful member of many of these secretive globalist organizations. One such group is the Bilderberg Group, which he addressed on May 21, 1992, telling them how this subversive betrayal of American sovereignty could be made manifest if, as David Rockefeller likewise stated, the right crisis were put into place. “Today Americans would be outraged if U.N. troops entered Los Angeles to restore order; tomorrow they will be grateful! This is especially true if they were told there was an outside threat from beyond, whether real or promulgated, that threatened our very existence. It is then that all peoples of the world will plead with world leaders to deliver them from this evil. The one thing every man fears is the unknown.

When presented with this scenario, individual rights will be willingly relinquished for the guarantee of their well being granted to them by their world government.”

As we now consider the role the United Nations has played and continues to play in the Church’s current apostasy, their documents reveal that this was part of their plan from its inception. Any loyalty which would compete with that of the New World Order would have to be eliminated. This would include one’s family, nation, religion and, ultimately, any traditional value. This was explicitly stated by Brock Chisholm, the first director general of the United Nations’ World Health Organization. “To achieve world government, it is necessary to remove from the minds of men their individualism, loyalty to family and tradition, national patriotism, and religious dogmas.” He stated this at the “Conference on Education” in Asilomar, CA on Sept. 11, 1954.

As we fast-forward a bit, we read that the plan is still underway, only more explicitly stated as the goal is within sight. From Robert Muller, the Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations:

“We must move as quickly as possible to a one world government; a one world religion; under a one world leader.” Mr. Muller wrote his own ‘World Core Curriculum’ which he credits to a demon spirit guide, Djhwan Khul, spirit guide to Satanist Alice Bailey.<sup>23</sup>

And from Maurice Strong, the founder of the United Nations environmental program:

“Isn’t the only hope for the planet that the industrialized civilizations collapse? Isn’t it our responsibility to bring that about?” Rio Earth Summit, 1992

### Summary

1. Part of the Great Apostasy is a drive towards an earthly Utopia, as defined by the godless, at the expense of the Faith.
2. Part of the current apostasy (whether the great one or not) is likewise the drive towards a one-world order with a Utopian vision.
3. Powerful forces have overtly stated their goal of destroying the Church, and have already realized great successes in this effort.
4. Yet, none of these things, even betrayals, constitute Apostasy. The Great Apostasy would necessitate the Church surrendering to these forces, accepting their ends, and willfully dissolving herself towards these ends.

---

<sup>1</sup>Pope Benedict XV, Moto Proprio: Bonum Sane, July 25, 1920.

<sup>2</sup> A Soviet defector, Yuri Bezmenov, has offered excellent lectures on the process by which entire nations are subverted by means of such “useful idiots.” They are available on public video networks and well worth viewing.

<sup>3</sup> Cited in The Philadelphia Examiner, October, 1994.

<sup>4</sup> Blount, George W. Peace Through the World Government. Durham, N.C.: Moore Publishing Co., 1974, p. 30.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Pope Pius XII. Address to the Seventh Week Pastoral Adaptation Conference, Italy, May 23, 1958.

<sup>7</sup> Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical Letter “Humanum Genus,” April 20, 1884.

<sup>8</sup> Ferrara, Christopher. “Masonic Family Values,” The Remnant Newspaper.

<sup>9</sup> Marcus Elia Ravage, Freemason and biographer of the Rothschilds. Chiesa Viva, June 2005, p. 3.

<sup>10</sup> Pope Leo XIII. Humanum Genus, #7.

<sup>11</sup> Bullock, Revolutionary Brotherhood.

<sup>12</sup> Brinelli, Lucio. ‘Il Sabato,’ October 6, 1990.

- 
- <sup>13</sup> Vennari, John. "The Permanent Instruction of the Alta Vendita. Rockford, Ill: Tan Books & Publishers.
- <sup>14</sup> Allen, Gary with Larry Abraham. "None Dare Call It Conspiracy." Seal Beach, CA: Concord Press, 1971, p. 16.
- <sup>15</sup> Pope Pius XI. Encyclical "Divine Redemptoris." Vatican City: March 19, 1937.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid., no. 57.
- <sup>17</sup> Villa, Fr. Luigi. "Paolo Sesto Beato?" Brescia: Editrice Civiltà, 1998, p. 136 ff.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>19</sup> Kramer, Fr. Paul. "The Devil's Final Battle." Buffalo, NY: Good Counsel Publications, 2002, p. 47
- <sup>20</sup> John F. Kennedy began the act of abolishing the Federal Reserve with Executive Order 11110.
- <sup>21</sup> Wilson, Woodrow. "The New Freedom: A Call for the Emancipation of the Generous Energies of a People," 1913.
- <sup>22</sup> The United States Senate Republican Policy Committee on Illiteracy, September, 1989.
- <sup>23</sup> Iserbyt, Charlotte Thomsen. "The Deliberate Dumbing Down of America." Ravenna, OH, Conscience Press, 1999, p. 281. All of the organs of religious apostasy and secular enslavement overlap and intertwine, hence this disciple of the Satanist Bailey was also influenced by the Jesuit apostate DeChardin, as he wrote in his book "Most of All They Taught Me Happiness."

## Chapter III

### **Schools of Thought: Liberalism & Modernity**

We have examined the political and social agents of the current apostasy, now we will look at the underlying philosophy. As Marxism was to Communism, so liberalism and modernity are to the modern enemies of the Church. Ultimately, Marxism and liberalism, while divergent on the surface, converge into the same reality (a goal acknowledged by those working for the one world order).

#### Part I. Liberalism

Liberalism is the school of thought which, ultimately, completely separates God from humanity and the world. It is not necessarily atheistic, but at best deistic, which is the belief that God exists, but has not revealed Himself, cannot be known, and therefore has left man to his own devices. With liberalism, there is no acknowledgement of divine revelation, divine law, or a divine order. Obviously, liberalism does not tolerate the notion of a Church founded by God, with the authority to define and uphold divine laws, so Catholicism becomes, at best, an obstacle or, at worst, an enemy.

The mentality of liberalism could be summarized as “nothing is sacred,” as God does not come down to touch man, and man cannot raise himself up to touch God. That this school of thought plays into the Great Apostasy is itself a fact written of in Sacred Scripture, as it both precedes and prepares for the Antichrist. We read in the First Letter of St. John, “Children, it is the last hour; and as you have heard that antichrist is coming, so now many antichrists have come...Who is the liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist, he who denies the Father and the Son...Every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God” (1 John 2:18ff).

This is the fullness of Apostasy, the denial of the Incarnation, but it has also been at the root of many heresies in the life of the Church in different degrees and manifestations. The Arian heresy denied the divinity of Christ altogether, precisely as St. John had warned. Likewise, many heretics have repudiated the Real Presence of Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament, denying that God would make Himself present under the appearance of natural objects. The iconoclast heresy was based on the prohibition of sacred images, denying that man could use nature to raise his mind and heart to God. Liberalism is based on the complete divorce of God from the world, with the conviction that an earthly Utopia, made by man and for man (in truth, for a select handful), is our true goal. Of course, a God who has never become incarnate as a man cannot have His laws incarnate in a society, and so we have the birth of the godless state, determined to bring about a godless world.

In “The Revolution, Historical Researches,” Bishop Gaume offers this eloquent summary of Liberalism. “I am the hatred of all order which man has not established and in which he is not king and God all together. I am the proclamation of the rights of man without care for the rights of God. I am the foundation of the religious and social state upon the will of man instead of the will of God. I am God dethroned and man in His place. This is why I am called Revolution, that is to say, overthrow...”<sup>1</sup>

### Liberalism & Apostasy

2 Thess: 2:3 – “Since the mass apostasy has not yet occurred nor the man of lawlessness been revealed – the son of perdition and adversary who exalts himself above every so-called god proposed for worship...” This verse from St. Paul offers two relevant insights:

- Lawlessness precedes the mass apostasy, and liberalism is precisely this; the denial of divine, religious and moral laws.
- The “man of lawlessness” exalts himself above God, as liberalism exalts man as being above God, truth and revelation. As Pope Leo XIII summarized, “followers of liberalism deny the existence of any divine authority to which obedience is due, and proclaim that every man is a law to himself.”<sup>2</sup>

That liberalism as a school of thought is a “school of apostasy” is a fact not a theory, as it openly espouses precisely these ideas. Pope Benedict XV explicitly labeled it as an extension of the apostasy of Protestantism, as will soon be cited.

Catholicism cannot be reconciled with liberalism; the insistence that they can co-exist is itself both a forerunner and manifestation of apostasy. Liberalism has already led to its obvious conclusions, conclusions which prepare the way for “the man of lawlessness”:

- Moral relativism: If there is no divine law binding man, then each man is free to be a law unto himself, with no higher authority than his own, poorly formed conscience. If each man is his own highest authority, then no one can insist that his morality is superior to another’s. If no morality is superior to another, morality does not exist. There is no moral law; hence, abortion, gay “rights,” divorce, and the proliferation of pornography, blasphemy, and every manner of vulgarity and indecency all flourish under the protection of law in liberal societies.
- Religious indifferentism: Likewise, if God has not revealed Himself, it is for each man to arrive at his own opinion as to who God is. If each man’s opinion is equally valid, then so is each religion. If all religions are equally valid, there is no true or false religion, only personal preferences, bringing us to indifferentism, the belief that one religion is as good as another. Therefore, there is no Divine law binding man or guiding a society, and certainly no religion can claim preeminence over another.

### Logical deterioration: Liberalism to persecution

A state built on liberal principals will necessarily persecute the Catholic Church. In fact, the reign of liberal governments have all begun by doing just that. Every protestant country persecuted the Church (in England, anti-Catholic laws are still in effect), the French Revolution ushered in the “Reign of Terror,” and every original colony in The United States had anti-Catholic laws. If a state is built on the principal that there is no Divine moral law and that all religions are equal, then the Catholic Church’s foundational principals to the contrary would, in the addled mind of the liberal (and the astute minds of the tyrants who actually control liberals), make her an enemy of that state.

As sources already cited have demonstrated, this is an element of the final apostasy and persecution of the Church; it is a question of logical sequence:

- Liberal states have always persecuted the Church.
- There is a global movement afoot to create a one world order, a global state.
- Liberal principals are the guiding force for this order.
- A global liberal state will lead to a global persecution.
- This persecution is precisely what Pope Benedict XV predicted.
- Liberalism espouses all of the signs of the current apostasy that Popes and the Blessed Mother have consistently spoken against and warned about.

### Liberalism & Tyranny

We will examine this a bit more closely in another section, but the simple fact is that liberals are liars. It cannot be any other way. Liberalism's inherent incoherence and hypocrisy are made apparent by a mere moment's logical inquiry (something increasingly few in the modern world are willing or able to do). A liberal state is built on the principal that all ideas are equal, except the belief that all ideas are not equal. Liberalism's history of expounding equality and tolerance has been accompanied by an actual policy of intolerance, persecution, and murder. Ultimately, liberalism is the ideology of Satan, as its principles and results make quite apparent. This is why Pope John Paul II repeatedly referred to the West (apostate Christendom) as a "culture of death." Just as Satan is "a murderer from the beginning" and the "father of lies," liberalism is itself an ideology of murder and lies, as history has proven and experience confirms. And so the logical deterioration continues: from Catholic nations to anti-Catholic, merely Christian nations; from Christian nations to a liberal man-centered nations (built on the killing of your fellow man); from once-Christian nations to an anti-Christian nations; from a collection of anti-Christian nations to a single, global, anti – Christian nation; from an anti-Christian one world order to the reign of the anti-Christ...

### The Dissolution of Catholic Nations

Pope Benedict XV wrote, "...the Church never was in such danger as that which showed itself at the end of the eighteenth century. It was then indeed that a philosophy in delirium, a prolonging of the heresy and the apostasy of the Innovators, acquired a universal power of seduction over minds and brought about a total bewilderment, with the settled purpose of ruining Christian foundations of society not only in France, but little by little in all the nations."<sup>3</sup>

While the current historical trend which has dissolved once Christian societies is usually seen as the continuation of a movement begun by the French Revolution, Pope Benedict observed that it actually began with protestantism. Of course, this observation is correct, as protestantism was founded on the denial of essential ways in which God reveals Himself and His law to man. Protestantism:

- Denies the Divinity of the Church.
- Denies the Divine institution and authority of the Papacy.
- Ascribes to man the authority to interpret Scripture as he sees fit, subject to no higher authority. Hence, every man is "a law unto himself," as Leo XIII, cited as being a hallmark of liberalism.

Protestantism was, in and of itself, an apostasy, as it was a rejection of God's revelation in place of a man's ideas. A protestant may counter that their founders cannot be blamed for people abusing their



principles at a later period in history, but this is not the case. The French Revolution and the triumph of godless states in once Christian nations is the logical conclusion to that which was begun by Luther. Once man decides it is his place to pick, choose, rearrange and uproot the means by which God touches man, the agenda of the antichrist is at work. Like rust, the spirit of antichrist oftentimes moves imperceptibly, but never sleeps. Even Luther had to concede as much in a rare moment of lucidity: “I am compelled to confess it; my doctrine has produced many scandals. Yea, I cannot deny it, these things often terrify me; above all when my conscience reminds me that I have destroyed the present state of the Church, so calm and peaceable under the Papacy...The nobles and the peasants have begun to live comfortably with their beliefs; they are swine, they think like swine, they die like swine...It is incontestable experience that we preachers are now more contemptible, more idle, than we ever were under the shadow of the Papistry.”<sup>4</sup> Such is the fate of any endeavor to replace the work of God with the work of man, i.e. Liberalism.

Protestantism held forth that each man should privately interpret the Bible as he saw fit, the beginning of modern relativism. Liberalism continued in this vein. If man is the source of law and truth, not God, and all men are supposedly equal, then every opinion must be equal and therefore entitled to the same rights and protections. Pope Gregory XVI wrote of this relationship between liberalism’s false definition of freedom and its success in dissolving Catholic nations: “Experience attests it and the most remote antiquity teaches us this: in order to bring about the destruction of the richest, most powerful, most glorious, most flourishing States, all that was necessary was this liberty of opinion without restraint, this license for public discourses, this ardor for innovations.”<sup>5</sup>

Protestantism destroyed many Catholic states, such as Germany, England, Holland and Belgium. The Catholic states that remained would be destroyed by the second wave of the attack – liberalism. This was most explicitly embodied in the French Revolution, which has already been discussed in the previous unit. But, the corrosive effects of this philosophy have continued to eat away at the Christian West, with only the Church to resist.

## Part II: From persecution to apostasy: Modernity

As one would expect, any manifestation of a school of thought or ideology based on godlessness, or the equality of truth and falsehood, has been consistently condemned by the Church. All of the successes of liberalism in usurping Catholic nations, abolishing rule by Divine law, murdering priests and religious, and stealing and destroying Catholic institutions amounts to the persecution which Christ told His followers to expect. As with the persecutions under the Roman emperors, many Catholics apostatized, but this was an apostasy *from* the Church, not within. For all the damage they do, persecutions make saints, purify the Church, and give her renewed strength; yet, if the errors are able to seep within her body, it becomes a far more perilous situation. Sadly, this was the case. The secular errors of liberalism came to permeate the Church in a school of thought labeled “Modernity.” Modernity, to a large extent, was the embodiment of another symptom of the great apostasy – presumed superiority to the past. For now, however, we will limit ourselves to its effects of infusing the Church with liberal doctrines.

### Infiltration

Pope Pius IX published the “Syllabus of Condemned Errors”<sup>6</sup> as a response to liberalism. For the most part, it was a condemnation of secular ideas, protecting the Church from enemies without. Yet, he also acknowledged that liberalism had indeed infected the Church, writing that “Catholic liberalism is a veritable plague,” and that “liberal Catholics are the worst enemies of the Church.”

Pope St. Pius X likewise acknowledged a liberal infection of the Church. It is certainly a sign of Apostasy when the Church's worst enemies are within, yet this was the fundamental shift that St. Pius had to address. As Pope Pius IX was primarily addressing errors outside of the Church, Pius X was acknowledging that the graver concern was the inroads they had made. He wrote in his encyclical "Pascendi"<sup>7</sup> that modernists were "In the very bosom of the Church," and their "counsels of destruction [stirred] not outside the Church, but inside of Her; so much so that the danger lies in wait almost in Her very veins and viscera."

St. Pius X called modernists, "enemies of the Cross of Christ." This is significant, as it shows their connection to the apostasy, an apostasy seeking an earthly Utopia. This is a theme to be taken up in the unit, "The Restraint Removed."

### Defending the Faithful

Faithful to their Divine mandate, however, the Popes set about doing all they could to warn and protect the faithful. Writings which contained errors were condemned, their authors were warned, disciplined and monitored, and every priest had to swear the "Oath Against Modernity," vowing to protect the Church and not undermine her. Yet, Pope Pius X had to indeed concede that the plan of the Masons, long since known and promulgated by preceding Popes, was advancing and succeeding. He wrote of the Church's enemies as laymen and priests "thoroughly imbued with the poisonous doctrines taught by the enemies of the Church," all the while putting themselves forward "as reformers of the Church." He continued, "they seize upon professorships in the seminaries and universities, and gradually make of them chairs of pestilence."<sup>8</sup> This was precisely part of the Masonic plan previously cited, the last step of which was the culmination of their collective subversive energies in a Church council, convoked by a Pope imbued with their ideas and amiable to their goals.

### Pius XII: "The Last Pope"

Pius XII continued to labor against these errors, yet had to acknowledge that they were gaining ground within. His encyclical "Humani Generis" (1950) noted, "...it is well established that there are not lacking today, just as in apostolic times, those who, in their extreme zeal for novelty and also in their fear of being held ignorant of those matters which the science of a progressive age has introduced, strive to withdraw themselves from the temperateness of the Sacred Magisterium; and thus they become involved in the danger of gradually and imperceptibly departing from the truth revealed by God, and of leading others into error along with themselves."<sup>9</sup>

Recall, it was Pius XII who had named the Masons as the "Mother" of the current apostasy, and in this statement he is recognizing the success of their goal to corrupt the Church through her younger clergy, who would one day elect a Pope formed in their school, making their ideas and goals his own; a destroyer who dreamed he was a reformer.

Thus, Pope Pius XII referred to himself as "The Last Pope" (to the French ambassador)<sup>10</sup>. No, he was not the last to be elected, but he was the last to ever raise his voice against the swiftly advancing tidal wave created by the Church's enemies. And so he was also heard to say, "After me, the deluge..."<sup>11</sup>

It was in his days as Cardinal Pacelli that Pius foretold the dangers the Church was facing, tying them in to the revelations to Lucy at Fatima. Pius would refer to himself as "The Pope of Fatima" because his episcopal consecration, carried out in the Sistine Chapel by Pope Benedict XV, was on the same day and

the same hour as the Blessed Mother's first apparition at Fatima (May 13, 1917). While his gift of mysticism is well-documented, perhaps that is not what was required for him to offer this prognostication. Perhaps all he needed to do to understand the sad fate of the Church and the Papacy after his death was to read what he always kept beside his bed – The Third Secret of Fatima.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Lefebvre, Archbishop Marcel. "They Have Uncrowned Him." Kansas City, MO: Angelus Press, 1988, p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Pope Leo XIII. *Libertas praestantissimum*. Vatican City: June 20, 1888.

<sup>3</sup> Pope Benedict XV: "Ex iam exeunte," Vatican City, March 7, 1917.

<sup>4</sup> *Opera Luther*, Edition Witt, II, 281, 387.

<sup>5</sup> Pope Gregory XVI, *Mirari vos*, Vatican City: Aug. 15, 1832.

<sup>6</sup> Bl. Pope Pius IX. "Quanta Cura," Vatican City: December 8, 1864.

<sup>7</sup> Pope St. Pius X. Encyclical Letter "Pascendi dominici gregis," Vatican City: September 8, 1907.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Pope Pius XII. Encyclical Letter "Humani generis," August 12, 1950.

<sup>10</sup> *30 Giorni*, year X, number 11, Nov. 1992, p. 70.

<sup>11</sup> Villa, Pope John, p. 19.

<sup>12</sup> Socci, 94.

## Chapter IV

### **Fatima as the Crossroads**

The events of Fatima, in particular the Third Secret revealed to the visionaries, are intimately bound to the popes of the past century, even as some would insist otherwise. In fact, her very appearance may well have been in response to the supplications of the Vicar of Christ. Only two years earlier had occurred the Armenian Genocide, perpetrated by Turkish Muslims. One million Christians were slaughtered, including 48 bishops. War followed, along with the deaths of nine million soldiers. The Hapsburg empire was extinguished, the last trace of the Holy Roman Empire. A Masonic type revolution in Russia drove Czar Nicholas from the throne, with Lenin and Trotsky beginning their savage, satanic reigns. Faced with the extinction of Christian civilization, the complete and utter disregard for the Holy See by secular governments, Pope Benedict XV, on May 5 1917, performed a small gesture in the sight of men, but acceptable to God in Heaven. He decreed that the Church would add “Queen of Peace, Pray for Us,” to the Litany of The Blessed Virgin Mary. Wrote the Holy Father, “Bring to Her the anguished cries of mothers and spouses, the weeping of innocent little children, the longing of every generous heart. That her most tender and benevolent solicitude be touched and that the peace we seek for this devastated world be granted.”<sup>1</sup> The Queen of Heaven and earth was not long in heeding her children’s cries: Eight days later she appeared at Fatima, offering the world peace. Yet, Our Lady of Fatima answered the pleas of a pope, only to have subsequent popes reject her answer...

As the Church continued to struggle against her enemies, both within and without, into the twentieth century, the Apparition of the Blessed Virgin Mary was a decisive crossroads between resistance and apostasy:

### **Sources**

- The message itself contains a warning against Russia. As already noted, communism was a principal agent of persecuting and infiltrating the Church, so the Blessed Mother appeared to tell the Church how to defend herself and triumph, culminating in the conversion of Russia.
- Also, Mary spoke, “In Portugal, the dogma of the Faith will always be preserved” etc... This statement would make no sense unless juxtaposed with the fact that the dogma of the Faith would not be preserved in other places. The “etc” actually appears in Lucy’s memoirs, indicating the portion that The Blessed Virgin had told her not to repeat (The Third Secret).
- Pope Pius XII, as Cardinal Pacelli: “I am worried by the Blessed Virgin’s messages to Lucy of Fatima. This persistence of Mary about dangers which menace the Church is a divine warning against the suicide of altering the Faith, in Her liturgy, Her theology, Her soul... Since Pius’ concerns are not relevant to the published portions of the message, they could only have arisen from the contents of “The Third Secret,” something to which

he would most likely have had access as Secretary of State. Clearly, the language of “suicide” refers to nothing less than self-destruction – apostasy.

- Fr. Joaquin Alonso, the official archivist at Fatima wrote that the secret involved “internal struggles in the womb of the Church and of grave pastoral negligence by the upper hierarchy,” and “deficiencies of the upper hierarchy of the Church.”<sup>2</sup>
- On March 17, 1990, Cardinal Oddi gave the following testimony to Italian journalist Lucio Brunelli in the journal, “Il Sabato.” He said that in the third secret of Fatima “The Blessed Virgin was alerting us against apostasy in the Church.” He also stated that the message indicated that “the apostasy would begin at the top.”<sup>3</sup>

#### Mary’s Message

- The Church’s supernatural mission: The Blessed Mother showed the seers a vivid vision of hell, as she had come to warn people about eternal damnation. This was a clear statement that, unlike the modernists’ priorities, the Church’s mission is supernatural, the salvation of souls.
- God was about to punish the world for its crimes by means of a war, famine, and persecution against the Church and the Holy Father.
- A worse war would break out if the message went unheeded.
- If her message was ignored, Russia would spread its errors throughout the world, causing wars and persecutions of the Church.
- Various nations would be annihilated

#### Mary’s Solution

- Devotion to The Immaculate Heart of Mary was to be established.
- Russia was to be consecrated to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, which would bring about its conversion to the Catholic Faith. In fact, Lucia testified that Jesus Himself appeared to let her know when the moment had come to fulfill this request: “Our Lord informed me that the moment had come. He willed for me to make known to Holy Church His desire for the consecration of Russia and His promise to convert it.” (June 13, 1929)
- First Saturday Devotion was to be established.
- The confirmation: The Miracle of the Sun, confirmed by even hostile witnesses and science itself, testified irrefutably to the authenticity of the apparitions and the message.

The fulfillment of these dire warnings was immediate. The Vatican reported that from 1917 to 1930 250,000 Catholics had mysteriously “disappeared” in Russia, while 33,000 churches and

200 chapels had been reduced to the number of 2 in that same time frame. Yet, this was only a sign of things to come, as absolutely no volume of slaughtered Catholics whatsoever would compel any Pope to employ the Blessed Mother's commands and reap her promise to put a stop to it and convert the murderers. It is worth noting that the solution for world peace offered by the Blessed Mother was indeed proven on a national level. The Bishops of Portugal consecrated their nation to The Immaculate Heart of Mary, and Cardinal Cerejeira acknowledged that it was precisely due to this act that Portugal was miraculously preserved from both "the scourge of war and the leprosy of atheistic communism." Pope Pius XII likewise marveled that Portugal was spared the horrors of the Spanish Civil War and the Communist menace. When World War II broke out, Sister Lucy informed her bishop that, due to the consecration, Portugal would be spared. She wrote to Pope Pius XII on December 2, 1940, "Most Holy Father, Our Lord promises a special protection to our country in this war, due to the consecration of the nation, by the Portuguese prelates, to the Immaculate Heart of Mary; as proof of the graces that would have been granted to other nations, had they also consecrated themselves to Her."<sup>4</sup> Already made manifest are the graces of obedience, and the price of rejection, a bitter lesson the Church has yet to heed. Yet, the fulfillment of her promises, again on a lesser scale, occurred on other occasions, as we will later read.

### The Secret

In 1944, Lucy became seriously ill, alarming her bishop, who knew that the Third Secret would die with her. He asked her to write it down. While obedient, Lucy was also fearful, both because of the content of the message and the command of Mary herself to not repeat it. The following transpired:

- The Blessed Virgin herself appeared on January 2, 1944, telling Lucy the time had come to commit it to writing.
- The Blessed Mother explicitly stated that it was God's will.
- Lucy also related that she was instructed that the message was to be read to the world upon her death, or in 1960, whichever came first. Lucy wrote, "the Blessed Virgin wishes it so."

It is not surprising that the Masons disapproved of this heavenly event. The Blessed Virgin Mary requested a chapel to be built in her honor. The masonic mayor had it blown up on March 6, 1922. The masons could not bear to have Heaven meddling with earth, nor could any liberal...

### The Decision

In an apparition approved by the Church and confirmed by science, Heaven came to earth to assist and direct the Church in her time of peril, giving her the solution which would lead to peace, and the preservation of the Faith. Of course, the notion of heaven coming down to earth is insufferable to a liberal, and 1960 came and went without the Third Secret being revealed; the very secret ordered to be read to the world by Mary herself, which the recently deceased Pope said caused him grave concern about the Church's impending suicide. The current Pope was John XXIII, who, in his own words, had no use for "prophets of gloom."<sup>5</sup> Apparently, this

included the Mother of God herself, as her instructions were ignored and her secret buried. (A fitting footnote: John regarded himself as a superior prophet than Mary at “reading the signs of the time,” a pomposity his successor would correct, as Pope John Paul II said at Fatima in 2000, “The Lady of the Message seemed to read, with a special perspicacity, the signs of our times”).<sup>6</sup>

Even more incorrigible than this decision was the beginning of the Vatican’s campaign to discredit the apparition altogether. In the official Vatican communication of February 8, 1960, stating that the Blessed Mother would not be obeyed, it was stated, “Although the Church recognizes the Fatima apparitions, she does not pledge herself to guarantee the veracity of the words which the three shepherds claim to have heard from Our Lady.” Note that it speaks of “shepherds,” not “visionaries,” and what they merely *claim* to have heard. Before consigning the secret, given by The Mother of God herself, to the dark oblivion of the Vatican archives, “Good” Pope John further insulted Our Lady and the visionaries by attaching his own note, stating that the message “could be a manifestation of the divine and could not be.” He clearly insinuated that the entire episode could be the delusions of a nun; did he believe that the seventy thousand witnesses to the miracle of the sun were likewise delusional? Most likely, he did not think about it at all, steeped in the unjustified self-satisfaction and intellectual shallowness that are endemic to liberals. He also was probably unaware of the powerful symbolism of the date on which he formally rebuked the Mother of God and her messenger, January 25<sup>th</sup>. It was on this date, years earlier, that the *aurora borealis* occurred, according to the prophecy of Our Lady of Fatima, announcing the advent of God’s punishment upon the earth, The Great War, for not heeding her message. In all probability, even had he known, the irony would have been wasted on John, as he tempted God to punish the world yet again by once more rejecting Mary’s message...

### A History Lesson From Jesus

In August of 1931, Sr. Lucia received an interior locution, following upon the Vatican’s refusal to obey the requests of Mary. Sr. Lucia conveyed these words of Jesus: “Make it known to My ministers that, given they follow the example of the King of France in delaying the execution of My command, they will follow him into misfortune.” Mr. Socci summarizes well the historical reference of Our Lord: “The explicit reference is to the apparitions of Paray-le-Monial in 1689. There Jesus gave to [St.] Margaret Mary Alacoque a message for the King of France, Louis XIV – a message which implied a grand design of Providence concerning France: Insert the Sacred Heart of Jesus into the coat of arms; construct a temple in His honor where the kings of France would venerate Him; make a consecration of France to the Sacred Heart; request from the pope – as sovereign of France – a Mass in honor of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Nothing was done. Thus, exactly 100 years later, the French Revolution exploded and the nephew of the Sun King, Louis XVI, remembered these requests only in 1792 while he was in prison. There, in desperation, he decided to fulfill them, but it was by then too late. He was guillotined on January 21, 1793. France had taken the opposite road.”<sup>7</sup>

True to the mandate of liberalism, Pope John likewise took the opposite road, trusting his own machinations over divine warnings and explicit heavenly instructions. Pope John called a Council, which was to address all of the world’s gravest issues (not really, but this will come). Whether deliberate or not, the symbolism is as obvious as it is tragic: Pope John’s Council began its official sessions on October 13, 1962, the anniversary of the miracle of the sun. The

day that heaven came down to earth was the day that man embarked on his own solution – the results were as destructive as they were predictable.

A final, poignant exclamation point as to the mindset of this Pope, a mindset that would not unreasonably be said to have its share of hubris and pelagianism, are to be found in his words to his doctor upon receiving a terminal diagnosis. “They say I have a tumor. But this means nothing, as long as God’s will is done. I hope to bring the Council to a conclusion, and to see peace in the world.”<sup>8</sup> Thus, he dreamed that *his* council, not The Blessed Virgin’s solution which he so derisively rejected (which was, in fact, the will of God which he refused to have done), would bring the resultant peace Mary had promised.

---

<sup>1</sup> Socci, 116.

<sup>2</sup> Socci, 54.

<sup>3</sup> Socci, 86.

<sup>4</sup> Kramer, 24.

<sup>5</sup> Opening speech at the Second Vatican Council, Oct. 11, 1962.

<sup>6</sup> Socci, 18.

<sup>7</sup> Socci, 102.

<sup>8</sup> Wiltgen, Fr. Ralph. “The Rhine Flows into the Tiber.” Rockford, ILL: Tan Books & Publishers, 1967, p. 72.



## Chapter V

### **Vatican II: Triumph of the Church's Enemies**

As St. Paul wrote that the advent of “the man of lawlessness” would mark the arrival of the last times, it is entirely correct to describe Vatican II as a Council of lawlessness. In a well-documented, pre-arranged maneuver, a clique of liberal bishops, quite literally, hijacked the Council. They violated the rules of the Council, took the microphone by force, and led a revolt against the lawful overseers of the council’s procedures. This rebellion was, in fact, instigated by a Mason. A priest who was also a freemason repented of his unlawful affiliation with “the kingdom of Satan” upon being healed at Lourdes. He testified that Cardinal Lienart was behind the illegal tactic to take control of the council. It is no wonder that, from his deathbed, this Masonic Cardinal could boast, “Humanly speaking, the Church is lost.”<sup>1</sup>

“The Church must be brought up to date and made meaningful to the problems of today.” With these words St. Anthony of the Desert described the mentality giving birth to the great apostasy. This is precisely the reason Pope John gave for convening the Council. In the longer quote from which this excerpt from St. Anthony is taken, he prophesied, “they will surrender to the spirit of the age.” And surrender they did: to the communists, surrender...to the masons, surrender...to the liberals, surrender. This is all a matter of historical fact, and the balance of this book will put forth the evidence. For the time being, however, here are some thoughts and conclusions to serve as a basis for further exploration.

### **Part I: Communism**

The victory of the communists at the onset of the council is a matter of public record. Yves Congar, a suspect theologian under Pope Pius XII whose theology had been condemned both as a doctrine and a method, crowed after the Council that “The Church has had, peacefully, its October revolution.”<sup>2</sup> He was later honored by Pope John Paul II by being elevated to the College of Cardinals. To repeat points already demonstrated:

#### **Communists and the Council**

- The Blessed Mother offered the spiritual remedy by which Russia would be converted. Instead, this remedy was refused, and Communist Russia got the Vicar of Christ to agree to their terms – silence in the face of their evil. The communist representatives (both of them K.G.B. agents), their demands met, arrived on the anniversary of the Miracle of the Sun.
- They would continue to exert their will upon the Pope for years to come, as Paul would choose the bishops they ordered, and persecute bishops who resisted them.
- Communists praised the Council, as the Italian Communist Party declared at its eleventh Party Congress in 1964: “The extraordinary awakening of the Council, which is rightly compared with the Estates General of 1789, has shown the whole world that the old politico-religious Bastille [i.e. Christendom] is shaken to its foundations.”<sup>3</sup>

## Communists and the Popes

- The communists praised and promulgated Pope John's communist vision for the world. They distributed millions of copies of Chapter V of his encyclical "Pacem in Terris." The Soviet magazine "Nauka: Religia," praised John as a "wise and farsighted politician." The result of this encyclical and its endorsement of communist ideology was an increase of a million votes to the Italian Communist Party in comparison to the election five years earlier. When the results of the votes were clear and the triumph of atheism was evident, throngs of communists packed St. Peter's square, cheering, "Long live John XXIII."<sup>4</sup>
- The use of John's encyclical in this manner could be viewed as simply a communist propaganda tactic and a distortion of his intent, but some facts would indicate other-wise. As Patriarch of Venice he publicly promoted a socialist convention, having advertisements placed around the city reading, "I welcome the exceptional significance of this event, which is so important for the future of our country."<sup>5</sup> In a similar vein, he stated "I see no reason why a Christian could not vote for a Marxist if he finds the latter to be more fit to follow such a political line and historical destiny."<sup>6</sup> No reason why? Is his being an atheist not sufficient? Can any Marxist or atheist have the correct vision of "historical destiny?" Is godlessness the destiny we seek?
- Even upon becoming a Cardinal, John used the occasion to demonstrate his subservience to communists. He chose to receive his red cardinal's hat from Vincent Auriol, the President of France. He was a socialist, bitterly and overtly anti-Catholic. Yes, "Good Pope John" literally knelt at the feet of an avowed enemy of the Church and hater of clergy to receive the symbol of a "Prince of the Church." Is it unreasonable to conclude that whom the prince had chosen to serve was made obvious by both the symbolism and reality of this act?
- Only one more example of the vast collection of data proving John was sympathetic towards Communism and seemed to place the Church's considerations and teachings in a secondary light are found in the biography by Alden Hatch. John was a "good friend and confidant" of Edouard Herriot, Secretary of the anti-Catholic radical socialists. He was overtly anti-clerical, which could only lead one to conclude that Cardinal Roncalli did not strike him as being primarily a cleric (an impression he gave many others who are on record to that effect), as their friendship was mutual and common knowledge.
- The silence of Paul VI in the face of communist persecution of the Church and his own vindictiveness towards bishops the communists didn't like is a matter of public record. Fr.Villa's work on Paul VI documents well his shameful treatment of Cardinal Joseph Slipyi (who spent 17 years in Soviet concentration camps) and Cardinal Mindszenty. Even as he persecuted and deposed the heroic resisters of communism, he received and honored their persecutors as often as they called upon him at the Vatican.
- "Russia will spread her errors..." This was foretold by The Blessed Mother at Fatima, and this is precisely what happened as a result of rejecting her solution. Not only did it gain a foothold in Italy, but communism has decimated the Church in Central and South America, as Jesuit agents have fostered communist sponsored "liberation theology" in place of Roman Catholicism, leaving the Church in shambles. Apart from overt communism, the errors of Russia have subversively eroded the west as their models of economics, education and psychological conditioning proliferate. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops has adopted all

communist and socialist principles, as demonstrated by their substantial financial backing for a convention to spread liberation theology held in Detroit.<sup>7</sup>

Again, it is the arrogance of modernists, convinced that they are superior to the past, that has led to such ruin. Not only was the Blessed Mother ignored, but so were the words of Pope Pius XI, “No one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever.” Less than three decades after this observation by Pius, communists were dictating the terms of an ecumenical council, choosing bishops which the Pope “rubber stamped,” and being endorsed by a papal encyclical, advancing their influence into the heart of Catholicism.

The August 19, 1978 edition of *Avvenire* reprinted these words of Padre Pio, spoken to his spiritual brothers in 1963: “Because of the spreading of injustice and the abuse of power, we have arrived at a compromise with atheistic materialism, denying the rights of God. This is the chastisement preannounced at Fatima...All of the priests who maintain the possibility of a dialogue with the deniers of God and with the Luciferian powers of the world *are mad, they have lost the faith, they no longer believe in the Gospel!* They thus betray the Word of God, because Christ came to bring to earth a perpetual alliance only with men of goodwill, but not to ally Himself with men thirsty for power and domination over their brothers...The flock is dispersed when the pastors ally themselves with enemies of the Truth of Christ. All of the forms of power made deaf to the will and the authority of the heart of God are rapacious wolves who renew the Passion of Christ and cause the tears of the Madonna to pour forth.”<sup>8</sup> Pope John’s persecution of this true saint will be recounted later.

## Part II: The Masons

That they had been succeeding in their plan to infiltrate the Church was conceded decades before by Pope Leo XIII. In an 1892 encyclical to Italian bishops, he expressed, “particular concern regarding penetration of Masonry among the clergy,” and their plans to “soften the opposition of the lower clergy.” Likewise, in 1913 Padre Pio lamented in a letter to a friend, “Jesus, regrettably, has reason to complain for the ingratitude of his own ministers! How many unfortunate brothers of ours correspond to the love of Jesus by throwing themselves with open arms into the infamous sect of Freemasonry!” As already documented, it was their plan that these “lower clergy,” who would one day become “the higher clergy,” would eventually elect one of their own to the throne of Peter. By the Masons’ own standard, they had finally succeeded in John XXIII. Carl J. Burckardt, a Masonic dignitary and Swiss diplomat, opined, “He is a deist and a rationalist...He will change many things; after him, the Church will never be the same.”<sup>9</sup> While one can argue that no Pope can be held accountable to every opinion anyone cares to render, that Mr. Burckardt was entirely correct in his predictions does give credence to the fact that he knew of John’s Masonic affiliation and support, as he had already made publicly manifest.

Pope John, as Archbishop in 1944, gave a Pentecost sermon in the Cathedral of Istanbul clearly espousing his own Masonic views, with the not-so-subtle undercurrents of relativism and indifferentism. “We can all find the best reasons to underscore the differences of race, culture, religion or conduct. The Catholics, in particular, are keen to distinguish themselves from the “others:” Orthodox brothers, Protestants, Jews, Muslims, believers and non-believers of other religions...Dear brothers and sons, I have to tell you that, in light of the Gospel and of the Catholic principle that is false logic. Jesus came to knock down these barriers; He died in order to proclaim universal brotherhood. The central point of his teaching is charity, that is, the love which binds all men to Him as the first of all brothers, and which binds Him, with us, to the Father.”<sup>10</sup> We see a mindset that will manifest itself time and again; it is *especially* the Church that is wrong wherever disagreement is found; it is the Church which has been

operating outside the “light of the Gospel.” According to the modernist, the Church of the past is always the culprit, as the enlightened Church of the present now realizes, in total agreement with her enemies.

The Archbishop’s pro-masonic bent went well beyond sharing elements of their vision; he concretely advanced their sinister cause within the Church. When Roncalli was nuncio in France he appointed a 33<sup>rd</sup> degree Freemason, Baron Yves Marsaudon, as head of the French branch of the Knights of Malta. This was the very order which Pius XII had suppressed and placed under investigation as he was well aware that it had become an organ of Freemasonry within the Church. John suspended all such investigation (June 24, 1961) and restored free reign to the order. But, let’s hear from the Masons themselves...

- “To us (freemasons) it was a great emotion, but, to many of our friends it was a sign.” Mason Baron Marsaudon (referred to above), a friend of John XXIII, on his election
- Mr. Marsaudon went on to write, “One could really speak of a revolution that from our Masonic Lodges has spread out magnificently, reaching the top of St. Peter’s Basilica.”
- The same encyclical praised by Communists was equally extolled by Freemasons as a victory of their doctrines within the Church. The Masonic Bulletin in the United States printed, “The encyclical *Pacem in Terris* is a vigorous statement of Masonic doctrine...we do not hesitate to recommend its thoughtful reading.”<sup>11</sup>
- There is substantial evidence that both John XXIII and Paul VI were masons. John’s name appears on the lists of the P2 Lodge. However, even if this were not the case, it is irrefutable that they were on very fraternal terms with these sworn enemies of the Church, and shared their philosophy and goals. Mr. Marsaudon wrote in his book that Paul VI was indeed the man they were grooming for the Papacy, but that John XXIII was as good a second choice as any. He wrote, “When Pius XII decided to direct personally the very important ministry of Foreign Affairs, Msgr. Montini [Paul VI] did not receive the purple. It thus became, not canonically impossible, but traditionally difficult that upon the death of Pius XII he could accede to the Supreme Pontificate. But then came a man whom, like his precursor, called himself John, and then it all began to change...If some small islands exist, not too distant, in the mind, from the times of the Inquisition, they would be forcibly drowned in the high tide of Ecumenism and Liberalism, one of the tangible consequences of which shall be the lowering of the spiritual barriers still dividing the world. It is with all our heart, we wish success to John XXIII’s ‘revolution.’”<sup>12</sup>
- The first step in John’s revolution was to reinstate Archbishop Montini to his trajectory towards the Papacy, and so he was the first Cardinal named. On his deathbed, he revealed him as his choice to succeed him. The man whose betrayal of Pope Pius XII led to his expulsion from the Vatican was back, and in charge.
- Upon his death, John was roundly praised by all of the Church’s enemies; this was more than diplomatic protocol; they were mourning the loss of a man who shared their vision and advanced their cause. Here is but one example: “The Great Western Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons, on the occasion of the death of John XXIII, makes known its sorrow for the disappearance of this great man who revolutionized the ideas, thoughts, and forms of the Roman Catholic liturgy [hearken back to Bishop Baum’s of liberalism: ‘revolution, that is, overthrow’]...Mankind has

lost a great man, and we Masons acknowledge his high principles, his humanitarianism, and his being a great liberal.”<sup>13</sup>

- Several high ranking churchmen were masons, and the fact was so apparent that, in one case, it was publicly documented in a court in Vienna (the mason being Cardinal Koenig). Upon the death of Pope Paul VI, the Masonic Grandmaster of the Roman headquarters, Giordano Gamberini, stated, “For the first time in history, the Freemasons can pay respect to the tomb of a Pope, without ambiguities or contradiction.”<sup>14</sup>
- That Mr. Gamberini should speak so highly of Pope Paul is no surprise. Pope Paul wanted him on the Executive Committee for a Concordant Bible. This was despite the fact that Mr. Gamberini was among the founders of the “Gnostic Church of Italy,” which is an extension of the “Satanist church,” officially founded in France in 1888 by the Freemason Jules Doinel.
- There is substantial evidence, even among documents of United States intelligence agencies, that Paul was not elected Pope at the conclave of 1963 until the Freemasons intervened. Prince Borghese was chair of the conclave, and his German cousin Prince Scortesco wrote, “During the Conclave, the masonic Cardinal Tisserant stepped out of the Sistine Chapel, consulted with representatives of the B’nai B’rith, and announced to them the election of Cardinal Siri. These replied saying that the persecutions against the Church would resume immediately. Returning to the Conclave, he had Montini elected.”<sup>15</sup> These illegal actions were witnessed by the “Noble Guard” of the Vatican, guardians of the Conclave. Paul VI had this ancient Guard abolished soon after his election. Shortly after revealing that he had proof of these assertions, Prince Scortesco was found dead under circumstances labeled “suspect.” It was widely reported that he had been burnt alive in his bed.

Recall from an earlier chapter, the B’nai B’rith (Sons of the Covenant) is the Jewish arm of the Freemasons, whose hatred of the Church is clearly documented. Their predilection for Cardinal Montini could perhaps be explained in light of the fact that Paul VI’s maternal grandfather and his mother were Jews. His mother was baptized on the eve of her wedding, hence she chose the name “John Baptist” for her son. On her tomb there are Masonic symbols. As Pope, Paul would oftentimes put over his Papal vestments the “Ephod,” the insignia of the “High Priest,” in the time Jesus was condemned, such as would have been worn by Caiaphas during that very act.

A Mr. Andreotti, member of the P2 Lodge, wrote in his book “A Ogni Morte di Papa” of a meeting attended by the Masonic Cardinal Suenens to prepare the election of Paul VI just before the conclave. After his election, Paul named Suenens moderator of the Council.

- Perhaps the Masons’ ultimate symbolic flaunting of their conquest of the Throne of Peter in the person of Paul VI was to be found on the Bronze Door of St. Peter’s Basilica. A panel was inserted on the door to commemorate the Council. On the left and right of the panel were John XXIII and Paul VI respectively, indicating that one opened the Council and the other concluded it. On the back of the hand of the image of Paul VI, for the entire world to see in the full light of day, was the Masonic Star. It was removed when a Catholic noticed this satanic stamp on Paul’s hand, but photographs of the panel’s original state exist.

### Freemasonry spreads

“We had struggled for a century and a half to bring our opinions to prevail with the Church and had not succeeded. Finally, there came Vatican II and we triumphed. From then on the propositions and principles of liberal Catholicism have been definitively and officially accepted by the Church.” -Marcel Prelot, Senator for the Doubs Region of France

- So cordially was “The Kingdom of Satan” embraced by the Post-Vatican II Church that Cardinal Willebrands, President of the Secretariat of Christian Unity, addressed representatives of a masonic order on their fiftieth anniversary, noting that he was there at the direction of the Secretary of State.
- In 1967, the official bulletin of the Norwegian Bishops reported, “The Scandinavian Episcopal Conference has decided, after lengthy and careful reflection, that the bishops may allow, individually, the members of the Masonic Order of our Northern Nations wishing to embrace Catholicism, to be welcomed in the Church without renouncing their active membership in Freemasonry.”
- The ultimate triumph of Freemasonry would be when one of their own, Archbishop Bugnini, was given free reign to annihilate the Mass and fabricate his own, but this will come later...
- The Freemasons bestowed on John Paul II one of their highest honors, “The Order of Galilae.” The representative of Italian Freemasonry said he merited the honor because he promoted, “the values of universal Freemasonry; fraternity, respect for the dignity of man, and tolerance...”<sup>16</sup>
- Again, the B’nai B’rith’s prominence and high regard they enjoyed with the head of the Church they sought to destroy cannot be passed over in silence. Then director Max Jules Isaac arrived at the Vatican only a week after the establishment of the “Secretariat for Christian Unity,” spending more than an hour with the Masonic Cardinal Bea. He said he was promised by John XXIII a “revision” of Christian doctrine amenable to his ends. This meeting was covered in the Jan. 25, 1966 edition of “Look” magazine (with a circulation of 7 million) in an article entitled: “How the Jews have changed Catholic thinking.” Likewise, at least four times representatives from this overtly anti-Catholic group were formally received by John Paul II. Perhaps the B’nai B’rith recognized in their new-found influence at the Chair of Peter the plan stated in their 1936 meeting in Paris: “Let some of our sons become bishops and cardinals, that these may destroy the Catholic Church!”

### **Part III: Liberalism & Modernity**

As Cardinal Suenens brazenly declared, the Second Vatican Council was the French Revolution in the Church.<sup>17</sup> In short, he was rejoicing that the violent overthrow of the Church by liberals had finally permeated the core of the Church. The French Revolution was described by Pope Pius IX as “inspired by Satan himself. Its goal is the destruction of the building of Christianity.” In the words of this Cardinal, and as the facts confirm, the work of the Council was inspired by the Devil towards the destruction of Christianity. Another Cardinal agreed: Cardinal Ratzinger (Pope Benedict XVI) opined that “Gaudium et Spes,” the Council’s document on the Church, “represents on the part of the

Church, an attempt at an official reconciliation with the new era inaugurated in 1789 [by the French Revolution].” Yet, as the masons explicitly stated in “The Permanent Instruction of the Alta Vendita,” their shared goal with the French Revolution was “the final destruction of Catholicism and even of the Christian idea.” This is the “new era” with which, as a future Pope himself admitted, the Church sought to reconcile herself: the Church reconciling with the anti-Church. Of course, the anti-Church conceded nothing, but only lauded the Church’s concession to her own self-destruction (the very phrase used by Paul VI to describe the Church’s state after the council).

Pope Pius IX said that this revolution was inspired by Satan himself, with the destruction of Christianity as its goal. In fact, shortly afterward, The French Directory ordered Napoleon Bonaparte to invade Rome, so as “to overthrow the last of the popes and take the tiara from the pretended Head of the universal Church.” Tragically, yet fittingly, there was no need. Pope Paul VI, of his own freewill, removed the Papal Tiara, worn by the Supreme Pontiffs since the first millennium, to never take it up again (Nov. 13, 1964). “They will surrender to the spirit of the age...” In this action, and in so many others, the surrender was made manifest. We will proceed to look at these ways.

### Modernist theologians given control of the Council

This subject will be treated in more detail in the sections “The Restraint Removed,” and, “I Will Not Lead.” For now, I will merely point out a fact of historical record: authors who were deemed suspect and whose writings were condemned for threatening to undermine the Faith with modernism were not only welcomed at the Council, but given great prominence and influence over the documents themselves. (Pope John himself was twice removed from teaching posts as a young priest due to suspicions of modernism). Here are but a few examples:

- In his book, “Principles of Catholic Theology,” Cardinal Ratzinger (Benedict XVI) lauded the fact that Teilhard de Chardin exerted a wide influence at the council, referring particularly to the document on The Church in the Modern World. The full context of this remark is bizarre to say the least, and will be provided in a future chapter. For our purposes here, we only need to take a brief glimpse into the thought of de Chardin: “I think the great religious fact of the present time is the awakening of a new religion which, bit by bit is leading to the worship of the world, and which is indispensable to humanity in order that it may continue to labor.”<sup>18</sup>

In 1962, the veritable eve of the Council, The Holy Office declared his writings contained “ambiguities and grave errors.” Yet, a man who would become Pope was pleased with his influence, declaring that the entire document took its cue from de Chardin. [A point of possible interest for the reader: de Chardin was instrumental in fabricating one of the hoaxes put forth by scientists to “prove” evolution. Also, two priests who were enamored by his heretical writings were subsequently victims of diabolical possession as a direct result of believing his works. See “Hostage to the Devil” to read the complete account]. DeChardin was a freemason of the Martinist Order, and although he was a heretic, one of his disciples, Henri DeLubac, who was banished by Pius XII, was restored by John. DeLubac would later boast, “the post-conciliar period represented the victory of Protestantism within Catholicism.”<sup>19</sup> He was rewarded for his efforts on behalf of Protestantism by being made a Cardinal by John Paul II.

- Another censured writer who found himself thrust into prominence was Fr. Edward Schillebeeckx. He called into question the Divinity of Christ, the virginal conception of Jesus, the resurrection and the authority of the Church’s Magisterium. He and other theologians deliberately crafted the documents so that they could be exploited later for their modernist

agenda. In his own words, “We have used ambiguous phrases during the Council and we know how we will interpret them afterwards.” In speaking of the modernist plan to usurp the council documents, he stated: “We will express it in a diplomatic way, but after the council we will draw out the implicit conclusions.”<sup>20</sup>

- Hans Kung is so utterly heretical that he is one of the few theologians to have actually received a formal censure after the Council (of course, he has never been excommunicated, despite his repeated espousal of heresies). He declared that “what had once been the dream of an *avant garde* group in the Church [i.e. modernists] had spread and permeated the entire atmosphere of the Church, due to the Council.”
- Paul VI filled the “Pontifical Biblical Institute” with heretical writers. Among them were the Jesuits Zerwik and Lyonnet, both of whom the Holy Office had condemned and expelled.<sup>21</sup> As yet another sign of the Church’s surrender to her enemies, The Holy Office itself, which came into being in 1542 to oppose the heresies of Luther, was terminated in 1964 by Paul VI. The father of liberalism had gained yet another crucial victory over the Church he despised, with the Pope, whom he referred to as the anti-Christ, doing his bidding for him. This would not be the last time, as we will read in the section on the Mass.
- Modernity’s final triumph: Ever since it was instituted by St. Pius X, every cleric in the Church had to swear the Oath Against Modernism. As writer Michael Davies summarized: “The first part of the oath is a strong affirmation of the basic Catholic truths opposed by Modernism: the demonstrability of God’s existence by human reason; the value and suitability of miracles and prophecies as criteria for revelation; the historical institution of the Church by Christ; the inviolable character of Catholic tradition; the reasonableness and supernaturalness of faith.”<sup>22</sup> Pope Paul VI abolished the oath.
- It was at the opening of the Council that Pope John declared his policy of “mercy towards error,” and his successor would take that one step further. In his pastoral letter for Lent in 1962 Cardinal Montini wrote, “today there are no errors in the Church, or scandals or deviations or abuses to correct.” Likewise, as pope, he wrote in his first encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam* that: “At the present time it is no longer a matter of ridding the Church of this or that particular heresy or of certain specific disorders. Thanks be to God there are none in the Church.” This statement is either the wishful thinking of a man gravely out of touch with reality, or the consecration of modernism. As Pius X declared modernity to be the “synthesis of all heresies,” John XXIII empowered those guilty of this mega-heresy to form a council, and now Paul VI declared that the Church had passed from being threatened by the “synthesis of all heresies” to having none at all. Yet, both the state of affairs at that time and subsequent history would undeniably demonstrate that Paul was woefully unfit to interpret the “signs of the time,” the supposed impetus and mandate for the Council.

## **Part IV: The Triumph of the Arch-enemy**

As Satan was known by Pope Pius IX to be the “father of the French Revolution,” as Freemasonry was known by Leo XIII to be the “Kingdom of Satan,” and as Pope Pius IX dubbed communism a “satanic scourge,” we have Popes themselves directly connecting to Satan these three entities/ideologies; the proof is irrefutable that these three satanic plagues were embraced at the



Council and by the conciliar popes. Every council in the history of the Church was convoked to combat Satan and to put an end to the errors of the age; now, Satan had a council of his own through which to disseminate his errors.\* This assertion is confirmed in nothing less than a papal encyclical: “One must learn how to discern them [the fruits of the council] carefully from everything that may instead come originally from ‘the prince of this world.’ This discernment in implementing the council’s work is especially necessary in view of the fact that the council opened itself widely to the contemporary world...”<sup>23</sup> Any council which needs such a disclaimer (and I assure you, this is the only one) can only be classified as an abject failure, but that would not stop the onslaught of the relentless propaganda campaign by which the faithful would be incessantly assured that this council of “mixed satanic fruit,” was nothing less than a “Second Pentecost” and a “New Springtime.”

\*(The guaranteed protection of the Holy Spirit in the Church’s magisterium is not discarded by this analysis. That the parameters of this guarantee are often misrepresented and not so well understood by faithful Catholics is part of the reason the council was able to get away with such indescribable incompetence and recklessness. Many excellent works exist on the topic, but it is beyond the scope of this work).

---

<sup>1</sup> Villa, Paul VI, p. 120. Citing “Traditioin – Information,” n. 7, p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Lefebvre, Archbishop Marcel. “Open Letter to Confused Catholics.” Kansas City: Angelus Press, 1987, p. 100.

<sup>3</sup> Kramer, p. 62.

<sup>4</sup> Villa, John XXIII, p. 27.

<sup>5</sup> Klinger, Kurt. “A Pope Laughs: Stories of John XXIII,” p. 105.

<sup>6</sup> Arriaga, Fr. Joaquin. “The New Montinian Church,” p. 570.

<sup>7</sup> Miceli, p. 180.

<sup>8</sup> Socci, p. 134.

<sup>9</sup> Villa, p. 35.

<sup>10</sup> Villa, p. 30

<sup>11</sup> Arriaga, p. 147-48.

<sup>12</sup> Marsaudon, Yves. “Ecumenism Viewed by a Freemason of Tradition,” p. 42. Cited in Villa, Paul VI, p. 118.

<sup>13</sup> El Informador. Guadalajara, Mexico: June 4, 1963.

<sup>14</sup> La Rivista Massonica, ed., n. 5, July 1978, p. 290. Cited In Villa, Paul VI, p. 121.

<sup>15</sup> Villa, Paul VI, p. 100.

<sup>16</sup> Villa, Fr. Luigi. “Karol Wojtyla Beatified? Never!” Chiesa Viva, Year XL, No. 430, Sept. 2010, p. 30.

<sup>17</sup> Lefebvre, Open Letter, p. 100.

<sup>18</sup> Amerio, Ch. 3, note 45.

<sup>19</sup> *Il Sabato*, July 12 – 18, 1980.

<sup>20</sup> The Dutch magazine ‘De Bazuin’, No. 16, 1965

<sup>21</sup> Villa, Paolo Sesto, p. 65.

<sup>22</sup> Davies, Michael. “Partisans of Error.” Long Prairie, MN: Neumann Press, 1983, p. 104.

<sup>23</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Encyclical Letter “Lord and Giver of Life.” Vatican City: May 18, 1986.

## Chapter VI

### Liberals Are Liars

“When he [the devil] lies, he speaks according to his own nature, for he is the father of all lies.”

-John 8:44

“I must lie like a devil, not timidly, or only in passing, but boldly and always.”

-Voltaire, Letter to Thiriot

As Cardinal Billot, S.J., so succinctly summarized, “The Liberalism of the ‘liberal Catholics’ escapes all classification and has only one sole distinctive and characteristic note, that of perfect and absolute incoherence.”<sup>1</sup> Indeed, they are not alone. Every false system of those opposed to the Church is a precursor to the final deception of the antichrist, whose solution is at the price of Truth. Since their own incoherence will never be admitted (or even recognized) by them, it lies concealed beneath layer upon layer of hypocrisy, with an endless campaign of hollow propaganda and senseless sound bites to prevent people from genuinely seeing into the heart of the matter. In current American culture, we call this “political correctness,” a system of vapid clichés which prevents people from telling the simple truth about a matter, as to do such would be a “sin” against the prevailing liberal tyranny.

Lenin once wrote, “the lie is sacred and deception will be our principal weapon.” Communism has been called “the culture of the lie” for precisely this reason. Vaclav Havel referred to it as “a world of appearances trying to pass for reality.”<sup>2</sup> Communism insisted on an endless mantra of State slogans, which in no way corresponded to reality, but were necessary to procure mindless obedience. This topic will be taken up in a subsequent chapter. The only point to be made here is that all of the forces seeking to destroy the Church have this in common; they cannot exist apart from lies. This is more than saying that people within these systems lie, but that lying is at the very foundation, the essence of these realities. This is precisely the distinction Jesus made in the verse above by teaching that lies are in accord with the Devil’s very nature. Ultimately, Satan is at the heart of every attack upon Christ and His Church, and it only stands to reason that the children of the “Father of all Lies” themselves do so quite freely. Here is a cursory look:

#### Martin Luther

- Luther rejected the authority of the Church, teaching people “Sola Scriptura,” only the Scriptures, were necessary. Yet, this was a lie. Luther himself changed Scripture, adding to Romans, “we are justified by faith,” the word “alone.” This “alone” became the foundation of his sect, as he readily admitted it was his own fabrication. “I know very well that the word ‘alone’ is not in the Latin or Greek texts; but Dr. Martin Luther will have it so, and I order it to be so, and my will is reason enough.” Therefore, he clearly believed himself to be the foundation of his religion, not the Scriptures as he professed.
- Luther taught there was no religious authority between the Christian and God, thus his hatred of the Papacy. This was a lie. He did believe in an ultimate human religious authority, he just believed it was himself, not the Pope. As he wrote in 1522, “I do not admit that my doctrine can be judged by anyone, even by the angels. He who does not receive my doctrine cannot be

saved.” Again, in “Saemtliche Werke” we find, “whoever teaches otherwise than I teach, condemns God, and must remain a child of hell.” Lastly, the innovator of “private interpretation” admitted, “I can hear and endure nothing which is against my teaching.”

- In the same vein as above, he wrote, “He who does not resist the Papacy with all his heart cannot obtain eternal salvation.” A rather definitive statement coming from one proclaiming private judgment.
- As he admitted that he himself did not believe the alleged principles of his new religion, he lacked integrity in his personal life as well. The liberal propaganda which passes for history portrays him as a brave rebel standing up for his beliefs against the Pope, but the fact is he was a coward who only became “brave” when he had the support of princes. It is a documented fact that he sent absolutely groveling letters to the Pope which were nothing short of the fawning of a sycophant, even as he was preaching that the Pope was the antichrist.

### “A murderer from the beginning...”

This was another title Jesus gave Satan in the same verse cited at the opening of this chapter. Likewise, liberals, from their inception, have compounded their lies with murder, true to the example of their father.

- In a sermon he referred to himself as a “great rascal and murderer.” This was not hyperbole; his “vocation” itself was rooted in murder, as he stated that he had no attraction to monasticism, but had entered a monastery, “otherwise, I would have been easily arrested.” He had killed someone in a duel.
- When the peasants followed Luther’s teaching of private interpretation, thus provoking the peasants’ war, Luther urged the nobles to “track them down like dogs” and to kill these “children of the devil.” He had no idea how right he was in ascribing this name to them. Erasmus put the number slain at 100,000. Luther stated: “I, Martin Luther, slew all the peasants in the rebellion, for I said that they should be slain; all their blood is upon my head. But I cast it on the Lord God, who commanded me to speak in this way.”
- Likewise, as a biographer of St. Pius V has noted, Luther can rightfully be called the logical precursor to the holocaust. He referred to Jews as “young devils damned to hell,” summoning his followers in Germany “to burn down Jewish schools and synagogues and throw pitch and sulfur into the flames; to destroy their houses; to confiscate their ready money in gold and silver; to take from them their sacred books, even the whole Bible, to forbid their holding any religious services under penalty of death; and if that did not help matters, to hunt them out of the country like mad dogs” (Luther’s Works, Vol. XX, p.2230 – 2232).

### The Birth of Liberalism

Martin Luther began (or at least became the de facto icon of) the West’s march towards the apostasy of liberalism. By making religious truth and morality a private matter, all standards would be removed

from society and the individual. Liberalism has always spawned murder, sacrilege, and immorality because, ultimately, this is its purpose: liberty from God, His Church, His commands. With Luther as their religious leader, secular rulers everywhere began to jump on the bandwagon and declare their dissolution from the Church. Even at its inception, the movement of Liberalism showed its true colors. In 1526, Rome was sacked; the following are only some of the crimes committed by the first children of the dawning “enlightenment.”

- The invaders murdered the sick in the Santo Spirito Hospital, as well as the children in a neighboring orphanage. People were murdered inside St. Peter’s Basilica.
- Contemporary chroniclers are unanimous in the assertion that the rape, murder and plunder defied description.
- Once a house was plundered, the invaders demanded a ransom for the inhabitants. Those who could not pay were tortured and murdered.
- Once plundered, houses were burnt and children were thrown out of windows.
- Women were raped in front of their husbands and fathers. So desperate was the situation that some fathers killed their own daughters to spare them from this.
- The Blessed Sacrament, along with relics, vestments and vessels was desecrated.
- Graves were opened and corpses robbed.
- The protestants vowed to kill every priest they saw, and nuns were taken to brothels and sold after being raped.

### The French Revolution

Two hundred and fifty years later, French liberals would resume this same work of their historical and ideological predecessors. As Bd. Pope Pius IX observed, “Satan was the father of the French Revolution.” During the September Massacres, 1,400 people were killed, including 225 priests in a single day in one city. During the Reign of Terror, Catholics were murdered in such great numbers that the number of martyrs cannot be known.

### America

The founding fathers touted our religious freedom, but this was a lie. One religion was not free, the true one. Each of the original thirteen colonies enacted anti-Catholic laws. In fact, England wanted to extend persecution of Catholics into Canada, but they were already too numerous, so instead they were given freedom to practice by the so-called “Quebec Act.” At the beginning of the American Revolution, the Congress of Philadelphia violently reproached England for this concession. Just one anecdotal insight into the hypocrisy of the so-called liberal founders of this nation:

It is ironic that, inscribed inside the dome of Thomas Jefferson’s monument, we read his words, “I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility towards every effort of tyranny over the mind of man.” Yet, Mr. Jefferson himself engaged in such tyranny. He was a deist, and rewrote the Bible, eliminating every reference to Christ’s divinity. “Who is the antichrist, but he who denies Christ come in the flesh.” Jefferson, like his predecessor Luther, like every liberal, indeed believed in tyranny over the mind of man, provided he was the tyrant.

The reasonable objection may be made, “but hasn’t Catholicism had its share of unsavory characters, hypocrites, liars, murderers and immoral people of every persuasion?” Of course, the answer is “yes,”

but these people were not our founders, and these actions were a contradiction of our fundamental beliefs, not the logical extension of them.

At the Second Vatican Council, the Church's enemies had an opportunity to make significant inroads. Her enemies from without would find the Church's perennial resistance transformed into cowering accommodation, and her enemies within, silenced and subversive, suddenly found themselves empowered and honored. Sadly, one of liberalism's successes in infecting the Church was in its fundamental failure to grasp truth. We will now look at the documented ways in which dishonesty lies at the very foundation of the Council's work.

### Pope John XXIII

As already mentioned, Fr. Luigi Villa composed a scholarly work, his endeavor to be "The Devil's Advocate" in light of Pope John's impending beatification. His scholarship and documentation are impeccable; no one was ever even endeavored to refute his work, because as St. Thomas Aquinas wrote, "there is no argument against a fact." His work is mandatory reading for any serious Catholic who seeks to understand what has happened to the Church these past fifty years. I will only mention a few incidents that are relevant to the current discussion:

### The Convoking of the Council

In his spiritual diary, Pope John wrote, "without giving it a thought, there popped out, in a first discussion with my Secretary of State, on January 20<sup>th</sup>, 1959, the words of 'ecumenical council.'"<sup>3</sup> Pope Paul VI promulgated this version of events on Sept. 29, 1963, stating that the council was convened and initiated "by divine direction."<sup>4</sup> Pope John Paul II was even more effusive: "...he tied his name to the greatest and transforming event of our century: the call of the Vatican II Ecumenical Council, which he perceived, as he declared, as a mysterious and irresistible inspiration of the Holy Spirit..."<sup>5</sup>

The fact is, however, this bit of contrived modern folklore is untrue. Many facts, some from John himself, demonstrate otherwise. Cardinal Ottaviani has testified that it was discussed with John at the conclave prior to his election, and two days after his election he spoke to his secretary, Capovilla, of the "necessity of convening a council." Furthermore, he discussed a council with the new Patriarch of Venice, Giovanni Urbani, and the Bishop of Padua, Girolamo Bordinon. "On Nov. 28, the decision is taken, and Pope John XXIII's decision of holding a council becomes final in December of 1958." At this time he also discussed it with his confessor, Msgr. Cavagna, together with three other people. On the morning of January 9<sup>th</sup> he met with Msgr. Giovanni Rossi, of the "Pro Civitate Christiana" and told him, "I must tell you about a great thing, but you must promise me it will remain between us. Tonight a great idea occurred to me: to do a Council." Msgr. Rossi did eventually print this in his bulletin, "La Rocca."<sup>6</sup>

### The purpose of the Council

The Pope stated that the purpose of the Council was to address the greatest concerns of modern man. Again, this was not true.

Communism: Communism was the greatest threat to modern man, and an enemy and persecutor of the Church. Millions of Catholics lived under the yoke of their oppression, and millions had already been killed. Yet, in 1962 Cardinal Tisserant signed an agreement with the Metropolitan Nycodim, “spokesman of the Kremlin,” with the aim of being able to invite some Orthodox “observers” to the Council. Moscow, in fact, would accept the invitation, but on condition that not a word be uttered about Communism at the Council.

To compound this chicanery, Pope John went so far as to state in the opening address of the Council, “the conditions of modern life have removed those innumerable obstacles by which the children of the world once impeded the free action of the Church.” With full knowledge of the oppression of Catholics by Russia, this is either dishonesty or a delusion. A more visible witness could not be found than the Berlin Wall, which had gone up only a year before this declaration that the “obstacles” impeding the free action of the Church had been removed. Only years earlier Pope Pius XII had spoken of “the evil spirit who won’t lay down his arms,” yet his immediate successor seemed to think he had done just that.

This is an incredible triumph for a sworn enemy of the Church. Only years earlier a Pope had written that no one who wished to save Christian society could collaborate with communists in *anyway whatsoever*, and now they were collaborating in setting the preconditions for a Council, an action which blatantly undermined the very reason the Pope claimed to be calling the Council in the first place.

Hell: The greatest threat facing any man, modern or otherwise, is the eternal loss of his soul. However, in vain will one search for a listing under “Hell” in the index of the Council documents, as there is none. Not only does this betray a victory for modernism in excluding the supernatural from the official texts, it is a double rebuke to The Blessed Mother. At Fatima, she warned of both the earthly chastisement of which Russia would be the means, and the eternal pains of Hell, of which the children were shown a vision. At the Council which was called simultaneously with the refusal of her own wishes, silence reigned, to the delight of communists and Satan alike.

O, what tangled webs we weave...

It is amazing that, at an Ecumenical Council, bishops themselves would be unaware that they were not acting freely, and that limits had been placed on them before the Council began by the Church’s greatest earthly enemy. Lies beget lies, as the course of the Council would soon demonstrate:

- A letter dated Sept. 25, 1965 was signed by 25 bishops to those responsible for determining the agenda of the Council. It warned that just as Pius XII was at present being publicly reprimanded – but unjustly – for having kept silent on the Jews, so one could well imagine that “tomorrow the Council will be reproved – and justly so – for its silence on Communism, which will be taken as a sign of cowardice and conniving.”<sup>7</sup>
- Also, a petition signed by 450 conciliar fathers demanding the condemnation of communism, mysteriously “vanished.” As liberals are liars, when the responsible parties were cornered on the subject, they denied having ever received such a document. When pressed, they admitted that this was a lie and that the request was simply set aside. As Fr. Villa observed, “Thus John XXIII subjected the Church to the veto of Moscow, and put a shameful silence on the bloodiest and most criminal of totalitarianisms.”<sup>8</sup>

- Having all of the world's bishops together with the Pope would have been the ideal opportunity to comply with the command of Our Lady of Fatima and to carry out the consecration. ***Five hundred and ten bishops*** from seventy six countries petitioned Pope Paul to do just that; he refused.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Lefebvre, *Uncrowned*, p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> Weigel, George. "The Final Revolution." New York: Oxford University Press, 1992, p. 40.

<sup>3</sup> Pope John XXIII. "Story of a Soul." Rome, 1967. P. 359, 347.

<sup>4</sup> Villa, John XXIII, p. 13.

<sup>5</sup> "Teachings of John Paul II." Vatican City: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1981, p. 752.

<sup>6</sup> Villa, 13-14.

<sup>7</sup> Wiltgen, p. 274.

<sup>8</sup> Villa, John XXIII, p. 2.

<sup>9</sup> Wiltgen, p. 241.

## Chapter VII

### **Rome Will Lose the Faith**

#### Sources

- Our Lady of LaSalette: “Rome will lose the faith and become the seat of the antichrist.”
- Our Lady of LaSalette: “In the year 1864, Lucifer together with a large number of demons will be unloosed from hell; they will put an end to faith little by little, even in those dedicated to God. They will blind them in a special way, that, unless they are blessed with a special grace, these people will take on the spirit of these angels of hell. Several religious institutions will lose the faith and will lose many souls.” Note the consistency with the Masonic plan to infiltrate and destroy the Church; it will be something gradual and unperceived.
- From the same apparition: “The Vicar of my Son will suffer a great deal, because for a while the Church will yield to a persecution, a time of darkness, and the Church will witness a frightful crisis.”
- “In the Third Secret is predicted, among other things, that The Great Apostasy in the Church will begin at the top.”<sup>1</sup> Our Lady of Fatima, according to Cardinal Mario Luigi Cappi, theologian for the pontifical household from 1955 to 1989.
- According to Fr. Joaquin Alonso, the official archivist of Fatima, the third secret tells of “internal struggles in the womb of the Church and of grave pastoral negligence by the upper hierarchy [and] deficiencies of the upper hierarchy of the Church.”<sup>2</sup>

#### The trajectory

- Resistance: For hundreds of years, popes consistently and clearly identified and condemned the Church’s enemies and their respective schools of thought.
- Infiltration: Nonetheless, these enemies began to make inroads into the Church, as the Blessed Mother foretold and popes acknowledged.
- Surrender: At Vatican II, these same enemies were embraced and given positions of prominence and influence, as their praise of the council confirms.
- Diffusion: The post-Vatican II Church would now diffuse these errors to all of her members, creating the new church schemed by the masons and longed for by the modernists, fulfilling the long-fermenting apostasy.



## **Introduction: “The Blind Leading the Blind...”**

When Jesus foretold His passion, St. Peter said “God forbid, Lord, that such a thing ever happen!” to which Jesus gave the famous retort, “Get thee behind me, Satan! You are judging as men judge, not as God judges!” This verse is worth bearing in mind for a few reasons:

- Peter was acting contrary to Christ, yet he was sincere. He truly believed he was acting in Jesus’ best interests. Likewise, at least some of the agents of the apostasy, even those at the top, may sincerely believe that they were and are acting in the best interests of Jesus.
- It is precisely because Peter is thinking like a worldlyling that he is rebuked. Likewise, the great apostasy is built upon worldliness; a worldly view with worldly goals for a worldly Church, with the supernatural and eternal life relegated to the footnotes.
- Yet, Peter is not excused. Christ had just spoken a prophecy, not suggested a possibility. Likewise, the agents of the apostasy in the Church had two thousand years of history, tradition and doctrine which they disregarded in favor of their own worldly categories, and they had the constant witness of two centuries worth of popes condemning the same errors which they embraced. Liberalism’s hallmark of incoherence, as well as our Lady of LaSalette’s description of the “dimming of intellects” seem plainly manifest in the Vatican II Church, as men who sincerely believe they are working for Christ instead hasten the apostasy.

Sr. Lucia [Fatima] said, “the worst is that he [the Devil] has succeeded in leading into error and deceiving souls having a heavy responsibility through the place which they occupy...! They are blind men guiding other blind men...”<sup>3</sup> This topic will be furthered examined in the section, “I Will Not Lead.”

### **The Smoke of Satan**

This incoherence is perhaps best manifested in Pope Paul VI’s now famous statement, “from somewhere or other the smoke of Satan has entered the temple of God.”<sup>4</sup> He likewise recognized the Church as being in a state of self-destruction. These statements are sometimes hailed as prophetic and heroic, yet they are nothing of the sort, as they betray an intrinsic deficiency among liberals: a remarkable inability to grasp the laws of cause and effect. The smoke of Satan did not enter “through a crack,” as Pope Paul suggested; the doors were flung wide open by the pope himself, and Satan was invited in. The Church’s enemies dictated the terms of the council, wielded heavy influence over its deliberations and documents, and were given the power to destroy the ancient Mass and replace it with their own protestantized, Masonic substitute. And so Pope Paul lamented the destruction in the Church, never seeming to grasp his own egregious contribution to it. He is not the only one to have publicly acknowledged the disaster that Vatican II unleashed...

## **Part I: The Council as a Force of Destruction**

*“I have come to the conclusion, if I am to write truly, that I shun every assembly of bishops, for I have never seen a good end come of any council, because, so far from bringing about the diminution of evil, they have augmented it.”* -St. Gregory Nazianzus

- “In many areas the Council has not so far given us peace but rather stirred up troubles and problems that in no way serve to strengthen the Kingdom of God within the Church or within its souls.”<sup>5</sup>

- Pope Paul VI

“It was believed that after the council a sunny day in the Church’s history would dawn, but instead there came a day of clouds, storms and darkness.”<sup>6</sup>

- Pope Paul VI

- “The opening to the world became a veritable invasion of the Church by worldly thinking. This invasion deprives the Church of its power to oppose the world and robs it of its own specific character.”<sup>7</sup>

- Paul VI

- “Doubt has entered our conscience, and it has entered through windows that were supposed to be opened to the light instead...”<sup>8</sup>

- Paul VI, June 29, 1972

- “Profane and secular humanism has shown itself in its own terrible stature and has in a sense defied the Council. The religion of God made man has come up against the religion of a man who makes himself God.”<sup>9</sup>

- Pope Paul VI

- “The Church is in a disturbed period of self-criticism, or what would better be called self-destruction. It is an acute and complicated upheaval which nobody would have expected after the council. It is almost as if the Church were attacking herself.”<sup>10</sup>

- Pope Paul VI

This constitutes nothing less than an admission by the Pope himself that an apostasy is underway. The Church’s enemies had been trying to destroy her for two thousand years; yet now a Pope has conceded that it is the Church acting as her own enemy. If this does not warrant the adjective “Great” with the current apostasy, whatever would? Here is repeated an even more startling admission

- [In assessing the council’s fruits,] “One must learn how to discern them carefully from everything that may instead come originally from the ‘prince of this world.’ This discernment in

implementing the council's work is especially necessary in view of the fact that the council opened itself widely to the contemporary world..."<sup>11</sup>

- Pope John Paul II

It is unprecedented and truly stunning that a Pope has to warn that a council gave inroads to Satan to corrupt the Church. Now, the faithful are somehow supposed to know how to discern the evil one's effects, even though a council itself allowed them to take root. Some of those diabolical fruits were described as follows by the same pope...

- "We must admit realistically and with feelings of deep pain, that Christians today in a large measure feel lost, confused, perplexed and even disappointed; ideas opposed to truth which has been revealed and always taught are being scattered abroad in abundance; heresies, in the full and proper sense of the word, have been spread in the area of dogma and morals, creating doubts, confusion, and rebellions."<sup>12</sup>
- "The image of the Church of modern times has changed, and is characterized by the fact that it has become, and will continue to become still more, the Church of pagans; no longer the Church of pagans who have become Christians, as she used to be, but the Church of pagans who still call themselves Christians. Paganism is at home today in the Church, and that is typical of the Church of modern times as well as of the new paganism, which both involve a paganism in the Church and a Church in whose heart paganism dwells. We are not speaking here of that paganism which has become a united front against the Church in the Eastern countries...But we mean that much more typical phenomena of our time which constitutes the real threat for Christians, namely paganism within the Church, the 'abomination of desolation in the holy place'" (Mark 13:14).<sup>13</sup>

This observation was made by Cardinal Ratzinger in 1969. It is amazing in light of its proximity to the close of the council; the Cardinal could have had no idea how far it would go. While recognizing the threat of pagans within Church, he could not have dreamed that a future pope himself would declare overt pagans to be a part of the church, participating in their rituals and offering them Catholic altars on which to offer their pagan sacrifices.

- The same Cardinal would concede in an interview many years later, "It is incontestable that the last twenty years have been decidedly unfavorable for the Church," as we went on to describe the post-conciliar Church as being in "a continuing process of decay."<sup>14</sup>

Despite these sober, realistic assessments, true to the liberal prerequisite of incoherence, the same Council has been the recipient of a relentless propaganda campaign wherein the faithful are reassured, ad nauseam, that the "fruits of the Council" are irrefutable and overwhelmingly positive, never quite mustering any data to support this fictional assertion. We will read more of this in the chapter "Even the Elect Will Be Led Astray."

## **Part II: The Papacy Attacks Itself**

Pope Leo XIII was one of those popes who labored against modernity within the Church, as well as the persecutions of the liberal states that were systematically eliminating her from social and cultural life, while harassing clergy in every conceivable way. Throughout it all, even though he would concede later in life that the recovery of the Papal States and the Pope's rightful sovereignty seemed improbable, he never lost sight of the divine and irrevocable loftiness of his office. Likewise, he reminded apostate Christendom of all that they owed to the Papacy:

"Now, if we consider the labors of the Papacy, what can be more unjust than to deny the great and glorious services rendered to the whole civilized world by the Bishops of Rome? Our predecessors, in securing the good of nations, never hesitated to face struggles of every kind, to undergo any amount of labor, to expose themselves to bitter troubles. With their eyes fixed on Heaven, they did not quail before the threats of the wicked, nor allow either flattery or bribes to elicit from them an assent which would prove them to be degenerate or unworthy of their office."<sup>15</sup>

Pope Leo offered no apologies for what he was, either in words or by unbecoming actions, nor did he beg forgiveness for the liberal version of history which portrayed his predecessors as the enemies of civilization rather than its defenders and promoters. Instead, he told the truth in Christ, and reminded Europe that it was the rejection of the Papacy and the Church, not their influence, that brought society to its ruin. "It was the glory of the Popes that they placed themselves, with inflexible constancy, like a wall and a bulwark to prevent human society from falling back into the ancient superstition and savagery. Would to God that this salutary authority had never been neglected or repudiated! Then, assuredly, civil sovereignty itself would not have lost that august and sacred character which religion had bestowed upon it, and which alone gave to the obedience of the subject its worth and nobility; nor should we have witnessed so many rebellions and wars which have filled the earth with blood and misery; nor would realms formerly most prosperous and powerful be now fallen down to the depths of helplessness and oppressed by calamities of every kind."<sup>16</sup>

Pope Leo spoke of the tragic consequences of rejecting the Papacy and Catholic States, and this was before the carnage of two World Wars, the holocaust, and the slaughter of tens of millions by Communist Russia. Amid all of the Church's apologies for the past, has a post-Vatican II pope ever spoken so clearly and, yes, proudly (as it is truly boasting "in Christ"), like Leo, and reminded Europe that none of these things would have happened had she remained true to her Catholic foundation? Rather, the very movements which led to these atrocities (and deliberately caused them) are now deemed the most suitable architects for the "New Humanity," and the Church embraces them, perhaps with the hopes of being their chaplain. These historical scourges left the world eager to build a civilization where such things would no longer occur, yet, the Church decided to join in with this globalist chorus of collective ignorance, not reminding the world, perhaps no longer believing herself, that the order of the world they were so eager to leave behind and stigmatize would, in fact, have prevented these things from ever happening in the first place.

These reflections likewise are relevant in the unit which deals with the Vatican II Church's contempt for the past; for now, I would just ask the reader to take note and, yes, be edified by the words of Pope Leo,

his surety of his office, his conviction that Catholicism and the Papacy were the solution to the world's problems, rather than contributors, his belief that a world centered on Christ is better than a world without Him and, yes, by Divine mandate that world rested on the shoulders of His Vicar. How refreshing it would be for the few remaining Catholics to hear similar words today.

Every movement of apostasy and schism in the history of the Church has been hostile to the papacy, as it was the pope who opposed them and upheld the true doctrine. Yet, wouldn't it stand to reason that in the Great Apostasy, it would be the popes themselves who doubt the papacy, as Mary foretold? Not every schismatic believed the papacy should not exist, just that it was not what Catholic doctrine taught. Likewise, the post-Vatican II popes, while not "dis-believing" in their office per se, have gone a long way towards emptying it of its substance. As Pope Paul observed that the Church was attacking itself, is it not unreasonable to hold that the Papacy, as part of that Church, was doing the same? This was the Catholic Church called for by the masons; using the same name, retaining the same appearance, but robbed of its substance and replaced by a counterfeit. A curious incident from the council was a sign of even more curious things to come...

In his biography of Pope John Paul II, George Weigel related a story about a private discussion Pope Paul had with his advisors. He was aware of the anti-papal strain being adopted by the council and wanted to combat it. He suggested that the sentence, "The Pope is answerable to God alone," should be added to the document in question. His advisors, however, had to correct him and inform him that the Pope is in fact answerable to two thousand years of doctrine and tradition. Now the reader may think, 'this shows that Pope Paul had too *grandiose* a sense of the papacy, not too little, as the author is suggesting.' Yet, as will be more fully developed in a subsequent chapter, this embodies the intrinsic incoherence of liberalism; the Vatican II popes consistently denied the genuine nature of their office on one hand, and on the other betrayed a hubris of cosmic proportions in abusing their power to do things they had no right whatsoever to do. However, two points from this episode are relevant:

- That the Council sought to undermine the papacy was recognized by even a liberal Pope.
- In Paul VI, the Church had a Pope who actually *needed to be told what a pope was* by his advisors!

The acts of the Council actually confirm the anti-papal forces which dominated. The drafts for the document "Lumen Gentium" sought to water down the full authority of the Papacy by employing a favorite corrosive buzzword of liberals, "collegiality." As liberal council members freely admitted, they inserted ambiguous words in the documents which they could later exploit to their own ends; collegiality was one of them. Even Paul VI noticed this and, despite his own liberal beliefs, recognized the future threat to the rightful authority of the Pope. For this reason, he issued a "nota praevia," a preface, to clarify the concept of collegiality. This is significant in that it embodies a number of sad realities surrounding the council:

- Forces in the council, forces powerful enough to effect the final draft of a major document, sought to undermine the papacy.

- The Council's disrespect for the Pope as well as his absolute impotence in the face of their rebuffs is made clear in the fact that, what a pope decreed to be placed at the *beginning* of the document was only inserted as a footnote *at the end*.
- This episode also betrays the incompetence of the council fathers and the insipid, indecisive, feeble nature of their documents. As Mr. Amerio rightfully observed, "It seems inexplicable, after so many consultations, corrections and revisions and the acceptance and rejection of so many amendments, that the council should issue a doctrinal document so imperfect as to require an explanatory note at the very moment of its promulgation."<sup>17</sup>

An anecdotal summary of the attitude underlying this episode played itself out during the council. The bishops were unhappy that Pope Paul had rightfully used his supreme apostolic authority to influence a document, and gave vent to their poutiness; the St. Louis Review reported the following scene on Nov. 21, 1964:

"As Pope Paul was carried into St. Peter's on his sedia gestatoria, he passed between the two rows of 2100 stonily silent bishops. No applause from the bishops' stalls greeted him. Even as the Pope made a simple blessing sign, only one in ten of the bishops crossed themselves. Newsmen witnessing the scene double-checked with each other about what they were seeing."<sup>18</sup>

The following points are relevant:

- True to modernism, these bishops betrayed their protestant belief that the papacy is about the man, not the office. The refusal to accept a blessing from the Vicar of Christ shows their disdain for his office, a disregard for the sign of the Cross bordering on contempt, and a disbelief in the grace conferred by the Apostolic Blessing. To them, he was nothing more than John Montini, with whom they were not well pleased.
- Their infantile rebellion, not caring that they gave scandal to onlookers, would be unacceptable in mere school children. Coming from "Successors to the Apostles" and the "Fathers of an Ecumenical Council," it gave clear evidence of the sad caliber of men to whom so great a task had been entrusted. Thirty years ago Pope Pius XI had been warned that, given the caliber of the world's bishops, a council was a bad idea; the intervening decades brought no improvement. It is no wonder that soon after a Pope would have to warn the faithful about the fruits of Satan emanating from the council.

Before becoming Pope, John XXIII likewise displayed his disregard for the sacred symbols of the papacy and all that they embodied. As nuncio in Paris, he was paid a visit by his friend Dom Beauduin, reprimanded by The Holy Office for his modernism. Dom Beauduin recalled how he was brusquely escorted into a chair that was on a platform, and that Roncalli was laughing heartily at the scene, and he came to realize that he had been seated on the Papal throne which is to be found in the residence of all legates. The future pope's use of a symbol of the papal sovereignty as a mere prop for his own jokes was sadly more than just a misguided attempt at humor; history would show it was prophetic, as he would use the papacy to promote heretics and debase the authority of his own office.<sup>19</sup>

### Attacking the doctrine of the Papacy

We have already discussed the surrendering of the Papal tiara (whose earliest mention was in 708) as a symbolic act of surrender and subservience by the pope towards the modern world which rejected the Church's teachings about her supreme office; now we will see how the Papacy has sought to deny its own essence on the doctrinal level.

- Matthew, chapter 16, "You are Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church..."

As has always been the doctrine of the Church, the "rock" upon which Jesus built His Church was Peter and his successors. To justify their rejection of the Papacy, the protestant response was that the "rock" was merely Peter's profession of Faith, "you are the Christ, the Son of the living God," not Peter himself. This is pure fiction in light of the verse itself; Jesus is clearly referring to Peter (literally, rock), and that is why he changed his name from Simon. The Church has always taught (with the explicit stamp of infallibility at Vatican I) that Peter *alone* was the object of Christ's words. Even Vatican II, despite its already noted anti-Papal leanings, cited this same verse in teaching that Jesus built His Church upon blessed Peter, the leader of the Apostles.<sup>20</sup> Yet, despite this affirmation of the Church's constant teaching, the apostasy was in motion "at the top..." and being diffused to every level.

- The Feast of the Chair of Peter, celebrated on February 22, is a commemoration of Peter's primacy over the universal Church, as conferred by Christ. Yet, the opening prayer reads, "All-powerful Father, you have built your Church on *the rock of St. Peter's confession of faith*." On the very feast honoring the primacy of the Pope, the Church is mandated to *pray a heresy*, a heresy which undermines the office of the Papacy it is supposed to be celebrating! Indeed, "the apostasy in the Church will begin at the top..."
- The Catechism of the Catholic Church: the incoherence of liberalism marches on...

Pope John Paul described the Catechism as a "sure norm" for teaching the faith, but let's not be so sure after all, as this catechism also lays the groundwork for the current and future apostasy by undermining the papacy.

In paragraph 424, the heresy from above is repeated: "On the rock of this faith confessed by St. Peter, Christ built his Church." (These words were not confessed by Peter, but by Simon, whose name was changed to Peter, Rock, *after* speaking them; especially in this context, the distinction matters). Using a typical modernist tactic, the Catechism even references Pope Leo the Great in support of this heresy in order to give itself the semblance of orthodoxy. The letter cited, however, in no way supports this protestant notion; rather, it upholds true doctrine, as truly great

Popes always have. As Pope Leo wrote, “he was ordained before the rest in such a way that from his being called the Rock, from his being pronounced the Foundation, from his being constituted the Doorkeeper of the kingdom of heaven, from his being set as the Umpire to bind and to loose, whose judgments shall retain their validity in heaven, from all these mystical titles we might know the nature of his association with Christ.”<sup>21</sup>

- Yet, true to the incoherence of liberalism and the schizophrenia of the post-Vatican II Church, one can read in the same Catechism (552, 881), that it was in fact Peter, not his confession of faith, upon which Jesus built His Church. In fact, 881 goes so far as to prohibit a double interpretation of this verse which would allow one to say that Christ meant both things, by specifying that Christ made Peter *alone* the rock of His Church.

While Orwell was not a prophet of the great apostasy, his “double-speak” would certainly be a fitting moniker for these shenanigans. A faithful Catholic who read the heresy in 424 could have his troubled mind assuaged by being directed to the subsequent orthodox citations, while the apostate and those who will try to lead the faithful astray are also armed with the same book, which the “great” Pope himself has called a “sure norm” for teaching the faith. A protestant arguing this point with a Catholic can now pull out the Catholic’s catechism to prove the protestant position! Indeed, the apostasy has begun at the top.

- The post-Vatican II Church also undermines the Papacy, therefore the entire Church, in repeatedly asserting that the notion that the Orthodox churches must reconcile with Rome is “outdated.” In short, this is a full endorsement of Apostasy. This teaching explicitly puts forth the Church as founded by Christ as being “obsolete,” and those who reject the Church as Christ established it as being indeed correct. One example is the Balamand Statement (cited with approval by John Paul II in “Ut Unum Sint”), which reads, “The Catholic Churches [Churches? Are there now more than one?] and the Orthodox Churches recognize each other as sister Churches, responsible together for maintaining the Church of God in fidelity to the divine purpose...”<sup>22</sup> Again, this statement indicates that the “divine purpose” was not to have *a* Church, but churches, some founded on Peter, some not, yet somehow equal partners in the work of salvation. Yet again, the words “apostasy” and “incoherence” are entirely in order.
- As with Pope Paul VI in the anecdote already cited from the Council, John Paul also gave cause for the faithful to question how well he grasped the divine foundation and nature of his own office. In 2001 he offered these troubling, almost pathetic thoughts: “With rigorous and serene theological research, with constant imploring for the light of the spirit, we will be able to address even the most difficult and seemingly insurmountable questions in so many of our ecumenical dialogues, as, for example, that of the Bishop of Rome.”<sup>23</sup> First of all, the Vicar of Christ now limits himself to being merely “The Bishop of Rome;” yes, a completely legitimate title, but also the preferred one of liberals, as it suggests that the Pope’s authority is in no way universal. Secondly, a truth which has been clearly taught by the Church as having been revealed by God is now reduced to a “seemingly insurmountable question.” If the Pope feels that way about his own office, who could he possibly expect to follow him in his exercise of it?



### **Papal Subservience**

By a series of symbolic gestures, both Pope Paul VI and Pope John Paul II demonstrated that, unlike their predecessors throughout the ages, they did not ascribe to the high and noble regard given to their office. Here are but a few examples:

- When meeting the Metropolitane Melitone, a mere envoy of the schismatic Patriarch of Constantinople Demetrius, Pope Paul VI kissed his feet.<sup>24</sup>
- On March 23, 1966, Paul VI put on the finger of Dr. Ramsey, the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, his new “conciliar ring” and then imparted, together with him, the “blessing” to those present.
  - Dr. Ramsey, as an Anglican, did not possess true holy orders, therefore is not capable of conferring blessings, yet Paul VI participated in this simulation, implying the blessing of a layman wrongly believing himself a bishop was equal to that of the Pope.
  - Dr. Ramsey was a freemason, a sworn enemy of the Church, now honored, endowed with gifts, and legitimized in his delusion that he is a priest by the Vicar of Christ himself.
- When meeting with the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, Pope John Paul II kissed his ring.
  - The kissing of an ecclesiastical ring is a sign of subservience by an inferior. Again, apart from debasing his own office, the Pope was either dissenting from the Catholic doctrine that Anglicans are not true priests, or guilty of the sin of falsification by “playing along” with this man’s delusion that he is an actual bishop.
  - The Archbishop in question was pro-sodomy, pro-abortion, and a practicing Druid. That the Vicar of Christ would condescend to grovel to him in this way goes beyond merely scandalous to truly disgusting.

### **True & False Humility**

At the beginning of this section were some thoughts on Peter’s false charity; while he thought his love of Christ to be genuine, it was, in fact the opposite, as his worldliness deceived him. Likewise, I believe the same could be said of attempts by the Vatican II popes to be humble; their humility was anything but, and it was their worldliness that deceived them, to the grave detriment of their office and the Church. As Catholics have known throughout the ages, it is the office, not the man, which is worthy of reverence. Of course, the ideal as well as the expectation should be that the man who holds the office should rise to the occasion in his personal life as well. Yet, every man who holds ecclesial office should firmly believe in its dignity and authority; it is himself he should doubt.

G.K. Chesterton noted in his book Orthodoxy: “But what we suffer from today is humility in the wrong place. Modesty has moved from the organ of ambition. Modesty has settled upon the organ of conviction, where it was never meant to be. A man was meant to be doubtful about himself, but undoubting about the truth; this has been exactly reversed.” The false humility that has gripped the Vatican II Church embodies this reversal; men now have complete confidence in themselves as individuals (in line with Luther’s “My Will Is Enough”), yet harbor grave doubts about their office, the nature of which is an article of faith (see the unit “I Will Not Lead”).

As will be discussed in the section “Even the Elect Will Be Led Astray,” immediately upon the death of John Paul II there was a mad rush to canonize him, even if only on the level of editorials. One of his “virtues” was his humility, yet the commentators themselves betrayed this false understanding of humility, and embodied a defining characteristic of the apostasy; a wrongly imagined sense of superiority to the past. John Paul, they opined, was clearly more humble than his stuffy predecessors, as he disliked having his ring kissed and other protocols which, for centuries, demonstrated the reverence one should have for the Vicar of Christ. Yet, this only demonstrated that *he thought it was about himself, not the office he bore*. Karol Wojtyla, presumably trying to be humble, wanted to deflect being so honored; yet, it was the Pope whom people sought to honor, not the man who happened to be Pope. It was not “The Ring of John Paul II” that the faithful rightfully sought to venerate, it was “The Ring of The Fishermen,” St. Peter, whose present successor John Paul happened to be. The truly humble thing would be to accept that, as St. Paul wrote, “By the grace of God, I am what I am,” and allow people not only the privilege, but in fact the duty of showing proper respect to the world’s highest authority. When Karol Wojtyla became Pope, it seems that at times he thought the Papacy became Karol Wojtyla, a topic to be treated in a later section.

Immediately upon the election of a Pope, the Cardinals present approach the throne on which he is seated and offer him their homage. John Paul refused to do this, stating, “I will greet my brothers standing.” Again, the truly humble thing would have been to accept the fact that he was indeed their superior, and allow the ancient rituals to be followed. Yet, just as he felt his personal preferences should trump a centuries old tradition, so he thought his personal identity should trump the doctrine of who the Pope is. So, in insisting only on his equality before the other Cardinals and downplaying his superiority, during his papacy he would rarely if ever discipline bishops, no matter how heretical or incompetent they proved themselves to be. For any cleric, to not recognize the full dignity and responsibility of your office, and to not allow others to recognize it in the proper ways, only serves to weaken the office; the humble man keeps his office strong despite his personal tastes and knowledge of his own unworthiness.

Other manifestations of “Rome Losing the Faith” will be outlined later. At present, this chapter has sought to demonstrate that the prophecies of LaSalette and Fatima seem to have been fulfilled by these clear signs and overt statements revealing that the Papacy has sought to dilute both its own doctrinal foundations and intrinsic nature and dignity. It would only stand to reason that such a loss of the sense of one’s office at the highest level would indeed descend upon the others as well, as the subtle doubts and overt undermining of all that is regarded as sacred would continue once modernity commandeered the Barque of Peter.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Socci, p. 86.
- <sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 54.
- <sup>3</sup> Kramer, p. 34.
- <sup>4</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Audience of June 30, 1972.
- <sup>5</sup> Lefebvre, Archbishop Marcel. "Open Letter to Confused Catholics." Kansas City: Angelus Press, 1986. P. 91.
- <sup>6</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Address of Dec. 7, 1969, cited in Lefebvre, 91.
- <sup>7</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Speech of June 29, 1972.
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>9</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Second Vatican Council, closing speech.
- <sup>10</sup> Lefebvre, "Open Letter," p. 91.
- <sup>11</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Encyclical Letter "Lord and Giver of Life." Vatican City: May 5, 1986.
- <sup>12</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Feb. 7, 1981.
- <sup>13</sup> Ratzinger, Cardinal Joseph. "The New People of God," p. 325.
- <sup>14</sup> L'Osservatore Romano, Dec. 24, 1984.
- <sup>15</sup> Leo XIII, Pope. Encyclical Letter "Inscrutabili." Vatican City: April 21, 1878. No. 7.
- <sup>16</sup> O'Reilly, Right Rev. Bernard. "Life of Leo XIII." England: Sampson Low, Marston & Co. 1903, p. 327.
- <sup>17</sup> Amerio, p. 91.
- <sup>18</sup> Wiltgen, 240.
- <sup>19</sup> Villa, "John XXIII," p. 4.
- <sup>20</sup> Second Vatican Council. "Lumen Gentium," no. 19.
- <sup>21</sup> Pope Leo the Great, Sermon III, Part III
- <sup>22</sup> Ferrara & Woods, p. 46.
- <sup>23</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Address to the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, Nov. 13, 2001.
- <sup>24</sup> Villa, "Paul VI," p. 104.

## Chapter VIII

### **The Dissolution of the Priesthood**

*“When people want to destroy religion, they start by attacking priests, because where there are no priests, there is no sacrifice, and where there is no sacrifice, there is no religion.” -St. John Vianney*

*“The people will not be happy, but the day will come when the last king is strangled with the guts of the last priest.” – The Mason Diderot*

We have just examined the ways in which the Vatican II Popes have contributed to the current apostasy by actively weakening their own office. This has been done doctrinally, liturgically, and by example. The same systematic degradation has extended to the priesthood as well; bear in mind, the agents of the apostasy had this as their explicit goal. Without repeating the full quotes:

- Pope Pius XII stated on May 23, 1958 that laicism (a type of anti-clericalism denying any distinction between priest and layman, and refuting the hierarchical nature of the Church as instituted by Christ) was one of the root causes of the modern apostasy.
- The Freemasons desired to win priests over to modernism and their own program for destroying the Church from within, ideally without their ever realizing that such a betrayal had occurred.
- In his 1925 encyclical “Quas Primas,” Pope Pius XI wrote of “the plague infecting society...the plague of our time is laity, its errors and its impious attempts.”
- “It is the priesthood they [the enemies of the Church] desire to be rid of; that they may clear the way for the destruction of the Church, which has been so often attempted yet never achieved.” Pope Pius XI, Encyclical Ad Catholici Sacerdotti.

#### **Some background**

The Church’s teaching on the priesthood is that a priest is a man whose soul is indelibly configured to Christ and that he bears a supernatural power in order to confer supernatural graces and save souls. The Catechism of The Council of Trent reads:

“In the first place, then, the faithful should be shown how great is the dignity and excellence of this Sacrament [Holy Orders] considered in its highest degree, the priesthood. Bishops and priests being, as they are, God’s interpreters and ambassadors, empowered in His name to teach mankind the divine law and the rules of conduct, and holding, as they do, His place on earth, it is evident that no more noble function than theirs can be imagined. Justly, therefore, are they called not only Angels, but even gods, because of the fact that they exercise in our midst the power and prerogatives of the immortal God.

In all ages, priests have been held in the highest honor; yet the priests of the New Testament far exceed all others. For the power of consecrating and offering the body and blood of our Lord and of forgiving sins, which has been conferred on them, not only has nothing equal to it on earth, but even surpasses human reason and understanding.

And as our Savior was sent by his Father, and as the Apostles and disciples were sent into the whole world by Christ our Lord, so priests are daily sent with the same powers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, and the edifying of the body of Christ.”

St. Francis of Assisi said, “If I should happen at the same time to come upon any saint coming from Heaven and some little poor priest, I would first show honor to the priest, and hurry more quickly to kiss his hands. For I would say to the saint: ‘Hey, St. Lawrence, wait! His hands may handle the Word of Life, and possess something more than human!’” St. John Vianney said, “Leave a parish twenty years without a priest, and they will be worshipping animals.” Priests are essential to the life of the Church, and so unacceptable to those conspiring towards the current apostasy. This is because;

- According to modernity, “nothing is sacred,” hence the priesthood as always understood by the Church must be purged of every notion that the priest is some kind of bridge between the human and divine.
- Those seeking a one world order with a one world church (an explicit goal of the United Nations and many others) would be impeded by a group of men who believe that they are not interchangeable with the ministers of any other religion and that their office is superior due to its divine origin and powers.
- The only hierarchy endorsed by socialism is the existence of two classes: the elitist cadre of tyrants which controls everything, and the rest of vanquished humanity. Therefore...
- “A last tribute to the priesthood is given by the enemies of the Church. For as We have said on a previous page, they show that they fully appreciate the dignity of and importance of the Catholic priesthood by directing against it their first and fiercest blows...The most rabid enemies of the Catholic priesthood are today the very enemies of God; a homage indeed to the priesthood, showing it the more worthy of honor and veneration.” Pope Pius XI, *ad Catholici Sacerdotii*

To get such men to lower themselves to a purely earthly self-understanding would require, not eliminating the Catholic priesthood, but depleting it of its substance. This has been systematically occurring in many ways for decades, and the fruits of this movement within the apostasy are unmistakable. It has already been noted how the communists and masons worked to infiltrate the priesthood, and that part of the Masonic program was to deceive priests into adopting their own humanistic mindset, while letting them believe that nothing has changed (the success of this plan was foretold at LaSalette).

As modernism gained hold within the Church, so did the diluted sense of priesthood. One of the communist influences within the Church was the “Worker Priest Experiment.” Indifferent to their

sacred character and the divine mandates with which their days should have been fully occupied, modernist priests opted to work as layman instead. When Rome banned further activities by the group in 1951, many priests simply quit priesthood and abandoned celibacy, proof that their communist and modernist overlords succeeded in eradicating their own identity. Biographer Alden Hatch wrote that John XXIII was very fond of this movement.

Paul VI's close friend and confidant, Jean Guitton, recounted these words of Paul: "I had an intense vocation to live in the world, to be a layman, as they say today. I did not feel cut out for the clerical life that, at times, seemed to me static, closed, more interested in preserving than promoting, implying the renunciation of earthly tendencies in the measure of its condemnation of the world." This same friend wrote of Paul, "I noticed how his thoughts were of a secular kind. With him, one was not in the presence of a 'clergy,' but of a lay, promoted, unexpectedly, to the papacy."<sup>1</sup> Perhaps these observations reveal in Pope Paul a man whose formation was imbued with the systemic diminution of the priesthood long underway, and the state of the priesthood under his papacy would manifest the effects.

Even at the current time, the priests whom the remaining faithful would qualify as "conservative," offering them the hope that the true faith is reemerging, those who understand this desire to deplete the priesthood of its God-given substance and strive to live in accord with this conviction, often find themselves thinking, speaking, acting and acquiescing in ways which demonstrate just how difficult it is to overcome both the overt inundation and subtle permeation of this spirit of "anti-priesthood" which has for so long been in the very air they breathe. We will now look at some ways in which the Church herself has in recent years sought to dilute, downgrade, and obscure the true nature of the priest.

### Part I: Permanent Deacons

I have known many permanent deacons who are the finest of men; devout, faithful, and driven by a sincere desire to serve Christ and His Church. Yet, I have also known many who are overt heretics, and some who are so clueless that it is difficult to imagine by what standard they could be considered Catholic at all, let alone Catholics who have received some form of "advanced education," sent to shepherd the rest of the flock. However, the gifts or deficiencies of any given deacon, or deacons as a whole, are not the point; the point is the objective reality of the introduction of the permanent diaconate after the Council, the mentality behind it, and the results.

#### Celibacy: From diminishment to elimination

Clerical celibacy has long been a central distinction of the Catholic clergy. Apart from its practical considerations, it is meant to be both a sign and a manifestation of the fact that a priest lives to configure himself more closely to Christ, to be freed from earthly attachments, and to sacrifice present joys and rewards for the world to come. Heretical sects, schismatics and liberals have almost always repudiated celibacy. Now, for the first time since the Catholic Church mandated celibacy, there is a married clergy within the church, the permanent deacon, acting as a type of hybrid between priest and layman.

Using permanent deacons to diminish the value of a celibate clergy, as with every other manner of the apostasy advancing in the Church, is one that quickly progressed down the slippery slope. For the first

time in a millennia and a half the Church ordained married men, and shortly thereafter, for the *first time ever*, ordained men were allowed to marry. Note how this also relates to the symptom of the great apostasy by which any manner of sacrifice or restraint is repudiated:

- For centuries a Catholic man beheld two beautiful callings: the married state and Holy Orders. He had to choose one, and live with his choice all his life. Now, true to Western narcissism, a man is no longer compelled to choose, but may claim both while sacrificing nothing.
- As has often happened, when the wife of a permanent dies he is afforded a dispensation by which he can remarry, something previously unheard of in the Church.
- The disintegration between states of life and the conviction that a man should make no firm commitment has been further endorsed by the Church as tens of thousands of priests have received dispensations to marry, and divorced men have in turn become priests.

### The diaconate and the minimization of the priesthood

As we read in the Acts of the Apostles, the role of the first deacons was to carry out the administrative tasks so that the Apostles could be free for their sacred duties. In most parishes, the opposite happens. Deacons carry out the work of the priests, leaving priests to chair meetings, manage the business, and oversee the maintenance of the parish. In most cases, demonstrating the two-fold effectiveness of the underlying agenda, the parish priest is grateful for this state of affairs. It is the deacon who is sent to pray the vigil at funeral homes, offer the graveside blessing, lead novenas and holy hours, and conduct sacramental preparation. The priest is, all too often, relieved to not have to perform these tasks. Doing these things would mean missing a parish council meeting or cutting short his day off, two “absolutes” which should only be violated under the direst of circumstances. These observations are meant to be judgmental, but of the state of affairs, not the priests in question. Many of these priests are fine men, who genuinely love their people; yet, the success in eroding their own identity and getting the priests themselves to regard their work as superfluous and even burdensome, to be “outsourced” whenever possible, is evidenced time and again, day after day, parish after parish. “How can I work this into my schedule” regarding things so essential to the pastoral ministry is quickly circumvented by, “great – I’ll just get the deacon to do it.” It is often an instinctive response, elicited from a subconscious long since conditioned to react in such a way.

This minimalization is most apparent during Mass. A deacon gives the sermon as the priest sits idly by. The deacon recites parts of the Mass and proclaims the Gospel, which, quite obviously, the priest could just as readily do. The underlying motif is apparent; if a priest doesn’t have to do something, then he shouldn’t. The efforts to minimize the priest have borne fruit, as a minimal number of men now seek priesthood.

My own experience offers an example that is not uncommon in how the diaconate has diluted the priesthood and diminished the number of priests. In the parish where I was assigned as a transitional deacon, a young man looked into the seminary program. When faced with the necessary sacrifices, he

decided against it. Ten years later he re-introduced himself to me along with his wife and two children. He informed me that he had just been ordained a permanent deacon and, of course, thought it was his place to call me by my first name. This is just one example of how the message sent has been received: why sacrifice? I can have it all. Now, he can drive to church with his wife, dress in his liturgical vestments and preach to his own children, enjoying the benefits of Holy Orders and a layman all at the same time. No Cross of Christ required, just the best of both worlds.<sup>2</sup>

Ultimately, the deacon is a midway point towards protestantizing the Catholic priesthood. Catholics are now quite comfortable with a married clergy, and the Church now ordains married men and allows the ordained to marry. Such a watering down would be necessary if Catholic priests are to congeal into the amorphous one world religion which is the stated goal of the great apostasy. This is not mere speculation, but a plan well underway...

## **Part II: The Downgrading of the Priesthood**

Just as the Vatican II's relentless program of ecumenism has fostered indifferentism, it stands to reason that the Church would likewise put her ministers on par with others. Again, we will begin by examining an intermediate point towards the dissolution:

### **Ordaining protestant converts to Catholicism**

Upon converting to Catholicism, ministers from protestant denominations are now routinely ordained as Catholic priests. Ironically, as their conversion highlights that they have come to see that Catholicism is indeed the true religion, their subsequent ordination fosters indifferentism and waters down the priesthood in many ways.

This action basically equates protestant ministers with Catholic priests, disregarding the supernatural character of both the priesthood in particular and the Faith as a whole, as it is because they have done similar jobs on the human, external level that they are regarded as good candidates. The fact that their whole lives they have believed and taught heresy, never made a single confession or once received Holy Communion or picked up a rosary in no way prohibits them from achieving Holy Orders in the Church, virtually simultaneously with their conversion. Of course, they keep their families intact, and make no vow of celibacy. St. Hildegard of Bingen wrote that the devil subverts the Church "through subtlety and mockery." Indeed, this is a not so subtle mockery of every Catholic man, lay and ordained...

Why should a protestant convert be entitled to both Holy Orders and a wife and family, but not the Catholic priest? Because the Catholic priest was never non-Catholic. Why should the faithful Catholic layman with a wife and children not likewise be allowed to become a priest? Because he was never a protestant minister. Religious indifferentism is implicit in this practice. The Church is stating that, in the hierarchy of the "Ecumenical, one-world-order-tending Church," the protestant minister, with all of his heresies and errors, denied the graces of Holy Communion and Confession, still ranks ahead of the Catholic layman, and ahead of the Catholic priest in terms of his entitlements. Again, the swiftness of



the slippery slope is manifest: not only is Catholicism no longer above other religions, it would seem that there are penalties attached to its lifelong adherents.

An incident from my life is one I am sure has been played out a million times over. A teenager from a good Catholic family, herself quite devout, told me of the new “married” priest at her parish. He was an Anglican convert, and she told me in her usual bubbly manner, “Now we have a single priest *and* a married priest!” Just like that, the value of celibacy is eradicated from the mind of a faithful Catholic, and it is reduced to an individual’s lifestyle choice. Yes, many faithful Catholics do not care for this triumph of protestantism in the Church, but I have heard many more come to say, “Yeah, why can’t we have married priests?” as the consciousness of the faithful is already conditioned to accept further dilutions and alterations of the priesthood in the future.

### Negotiated conversions

The situation has become so ludicrous, that on occasion protestant ministers would not convert until they were guaranteed to be ordained as Catholic priests after the fact! Not only does this betray their own indifferentism, as they will not convert simply because the Catholic Faith is true, it betrays the erosion of faith on the part of the bishops who ordain them. The insincerity of their conversion is not a factor, and the unmitigated hubris and sense of entitlement they display is by no means an impediment. Again, the supremacy of Protestantism over Catholicism in the minds of bishops is made manifest. If a Catholic man told a bishop he would be willing to go to seminary only if he were guaranteed a specific assignment upon ordination, he would be shown the door; a protestant lays down his conditions for conversion and is told, “but of course.”

### The Vatican II Church & clerical relativism

The Vatican’s posture towards protestant ministers confirms this position of equivalence (if not superiority) of protestant ministers and authentic Catholic priests with valid Holy Orders. In the Directory of Ecumenism, it is stated that, when having joint services with non-Catholics, protestant ministers are to join the Catholics “according to their ecclesial rank.” Yet, according to Catholic doctrine, they have no rank apart from lay non-Catholic. By putting their invalid holy orders on par with the Catholic priesthood, the Vatican II Church is explicitly and formally downgrading her own sacramental theology and her own ministers. In fact, Pope John Paul II repeatedly gave the Catholic symbols of the episcopacy to protestant ministers. Either:

- 1) he genuinely believed they were priests and bishops, contrary to Catholic doctrine, or
- 2) he was guilty of falsification, that is, confirming them in their erroneous belief that they are what they are not or,
- 3) he genuinely saw no distinction, true to the Directory on Ecumenism.

Likewise, true to the Directory’s indifferentist directives, John Paul repeatedly co-led prayer services with protestant “bishops.” Laymen and laywomen, members of heretical sects, who teach that abortion is fine, stood side by side with the Vicar of Christ, gaining his not-so-silent assent to their delusion, and

honoring those who use their imaginary role as truly ordained ministers to advance the Culture of Death in the name of Christ. Truly, Rome has lost the Faith and the Church has doubted, while indifferentism and relativism gain an ever more visible sanction.

### Priests of the Chinese National Catholic Church

This is a schismatic, heretical sect that does not recognize the Primacy of the Papacy, and promotes abortion. The Vatican has given these priests faculties to come to the United States and serve in Catholic parishes, even as their countrymen who are priests for the true Church suffer persecution and imprisonment. Unequivocally, we witness the Vatican II Church legitimizing schism, engaging in a repugnant moral relativism, and mocking her own faithful children who languish in prison while apostates are rewarded with faculties and revenues in the “promised land” of America.

### **Part III: Seminaries**

The most effective means by which to undermine the priesthood is to strike at the source, the seminaries where they are trained. For this reason Masons sought out seminarians, and modernists gained control of most of them (a century ago Pius X conceded they had advanced to key positions)<sup>3</sup>. In doing so, it is no longer a question of getting the clergy to *stop* believing in their supernatural character, but to have them never believe in the first place. The ideal for the modernists and all of the Church’s enemies would be to simply eliminate any potentially orthodox priest before he ever started, rather than having to weed him out later or, worse still, have him “infect” his fellow seminarians with the true faith and authentic piety. This was written of by Archbishop Elden Curtiss, a former seminary rector and vocations director:

“It seems to me that the vocation ‘crisis’ is precipitated and continued by people who want to change the Church’s agenda, by people who do not support orthodox candidates loyal to the magisterial teaching of the pope and bishops, and by people who actually discourage viable candidates from seeking priesthood and vowed religious life as the Church defines these ministries...I am personally aware of certain vocations directors, vocations teams and evaluation boards who turn away candidates who do not support the possibility of ordaining women or who defend the Church’s teaching about artificial birth control, or who exhibit a strong piety toward certain devotions, such as the rosary.”<sup>4</sup>

I can relate to Archbishop Curtiss’ mention of those who scorn Catholic piety and regard those who practice it as undesirable candidates. When I began seminary, on our first day we were “greeted” by the rector. Apparently, somehow in the very act of moving in, seminarians and staff had gleaned that we were a pious bunch, quite a stark contrast in the seminary which, for decades, had been known as “The Pink Palace.” Our “welcome” was an angry lecture on the fact that we weren’t going to last long if we

thought we could change anything and that he would not tolerate seminarians “walking around with rosaries like pious little holy cards.” The derision in his voice as he spoke the word ‘Rosary’ indicated that even to mention the word was as tortuous to him as the splash of holy water upon the possessed.<sup>5</sup>

I could provide numerous stories from my own experience, but instead will simply hope that the reader will accept my testimony that the bishop’s observations are true, and exist on a grand scale. For further reading, I recommend Michael Rose’s “Good Bye, Good Men.” This book investigates the state of many American seminaries, and the fact that they are controlled by anti-clerical factions within the Church. Orthodox, heterosexual candidates are systematically persecuted and weeded out, leaving only those who do not believe in the divine character to be ordained. I and people I know are firsthand witnesses to some of the stories related by Mr. Rose, and they are entirely true.

Yet, despite all of this, a fair number of men make it to Holy Orders having retained their faith and not sacrificed their integrity in the process. These seminaries do all that they can to eliminate such men, but with the counter-leverage of bishops and vocation directors to consider as well as the need for revenue in the face of diminishing enrollments, sometimes they must concede defeat. Yet, oftentimes, it is but a temporary setback...

#### Priesthood: A typical trajectory

It is true that a new wave of bishops and vocations’ directors have emerged who, even if not decidedly orthodox or pious themselves, likewise lack the viciousness and malice which is overt in the liberal wing of the machinery; they have good hearts and don’t regard being orthodox and prayerful as an impediment to Holy Orders.<sup>6</sup> However, the wider concentric circle of the reality persists; the seminarians who made it to ordination in the days when overt homosexuality and public heresy were the rule in seminaries have not disappeared, and in fact remain as empowered as ever, albeit the boundaries have shifted and their tactics have necessarily responded to the change in climate. (Many would like to think that this sad reality ended with the 70’s, but it was on April 24, 2002, that Bishop Wilton Gregory, head of the USCCB, had to concede, “It is an ongoing struggle to make sure the Catholic priesthood is not dominated by homosexual men”). Orthodox seminarians who have to “lay low” and endure the persecutions (some petty, some severe) of their modernist faculties console one another with the hope that, once they are priests, the shackles will be removed and they can live, practice and speak the faith freely. There is some extent to which this is true, yet, a greater extent to which it is not. Ironically, bishops tend to foster close relationships with their seminarians and this gives the seminarian a sense of surety that he would be “backed up” if he were badgered for an unjust reason. Yet, while these bishops, will on occasion protect a seminarian from seminary faculties and rectors, they often become quite timid and strangely silent in terms of their own diocesan-machinery, composed of liberals of a different ilk, who always seem to find their way to the key “levers” of the machine. I have heard many a young priest describe how, after ordination, he felt “fed to the wolves” by the bishop who once seemed so paternal, yet now kept a safe distance, as the new priest had to fend for himself.

Again, dear reader, I apologize for the excessively anecdotal nature of this section; such “resources” seem inconsistent with the grave matter of this work and the reference of primary sources I have tried to

rely upon. However, in the day to day workings of the Church, this is where the apostasy happens and the means by which it is achieved, as perhaps you have encountered in your own parishes and experiences. The next means of attack upon the newly-ordained, orthodox priest comes in the form of his first assignment. Those who could be neither “fixed” nor weeded-out in seminary are typically sent to an assignment deliberately chosen to orchestrate a combative and demoralizing environment for the new priest. Not atypically, diocesan chanceries have contact people in such parishes who regularly offer negative reports, and the newly ordained priest quickly finds himself (although never told the fact or the reason) on the “never a pastor” list.<sup>7</sup>

The explosion of nuns and laywomen who now run parishes is the most obvious example of the convergence of these many elements. In most dioceses where this happens, it is not the shortage of priests that precipitates this; there are still many available who could become pastors of those parishes. However, since they are on the “never a pastor list,” this will never happen. In one archdiocese, as is to be expected, the local newspaper ran bold headlines and lengthy stories about this state of affairs when the first wave of “pastoral life directors” was named. When interviewing one of the new “lay-pastoreesses” the woman told of a “religious conversion” she had had three years earlier. Now, that same year, eight seminarians were ordained for that diocese, and that after six years of formal formation and their own “religious conversion” some years before that. Yet, none of these eight were deemed fit to be a pastor, and a lay-woman who had a “conversion” the very year they were ordained was deemed a more suitable “pastor” by the “conservative” Cardinal who technically ran the diocese. The Cardinal was quoted at length in the articles as to what a wonderful, positive state of affairs this was; a fruit of the New Springtime of the Second Vatican Council! This scenario is played out time and again, diocese after diocese, revealing the advancement of the apostasy in overt fashion.

- Both anti-clericalism and anti-Catholicism are explicit, as it is because of his “Catholic” understanding of priesthood that the conservative priest is deemed unfit.
- “I Will Not Lead” – A symptom to be discussed in a later chapter, demonstrating the systematic renunciation of authority and responsibility on the part of the Church’s shepherds.
- Laicism: Most parishes which have a “pastoral life director” for a pastor also have a priest officially named as the “sacramental provider.” Hence, the reverse hierarchy of liberalism is unabashedly manifested by the bishop, as a priest is now the employee of a laywoman.
- The previous point also highlights the active promotion of a priestless Church: if a priest is available to be the “sacramental provider,” he obviously could be named the pastor. Even if other duties prohibited him from being a fulltime presence in the parish, the “lay-pastoreess” could be hired as *his assistant*, not vice versa. Yet, that would not advance the agenda of liberals, so the emasculated priest has to learn his place and do what he is told. I could relate numerous stories of such priests who, when complaining to the chancery that the Masses they had to offer were rife with abuses mandated by his governess, were told to “obey” the orders of their superior. Hence, “My Will is Enough” (a chapter to come) for any liberal in any place of authority, and the lay-pastoreess holds a higher place in the hierarchy than the Vatican itself, as

she is free to contradict its mandates with the full support of the emasculated bishop and his anti-clerical chancery.

- The triumph of liberalism could not be more overt. In my diocese and, from what I gather, in most, only liberal women need apply for such positions. For the bishop to appoint a man is not divergent enough from the priesthood he seeks to eradicate, and to appoint a conservative would slow down the avalanche-like speed of the dissolution of the faith.

#### **Part IV: Clerical Abuse**

The term “clerical abuse” is usually associated with the sexual abuse of minors by priests (the seriousness of which I in no way intend to diminish), yet, the far more pervasive, albeit disparate in gravity, reality is that priests are the recipients of abuse by the same churchmen and church entities always crying out in sanctimonious hypocrisy for “the rights of man,” “freedom of conscience,” and “the dignity of the human person.” Again, my intent is to delineate a clear parallel, not suggest interchangeability; the mentality behind this clerical abuse is the same mentality behind the abortion-rights lobby. The fact that a fetus is, by every scientific and biological standard, a living human being cannot be denied, despite any propaganda to the contrary. Ultimately, those who promote abortion can state as their only honest justification the child’s complete and utter dependence on the mother. By this same mentality priests are repeatedly and unabashedly abused by bishops and their chanceries. A priest is absolutely helpless as an individual, as he can do nothing as a priest whatsoever without a mandate from or at least the permission of his bishop and, like the unborn child, he has no recourse when attacked. In short, bishops and chanceries overtly abuse their power over priests simply because they can. They documented cases which prove this reality could (and probably should) be a hefty tome unto itself.<sup>8</sup>

Pope John Paul II once noted the hypocrisy of the prevailing pseudo-liberal machinery in that they incessantly employ enlightenment rhetoric of “the rights of man” in an unprecedented manner when it is precisely the overlords of these same entities who violate these same rights in an historically unequaled fashion.<sup>9</sup> Yet, it would seem that the Pope did not recognize this same reality, with the same unabashed hubris, being carried out within the Church entrusted to him in the same unprecedented manner. In fact, in the same sad fashion of all of the Vatican II popes, John Paul openly lamented realities to which he himself gave legal sanction, never seeming to grasp the laws of cause and effect he set in motion.

#### **The New Code of Canon Law**

In accord with the dignity of their divine office and their necessity for the salvation of souls, as well as the dictates of simple justice, priests were always afforded their appropriate rights within the Church. While all through the history of the Church you will surely find examples of priests denied their due rights through the hubris and injustice of their superiors, the 1983 code marks the first time that most of their rights were simply revoked. Even the few rights which remain are never enforced, and it has fallen to numerous associations of faithful laymen to defend priests who are systematically and unabashedly

denied their rights and abused by their bishops.<sup>10</sup> Within the Church, priests are now treated as they had been by heretical sects in ages past. Not only are they afforded no particular rights by virtue of their office, they are afforded less rights than liberal society affords their actual criminals. This comment is not in regards to abusive or criminal behavior, but simply the day to day running of the Church.

The anecdotes are infinite, and the documentation is readily available. I will limit myself to a couple of examples that concern Cardinals who are actually regarded among the “conservative” appointees of John Paul II. One chancery priest was threatened by his Cardinal Archbishop because he simply informed a priest of the rights he had under Canon Law, rights the Cardinal was brazenly disregarding. Another priest wanted to read his personnel file and informed the Cardinal that it was his right. “Not in my archdiocese,” was the answer. The anti-clericalism of modernity has found itself enshrined in the Canon Law of the Vatican II Church, but even that doesn’t matter since, true to the spirit of the Apostasy, virtually every bishop is “a law unto himself.” I have known many priests who had negative reports about them given to their chancery which were total fabrications. Not only would the chancery official not tell him the source (a right the priest allegedly has), guilt is always presumed, regardless of the priest’s response and the evidence (or lack thereof) at hand.

### The Divinization of Psychology

If you would indulge me in a brief historical detour, when Russian operatives were training American Communists to undermine American society and control the minds of citizens, psychology was their primary tool. The following is a direct quote from the manual they gave to their agents: “The psychiatrist is aptly suited for this role [subverting minds, extracting obedience, and destroying the lives of those they can’t control] for his brutalities are committed in the name of science and are inexplicably complex, and entirely out of view of human understanding...As long as the psychopolitical operative or his dupes are the only authorities as to the difference between sanity and insanity, their word as to the therapeutic value of such treatment will be the final word. No layman would dare adventure to place judgment upon the state of sanity of an individual whom the psychiatrist has already declared insane, and the individual himself is unable to complain.”<sup>11 12</sup>

It could be argued that simply because the Communists misused a legitimate discipline, as they did with virtually every discipline, that does not render it void of any genuine and useful application. This is fair enough, yet the same framework, mentality, and tactics are still employed, as we see demonstrated time and again. The Communist plan relied upon the self-granted superiority of “the expert,” allowing them to create a closed world, entirely under their control, with no external standard to which they could be held accountable or even questioned. The essential part of the charade is getting everyone else to play along, to obey, because they are “the experts,” so who are we to disagree? Ours is not to question why, ours is to obey or die. We see this liberal tactic time and again in society; climate control “experts,” financial “experts,” environmental “experts,” tenured academics, living in their self-created, self-defined, self-sustaining world, appealing to their own expertise which, of course, no outsider is allowed to question; and the outsiders acquiesce and live by the rules they dictate from their insulated thrones.

This has been their tactic in destroying the faith as well: liturgical “experts,” Scripture “experts,” catechetical “experts,” spiritual “experts” create the same illusion, and have garnered great success.

It is in this vein that I refer to the “divinization of psychology.” It is not merely a question of the Church employing psychology as *a* tool of evaluating individuals, it is granted the infallible and unquestionable nature which those wishing to control the population had desired; bishops do nothing without consulting the demigod of modernity, and mere questioning, let alone disobedience, is unthinkable. These are statements of fact, dear reader, and are yet another manifestation, perhaps one of the gravest, of how evil men have been given control of the Church, and the Church’s leaders clearly demonstrate their rejection of both Church teaching and the supremacy of the Faith. Here are some ways in which the hierarchy’s virtually unanimous, willful subservience to psychological “experts” is made manifest:

- The reversal of what is absolute and relative: We have seen (or will shortly) how the Vatican II Church has taken what used to be held as absolute (the Faith, membership in the Church, the definition of the Church, believing in Jesus, the conditions for Holy Communion, Final Judgment) and made it relative in light of the new “absolutes” of globalism, ecumenism, indifferentism and universal salvation. This inversion of what was absolute and what was relative reaches its summit in the explicit words of Popes that the Church *does not desire* to gather all of humanity into her fold, but that all of humanity *is obliged* to adhere to the governing institution of the New World Order. In like manner, psychology is superior to the Faith.
- The “dignity of the human person” and the “inviolable rights of conscience” are patently revealed as a farce. Again, it is the liberal world’s own version of the priest (Skinner stated that psychologists would be the new priests), the psychologist, who is the confessor, mystic and judge, who is superior to the Catholic priest and even the Pope himself in terms of his “rights” and his authority to place demands on people. His insights are infallible, no matter how often they are proven wrong, and his judgments irrevocable and allowing of no appeal.
- Habituating people to their own degradation in the name of a self-appointed authority: By way of a secular parallel, in airports people are subjected, literally, to sexual molestation and having pornographic photos taken of them and stored forever.<sup>13</sup> This is a fact: if the same actions were committed outside of the airport, even by a police officer, they would be arrested and subject to criminal prosecution. What is done in airports *legally qualifies as child molestation and child pornography*. The point is not that the government paid child molester really thinks a child is concealing a W.M.D. in his pants; the point is to habituate the child and everyone else to their own subservient state and to not question the “authority’s” right to do whatever they want. This is the state with mandated psychological evaluations as well. This is a fact acknowledged by the Vatican, that is why...
- The Vatican has on numerous occasions stated that, because it is a violation of the conscience of the individual, no one may ever mandate a comprehensive psychological evaluation. “There is a large part of his inner world which the person discloses to a few confidential friends and shields

against the intrusion of others. Certain matters are kept secret at any price and in regard to anyone. Finally, there are other matters which the person is unable to consider...And just as it is illicit to appropriate another's goods or to make an attempt on his bodily integrity without his consent, so *it is not permissible* to enter into his inner domain against his will, whatever is the *technique or method used*" (Pope Pius XII, 1958)<sup>14</sup>. Of course, the categories of faith as taught by a Pope and the "rights of man" have little stock in a Church where everyone is "a law unto himself," and not a single bishop regards himself as bound by this "absolute" right. Bishops turn to people schooled in an ideology which rejects the origin, nature, and destiny of man to teach them about men. Hence, they are truly disciples of Skinner: "It isn't the person who is important, *it's the method*. If the practice of psychology survives, that's the main objective. It's the same with cultural practices in general: no one survives as a person."<sup>15</sup>

### Seminary Candidates

No young man can even begin to pursue priesthood until he is approved by a psychologist, thus giving these people total control over who can and can't be a priest. The reader may object that psychology is a legitimate field and many men and women who are faithful Catholics understand and exercise their profession in the light of Catholic moral teachings and the supremacy of grace over our natural faculties. Yet, in the first instance this is a mute point, and in the second instance only underscores the corruption of chanceries all across America and the world.

- In the first instance, it is again a question of the Church no longer believing in herself, her doctrine, or her moral principles. All of these "absolutes" are transferred to our godless secular counterparts.
- Any priest who used his position in the confessional to extract information from a penitent regarding his sins, in particular sins against chastity, beyond what was necessary for a valid sacramental confession would be seriously reprimanded. Yet, the secular priest, the psychologist, does precisely this, and it is the Church which mandates it.
- Not even the Pope himself can force someone to make a general confession of his entire life; the secular supreme pontiff, the psychologist, can and does.
- If a priest were found to be taking notes in the confessional and placing them in a file with the penitent's name, he would be the recipient of an excommunication which only the Pope could lift. The psychologist does this, makes copious copies, and it is filed in multiple locations. Hence, *every chancery* has in writing what is *beyond a general confession* of every priest in the diocese which any of a number of people is free to review for whatever reason. Is this anything less than the type of degradation to which a gulag inquisitor would subject the one they were interrogating? Is it just a coincidence that this is precisely the tactic used by cults and secret societies to degrade potential recruits and then blackmail them at a later point?<sup>16</sup>



- Again, in the first instance, it is not a question of the faith, beliefs, or approach of a given psychologist; in fact, this distinction proves the point. Psychology is by no means an “absolute.” When the same candidate goes for his physical, there is an absolute science and standards to which the entire profession adheres; if the candidate has high blood pressure, a disease, or is obese, these things are facts determined by a standard agreed to by everyone in the field, and even a layman can do research and verify the results. Psychology is a subjective and relative profession. Even the “objective tests” they use have their results tainted by the biases of the one administering the test and interpreting the results. A woman who conducts polygraph tests for the N.S.A. admitted to me that even they don’t work; whoever is conducting the test, even if they have no agenda, influences the result. While all psychologists may agree with a set of principles and standards in some theoretical way, the fact is you can always find a psychologist with equal credentials to contradict the conclusions of another, which brings us to the second instance:
- As in every manner of the “openness” of the Vatican II Church, it is an openness exclusively to the left. Psychologists who are also committed Catholics (in fact, not just name) always find themselves marginalized and excluded. One such group, The Catholic Medical Association, felt compelled to address a letter to the U.S. bishops in the light of their injustice, incompetence, and malice in destroying vocations before they even began:

“There are numerous reports that mental health professionals who do not support the teachings of the Catholic Church on sexuality have been chosen to evaluate candidates for the priesthood and reject candidates who do accept the Church’s teachings on the grounds they are ‘rigid.’ There are also reports that some mental health professionals do not report homosexual attractions and conflicts in candidates for the priesthood to diocesan officials or religious superiors. Mental health professionals chosen to evaluate candidates for the priesthood should be Catholics in good standing who support the Church’s teaching on sexuality, life, contraception, homosexuality, celibacy of the priesthood, the ordination of only men, and the hierarchical structure of the Church...Non-Catholics and Catholics who do not support the teaching of the Church should not be employed in this task.”

When seminaries have been forced to accept orthodox candidates, they do not relent in trying to have their vocation terminated by the “psychology gulag.” The CMA report continued:

“There are reports that seminarians who during the course of studies expressed support for the teaching of the Magisterium, the Catechism, Sacred Scripture, particularly on issues of sexuality and homosexuality, were told they were rigid and divisive and need new psychological evaluations.”

Of course, the seminaries have pre-selected psychologists who use their position to eliminate the orthodox candidate. “Salt for Their Wounds” is an excellent article that ran in “Catholic World Report.”<sup>17</sup> It thoroughly documents the epidemic in the Church of using psychology to persecute orthodox priests and stigmatize them for life. In clerical circles, it is referred to as “The Psychology Gulag,” and it is precisely that. Bishops, seminaries and chanceries simply use psychologists to deem

unfit any seminarian or priest they desire. That is not to say that some priests may not very well be unfit for public ministry, but that there is a dishonest, even diabolical, agenda at work by which unqualified “professionals” who reject the Church’s moral teachings are themselves deemed fit to determine a priest’s moral character. Orthodoxy is regarded as a psychological disorder in these settings, and the priest too “rigid” and “closed” to serve in a parish. The article above documents rampant pro-homosexuality in these facilities, as well as testimony from former staff about the unethical manner in which these facilities are run, and the malice of bishops and seminary rectors who inform the facilities of the results they expect to see before any “evaluation” even begins.

I will interject a few observations of my own at this point:

- Those deciding on the acceptability of a candidate could easily satisfy the prudent desire to know something of his moral history and mental state while completely respecting his inalienable rights. It would simply require a priest who is also a psychologist to conduct the interview, offering only an objective evaluation with his recommendation, while not committing to the permanent historical record every sin or sinful tendency the young man has ever had, upon which that recommendation is based, and consigning the rest to the sacredness of the confessional seal.
- From my own experience, it would seem that whatever type of psychological screening exists is inferior to simply the experience you will have of the man in his five or six years of formation. In no means do I intend to ridicule the struggles of these men, but I will offer two examples from my very limited experience. In seminary, one young man was accepted, after his psychological evaluation, who was so troubled that he spoke to himself constantly and, when using the common restroom, could be heard from quite a distance maintaining a conversation with his member. In another young man’s case, it was clear that he had two very distinct identities and alternated back and forth. Both of these situations existed upon their arrival, making all of us wonder exactly how useful any type of evaluation truly is.

#### More than an oversight

This state of affairs is more than a result of overworked bishops and chanceries not being able to carry out due diligence in these matters. It is precisely in line with the communist strategy outlined at the beginning of this section. The communists sought to inflict on people things that would have been regarded as criminal anywhere else but the inviolable sanctuary of their own centers, allowing them to do in the name of science what would be regarded as perverse and criminal in any other instance, cloaked in their armor of “scientific expertise” which no outside party, let alone the victim, could dare question. This is precisely what happened, and these individuals form an uninterrupted chain from evil degenerates straight to the bishops. Again, these are historical facts, readily available.

The originator of the school of thought subscribed to by the bishops' "experts" is Alfred Kinsey. Here are some facts about him, facts which show the Communist plan to be no mere fantasy:

- He was a sado-masochist and bisexual, approving of bestiality.
- He was addicted to pornography and masturbation.
- He forced his wife and the wives of his staff to perform sex acts for him in his attic as he filmed them.
- He directed pedophiles to molest children as young as two months old for his "research."
- He directed members of the Gestapo in Nazi Germany in child sexual abuse techniques.
- He was an adoring disciple of Alastair Crowley, a pedophile and known Satanist (this is literal – he traveled to a shrine in his honor and worshipped him there).
- He ritualistically hung himself by his testicles from a pole until he fell unconscious.
- He claimed that children enjoyed sex and the real harm of adult-child sex stemmed from 'hysterical' parents, teachers and professionals who reacted with anger and horror to children's disclosures.<sup>18</sup>

This clinically definable sexual psychopath, pornographer and child molester both directly and through his disciples, "is the educator who trained your psychiatrists, psychologists, some of your bishops and priests, and other mental health officials in what is normal human sexuality."<sup>19</sup> A dedicated disciple of Kinsey was Dr. John Money who, along with his partner and fellow Kinsian Dr. Berlin, co-founded The Johns Hopkins Sexual Disorders Clinic. Dr. Money is an advocate for pedophilia and gave an interview for a pro-pedophilia publication in which he stated, "a relationship that is totally mutual between a boy of 10 or 11 and an adult male would not be pathological in any way."<sup>20</sup> (That moral degenerates within the field of psychology is an epidemic, not an aberration, is clearly demonstrated by the 1999 journal of The American Psychological Association, in which it stated that pedophilia is *harmless and even beneficial* if consensual. Such are the demigods of the new "man-centered" religion who control bishops).<sup>21</sup>

While at Hopkins, these degenerates were working for Dr. Paul McHugh. It was McHugh who defended the policy of not reporting multiple incidents of child rape and fondling to police, in defiance of state law. ***This was the man chosen by the Bishops' Conference as the chief behavioral scientist for their clergy sex crimes review board!*** (Where he joined pro-abortion activists named to the same board by the same bishops). Likewise, Cardinal William Keeler of Baltimore made him a member of his own archdiocesan review board. Meanwhile, Dr. Berlin, who described the self-proclaimed pedophilia defender Money as "one of his most important mentors" had been the U.S. Catholic Bishops' chief advisor child sexual abuse. When meeting in Dallas to compose their response to the sexual abuse crisis, the only suggestion made by Pope John Paul was that there be an acknowledgment that the crisis stemmed from the "training" these priests received in the seminaries as already described. As one would expect, the bishops ignored the Pope's suggestion that it was their own institutions, lack of leadership, and un-Catholic agendas that in anyway precipitated this, and instead incorporated the advice of these child-molestation advocates. When Bishop Fabian Bruskewitz proposed that the statement include that the 'current homosexual culture' was the root of

the sex-abuse crisis [the abuse was almost exclusively homosexual], and that bishops would be required to force strict conformity with all church doctrines on sexuality, the bishops soundly rejected his proposal, with about six bishops supporting him. The statement of apostasy could not be more explicit; almost every bishop rejected the notion that priests should be loyal to Church moral teachings. This is a fact.

The reason this destructive crisis ever occurred was because, time and again, bishops gave known child abusers further assignments where the behavior continued. And why would they do such a thing? - because it was the advice psychologists gave them! The very people who caused the problem are the ones charged with rectifying it, with bishops acquiescing in both instances. The faith has no relevance, intelligence is non-existent: the demigods of liberalism are always obeyed, no matter how many times they are proven wrong, no matter how destructive they have shown themselves to be.

### The Gulag Continued

This use of psychology to undermine the Faith and decimate the priesthood does not end once the seminarian has made it to Holy Orders. One of the most relied upon “treatment centers” in America for clergy is St. Luke’s Institute. The highest court in the Church, the Roman Signatura, passed this judgment on the institute: “Saint Luke Institute, founded by a priest who is openly homosexual and based on a mixture of Freudian pan-sexualism [which allows homosexuality, bestiality, and pedophilia] and behaviorism, is surely not a suitable institution apt to judge rightly about the beliefs and lifestyle of a Catholic priest.”<sup>22</sup> Again, recall the Communist counsel to their psychologists that they could conduct abusive experiments in the safety of their self-created kingdoms, and this is precisely what happens at St. Luke’s. So perverse and degrading were some methods of their “treatment” that the Vatican intervened and put a stop to it (incredibly, they were obeyed this time). Yet, to bishops, it simply does not matter; their faith in their demigod can never be shaken, even when the supreme juridical authority of the Faith they profess dictates otherwise. If any priest had been caught abusing people in the same manner, in the name of “treating” them, he would be reported to the police, suspended for life, and laicized. When the priests of Skinnerian dehumanization do the same things to priests of God, “So what? We’ll still send you more; after all, you are the experts, we are merely the fawning subjects.” Many elements of the apostasy are evident in the continued use of this facility:

- Every bishop is a law unto himself, and the prohibition of the Vatican high court means nothing.
- Religious indifferentism is likewise manifest, as what the Church teaches does not matter in practice.
- Moral relativism is manifest, as psychologists are not bound by the moral laws of the Church, and bishops explicitly subject their priests to what the Church calls intrinsically evil.
- “I will not lead,” as bishops insist that it is the prerogative of their demigods to decide what is and is not moral, who can and cannot be a priest.

- Anti-clericalism could not be more evident, as priests are merely fodder for the modernist mill that is the Great Apostasy, in strict accord with the agenda for dehumanization that is the foundation of their therapeutic models.
- Apostasy: morality as infallibly taught by the Church is explicitly rejected.<sup>23</sup>

The founder of St. Luke's overtly advocated the teachings of the pedophilia supporters Berlin and Money, using them as the basis for the institute he founded. So inadequate is this facility by even the secular standard that twice it has been on the brink of being closed for problems "serious in nature."<sup>24</sup> Yet, to this day, it can boast as being the most used treatment center in the world for Catholic clergy. After the priest who founded this institute died of A.I.D.S., Cardinal James Hickey praised him as a "brilliant and hardworking priest." Such is the caliber of man who becomes a "Prince of the Church" in the Vatican II era of dissolution, and the caliber of man given power over the minds and vocations of priests.

### Back to Where We Began

My apologies if the preceding elements were unduly protracted and emphasized, but it is an essential state of affairs. Nonetheless, regarding the current apostasy and the essential role of orthodox priests who believe both in their own office and the Faith as a whole, this is where it touches the faithful and the priests in a day-to-day way. I survived one of the worst seminaries in the world despite being an orthodox heterosexual by turns of events which I can only hope were divine providence. However, I can also testify that so did many men who were express heretics, having openly denied truths of the faith, even those concerning the nature of Holy Orders. They were the darlings of the faculty and administration, and have now gone out to spread the poison of modernity and sow the seeds of apostasy in their respective dioceses.

I can also testify that, when told by seminarians of the heresies being taught and the articles of morality being denied, many bishops simply do nothing, or, if anything, inform the seminarian that he is now suspect due to his "rigidity" and inability to dialogue. Again, it is oftentimes the "solid, conservative, John Paul II bishops" who flatly refuse to exercise the demands of their office (I Will Not Lead) and instead threaten the victim (Love Will Turn to Hate).

I will offer an anecdote from my own life as to how effective seminaries have been in giving the Church priests with no real sense of the sacredness of their own being or mission, one which shows the effects of a subtle subversion to erode the faith in parishes. Once as a seminarian and again as a priest, I was in parishes with three priests assigned, yet did not offer a morning Mass on Saturday. In my seminary assignment, the three priests would sit around the kitchen table as a nun (sans-a-habit, of course), would conduct a Communion service, complete with her feminist sermonette. As a priest, a deacon led the Communion service. When he went on vacation, he would ask if I could cover his Communion service with a Mass! These instances demonstrate the systematic, relentless erosion of the faith "beginning at the top." Bishops send seminarians to fetid seminaries, these seminaries produce priests who do not believe in the priesthood, and so in the parish there is no sense of their priestly character compelling them to offer Mass daily, nor regard for the spiritual welfare of their parishioners in assisting at the

Sacrifice of the Mass. Instead, they are content to loaf around their rectories, glad that they have a “day off,” and, deep down, not believing there is any difference between the Mass they offer and the Communion service in its stead (or the protestant service down the street).

When in the parish as a newly ordained priest, after a year I took responsibility for making the priests’ schedule. I promptly began to schedule a Saturday Mass. Shortly thereafter, I found myself accosted by two members of the diocesan machinery, demanding an explanation as to why I thought it was my place to do something so pastorally insensitive. This is the day to day way in which the “diabolical disorientation” noted by St. Lucy occurs. A priest who actually recognizes his own priestly character and wants to offer Mass for his people every day is reprimanded, while the indolent pastors who allowed such a pitiful state of affairs to begin are rewarded. (The pastor in one of the parishes was vocal in his support for contraception, women’s ordination, and voting for pro-abortion candidates. He was made a monsignor for his efforts).

Again, please indulge me as I draw from my own experience to demonstrate how such actions, decade after decade, become a sort of hypnosis eroding the faith of even the most devout Catholic, thus preparing them for the apostasy. In a different parish (a rather solid, devout one by post Vatican II standards), by some miscommunication no priest arrived for one of the daily Masses. A parishioner, a daily communicant for decades and a sincerely Catholic man, took it upon himself to have a Communion service. Ask anyone who remembers the pre-1963 Church if anywhere, under any circumstance, a layman would have dared taken it upon himself to go to the tabernacle and distribute Holy Communion. *Not a single parishioner* in attendance found this odd enough to say something to me about it later. The man in question was quite apologetic when I told him he was well out of line, yet his reasoning was valid: “I’ve been giving communion for years. It didn’t seem like a big deal.” This is the success of forty plus years of eroding the priestly identity in the consciousness of the faithful, as well as a sense of awe and reverence for the Blessed Sacrament. Going to a tabernacle and doing what only a priest could do for nearly 2,000 years is just “not a big deal.”

Just one more story: A young woman in the parish, devout and well-educated in the faith, wanted permission to bring communion to her dying mother. The pastor went over the procedures, gave her the blessing of commissioning, and then let her take the Blessed Sacrament to her mother. A few days later the same pastor went to give the woman Last Rites. Before leaving the house, the daughter said as an afterthought, “O, let me get the Host. Mom was too sick to receive it on Sunday.” Even a woman who is comparatively serious in her faith by Vatican II standards did not know, even on the instinctual level of piety, that she should have called the priest immediately and arranged to have returned the Sacrament to the tabernacle. Jesus just sat on the dresser until she got around to it. What of the not-so-faithful? This one anecdote is an icon of what has happened to the faith of tens of millions by the Vatican II Church’s dissolution of the priesthood, allowing priestly duties to be carried out by anyone whomsoever, with the Blessed Sacrament being downgraded along with the Holy Orders. Of course, since the two are so intimately bound, you cannot undermine one and not the other. Hence, the Vatican II Church’s greatest assault on the priesthood is embodied in the Novus Ordo Mass. Since, however, this is also bound up with efforts to end belief in the Real Presence, there will be a separate chapter dedicated to the subject.

The success of the agents of apostasy is again staggering. While apostates have always attacked the papacy, the current apostasy has the popes attacking themselves. Likewise, just as every heresy and apostasy has attacked the priesthood, it is the priests themselves who adopt and promulgate these very assaults on their own divine character. Yet, this is the logical conclusion of a Church who no longer believes in her own divine charter (The Church Will Doubt). If the Catholic Church is not necessary for salvation, then neither are her priests. Hence, a priest is just a profession among others, as many priests believe, making the sacrifice of a family and the demands of the job utterly pointless, as thousands upon thousands of priests have concluded.

The facts speak for themselves: Modernists, masons and communists alike conspired to hollow the Church of her substance by having the clergy deny their own. The success of these agents of apostasy is a documented fact, and the results speak for themselves. In the immediate aftermath of the Council, 50,000 priests defected from Holy Orders. "The devil knows that religious and priests who fall away from their beautiful vocation drag numerous souls to Hell," stated Sr. Lucy. The 1998 Catholic Directory for the United States reveals 1,700 seminarians, a decline of almost 97% from the 1965 figure of 48,992. I have heard the phrase "New Springtime" more times than I care to remember to describe this period in history; then what does the dead of winter resemble?

---

<sup>1</sup> Guitton, Jean. "Dialogues with Paul VI." Mondavi, p. 285, cited in Villa, Paul VI, 22-23.

<sup>2</sup> "Cardinal Bacci, of the Roman Curia, spoke out against the principle of a married diaconate; it was inopportune and dangerous. If the law of celibacy were relaxed for deacons, the number of priests would certainly decline, since youth would choose the easier way." Wiltgen, 98.

<sup>3</sup> Pope John XXIII was twice expelled from seminary posts for his modernist beliefs.

<sup>4</sup> "Crisis in Vocations? What Crisis?" Christian Order, March 1996.

<sup>5</sup> His disdain for prayer was not limited to the Rosary, as he stated in front of the full student body "Prayer is useless." The nun who dared to disagree was soon looking for another job. The Cardinal Archbishop who was chancellor of the seminary rewarded him with papal honors.

<sup>6</sup> This is often regarded as proof that the Church is being restored; I do not believe this to be the case; rather, it should be regarded as the foreseen result of the Hegelian dialectic which wanted to establish a new center which seems comparatively superior while assuring that a true restoration of the orthodox center never comes about.

<sup>7</sup> So pitiful is the typical diocesan machinery, I am aware of chancery priests who, during "fraternal gatherings" of the presbyterate, plant people at the various tables who later submit a report on the private conversations of priests and place them in their personnel file.

<sup>8</sup> On April 27 & 28, 2005, a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist for the Wall Street Journal published "A Priest's Story," a story described by "First Things" as "a Church and a justice system that seem indifferent to justice."

<sup>9</sup> Pope John Paul II. Post Synodal Apostolic Exhortation "Reconciliation and Penance," Dec. 2, 1984, no. 2.

<sup>10</sup> Many of these associations testify that, once the bishop becomes aware that the priest has actually been proactive and enlisted canonical assistance they immediately desist their persecution of him. Hence, it could not be more apparent that they are clearly aware that their actions are illegal and unjust and were simply relying on their ability to abuse their power without consequence.

<sup>11</sup> Goff, Kenneth. Are the People of America Being Brainwashed into Slavery? Center Valley, CA: Freedom Builders of America, p. 32.

<sup>12</sup> After WWII, there was an explosion of psychiatric treatments across America to treat returning veterans. These were all based upon the Soviet model, hence the "reprogramming" of America was much more widespread than the average citizen realized.

<sup>13</sup> Without fail, "Liberals are Liars." The T.S.A. assured the public that these photos could not be stored, and then had to admit it was a lie once these images were found to be stored and shared.

<sup>14</sup> Isyrbt, p. 138.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., A-144.

---

<sup>16</sup> For example, a young man applying for seminary had to compose his entire "life story," which was nothing less than a written general confession which was read by the entire screening committee comprised of laymen and women. Ten years later this man could well be a priest who has to look out at his congregation and see congregants aware that he had once lived immorally and specifically what those sins were. Would anyone with a whiff of the Catholic Faith regard this as right?

<sup>17</sup> Payne, Lesley. "Salt for Their Wounds," *The Catholic World Report*, Feb. 1997, pp. 50-59.

<sup>18</sup> Likoudis, Paul. "The Real Expert Advises Bishops: Sue Your Experts."

<sup>19</sup> Reisman, Dr. Judith. *Catholic Citizens of Illinois*, Aug. 16, 2003.

<sup>20</sup> Martinez, Fred. "The Sex Abuse Lobby, The Bishops and VOTF" citing *The Washington Post*.

<sup>21</sup> Citizens Committee on Human Rights. "Unholy Assault: Psychiatry vs. Religion," reports: "A 2001 U.S. study of therapist-client sex involving minors reported that 1 out of 20 clients who had been sexually abused by their therapist was a minor."

<sup>22</sup> Martinez, citing *The National Catholic Reporter*.

<sup>23</sup> "I have become progressively uncomfortable with the moral tone of the Institute and its therapeutic programs. In my opinion, the Institute has been used as an outlet for the psycho-pathology of its founder and for other members of the staff from its inception." A doctor who resigned from St. Lukes, cited in Payne.

<sup>24</sup> The National Joint Commission of Healthcare Organizations moved to revoke its accreditation, *Washington Post* reporting.



## Chapter IX

### The Mass

*“The devil has always managed to get rid of the Mass by means of the heretics, making them the precursors of the Antichrist who, above all else, will manage to abolish, and in fact will succeed in abolishing, as a punishment for the sins of men, The Holy Sacrifice of the altar, precisely as Daniel had predicted.”*  
-St. Alphonsus Liguori, “Opere Ascetiche”

---

*“Let us destroy the Mass and we shall destroy the Church.”*  
-Martin Luther

*“The liturgical reform has taken a remarkable step forward and has become closer to the liturgical form of the Lutheran church.”*  
-L’ Osservatore Roman, Oct. 13, 1967

### Part I: Introduction

As the Church’s central act of worship and supreme manifestation of her faith, it only stands to reason that the Mass will be an object of attack by the agents of the Great Apostasy. Central to the current apostasy is the Novus Ordo, The New Order, of the Mass. If the Mass is the supreme expression of the Faith, then what is being said about the Faith when that supreme act is not only outlawed but deemed a threat to the [new] faith? This is not the writer’s hypothesis; it has been openly stated by Cardinal Ratzinger. He conceded that the Church was “calling its very being [Recall the prophesy of Cardinal Pacelli, “The Church will doubt...”] into question when it suddenly declares that what until now was its holiest and highest possession is strictly forbidden, and when it makes the longing for it seem downright indecent.”<sup>1</sup> In a similar vein, the future pope wrote in “My Life;” “I am convinced that the ecclesial crisis in which we find ourselves today depends in great part on the collapse of the liturgy, which sometimes comes to be conceived ‘as if God does not exist’: as if it no longer matters whether God is there and is seen and heard in it. But if in the liturgy there no longer appears the communion of the faith, the universal unity of the Church and of her history, where does the Church appear in her spiritual substance?” In this one excerpt, the Cardinal touches on themes consistent with the mentality of the Great Apostasy, to be developed later in this chapter: a man-centered enterprise, the expulsion of the sacred, the dissolution of the Faith, rupture with the past, and denial of the Church’s oneness. It was in the same work that the Cardinal wrote of the “*tragic error* committed by Paul VI with the prohibition of the use of Pius V’s Missal, which would *break away from the liturgical tradition* of the Church.”<sup>2</sup>

In discussing the Novus Ordo, its grotesque inferiority to the perennial rite, all of the deficiencies in its rubrics and prayers, the insufficient expression of Catholic theology and its predisposition to heresy and sacrilege, an exhaustive treatise would simply take too long. Many excellent works exist on the topic, and some are included in the bibliography. Some writers have, in a manner worthy of serious consideration, endeavored to demonstrate that the Novus Ordo is the fulfillment of the ancient prophesy

of Daniel, and the warning about the “Abomination of Desolation,” which Jesus said would indicate the end times. In a very limited way, I will try to give the reader sufficient information to see that the Novus Ordo is indeed central to, as both a deliberate cause and a fetid fruit of, the apostasy in our own time, be it the great one or not.

## Sources

- Regarding the impending apostasy and corresponding chastisement, Our Lady of LaSalette had this to say about priests: “By their irreverence and their impiety in the celebration of the holy mysteries, by their love of money, their love of honors and pleasures, the priests have become cesspools of impurity. Yes, the priests are asking vengeance, and vengeance is hanging over their heads.” And this was a century before priests would, literally, dress as clowns to offer Mass.
- Pope St. Pius X: “But for Catholics nothing will remove the authority of the second council of Nicea, where it condemns those ‘who dare, after the impious fashion of heretics, to deride the ecclesiastical traditions, to *invent novelties* of some kind...or endeavor by *malice or craft* to overthrow any one of the legitimate traditions of the Catholic Church.’”<sup>3</sup>
- Pope Pius XII: warned of the “suicide” of the Church in altering her liturgy, tying it in with the message of Fatima.
- Again, “A community is calling *into question its very being* when it suddenly declares that what until now was its holiest and highest possession is strictly forbidden, and when it makes the longing for it seem downright indecent.” Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, Salt of the Earth

## Part II: The Council

The council is not the culprit for the new Mass (although the bishops perhaps are not without culpability in the matter), rather, the dishonest pretext used to justify Paul VI’s passion for destruction and novelty. The Council declared that “Holy Mother Church holds all lawfully recognized rites to be of equal right and dignity;...She wishes to preserve them and in the future and to foster them in every way.”<sup>4</sup> Even many orthodox voices suggested that some modifications in the Mass may be in order, something which, while never to be done lightly, had happened often enough in the Church’s past. Still, the voices of protestantization were not without representation.

Bishop Duschak (Philippines) wanted Mass said aloud, facing the people and in the vernacular. He said, “I believe it is also likely that if the world receives such an ecumenical form of Eucharistic celebration, the faith of non-Catholic Christian communities in the sacramental presence of Christ might be renewed or even rectified.”<sup>5</sup> The “dimming of the intelligence” is not lacking here:

- Doing the very things protestants did to end belief in the Real Presence would now make them believe it again?

- Since the bishop was from an overwhelmingly Catholic country, perhaps he can be excused for not considering an obvious point: exactly why would protestants be at a Catholic Mass in the first place that this novelty might convert them? Was he not aware that they had churches and worship services of their own?
- Is not what actually happened the more logical hypothesis than the one put forth by the bishop? Would changing Catholic practices to mimic protestant beliefs not be more likely to make Catholics adopt those beliefs, rather than the reverse? The subsequent history gives the unequivocal answer, yes.
- He was speaking during the Council's first session, and already the tone of self-exultation was apparent. He stated that the Council should be able to create its own liturgy because it was "the greatest of all ecumenical councils."

Still, like Pius X decades before, some at the council were not unaware of the revolutionary undercurrents and spoke up:

Cardinal Ottaviani warned, "Are we seeking to stir up wonder, or perhaps scandal, among the Christian people, by introducing changes in so venerable a rite, that has been approved for so many centuries and is now so familiar? The rite of Holy Mass should not be treated as if it were a piece of cloth to be refashioned according to the whim of each generation."<sup>6</sup> Ironically, and perhaps fittingly, this was the exact analogy Cardinal Montini [Paul VI] used in making his case to destroy the ancient rites to satisfy his revolutionary bent: "...the form in which the liturgy had been handed down, and which was like a garment clothing the divine mysteries, could be changed and made more applicable to present needs." The topic of the *Novus Ordo* and the worship of man will be taken up in greater detail; for now it is only worth noting that the defenders of the ancient Mass were concerned for maintaining the Faith and the reverence due to God, while Paul's argument stemmed for man's momentary "needs" [whims?] and desires. This is precisely the hermeneutic of Protestantism and relativism: it is no longer man who conforms to the sacred; it is the sacred which is conformed to man or, better said, altogether dissolved.

Still, we have to bear in mind that all of the elements of the apostasy overlap and are interwoven. Pope John's disregard for Pius' wisdom opened the door for condemned writers to have influence at the Council, and these same writers later boasted of the vague wording they introduced into the documents to be exploited at a later date. This was true of the Mass as well and, as in other regards, the bishops were remiss in their duty and allowed such sinister machinations to prevail. One can find in the same document cited above, declaring that all rites will be preserved and fostered, the loophole, "The Council also desires that, where necessary, the rites be revised carefully in the light of sound tradition, and that they be given new vigor to meet the circumstances and needs of modern times."<sup>7</sup> This sentence reveals the duplicity of those who had it inserted, and the dimming of the intelligence on the part of those who let so loaded and muddled a statement be approved. First of all, it is a theological oxymoron: sound tradition repudiates the notion of revising traditions to fit current trends. Secondly, how can such a revision be declared "necessary" given that the Rite was in use *ad perpetuum* (the Canon had not been modified since Gregory the Great)? Even to call such a revision "desirable" would be suspect enough to

tradition and Catholic thought; by what calculus is it now deemed necessary? The Council does not answer this; it just leaves the doors wide open for the protestants and masons. Still, the most disturbing changes to the Mass were in no way directly validated by the council, but, as has already been documented...

### Liberals are liars

The destroying of sanctuaries, altars and statues, the removal of altar rails, the banishment of tabernacles (and Jesus) from the center of churches, communion in the hand, the priest facing the people, the end of Latin – all of these things were presented to people as being “from the council,” so they obeyed. These were lies, and the people telling these lies knew it. For example, Archbishop Dwyer of Portland, Oregon lamented, “Who dreamed on that day (when the council approved the document on the liturgy) that within a few years, far less than a decade, the Latin past of the Church would be all but expunged, that it would be reduced to a memory fading in the middle distance. The thought would have horrified us, but it seemed so far beyond the realm of the possible as to be ridiculous. So we laughed it off.”<sup>8</sup> This is no figure of speech. When Cardinal Browne expressed at the Council his fear that, if the Council allowed the vernacular into the liturgy the Latin Mass would disappear within ten years, he was laughed at.

Paul VI led by example in this regard. He promulgated his “Novus Ordo” as being “due to the express wishes of the recent Ecumenical Council.” This was not true, as the Novus Ordo was in many ways a direct contradiction of the express wishes of the council, the insistence that “the use of Latin be retained” being just one example (as well as the retention of Gregorian Chant). In fact, the Council mandated that the entire ancient rite, soon to be prohibited by Paul VI, was to be preserved in the future and fostered in every way. Either Paul thought eradicating meant the same thing as preserving and fostering, or he was lying. [It is worth noting that the same pope who gave the Church’s approval to formerly banned books was about to place her most sacred one, the ancient sacramentary, on his own “index of prohibited books.”]

Likewise, in accord with the self-contradiction of liberals in the principles they espouse, we find Paul less than forthright in living out the clichés he so consistently promulgated as the hallmarks of the “New Church.” The “Pope of the Council” who championed “ecumenism” and “dialogue” had no use for either when his novelties were opposed. As Fr. Villa relates that, “bishops, after attending that ‘normative Mass’ Paul VI had presented to them, rejected it...In fact, it failed to reach the majority of two third of the conciliar Fathers. The ‘new Mass’ is thus entirely Paul VI’s doing.”<sup>9</sup> We again see the insincerity, or at least the exclusively left-mindedness, of Paul’s mania for “dialogue” in that there was a serious movement among Europe’s intellectual and cultural elite, whom Paul so fawned over when they championed modernity and communism, who sent him a manifesto bearing their signatures opposing the proposed abandonment of the ancient rite. Not only was their invitation to “dialogue” not accepted, no response was ever given at all.

## Part III

### The Novus Ordo Missae: Triumph of the Church's enemies

Throughout the Church's history, every heretical sect that arose in turn altered the Mass to reflect their errors, Protestantism being no different. Because of this, the Church has always understood the importance of maintaining the fullness of the sacred rites, and despised any attempt at novelty, knowing full well that novel practices reflected an underlying novel belief. Simply the omission of a single word was enough of a "red flag" to know that there was a corrosive agenda beneath the surface. Pope Pius VI rightly foresaw this and thus condemned the heretical Synod of Pistoria because, "The doctrine of the synod absolutely omits to make any mention of transubstantiation... Since by an indiscreet and suspicious omission of this sort knowledge is taken away both of an article pertaining to the Faith, and also of the word consecrated by the Church to protect the profession of it, as if it were a discussion of a merely scholastic question." This one omission was condemned as "dangerous, derogatory to the exposition of the Catholic truth about the dogma of transubstantiation and favorable to heretics."<sup>10</sup> This omission was repeated by Paul VI, which is not surprising, as it was protestants who handed him the document to sign. Now, not only were heretics allowed to alter the Church's ancient, immutable Rite of the Mass, they were given the authority to outlaw it, and completely replace it with a fabrication conformable with their errors.

#### Martin Luther

Shortly before his death in 1419, St. Vincent Ferrer prophesied that the precursor to the Antichrist was near.<sup>11</sup> Given that St. Vincent repeatedly raised the dead, I think we can regard his capacity as a mystic as altogether reliable. Martin Luther was born in 1483. It has already been discussed how this apostate was indeed the founder of liberalism, the culmination of which is at the root of the apostasy we are now enduring. He had this to say about the Mass:

- "I declare that all brothels, murders, thefts, adulteries, are less evil than the abominable Mass."<sup>12</sup>
- "When the Mass has been overthrown, I think we shall have overthrown the Papacy. I think it is in the Mass, as on a rock, that the Papacy wholly rests...Everything will of necessity collapse when their sacrilegious and abominable Mass collapses." Again, as with the liberals and the Tiara, could Luther have ever dreamed that it would be a Pope himself who would overthrow the Mass?
- "Above all, from the evils of this dragon [the Mass] the scum and vermin of all manner of idolatry has been begotten."

His thoughts on the Papacy were equally sacrilegious and blasphemous:

- “It is all up with the Pope, as it is with his god, the devil. They are both impenitent and sin consciously against the truth, so that they are beyond prayers and hope.”<sup>13</sup>
- As he burnt the Papal Bull condemning his teachings, he said “He who does not resist the Papacy with all his heart cannot obtain eternal salvation.”<sup>14</sup> Centuries later, it would be the Pope who stopped resisting him

### Martin Luther as the inspiring force for the Novus Ordo

Protestants formed a part of the committee that contrived the Novus Ordo. While the Vatican’s public line was that they were merely observers, those with firsthand knowledge confessed the true state of affairs.

- Msgr. Baum, the President of the American Bishops’ Committee on ecumenical matters: “They are not there simply as observers, but also as *expert advisers* [heretics who do not believe in the Real Presence are now experts on the Mass] and they *participate fully* in discussions on the Catholic liturgical renewal. If they had only listened there wouldn’t have been much sense in it, but they contributed.”<sup>15</sup>
- Their influence was so strong that they actually were responsible for the heretical definition of the Mass which Pope Paul VI approved.
- L’Osservatore Romano, on October 13, 1967 (the fiftieth anniversary of the Miracle of the Sun) remarked that “The liturgical reform has taken a remarkable step forward and has come closer to the liturgical form of the Lutheran church.” Following a heretic who regarded the Mass as “scum and vermin” is now to be regarded as “a remarkable step forward.” This is nothing less than a public profession of apostasy.
- One of those “experts,” the Lutheran representative Dr. Smith could later proclaim, “We have finished the work that Martin Luther began.”<sup>16</sup> Yes, the man who called The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass “evil,” “scum,” and “vermin” now had one of his disciples, from the church bearing his name, proudly declare that he had witnessed the triumph of Luther in the destruction of the Mass he so despised. This was confirmed by a Catholic expert...
- “This needs to be said without ambiguity: the Roman Rite as we knew it no longer exists. It has been destroyed.” Fr. Joseph Gelineau, S.J.<sup>17</sup>

### The Freemasons

*[Their goal is] “the ruin of all forms of religion, and especially the Catholic Religion.” Pope Leo XIII*

In their plan for infiltrating the Church, the Masons foresaw the day when their descendants would “bring friends around the Apostolic Chair.” They succeeded, and one such friend was given charge of creating the New Mass.

- Anabelle Bugnini had once been expelled from the Vatican for his suspect views. Yet, once Paul VI, the Pope desired by the Masons, had ascended to the Chair of Peter, not only was he restored, he was given a power no man had ever had – to contrive a Rite of the Mass. As Cardinal Ratzinger rightly criticized: “Neither the Apostles nor their successors ‘made’ a Christian liturgy; it grew organically as a result of the Christian reading of the Jewish inheritance, fashioning its own form as it did so...”
- Once his Novus Ordo was complete, Bugnini could brag that his concoction was “a major conquest of the Catholic Church.”
- Eventually, he was exiled again when Pope Paul was confronted with the proof that he was working for the Freemasons. Mind you, there is no reason to believe that Paul removed him *for that reason*, but for the threat of publicity that accompanied the private confrontation.
- This is not speculation: Archbishop Bugnini later admitted that this was the reason Paul removed him (while maintaining that the Pope was mistaken).
- Again, Paul’s Masonic beliefs become evident: Knowing full well that a member of an organization committed to the destruction of the Church had been able to have one of their own fabricate the Church’s central act of worship, he did nothing to repeal or retract that work. A member of “The Kingdom of Satan,” using a heretic who regarded the Mass as “scum and vermin” as his model, is the creator of the rite of the Mass heard by the overwhelming number of Catholics. This is a fact. Therefore, it can also be stated as a matter of fact that:

***The purpose of the Novus Ordo is the loss of faith***

Faith in the Real Presence and the priesthood in particular, and the entire faith in general. This is simple modus ponens, as logic can lead to no other conclusion:

Fact #1 – Protestant services were designed to end belief in the Real Presence and priesthood.

Fact #2 – The Novus Ordo was designed to imitate a protestant service.

Fact #3 - Currently, over seventy percent of Catholics (in name) do not believe in the Real Presence, and the priesthood cannot mathematically withstand one more decade of the loss of numbers it has endured since the “New Springtime” of Vatican II.

Here are some additional sources to support these realities:

The Novus Ordo was intended to mimic a protestant service

- “We must discard from our Catholic prayers and from the Catholic liturgy everything that could constitute the slightest risk of obstacle or displeasure for our separated brethren, that is, for the protestants.” Archbishop Annibale Bugnini, chief architect of The Novus Ordo<sup>18</sup>

- Jean Guitton, close friend and confidant of Paul VI, stated, “The intention of Paul VI with regard to what is commonly called the Mass, was to reform the Catholic liturgy in such a way that it should almost coincide with the protestant liturgy.”<sup>19</sup>
- “The liturgical reform, that willed by Paul VI and realized with the contribution and satisfaction of protestant theologians, has produced extremely grave harm for the Faith.” Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, “My Life”

### The Novus Ordo regarded as heretical

- Cardinal Ottaviani was head of the Holy Office under three popes. He wrote, “The Novus Ordo Missae...represents a striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Holy Mass as it was formulated at the Council of Trent,” and that there are “implicit denials of Christ’s Real Presence and the doctrine of Transubstantiation.” His report concluded, “It is clear that the *Novus Ordo* no longer intends to present the faith as taught by the Council of Trent. Yet the Catholic conscience is bound to that faith in eternity. Hence the true Catholic, by the promulgation of the *Novus Ordo*, is faced with the tragic necessity of a choice.”<sup>20</sup>
- Charles Cardinal Jounnet of Geneva wrote that, upon reading the definition of the Mass in the Novus Ordo, he knew it was heretical and told Paul VI this. Paul told him, “Well, to speak truthfully, I did not read it. I signed it without reading it.” This admission truly defies words. A Pope did something so monumental *he had no right to do it*, even swearing a solemn oath to God to that effect. The reason for the oath was validated in the consequence of its repudiation: the loss of faith and an onslaught of sacrilege that no one would have ever dreamed possible. Even with all this at stake, he simply signed what a Masonic agent placed before him.
- A rather telling item of evidence is Paul’s forward, revised once confronted with the harsh critique of Cardinal Ottaviani. In it, the teaching of the Council of Trent is set forth, with the assertion that the Novus Ordo intended to present this faith. The fact that a Church document is promulgated along with a forward insisting that it is orthodox may be a good sign it is not so orthodox after all.

### Paul’s introduction of the Novus Ordo

Tradition is to Catholicism as novelty is to heresy. In II Thessalonians, the very letter in which St. Paul warns of the antichrist and “the man of lawlessness,” he wrote how the faithful could avoid falling for this deception: “So then ,brethren, stand firm and hold to the traditions which you were taught by us, either by word of mouth or by letter” (2:15). He likewise enjoins them, and us, “Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you keep away from any brother who is living in idleness and not in accord with the tradition that you received from us” (3:6).



This distinction between tradition and novelty as equaling the difference between Catholicism and heresy is as old as the Church herself. In his “History of the Church” (4<sup>th</sup> century), Eusebius wrote that his principal goal was to separate the true history of the Church from heretical deviations, while also identifying “the names and dates of those who through a passion for innovation have wandered as far as possible from the truth, proclaiming themselves the founts of knowledge falsely so called while mercilessly, like savage wolves, making havoc of Christ’s flock.”<sup>21</sup>

It has already been noted that St. Pius X condemned those who “invent novelties of *some kind*.” Yet, a novelty centered on the Mass is of the grandest kind. Leading up to the Council, Pope Pius XII continued the Church’s centuries old condemnation of innovations, especially in terms of the liturgy. His words were a veritable rebuke of the Novus Ordo, as he condemned “the temerity and daring of those who introduce novel liturgical practices, or call for the revival of obsolete rites out of harmony with prevailing laws and rubrics.” Such innovators, he wrote, “deserve severe reproof.”<sup>22</sup>

At the onset of his papacy, Pope Paul swore a solemn oath to uphold the perpetual Papal vigilance against innovators, swearing: “I vow to change nothing of the received tradition, and nothing thereof I have found before me guarded by my God-pleasing predecessors, to encroach upon, to alter, or to permit any innovation therein.” He even condemned himself in advance in the same oath: “I will keep without sacrifice to itself the discipline and the rite of the Church. I will put outside the Church whoever dares to go against this oath, may it be somebody else or I.”<sup>23</sup>

In what has to be one of the most bizarre, muddled speeches in the history of the Papacy, Paul gave his justifications for imposing his novelty on the Church. Yet, as the Church already had solemnly taught, *no such novelty ever could be justified*. Paul himself made a solemn oath to that effect; yet, liberals are liars, and a law unto themselves. It would seem that the archbishop who betrayed Pius XII got a taste for it; not even his own oath sworn to God, with the fearsome acknowledgement that “If I should undertake to act in anything of contrary sense, or should permit that it will be executed, Thou wilt not be merciful to me on the dreadful Day of Divine Justice,” would stop him from invading the most sacred place on earth and imposing his own fetid designs. Novelty reigned over tradition, heresy over Catholicism. The word used to condemn such an action, “novelty,” is the very word Paul used to describe his Mass:

“We ask you to turn your minds once more to the liturgical innovation of the new rite of the Mass...a change in a venerable tradition that has gone on for centuries. This is something that affects our hereditary religious patrimony, which seemed to enjoy the privilege of being untouchable and settled. It seemed to bring the prayer of our forefathers and our saints to our lips and to give us the comfort of feeling faithful to our spiritual past, which we kept alive to pass it on to the generations ahead...“We must prepare for this many-sided inconvenience. It is the kind of upset caused by every novelty that breaks in on our habits...” [The Holy Mass is reduced to a “habit”]

“It is here that the greatest newness is going to be noticed, the newness of language. No longer Latin, but the spoken language will be the principal language of the Mass. The introduction of the vernacular will certainly be a great sacrifice for those who know the beauty, the power and the expressive sacrality of Latin. We are parting with the speech of the Christian centuries; we are becoming like profane

intruders in the literary preserve of sacred utterance. We will lose a great part of that stupendous and incomparable artistic and spiritual thing, the Gregorian chant. We have reason indeed for regret, reason almost for bewilderment. What can we put in the place of that language of the angels? We are giving up something of priceless worth.”

“If I should undertake to act in anything of contrary sense, or should permit that it will be executed, Thou will not be merciful to me on the dreadful Day of Divine Justice,” (Paul VI, coronation oath). “By your own words you will be condemned” (Jesus Christ, Matthew 12:37).

## **Part IV: The Mass Itself**

Many exhaustive works exist which, line by line, go through the Novus Ordo and demonstrate how it is a deliberate attempt to make the Mass little more than a protestant prayer service, watering down and deleting nearly everything specifically Catholic. In this section, I will provide a brief sampling, thinking in lines of the symptoms of the great apostasy. As it was Paul himself who proclaimed that the Church had turned towards a man-centered view of the world, this new orientation is certainly visible in his new Mass.

### The Cult of Man and the altar facing the people

- Cardinal Ratzinger offered an eloquent summary of this innovation symbolizing the self-centered nature of the Novus Ordo, “a self-enclosed circle,” noting that it reflected the marginalization of God in favor of a man-centered experience.<sup>24</sup> “The united sense of the Church is spoiled by face to face celebration, because the Church’s sense of worship depends on a united looking towards God, and not upon its members contemplating one another.”<sup>25</sup>
- Also, this offers an example of the dishonest propaganda used by the Novus Ordo Church to foist novelties upon the faithful. Almost any Catholic will refer to the ancient arrangement as “the priest standing with his back to the people,” as they have long been taught. Yet, this is not the case: the priest and the faithful all faced east together, symbolic of their collective expectation of the coming of the Lord. This pejorative misrepresentation of the ancient practice instills a sense of superiority to the past, dominated by an alleged clericalism embodied in the priest’s “turning his back on you” while “he did his thing.” True to the narcissistic preoccupation of laicism, the people are now “empowered,” because the priest faces them, not God and Heaven.
- Likewise, the priest often is speaking to them, another fruit of the apostasy and mark of its success. Now instead of making present the Sacrifice of Calvary by acting in “persona Christi,” the consecration is often referred to merely as an “institution *narrative*,” the simple retelling of a story, not re-presenting of an expiatory sacrifice, as any protestant would agree. In the days when I had to suffer through Masses offered by others, at the moment of consecration, often the priest would look directly at the people, precisely as any school teacher would when telling a story to their children; sadly, many probably regarded their actions as little more than this.

- *The Mockery of Martyrdom:* When the Novus Ordo was promulgated, the Bishops of England sent a letter to the Vatican asking to be excused from adopting the new, protestantized rite. Their reason was that they venerated martyrs who died precisely because they refused to adopt protestant innovations the first time around, in particular turning the altar towards the people. To now have a Pope mandate the very action against which these saints died in protest embodied the “subtlety and mockery” of the Devil (St. Hildegard), and at least there were still some bishops who realized it and resisted. Since liberalism cannot withstand such logical argumentation, the letter was never acknowledged by the Vatican. Dialogue? What dialogue?

### “Non”- prayers

As will be demonstrated in a subsequent chapter, the Vatican II Church Book of “Blessings” in fact blesses nothing. Likewise, many prayers in the Novus Ordo Mass are not prayers at all. They are nothing more than a man, the priest, speaking to other men. Pedantic statements of fact are not a prayer; God doesn’t need to be told; He already knows.

For example, on September 20 (Andrew Kim Taegon & companions) the opening prayer reads: “In the land of Korea your call to Catholic faith formed a people of adoption, whose growth you nurtured by the blood of Andrew, Paul, and their companions.” Does God really need to be told that, or is it, rather, that the “prayer” is really an informational factoid for the sake of the congregation? On the feast of “The Beheading of John the Baptist,” we pray, “God our Father, you called John to be the herald of your Son’s birth and death.” Yes, He knows that. The rambling, verbose preface proscribed for that feast is truly insufferable. Again, it is nothing more than a horrendously constructed “life of John the Baptist” under the guise of a prayer. The examples could go on forever, so I will simply invite the reader to take a Novus Ordo Missal and explore for yourself how anemic and watered down so many of those prayers are. Comparing the old & new missals and their corresponding prayers side by side is truly a depressing exercise in minimalism and banality.

### Ending Belief in the Real Presence

1. The Sacrifice of the Mass reduced to a meal: Protestant theology abhors the notion of the Mass being the Sacrifice of Christ on Calvary made present. The Novus Ordo is an attempt to conform the Church to this belief by over-emphasizing the notion of Mass as merely a memorial meal. Pope John Paul II recognized this: “Stripped of its sacrificial meaning, it [the Mass] is celebrated as if it were simply a fraternal banquet.”<sup>26</sup>

Cardinal Ratzinger offered a similar observation: “To speak of the Eucharist as the community meal is to cheapen it, for its price was the death of Christ...and only at this price can we enjoy the Resurrection. Therefore, the Eucharist does not stand or fall by its effect on our feelings. Feelings come to an end, and ultimately, all entertainment becomes tedious – as we know only too well nowadays.”<sup>27</sup>

2. The Sacramentary itself seeks to perpetuate this protestant emphasis. The Real Presence is blatantly de-emphasized [precisely the objection of Cardinal Ottaviani], and an inordinate number of prayers use

terms that could just as easily apply to bread and wine as the Body and Blood of Christ. There is a deliberate vagueness in the formulas which in no way support the doctrine of transubstantiation, and can be interpreted in any of a multitude of ways, most of which would be agreeable to any protestant. The prayer after Communion, meant to give thanks for the Body and Blood of Christ we have received, uses the following vague terms...

- “Our communion” appears eight times.
- “Food from Heaven” is used seven times.
- “Food,” with no other qualification, on Tuesday of the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of Lent.
- “This mystery” is used thirteen times.
- “This eucharist” is used seventeen times. Although most Catholics equate “Eucharist” with the Blessed Sacrament, it literally means “thanksgiving,” a word any protestant would use to describe his service.
- “This sacrament” is used eight times.
- “Food of life” is used once. (Milk and eggs are rightly described thus)
- “Your food and drink” is used once (Christmas).
- “Gifts and blessing we receive” is used once.
- The very thing we have received, “Body and Blood of Christ,” is explicitly called such a mere four times.

The prayers over the gifts in preparation for the consecration likewise are a systematic attempt to obscure the Real Presence. When the liturgical year is taken as a whole, there are literally scores of occasions on which this prayer, absolutely in no way whatsoever, anticipates the fact that the bread and wine will become the Body and Blood of Jesus.

- In one such prayer, we ask God that they become “a source of health and strength,” as they would be even if they remained mere bread and wine.
- We ask God that “this bread and wine we offer as a sign of our love and worship lead us to salvation.” Yet, it is what the bread and wine become that leads to salvation. One may say that this transformation (transubstantiation) is implied; yet, the words do not justify that, hence the prayers is completely compatible with the protestant belief that the bread and wine remain as such.
- Repeatedly, we ask God that “our spiritual sacrifice make of us an everlasting gift to You.” It is the sacrifice of Jesus, made present on the altar, that makes us an everlasting gift to Him, not our nebulous “spiritual sacrifice,” which has no precise meaning and, again, is in no way dependent upon the Real Presence.
- It is repeatedly asked of God that “our offerings make us holy.” Jesus makes us holy, not “our offerings.”

- Repeated prayers are offered for our “health in mind and body.” Should our souls not be thrown into the equation?
- Over and over, we come across such vapid phrases as “source of blessing,” “this memorial,” “this mystery,” “source of health and strength,” “sacrifice of praise...” Could not each of these be explained in a way which does in fact imply the Sacrifice of Calvary and the Real Presence of Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament? Yes. Could they likewise be explained in a way which does not? Yes. Hence the protestant ministers who helped write the new Mass said that they could pray all of the prayers in complete accord with their own beliefs.

3. Communion in the hand: Once again, we find “The Kingdom of Satan” pulling the strings in the Vatican. It was the Masonic Cardinal Leo Suenens who led the drive to institutionalize this abuse. He openly patronized the “International Congress of B’nai B’rith” in Brussels and received the Masonic “Templeton Prize” for “his contribution to the transformation of ecclesial structures.” He favored women’s ordination and contraception, and in his own diocese only erected churches designed so as to make kneeling impossible. This rebellion which he instigated embodies the characteristics of the Great Apostasy in a number of ways:

A. Laicism/anti-clericalism:

Thomas Aquinas wrote that only the priests could touch the Blessed Sacrament with their hands for three reasons:

- He consecrates in the person of Christ and, included in the mandate of Christ at the Last Supper, they are the ones commissioned to give Communion to others.
- The priest exists to offer the people’s gifts to God, and God’s consecrated gifts to them.
- Out of reverence for the Sacrament, nothing touches it that isn’t consecrated, which is why the priests’ hands are consecrated at ordination.

B. Modernism – nothing is sacred: The German protestant Martin Bucer knew full well that the reason Catholicism insisted on Communion on the tongue only was to both live out and safeguard her teachings on the Priesthood and the Real Presence: “I have no doubt that the usage of not putting these sacraments into the hands of the faithful has been introduced out of a double superstition: firstly, the false honor they wish to show to this sacrament, secondly, the wicked arrogance of priests claiming greater holiness than that of the people of Christ, by virtue of the oil of consecration.”

C. Lawlessness: The mystery of lawlessness foretold by St. Paul could not be more apparent, or more dramatic, than in the Novus Ordo itself and with Communion in the hand. Yet again, *liberals are liars*: most Catholics assume, because they have been told, that communion in the hand was approved by the Council. This is false. Communion in the hand was an abuse begun in

Holland that spread through Europe. Pope Paul VI polled the bishops of the world on the matter and they *overwhelmingly rejected* allowing communion in the hand. Pope Paul communicated to the bishops of the world that the manner of placing the Sacred Host on the tongue “must be observed” because:

1. “It rests upon a tradition of many centuries.”
2. “A pressing sense of reverence toward this Holy Sacrament.”
3. It embodied the humility which receiving the Sacrament demanded.

He wrote that Communion in the hand could lead to:

1. A lessening of reverence “toward the noble Sacrament of the Altar”
2. Its profanation
3. The adulteration of correct doctrine

Yet, at the same time, he rewarded the rebels. In places where the abuse had begun he allowed it to continue if a secret ballot among the bishops voted in favor of it. In America, the bishops began this abuse *after* this mandate, thus compounding the rebellion and disdain for the Church’s rightful authority. What could be more in accord with the spirit of lawlessness and the antichrist than:

1. To use The Body of Christ Himself as the means of rebelling against the Church, and then...
2. To have the Church in turn *make those same rebels the source of law*. Mr. Amerio points out the icon of this incoherence is the bulletin issued on the matter, where the abuse is both permitted and forbidden in the same decree.
3. The Church’s hierarchy taking steps to dissolve its own authority: This ties in with the unit on “The Papacy Attacking Itself,” as we see the “self-destruction” observed by Paul VI in effect.

Again, this is evident in adapting the Mass to the beliefs of Martin Luther. Not only did Luther despise the papacy, he rightly understood that the Roman Rite was a safeguard preserving the Church’s doctrine concerning her own hierarchy and divine authority. That same authority would in turn incorporate Luther’s ideas, and soon find itself flatly disobeyed when it came to regulating that same Mass.

This was confirmed by Cardinal Gut, the Prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship in *Documentation Catholique*, No. 1551, p.18: “Many priests did whatever they liked. They imposed their own personalities. Very often unauthorized initiatives could not be stopped. In his great goodness and wisdom [!], the Holy Father then made concessions, often against his own inclinations.”<sup>28</sup>

Communion in the hand overlaps with many principles convergent in the Novus Ordo, and we will further discuss the implications of this practice under subsequent headings.

### Ending belief in the priesthood

- Communion in the hand: It is Catholic theology that *only a priest can self-communicate*, and even then only in the context of offering Mass. Yet, true to its desire to end belief in the ordained priesthood, in the Novus Ordo, everyone is his own priest and gives himself communion. When a priest places the Sacred Host on your tongue, he has administered to you Holy Communion. However, when he places the host in your hands, he is giving you a Sacred Host that you, in turn, will administer to yourself.
- Eucharistic ministers: The Latin word for priest, “sacerdos,” means “giver of sacred things.” When receiving Holy Orders, a priest’s hands are anointed with the sacred chrism for precisely this reason, as these hands have been consecrated and set apart to handle and give, sacred things to the faithful. This understanding of the role of the priest has been apparent from the first days of the Church. In fact, the Liber Pontificalis credits Pope Sixtus I (d. 127 A.D.) with having laid down as ordinances that none but the clergy should touch the sacred vessels. But a modernist could not accept such distinctions, and they would have their day. Now, not only can anyone pick up a chalice, anyone can distribute its sacred contents as well. Pope John Paul II affirmed the Catholic teaching that “to touch the sacred species, and to distribute them with their own hands, is a privilege of the ordained.”<sup>29</sup> Yet, this did nothing to stop the ever-increasing use of lay-ministers of communion, thus allowing the theology and practice of the priesthood to be diluted on a daily basis.
- The priests themselves: Priests are not exempt from the Apostasy, and it is oftentimes their own disbelief in the sacred character of their own office that inspires them to perpetuate this abuse. While the instruction permitting the laity to do what is reserved to the ordained (the same schizophrenia we saw in the document allowing Communion in the hand) states that only “genuine necessity” allows this exception, that is not the case in any parish of which I am aware. As incoherent as it is, there is no shortage of anti-clerical clerics who accept Holy Orders only to exercise it in such a way so as to deprive it of its substance.

I have never seen a parish with multiple priests in which the priests all come to the altar at that point in the Mass, vested, to help distribute Communion, as was always done before the Council. The other priest(s) can be found idling at the kitchen table, shuffling papers at his desk, or standing on the parking lot waiting to greet the people after Mass, but never carrying out their sacred function. While this is often a case of simple laziness, it is more so evidence that they simply make no distinction between themselves and a layman, laywoman, or even lay-adolescent doing that which is reserved to their sacred personage.

There is certainly no “genuine need” for the excessive number of people in parishes who take communion to the homebound and nursing homes. There is only a “genuine convenience” for a priest who would rather be pursuing the secular elements of his job, as increasingly, on the part of priests and chanceries alike, it is his ability to run the business that is the measure of a priest.

### Censuring God

Truly, nothing is sacred, as the Vatican II Church has even taken it upon itself to edit the words of God when they contradict their own agenda and ends; and this from the same men who said they would no longer censure heretics.

- “For all...” Even though the Latin version of the Novus Ordo contains the actual words of Christ at the Last Supper when He consecrated the chalice, “For many,” virtually every translation changed the words of Jesus Himself to better conform to the modernist belief of universal salvation and the absence of distinction between believer and non-believer. They cannot do this without The Holy See’s approval. (Pope Benedict has tentatively repealed this false translation, a development that figures in to the conclusion of this book).
- Even if one were to contend that a theological, even linguistic, justification for that translation can be rightly proposed, the Vatican took it a step further. The rite of the Assyrian anaphora (Nestorian) of Addai and Mari was declared valid by a document clearly approved by John Paul II, in spite of the fact that *it does not contain the words of consecration at all*. True to the post Vatican II hubris, “My will is enough,” and not even the words of Christ Himself in confecting His own Body and Blood are binding.
- The lectionary and breviary likewise are the objects of mutilations. This occurs most often in verses in which God does not come across as being “nice.” The Novus Ordo’s Masonic overlord, Archbishop Bugnini, stated that the censoring of the psalms was done at the personal insistence of Pope Paul.<sup>30</sup> All “imprecatory” verses were deemed at odds with Vatican II’s utopian views and removed. Likewise, in twenty two places verses from the Gospels used at Mass have been expunged in order to remove references to the Last Judgment, the condemnation of the world, and sin.

## **Part V: Dissolution**

### **A “New” Mass for a “New” Church**

Since Vatican II the Church has left virtually no dimension of her life untouched in an attempt to sever every semblance of her past. This process of historical dissolution, destroying the continuity that we profess to be the “Apostolic” Church, has touched her most sacred dimension, the Mass. I have heard numerous people recall stories of being in foreign lands, often in times of war, and being so comforted by the fact that, the second they stepped into a Catholic Church and Mass began, it was identical to the



Mass at home. This was both a symbol and a concrete expression of the Church's unity. Yet, it is precisely this unity, this supra-national cohesion, which the enemies of the Church rightly saw as an impediment to their own designs. They would rather have a Church divided, incoherent and fragmented, and so unable to even detect, let alone resist, their own designs. Now, in virtually every diocese, you can go down the road only a mile or two and find a Catholic church which in no way resembles its next door neighbor: both in the way Mass is carried out, the content of the sermons, the behavior of the people, and the divergence in the rituals. In fact, one can hardly speak of Catholic rituals at all, since ritual implies a uniform repetition. Parish by parish, and even priest by priest within the same parish, the "rituals" change on an hourly basis.

Again, the irony and incoherence are of such vast proportions that only the "dimmed intellect" of a liberal could miss them. The advent of ecumenism was hailed as the Church's era of "focusing on what unites us." The Novus Ordo was meant to "ecumenize" the Mass; now, it is a celebration of division. The Church and individual parishes have masses for every ethnic group and nationality, masses for children, masses for teens, masses for young adults, folk masses, polka masses, clown masses; what was the manifestation of the Church's true universal unity is now a festival of division; truly, her own Tower of Babel. However, the most significant act of violence done to the Church's universality was the elimination of her universal language.

### The Extinction of Latin

Liberalism gave birth to the protestant movements, all of which abandoned the sacred language of the Church in favor of the profane language of the local region. This was to accomplish a number of ends:

- "Nothing is sacred:" The termination of a sacred language would obviously diminish the sacred nature of divine worship.
- A man-centered religion: Rather than possessing a beautiful language, refined by the ages, which was reserved to divine worship and formal church writings and doctrines, whatever language prevailed in a given region was good enough for God.
- "The Papacy attacking itself:" The loss of a universal language in particular would likewise harm the universality of the Church in general, and also weaken the ability of her universal authority to govern.<sup>31</sup> With an endless multiplication of translations and rituals, the Vatican can no longer effectively govern them, with numerous doctrinal errors as a result. Martin Luther stated that, by destroying the Mass, the Papacy would likewise be undone; centuries later, Pope Paul would follow the decrees of a man who regarded the Pope as the Antichrist, calling the devil his god, and dying with the words "keep alive my hatred of the Roman Pontiff," and mutilate the Mass according to his designs. In attacking the Mass, Paul was attacking himself, a logic which his liberalized mind never seemed to comprehend.
- The dimming of the intellect: Just as secular liberalism has led to a systemic "dumbing down" of the West, the Church no longer requires her ministers to learn a common language (Canon

law says they should, but this “law” is not enforced in the age of lawlessness), nor expects the faithful to learn a handful of prayers in the universal language. The perpetual recourse to the “lowest common denominator” in ecumenism is likewise made manifest in this regard. If the Church wanted the faithful to better understand the prayers offered on their behalf, she could have taught them. Mere children throughout the world are multi-lingual; could not the modern Catholic, supposedly superior to his ancestors, learn a few pages worth of liturgical Latin?

- “The Restrainer Removed:” This is the title of a chapter soon to come, regarding the means by which the agents of the apostasy have sought to deny the faithful the sources of grace and supernatural protection. The Latin language is a sacred language, and has an efficacy above and beyond prayers said in the vernacular. (This is in the context of the Church’s formal prayers, and does not imply that a person praying to God privately in his own tongue is less heard than a seasoned Latinist). At the age of five, St. Gemma Galgani, a simple peasant girl, had taught herself enough Latin to pray the Church’s basic prayers, as well as the Office for the Dead, knowing the power of “the language of Heaven.” Likewise, as any exorcist will confirm, the Latin language is abhorred by demons and has a special power over them, a power we now surrender.

#### The Popes on Latin

The larger and, yes, sinister agenda behind destroying the Church’s sacred language can best be gleaned from the popes themselves:

- Pope Pius VI, *Auctorem Fidei*, 1794: In condemning the errors of the Synod of Pistoia, he rejected demands for the use of the vernacular on the following grounds: “As referring to the use of the vernacular in liturgical prayers – false, rash, disturbing the prescribed order of the celebration of the mysteries, *and easily productive of many evils.*”<sup>32</sup>
- Pope Pius XI: “For the Church, precisely because it embraces all nations and is destined to endure till the end of time...of its very nature requires a language which is universal, immutable, and non-vernacular.”<sup>33</sup>
- Pope Pius XII: “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 the corruption of true doctrine.”<sup>34</sup>

“The day the Church abandons her universal tongue is the day before she returns to the catacombs.”

- Pope John XXIII: “The Catholic Church has a dignity far surpassing that of every merely human society, for it was founded by Christ the Lord. It is altogether fitting, therefore, that the language it uses should be noble, majestic and non-vernacular.”

- Cardinal Montini (Paul VI) at the council: “When it is a matter of the language used in public worship, think seriously before you decide that those parts of the liturgy which belong to the priest should be in any other language than that handed down to us by our forebears; for only thus will the unity of the Mystical Body at prayer and the sacred formularies be maintained.”<sup>35</sup> ***Only thus!!*** Yet, the same Cardinal who issued these warnings would become the Pope who made it so.
- Incredibly, even as Pope, Paul would write in his apostolic letter *Sacrificium Laudis*, that abandoning Latin, “attacks not only this bountiful spring of civilization, this rich treasure of piety, but attacks too the decorum, the beauty and the original vigor of the prayer and song of the liturgy.”<sup>36</sup> By his own words, Paul would soon attack the vigor of the Church’s prayer!

All of these things warned against by previous popes embody safeguards against the beliefs and ends sought by the agents of apostasy: the universality of the Church, her divine nature, the unchangeable nature of her doctrines, her foundation by Christ, that she is more than a mere human enterprise. Other latent elements of the apostasy are likewise made manifest in the extinction of Latin:

“My will is enough.”

In teaching about the Roman Canon, the ancient prayer of consecration, the Council of Trent had this to say: “Since it is becoming that holy things be administered in a holy manner, and of all things this sacrifice is the most holy, the Catholic Church, to the end that it might be worthily and reverently offered and received, instituted many centuries ago the holy canon, which is so free from error that it contains nothing that does not in the highest degree savor of a certain holiness and piety and raise up to God the minds of those who offer. For it consists partly of the very words of the Lord, partly of the traditions of the Apostles, and also of pious regulations of holy pontiffs.” Such credentials were not sufficient for the modernists, and they would soon have their day.

The hallmark of the post-Vatican II Church’s leadership is a hubris exceeded only by incompetence. Paul VI’s embodiment of the “attitude of apostasy” could not have been more evident as it was in his eliminating of Latin...

#### Superior to the Past

Pope Pius XII wrote in his encyclical of 1947 “*Mediator Dei*” regarding “the serious reasons the Church has for firmly maintaining the unconditional obligation the celebrant has to use the Latin tongue.” Even Pope John XXIII, despite his manifest infection with modernity, wrote in “*Veterum Sapientia*” in 1962: “Let not innovator dare to write against the use of Latin in the sacred rites...nor let them in their folly attempt to minimize the will of the Apostolic See in this matter.” As already noted, Paul likewise regarded the directives of Vatican II subject to his own whimsical veto, even as he claimed to be enforcing them.

#### The “utter incoherence” of Catholic liberalism

This is yet another example of Paul's frequent bouts of schizophrenia. The same Pope who abolished Latin in the Church's formerly sacred rites reproached the mayor of Rome in January of 1970 for abolishing Latin in middle schools (a nationwide action). He called it "an offense to Rome, and a self-inflicted mutilation of Roman culture."<sup>37</sup> That he did not recognize his own identical action, only in a far graver venue, as being a mutilation of Catholic culture can only be recognized as what our Lady of LaSalette called it: a dimming of the intelligence on the part of negligent pastors.

Even more telling of Paul's schizophrenia was his response to an inane proposal to change the Rosary: "The faithful would conclude that 'the Pope has changed the Rosary,' and the psychological effect would be disastrous."<sup>38</sup> Could he, then, genuinely not foresee the same effect, on a far more staggering scale, when the ancient Mass suffered just such mutilations at his command?

### Laicism and the dissolution of the priesthood

As the priest is one set apart, praying "In the Person of Christ" for the sake of those present and the whole Church, His prayers were addressed to God, and the people did not need to hear or understand all of them. It was a conversation between the priest and God, albeit on the people's behalf. The elimination of Latin embodies the anti-clerical tenets of modernism which essentially holds that the priest does not have such a privileged position, is in no way superior to the community, and should not pray in such a way that it is not, in fact, directed to them. Therefore, the priest now faces the people, always speaking into a microphone, in the language they can understand, rather than the sacred language reserved for God.

## **Part VI**

### **The Man-centered religion & the fostering of irreverence**

The Mass of the ages was instituted and developed in a way which reflected the God-centered nature of Catholicism, with the logical culmination in Christ present in The Blessed Sacrament. The gravity of the Mass was, among other ways, reflected in the proscriptions that the priest had to observe. Given that the Mass was earth's greatest treasure, that he was standing in the person of Christ offering the Sacrifice of Christ to the Father, in accord with the universal Church, led to the seriousness with which every sacred action was taken. Defects in the Mass, ways in which the priest violated the Church's ancient rituals, perhaps even to the point of invalidating the consecration, were a possibility of which the priest was always conscious. As Mr. Amerio summarized, "These possible mishaps and irregularities were very carefully considered in the old Missal. But obviously, when the sacrament ceases to be sacred in its very essence, defects in its celebration become matters of no importance." For this reason, the instruction "Concerning defects occurring in the celebration of Mass" was completely dropped from the new missal.

The advent of a man-centered religion to replace the God-centered one would likewise mean abolishing those God-centered elements to reflect the new orientation towards "the cult of man" which Paul so effusively espoused. As already noted, this is reflected in the nullification of the divine orientation of the altar (which in most cases is no longer a true altar), as it now faces man, the abandonment of the "Language of Heaven" in favor of the pedestrian language of man, the replacement of prayers to God

with statements of fact intended for the congregation, the dissolution of the priestly character as “another Christ” by relegating his sacred duties to anyone whomsoever, and finally, the treatment of God Himself. When Christ, therefore the Blessed Sacrament, was regarded as the center of the universe and Mass, the Church acted accordingly. Now that it is man, the Blessed Sacrament is treated accordingly, with the logical consequence, foretold by the very pope who made it possible, that reverence for the Blessed Sacrament would decrease, correct doctrine would be adulterated, and finally, the Blessed Sacrament would be profaned: the sin of sacrilege.

It is not a matter of abuses; the Novus Ordo itself degrades the reverence due to the Blessed Sacrament in serious ways. From time immemorial, if the Sacred Host fell to the floor during the distribution of Communion, everything stopped; in short, people acted as though Christ Himself had been dropped to the floor. A bell was rung, everyone stopped in their tracks, the spot on the floor was purified, and a cloth placed over it so that further rites of purification could be carried out after Mass. The instruction for the Novus Ordo? Pick it up; nothing more. Just as you would if you dropped a cookie you were eating. Oftentimes this is mockingly called “the five second rule,” a reference as to how long food can remain on the floor and still be deemed edible.

In all of this we see a two-fold denigration of both the priesthood and The Blessed Sacrament. For all of the centuries in which only the consecrated hands of the priest could touch the Sacred Host, even that was only after he performed the ablutions at the altar and then touched nothing else whatsoever for the balance of the Mass, so as in no way profane the Blessed Sacrament. Now, as anyone whomsoever can handle the host, they do so in any deplorable manner whatsoever. People routinely stick out their hand to receive communion as they juggle their car keys in the same hand, or expect the sacred host to be placed on top of the note they have scribbled on their palm. Teenagers stick their hand out to receive the Host with their sleeves completely covering their palms, and simply respond with a vacant stare, revelatory of their spiritual stupor and shoddy parenting, clueless as to why I proceed to put the host in their mouth. Manual laborers whose professions leave their hands with a permanently embedded layer of grease and grime glibly stick it out nonetheless, never even stopping to consider that the Holiest object on earth and in Heaven just might deserve better. I can only ask you to consider, dear reader, who takes more pleasure in such “worship,” God or the Devil?

Likewise the division among Catholics is accentuated further still as people contrive their own “mini rituals” as they give themselves communion. Laymen who give communion think that they are so central to the Rite that they call communicants by name as they approach, hence creating a distinction between those they know and those they don’t. Truly, most novus ordo Masses have to be regarded as festivals of irreverence far beyond any measure in which they constitute anything even remotely approaching the worship due to God. Sadly, however, such irreverence is just the beginning...

#### Man as the greatest good leads to sacrilege for the sake of human pride

As duly documented, the goal of the ecumenical Church was to end distinctions among religions. This distinction is most apparent in the requirements for receiving Holy Communion; a Catholic in the state of grace. Such distinctions are not acceptable to the ecumenist, so on September 21, 1966, Paul authorized Miss Barbarina Olson, a Presbyterian, to receive Holy Communion, during her wedding

Mass, while in no way whatsoever abjuring her errors and making a profession of Faith of any kind. Such sacrilegious communions multiplied quickly, and eventually Pope Paul VI gave permission for Cardinal Willebrands to issue a decree (July, 1972) stating that inter-communion was left to the judgment of the local bishop. Many elements of the apostasy are revealed in this act: Paul's belief that he was a law unto himself, unbound by the deposit of faith, and then, in his typically incoherent fashion, renouncing his authority in lieu of individual bishops after using that same authority to exceed its proper limits. This also embodies the dissolution of the Church, as diocese by diocese bishops decide for themselves whether to uphold Apostolic Tradition or join the movement of indifferentism. In the Vatican, the Bishop chose the latter, and protestants were soon invited to desecrate chapels and altars by holding their services there, an abomination John Paul would take even further in Assisi.

Within the universal Church as well sacrilege flourished. Upon reports of priests sending consecrated hosts through the mail, the Bishop of Verdun stated that he saw nothing objectionable in the practice.<sup>39</sup> Fr. Villa testified, "I would never come to lay down my pen were I to document the countless lists of scandals and sacrileges, of "black masses," of obscenities, perpetrated after Vatican II, precisely on account of the "new liturgy." Pope John Paul II acknowledged this on February 24, 1980, in his Apostolic Letter, *Dominicae Cenae*. He described the results of the *Novus Ordo* thus: "Cases of a deplorable lack of respect towards the Eucharistic species have been reported, cases which are imputable not only to the individuals guilty of such behavior, but also to the pastors of the Church who have not been vigilant enough in regarding the attitude of the faithful towards the Eucharist..."

Yet, by likewise blaming the pastors under whose watch such sacrilege occurs, John Paul likewise brings some scrutiny upon himself. At Masses in St. Peter's square, the Sacred Host is indiscriminately placed in the hand of anyone who reaches for it; the obvious result, tourists, without a clue as to what they are receiving, carry home their "souvenir" from the Pope. World Youth Day's are an even greater abomination. How can one expect to hold a worthy Mass in which hundreds of people cover several acres to give communion to tens of thousands, again, many simply there for the "tourist event" of it all? How could such a scenario end in anything but mass sacrilege? Christopher Ferrara described his, sadly, not uncommon experience at World Youth Day: "The assisting priests who were to distribute Holy Communion, implementing enculturation, accommodated themselves to the heat and humidity by wearing tee shirts, shorts, flip-flops and baseball caps along with their stoles...Hosts were being distributed from big, shallow bowls that could have been used for punch or potato chips. People were reaching over each other's shoulders to grab the consecrated Hosts from the priests. I saw Hosts falling into the mud, where they were being trampled on."<sup>40</sup>

Mr. Michael Matt related his experience: "At the outdoor papal Mass in Des Moines during the papal visit of 1980, consecrated Hosts were being distributed from cardboard boxes. A group of Hell's Angels was given Holy Communion in the hand. I saw them washing down the Body of Christ with cans of beer..."

It is not only a matter of these horrifying examples; it is the day to day life in virtually every parish. Hosts are found in pews, stuffed in missalettes, and on parking lots all the time. The attentive priest will often have to chase after a communicant who clearly has no intention of consuming the Host and retrieve it. People, literally dressed worse than pigs I have seen at a State Fair, stick out their unwashed

hand, which, in the Novus Ordo Church, is the only *real* condition for receiving Communion, despite any rhetoric to the contrary.

Sacrilege and invalid consecrations have even been fostered by bishops and their chanceries. The Archdiocesan paper of Seattle published a “recipe” so people could make their own hosts to be consecrated. It included milk, Crisco, eggs, baking powder and honey. This is not the only instance of such sacrilegious activity but, as Fr. Villa wrote, “I would never put my pen down...”

As Christ so often taught, the Christian would at times have to make a choice between God and man, even to the extent of renouncing one’s own family. Likewise, Pope Paul, and the entire hierarchy with him, were confronted with a choice: is Christ and the reverence due to Him the greatest good, or is it the pride of man, even more specifically, those men who take it upon themselves to defy the Church and her rightful authority, *using the very Body of Christ* Himself as the means of their defiance? True to his mantra of the Church’s turn towards a man-centered view of the world, he chose the latter. Even as he stated it would lead to a loss of reverence, he let the rebels have their way, thus staking the approval won by placating their pride over the reverence due to Christ and the demands of his office.

The incidences of sacrilege, be it explicit profanation or the hidden guilt of tens of millions of unworthy communions, are known to God alone; yet, for fear of offending men, they continue unaddressed and unabated. Imagine a simple scenario: a Pope writes to the Catholics of the world explaining all of the sacrileges and desecrations, as well as the more subtle erosion of faith resulting from Communion in the hand. In conclusion, he mandates that the practice be abolished and all Catholics return to the traditional manner of communicating. In general terms, there would be three levels of responses:

- 1) Faithful Catholics would say “it’s about time,” and even those who somehow were oblivious to these realities would gladly accept the mandate for the sake of preventing such outrages once they were made aware.
- 2) Nominal Catholics, although they may grumble, reciting all of their catch phrases about returning to “pre-Vatican II” would nonetheless go along, all the while not really understanding, as that is how they have lived their entire lives.
- 3) Proud Catholics, the self-absorbed, self-worshipping liberals who have dominated the Church for forty years would refuse. They would find parishes where priests likewise refused to obey this decree and defy the Church to take any action.

It is this third group whom the Popes have feared and obeyed. Christ is not the greatest good; He is not the center. Likewise, even the “man-centeredness” proclaimed by Paul shows all the same incoherence as his “openness” and “dialogue.” Faithful Catholics who would like to attend a Mass where Christ is shown due reverence are told “be quiet and go away,” while those who insisted on the “right” to receive Communion in the hand, even though no such right existed were told, “as you wish.”

The simple act of informing mixed congregations at weddings and funerals as to who may and may not receive Holy Communion is almost an act of “heroic virtue” these days, as the priests who do so are in the minority and are often undermined by their chanceries and fellow priests. As one priest doing his

best to be faithful in the midst of all the irreverence conceded, he oftentimes feels a temptation to say nothing and not deal with the grumblers and malcontents. Priests who explicitly invite everyone to communion without distinction, on the other hand, do so freely and without consequence.

Even we “conservative” Novus Ordo priests (yes, I am aware that that may well be an impossible oxymoron) don’t do all that we should to prevent sacrilegious communions. I once asked a group of like-minded priests if any of them, after a Holy Day of Obligation, said to the congregation at the next Sunday Mass: “Since only one third of you came to the Mass for the holyday, and I am quite certain that I did not hear one thousand confessions between now and then, you are in a state of grave sin and your receiving Communion today would be another grave sin. Do not receive until you make a sincere confession and resolve to never miss another Mass again.” No one had, myself included. Pray, dear reader, that I do exactly that the next time around. In the meantime, however, I can only say that it is my firm conviction that at virtually every Novus Ordo Mass in the world, unworthy communions far exceed worthy ones and I have *never, ever, neither explicitly nor implicitly* in any formal context, at any workshop, seminar or priest gathering, had this put forth as a problem to be addressed. When we meet as a presbyterate, it is to talk about ourselves, the secular dimensions of the Church, and the litany of topics prescribed by liberals (diversity, inclusivity, the evils of rigidity, a pluralistic unity in the diverse fruity springtime of the new humanity, etc...). It simply isn’t about Christ anymore.

True to modernity, the war declared against Christ in the Blessed Sacrament and the relentless campaign to annihilate every sense of the sacred reaches its culmination in the Novus Ordo’s downgrading of the sacrament, but is not limited to that. The corrosive effect of forty plus years of people coming to Church for a thoroughly “horizontal,” secular, man-centered experience has permeated virtually every single pre-existing safeguard by which minds were raised to Heaven. As this chapter has already exceeded its due limit, I will instead add for your consideration a sermon given on the topic which conveys this dimension of the apostasy.

### **The Blessed Mother & The Gift of Piety**

Advent, 4<sup>th</sup> Sunday, Year B - Gospel: Luke 1:26 – 38 (The Annunciation)

Christmas is the Feast on which we celebrate the bridge from Heaven to earth being established in Christ, as His divinity took on our humanity. By the Holy Spirit’s gift of piety (literally, “godliness”) we, in a sense, begin to build the bridge from earth to Heaven, as we use and order creation to direct our minds and hearts back to the Creator. Piety, to a large extent, is the gift by which we employ the natural to raise us towards the supernatural.

Imagine if, when you had pulled up on the parking lot, you saw two churches; the one we are in and a second one next to it, of equal dimensions, but made of papier-mâché. Both would be “real” in the literal sense of the word, as the paper one does truly exist and takes up space, yet which one would you accept as the “real” church, the one of substance that will endure? This one, of course, and you would have entered this building not the vastly inferior, albeit real, counterfeit.



In fact, our lives offer us that very same choice, as we live within two coexisting, mutually permeating realities, the natural and the supernatural. Yet, so often we choose to live entirely within the counterfeit world, real, yet inferior, while paying little if any heed to the supernatural which surrounds us. If we could only “tear back the veil” for a moment, physically see the angels and demons which surround and outnumber us, if we could see the saints who share our communion and the God who is present among us, if only for a sliver of a second, our lives would never be the same. Yet, the greater reality *is* here, it is *real*, and the gift of piety is the human expression of our longing to live in it.

During the readings for Advent, twice the Archangel Gabriel is sent to announce the birth of a child. When he went to Zechariah to announce the birth of John the Baptist, Zechariah was frightened when he *saw* the angel. The Blessed Mother, on the other hand, was only troubled when she *heard* Gabriel’s message; the sight of an angel apparently caused her no alarm. Perhaps that is because seeing an angel was not unusual for Mary, living so immersed in the supernatural that its physical manifestation was not surprising to her. Seeing what she knew was there all along wasn’t much of a shock, and so the abundance of the gift of piety within her was made manifest.

With piety, we use the lesser reality of the material, natural order to draw us towards the greater reality, rather than allowing it to distract us or weigh us down. As Christmas marks the beginning of Christianity, it also was the beginning of Christian piety. A simple manger became the first temple of Christ, straw became God’s mattress, the breath of animals gave the Christ-child warmth, a star led the pilgrims’ way, and the first to arrive fell down in worship. This is piety; all of creation and the bodies of creatures being directed towards God to offer Him praise.

This is what St. Francis of Assisi had in mind when he created the first nativity scene. He used creation, a manger, real people and live animals, to draw men’s hearts and minds to the supernatural. He only did it after receiving the Pope’s approval, as he never wanted to be known as an innovator. God also manifested His approval of this act of piety. When people left St. Francis’ live nativity, they took pieces of straw with them, and the straw healed the sick to whom it was touched. As nature was used to draw minds to God, God used it as well to reveal His supernatural power through this natural act of piety.

I am reminded as well of St. Bernadette, the visionary of Lourdes. So reverently did she make the sign of the Cross, that people were sometimes converted merely by witnessing it. This is the gift of piety; a simple, human gesture raising minds and hearts to God.

Recent centuries have seen western politics infected with Deism, which is the belief that God exists, but that He leaves the world to itself, with no bridge between the two having ever been established. Many of our founding fathers were deists; in fact, Thomas Jefferson rewrote the Bible, removing ever reference to Christ’s divinity. Religiously, this has taken the form of Modernity, which St. Pius X described as “the synthesis of all heresies.” This heresy also asserts that the natural and supernatural are entirely separate; the divine does not descend to us, and we cannot ascend to it. While piety is the gift by which we seek to make all of creation sacred so as to raise us to the supernatural, modernity states

that this is just not possible. Modernity's credo could be summarized as "nothing is sacred." All is natural and material, as divinity keeps its distance.

The sad fact is, however, that the loss of piety, the physical expression of faith, will lead to the loss of religion, the corporate expression of faith, and ultimately to the loss of faith itself. By waging war on piety, modernism has caused many casualties of faith. Rome, like any major city, is crowded and loud. Yet, the moment you step into one of its churches, from the grandest basilica to a modest neighborhood parish, it is as though you have entered heaven's foyer. Everything about them calms the spirit, and allows the mind and heart to be raised to the things of Heaven. One such sanctuary is the Scala Santa, The Holy Staircase, which St. Helen brought to Rome from the palace of Pontius Pilate. For over sixteen centuries, Catholics have gone up these stairs on their knees, in atonement for the sins that caused Jesus to climb those same stairs on His way to crucifixion. No foot may ever touch the stairs that Jesus climbed, an act of piety in honor of the place where He trod. In all of those centuries, only one set of feet has been known to step upon them. While there may be the occasional pilgrim whose strength fails in mid-course and must resort to rising to his feet, only one man ever did it as an act of contempt against this act of piety. That was Martin Luther, the forerunner of modernity, and his destructive effect on religion is a matter of the historical record.

At that same shrine I too witnessed a sad spectacle which embodied the inroads modernity has made. As I went up the Scala Santa on my knees, I was eager to see the great shrine at the top, the Sancta Sanctorum, the Holy of Holies. As my guide book explained, it contains many great relics, including a piece of the true Cross and a portrait of Jesus which tradition attributes to St. Luke. Only the Pope was permitted to say Mass there, and when he was not present, no one at all was allowed to enter; thus the name, Holy of Holies. As I was admiring the relics through the grate which allowed pilgrims to see within, someone came traipsing through the Holy of Holies, and it wasn't the Pope; it was a tour guide with a band of slovenly dressed tourists in her train. Reserved for centuries for the Vicar of Christ alone, modernity had succeeded in making it just one more stop for glib tourists, who flashed away with their disposable cameras at things they did not understand, making no sign of reverence whatsoever. Not even the Sancta Sanctorum is sacred anymore, and so piety is extinguished. Martin Luther would have been pleased to see how his example has taken root.

The success of modernity in its war against piety and the sacred hits closer to home as well. Isn't it a sad day when we have to begin Mass by reminding people not to eat or chew gum? If you think that announcement is unnecessary, just run your fingers along the bottom of your pew, and you will feel the disgusting evidence to the contrary. We no longer know how to act (or dress, for that matter) in the presence of God; this is the loss of piety that soon becomes the loss of faith.

We have heard the Gospel of the Annunciation, truly the first Holy Communion, as the Body and Blood of Christ became present in the Blessed Virgin Mary. The same Jesus conceived within Mary is received within us in Holy Communion, yet here too we can witness the tragic loss of faith that soon follows the loss of piety. Today, over seventy percent of people who identify themselves as Catholics do not believe in the Real Presence. They can no longer "pull back the veil" to see the eternal which surrounds them, and instead can't see past the physical presence of a wafer of bread. They cannot escape the real, yet barren, counterfeit world of materialism to see the God Who is right there before

them, just as so many missed Him at Christmas and on Calvary. While there may be many factors contributing to this loss of faith, can it be denied that the loss of piety is among them?

- Piety once dictated that worshipping God should be done in our best clothes; now, everyday is a “dress-down day.”
- Gone is the pious act of fasting in preparation for Holy Communion (sorry, folks; not even in overweight America can one hour of not eating really be thought of as a fast).
- Piety dictated that we approached God on our knees to receive Him; now we stand, as we would for any other person.
- Only after several years of seminary and having his hands consecrated in the act of ordination was a priest able to touch the Sacred Host; now everyone does, and this as they possibly receive communion from their thirteen year old next door neighbor.
- The Sacrifice of the Mass was once offered on a magnificent, marble high altar; now it is on a wooden table, often amounting to little more than a shabby piece of plywood encased in thumbtack-hole-riddled two-by-fours.
- The sanctuary, the “Sacred Place,” was once marked by an altar rail; yet, since “nothing is sacred” the rail has no purpose and has been removed, leaving people free to saunter back and forth through the sanctuary as if it were their living room before and after Mass. Of course, their living room more than likely has better carpet than the shabby one which has replaced the marble floors we once laid as an act of piety.

Can anyone be surprised that the systematic destruction of layer after layer of piety, the purpose of which was to raise our minds towards the God Who was present, has nothing to do with the fact that His Presence is no longer believed? Is it only a coincidence that these are the same innovations adopted by the protestants precisely to end belief in the Real Presence, and that same loss of belief swiftly followed upon our imitation of them? Like Martin Luther’s proud defiance of the piety of the Scala Sancta, it may have taken centuries, but modernity has dragged the Church in his train. The loss of piety results in the loss of faith; the protestants knew this; perhaps someday we will as well.

If all of this sounds discouraging, it should. The loss of faith is a tragic thing, as is the loss of reverence for God that so often precedes it. Yet, no one can keep us from seeking the Holy Spirit’s gift of piety, and we must manifest it in every way possible. Perhaps, like St. Bernadette, our piety will edify someone else, but more importantly, protect and strengthen our own faith and, ultimately, please God. During this Holy Season of Advent, following the example of the Blessed Virgin Mary, we should step back, be quiet, allow ourselves to be immersed in that greater reality, and direct everything else towards it. Piety is that supernatural gift which should permeate every element of our natural lives; it is in the way we dress, the way we speak, the way we act, the way we adorn the walls of our homes. It is the gift of piety that “transforms our ordinary actions into acts of religion.” By piety, we make our natural lives something that draws us towards the supernatural, rather than allowing it to be a distraction that weighs us down and keeps us blind to it. In the words of St. Paul, “Exercise thyself unto godliness...for godliness is profitable to all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.”

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal. "Salt of the Earth," trans. By Adrian Walker. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1997, p. 115.
- <sup>2</sup> Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal, "My Life," pp. 105 – 115.
- <sup>3</sup> Pope St. Pius X. Encyclical Letter "Pascendi."
- <sup>4</sup> Vatican Council II. Sacrosanctum Concilium, Introduction, no. 4.
- <sup>5</sup> Wiltgen, p. 38.
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>7</sup> Sacrosanctum Concilium, art. 4.
- <sup>8</sup> Davies, Michael. The Eternal Sacrifice. Long Prairie, MN: The Neumann Press, 1987, p. 37.
- <sup>9</sup> Villa, Paul VI, p. 175.
- <sup>10</sup> Pope Pius VI, Auctorum fidei, August 28, 1794.
- <sup>11</sup> Micelli, p. 126.
- <sup>12</sup> Lefebvre, Open Letter, p. 3.
- <sup>13</sup> Pastor, Dr. Ludwig. History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd. 1923. Vol. 11, p. 375-76.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid., Vol. 7, p. 44.
- <sup>15</sup> The Detroit News, June 27, 1967.
- <sup>16</sup> Horath, Marian T. "The New Mass: A Flavor of Protestantism." Tradition in Action.
- <sup>17</sup> Davies, Michael. Liturgical Revolution III: Pope Paul's New Mass. Kansas City, MO: Angelus Press, 1980, p. 17.
- <sup>18</sup> L'Osservatore Romano, March 19, 1965.
- <sup>19</sup> Radio interview of Dec. 19, 1993. Radio-Courtoisie, Paris.
- <sup>20</sup> Ottaviani & Bacci, Cardinals: "Brief Critical Review of the Novus Ordo Missae."
- <sup>21</sup> Eusebius. "The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine." Trans. G.A. Williamson. London, England: Penguin Group, 1965. Book 1, Part I., b.
- <sup>22</sup> Pius XII, Pope. Encyclical Letter "Mediator Dei." Vatican City State: Nov. 20, 1947.
- <sup>23</sup> See Villa, Paul VI., p. 282.
- <sup>24</sup> See Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal. "Spirit of the Liturgy." San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000, ch. 3.
- <sup>25</sup> Amerio, 647.
- <sup>26</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Ecclesia de Eucharistia. Vatican City State: April 17, 2003. No. 10.
- <sup>27</sup> Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal. "Feast of Faith." San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986. Pp. 148-53.
- <sup>28</sup> Amerio, p. 154.
- <sup>29</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Apostolic Letter "Dominicae Cenae," Feb. 24, 1980.
- <sup>30</sup> See Bugnini, Annabelle, "The Reform of the Liturgy," trans. Matthew O'Connell. Collegeville, MN: Cited in Amerio, p. 640, note 89.
- <sup>31</sup> See Wiltgen, p. 42.
- <sup>32</sup> See Denzinger, The Sources of Catholic Dogma. Trans. Roy J. Deferrari. Fitzwilliam, NH: Loreto Publications, 1955. No. 1566 ff.
- <sup>33</sup> Pius XI, Pope. "Officiorum omnium. Vatican City State, 1922.
- <sup>34</sup> Pius XII, Pope. Mediator Dei, 59-60.
- <sup>35</sup> See "The Tablet," January 11, 1964.
- <sup>36</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Apostolic Letter "Sacrificium Laudis," cited in Amerio, 612.
- <sup>37</sup> Amerio, p. 612, note 6.
- <sup>38</sup> Ferrara & Woods, p. 173.
- <sup>39</sup> See Amerio, 597, note 20.
- <sup>40</sup> Ferrara, Christopher. "Vatican II & The Spirit of Woodstock," Remnant Press.

## Chapter X

### Superior to the Past

*“Only the learned who have studied the origin and development  
of the Roman Church can really understand its greatness.”*

- Pope Nicholas V, on his deathbed

It is the Church’s past which proves her greatness, as the dying Pope rightly noted. Yet, what would happen when a generation arose which thought that the Church’s past was a source of embarrassment, and that they, the current generation, were instead the source of greatness? This was the attitude of every protestant rebel, and would be the attitude of those leading the Church to apostasy.

Some words from St. Augustine offer a relevant insight into the mentality of modernists. “But more dangerous is the error of certain weak brethren who faint away when they hear these irreligious critics learnedly and eloquently discoursing on the theories of astronomy or on any of the questions relating to the elements of the universe. With a sigh, they esteem these teachers as superiors to themselves, looking upon them as great men; and they return with disdain to the books which were written for the good of their souls; and, although they ought to drink from these books with relish, they can scarcely bear to take them up.”<sup>1</sup>

The admonition of Jesus would seem to apply to modernists: “For whoever is ashamed of Me and of my words, of him will the Son of man be ashamed when He comes in His glory and the glory of the Father and of the holy angels” (Luke 9:26). In accord with the Masonic blueprint, a generation of clergy arose which was embarrassed by what they were compelled to profess and teach by the Church, convinced that the liberals were far wiser. Churchmen were embarrassed that they had to say that the one true Church was the Catholic Church. They felt backwards in having to insist that the miracles of Jesus actually happened, and that the Pope was Christ’s Vicar on earth and accepting this truth was necessary for salvation. In short, the generation longed for by the Masons arrived that found Church teachings to be a source of embarrassment, and were eager to recast them in a way that pleased a world that had no use for her, “for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God” (John – 12:43).

As described in a previous chapter, the post Vatican II popes did not have a very noble sense of the greatness of their office and frequently degraded it and made it equal to any other ecclesial office founded on the whims of degenerate men. This mentality has even been given the force of law in both the Catechism and the Mass, as the divine origin of the Papacy is watered down and even denied. This, once again, hearkens back to Our Lady of LaSalette’s message that a dimming of the intelligence and the failure of the Church’s shepherds would facilitate the apostasy. By not understanding (or simply not believing in) the Church’s Divine origin, belief in her greatness instead became an embarrassment of her past (as defined by her enemies), leading the Vatican II Church to believe they were somehow superior to a past which was, in fact, infinitely greater. Here are a couple of sources which indicate that this collective, generational hubris which regarded itself as superior to what had come before is a mark of the Great Apostasy.

- St. Anthony of the Desert: “They will say if they had lived in our day, faith would be simple and easy; but, in their day, faith would be complex; the Church must be brought up to date and made meaningful to the day’s problems.”
- Pope Pius XII: In speaking of a vision he had, which he related to the apparitions of Fatima, Pope Pius (as Cardinal Pacelli) said that part of the Church’s impending “suicide” would be “feeling regret for her historical past.”
- St. Hildegard of Bingen: In a vision, learned that Christians at the end of time, deceived by the antichrist, “will say, ‘Oh, woe to the wretches who lived before these times! For they made their lives miserable with dire pains, not knowing, alas, the loving kindness of God!’”<sup>2</sup>
- Regarding Modernists, Pope Pius X said: “It is pride which puffs them up with that vainglory which allows them to regard themselves as the sole possessors of knowledge, and makes them say, elated and inflated with presumption, ‘We are not like the rest of men,’ and which, lest they would seem as other men, leads them to embrace and to devise novelties even of the most absurd kind.”<sup>3</sup>

The utterly baseless self-satisfaction of the Vatican II apparatus is apparent, and some references have already been made to this reality. An icon of this unbridled generational narcissism was printed in the headlines of L’Osservatore Romano on October 20, 1982: “We are the most gospel-minded century in history.” We can only guess how well this rebuke was taken in Heaven by some first-century, apparently less gospel-minded types like Jesus, Mary, the Apostles and St. Paul. This obnoxious statement was borrowed from Fr. Congar, suspected under Pius XII, a Cardinal under John Paul II, who added: “...to renew itself, the Church must rediscover the Gospel.”

### **Pope John XXIII**

Here are some of the ways in which John disregarded the wisdom of both the Church’s ancient past, and recent history, trusting his own judgment to be superior.

- Pietro Cardinal Pallavicino, the Jesuit historian of the Council of Trent, said: “To convoke a general council, except when absolutely demanded by necessity, is to tempt God.”<sup>4</sup> Thus, for two thousand years ecumenical councils had been called with the express purpose of dealing with specific doctrinal questions. Never before had a council been called simply to “talk about everything.” This ambiguity of purpose soon found itself enshrined in ambiguous documents, as Mr. Amerio so well noted: Vatican II was the most verbose council in history *by at least a factor of six!* “The council’s lack of precision is admitted even by those theologians most faithful to the Roman See, who attempt to acquit the council of blame in the matter. But it is obvious that the need to defend the univocal meaning of the council is itself an indication of its equivocal character.”<sup>5</sup>
- When Pope Pius XI asked Cardinal Billot his thoughts on convening a council at the secret consistory of May 23, 1923, he persuaded Pius that there were too many unstable, modernist bishops in the Church, and that it was the worst enemies of the Church who were calling for a

council (part of the Masonic plan). In the Cardinal's own words, he feared the council would be "maneuvered by the worst enemies of the Church, who are already getting ready, as certain indications show, to bring forth the revolution in the Church, a new 1789"<sup>6</sup> [the very analogy used for the Council in its aftermath]. The situation had far worsened in the intervening thirty five years, yet John disregarded the wisdom of his predecessor in not giving the Church's enemies so powerful a venue.

- It is not uncommon in the Church's history that popes were elected who cared little for their predecessor.<sup>7</sup> Usually, however, this was rooted in political and personal differences. John's overt sense of superiority to Pope Pius XII struck more directly at the heart of the office of the papacy, and this ill-fated misjudgment led him to contradict Pius in ways that were devastating beyond measure.
  - The Masons confirmed in writing that they were grooming Cardinal Montini to be their pope, who had carried on relations with the communists despite Pope Pius' explicit prohibition of this. Pope Pius eventually removed Montini from his Vatican post, where he would have been assured of becoming a Cardinal and eligible for the next Papal election. Pius never bestowed this honor upon Montini; John XXIII, however, not only created Montini a Cardinal, but, on his deathbed, said that he was his choice to succeed him. In fact, Cardinal Silvio Oddi is on record as saying that, upon his election, John called Archbishop Montini and said, "Excellency, I'm keeping your place warm."<sup>8</sup>
  - Elsewhere in this book is treated Pope John's policy of "mercy towards error" and errant and dangerous writers. For this section, it is salient to note the tone of self-satisfaction John expressed, as well as his derision of his immediate predecessor. While not calling Pius by name, it was clearly him to whom John referred when speaking of the "severity" of the past, whereas he would act with "mercy," obviously believing his course to be superior.
  - John also gave Pius a posthumous rebuke when he stated that he was not like so many other "prophets of doom," for whom he had no use. It was Pius who said, only a few years earlier, that the world had never been in such a state of immorality and impiety. Likewise, Our Lady of Fatima, along with her prophecies, were certainly bound up in this statement. John clearly thought that his mere "power of positive thinking" gave him a more accurate assessment of the state of the world than Pius, and that both his assessment of the present and his vision of the future were more to be trusted than those of the Mother of God.
  - Msgr. Capovilla, Pope John's personal secretary, affirmed that he felt "repulsion"<sup>9</sup> for St. Pius X's anti-modernist policy. The word "repulsed" means driven in the opposite direction, that is to say, pro-modernist.
  - One manifestation of this "repulsion" was the repeal of Vatican censures on heretical and suspect writings, and rehabilitating the very authors from whom Pius XII had protected the Church. Again, the dire consequences of John's direct repudiation of Pius' decisions are a matter of public record.

## Pope Paul VI

That Paul felt himself superior to the past, including the Council itself and the ancient Papal Oath which he swore, has already been taken up in the section on the Mass. It has already been noted that, as secretary of state, he felt himself superior to Pope Pius XII and directly contradicted his orders. Like John, he felt his judgment superior to that of the Holy Office and reinstated into places of prominence theologians previously condemned. Although a mere anecdote from his younger days, a letter he wrote as a young man perhaps offers an insight into his self-estimation: “I am convinced that one of my thoughts, a thought from my own soul, is worth more to me than anything in the world.”<sup>10</sup>

Truly incredible in light of the unmitigated, unprecedented disaster that was his papacy is the smugness of Pope Paul in his derision of St. Pius X on the seventieth anniversary of the great encyclical “Pascendi,” which protected the Church from modernist heretics for over half a century. Pope Paul chastised his canonized predecessor stating that “there lacked the knowledge or the will or the respectful courage of reading distinctions and differences in their own reality.” He belittled the great encyclical as “a rash pruning of sprouts then attempting to grow.”<sup>11</sup> Yes, the sprouts of apostasy, of which Paul’s pontificate represented the poisoned flower in full bloom. On the one hand there is a canonized saint, whose perspicacity in identifying, defining, and condemning the heresies menacing the Church preserved her for decades; on the other hand, you have the chosen one of the masons, the puppet of the modernists, the destroyer of the Sacred Liturgy, a pope with the chronic habit of contradicting himself, often within the same speech, who openly confessed that as the Church was self-destructing he would not lead it, daring to rebuke his predecessor as his intellectual inferior and lacking in courage! True to liberalism, Paul’s inability to grasp reality was only exceeded by his hubris.

## The Second Vatican Council

The unabashed self-exaltation of the architects of this Council is simply amazing. They were quite overt in their belief that the event of the Council, because it was “their event,” was as great an event as the world had ever witnessed. Consider...

- Not since Pope Gregory the Great had a change been made to the Canon of the Mass. Pope John felt it was his place to do so, inserting St. Joseph into the Canon, to serve for all time as a reminder that he had been a Patron of the Council. Why did the Council of Trent, Vatican I, or any of the other seventeen councils not feel they were so important so as to leave a permanent thumbprint on the Church’s most sacred prayer?
- Pope Paul’s remark at the end of the Council also gives clear voice to this self-satisfied, collective hubris, as he stated that it “must be numbered without doubt among the greatest events of the Church...” *Must* be? And *without doubt*? Would it not seem sensible to wait and see the results of said event before making such bold assessments? Why must it, *without doubt* (and without any visible justification) be regarded as “*great*?” Because it was *our* event, of course.
- Cardinal Ratzinger opined, “After all the surprises [?!] that had emerged in the realm of theology proper, there reigned a feeling at once of euphoria and of frustration. Euphoria, because it



seemed that *nothing was impossible for this Council*, which had the strength to break with attitudes that had been deeply rooted for centuries...”<sup>12</sup>

- This quote from the Cardinal also reveals the attitude of being superior to the past, as any type of rupture from it is regarded as desirable (even to the point of ‘theological surprises,’ whatever that means). The word “new” appears two hundred and twelve times in the documents. Pope Paul stated, “The important words of the council are newness and updating...the word *newness* has been given to us as an order, as a program...”<sup>13</sup> Likewise, there is the self-satisfied estimation of having the *strength* to break with the past; would not the true manifestation of strength have been having the courage to stay the course?
- Again, a description of the atmosphere at the Council from Cardinal Ratzinger, “The feeling that now, at last, the world had to be, could be, changed, improved and humanized...”<sup>14</sup> Yes, the Church of the past was not even capable of producing a “human” world in its nineteen centuries, according to the future Pope.
- During the course of the Council, Paul effused, “Let us rejoice brethren: when was the Church ever so conscious of itself, when was it ever so happy and so harmonious and so ready for the fulfillment of its mission?”<sup>15</sup> When? As subsequent years would soon demonstrate, just about any other time you choose.
- In a monumentally ridiculous statement, the Cardinal Vicar of Rome [Traglia] boasted: “Never has the Catholic Church been so closely united around its head, never has it had a clergy so morally and intellectually exemplary as at present; nor is there any risk of a rupture in its organization.” As Mr. Amerio rightly noted, “A judgment like that can only be explained by a very excited state of mind, or a very defective knowledge of history.”<sup>16</sup>
- Paul VI: “No other council in the history of the Church of God has had such ample proportions, such assiduous and tranquil labors, or such varied and interesting themes.”<sup>17</sup> On what data he relied in making this comparison to the nature of the proceedings of twenty other councils is anyone’s guess, and the rating of a council based upon “varied and interesting themes” somehow sounds a more fitting criteria for a weekend workshop than an ecumenical council.
- In another inane statement, Paul wrote in 1975 that Vatican II “in some respects is even more important than the Council of Nicea.”<sup>18</sup> A Council whose relevance and gravity have endured for seventeen centuries is now trumped by a Council which closed a decade ago? And this comparative analysis is from the same Pope who confessed the Church’s self-destruction in the wake of the Council. Again, I refer the reader to the statements regarding the incoherence of liberals and the dimming of intellects.

- A self-aggrandizement of the conciliar mechanism that can only be classified as delusional was offered by the same Pope: "...the very time when her ecclesiastical magisterium and her pastoral government have, by reason of the council's solemnity, assumed greater splendor and vigor."<sup>19</sup>

### Assumed spiritual superiority

It is clear that the Vatican II apparatus regarded itself as superior to her historical past. But, as St. Hildegard foretold that the anti-Christ would lead people to believe that their conception of God was superior to that of ages past, the fathers of the Council likewise were convinced that their grasp of God (and by extension of this fact true doctrine) was superior. For example...

- From the future Pope Benedict XVI, Cardinal Ratzinger, we read "Eucharistic devotion such as is noted in the silent visit by the devout in church must not be thought of as a conversation with God. This would assume that God was present there locally and in a confined way. To justify such an assertion shows *a lack of understanding* of the Christological mysteries *of the very concept of God*. This is repugnant to the serious thinking of the man who knows about the omnipresence of God. To go to church on the ground that once can visit God who is present there is *a senseless act* which modern man rightfully rejects."<sup>20</sup>
- Cardinal Ratzinger likewise rejected infant baptism. "The conflict over infant baptism shows the extent to which we have lost sight of the true nature of faith...Whenever it is severed from the catechumenate, baptism loses its *raison d'être* [reason to be]."<sup>21</sup> As is commonplace in the Vatican II apparatus, when there is a difference in matters of faith between Catholics and non-Catholics, the assumption is that the Catholic Church is at fault. As Catholicism has always taught both the validity and desirability of infant baptism, the Cardinal now declares that it is the *true nature of faith itself* that the Church of the past had lost. He *clearly* holds to the protestant/evangelical/fundamentalist position that Catholicism is the corruptor of true Christianity, not its guardian. His condescension was even more overt in "God and the World," where he deemed "unenlightened" those who advocated for infant baptism, regarding it as something "devised" rather than revealed by God.<sup>22</sup> Infallible Church doctrine, as well as the millions of Catholics of ages past who believed it, are now decreed "unenlightened" by the man who would be Pope. (The Council of Carthage, 251 A.D., prescribed that baptism should be conferred on infants "even before they are eight days old." From St. Augustine we read that that infant baptism is an "apostolic tradition" and "the certain rule of truth." According to the future pope, St. Augustine had "lost sight of the true nature of faith").
- Perhaps the Cardinal regarded his grasp of the Sacrament of Baptism as superior to the entire Church of the past because he likewise thought he had a superior knowledge of original sin, deeming it a "misleading and imprecise term."<sup>23</sup> So imbued was the Cardinal with the protestant conviction that the Church corrupted the faith, that he wrote "Perhaps it will have to be admitted that the tendency to such a *false development*, which only sees the danger of responsibility and no longer the freedom of love, *already present in the [Apostle's] Creed*."<sup>24</sup> The Cardinal could only lament the fact that he was not there in the first century to preserve genuine Christianity from the corruption of those who actually knew Christ.

- Again, Cardinal Ratzinger wrote of the inferiority of the Catholic position and, true to modernism, the assumption that the Church is at fault wherever discord is found. “The Council of Trent concludes its remarks on Corpus Christi with something which offends our ecumenical ears and has doubtless contributed not a little toward discrediting this feast in the opinion of our Protestant brethren. But if we purge its formulation of the passionate tone of the sixteenth century we shall be surprised by something great and positive.”<sup>25</sup> In other words, the feast instituted to celebrate the Real Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament needs to be toned down to suit those who do not believe in the Real Presence. The reason this feast is discredited in the sight of protestants is because they reject the doctrine of the Real Presence, not the wording of a document. This, along with the first quote in this section, is a clear rejection of the infallible teaching of the Church that The Blessed Sacrament should be worshipped.
- The nest of contradictions and infinitude of incoherence never ends among the heads of state of the Vatican II machinery. As the unit on the Mass cited Cardinal Ratzinger’s critique of the Novus Ordo’s distorted emphasis on the congregation, he nonetheless also wrote: “The validity of the liturgy depends primarily, not on specific words, *but on the community of the Church*.”<sup>26</sup> Any Catholic with a modicum of a grasp on Sacramental theology knows how false and heretical this is. “The community” is utterly powerless to effect the validity of a Mass. This is solely dependent upon a validly ordained priest using the proper matter and saying the proper words. The Council of Florence (1439) infallibly decreed: “All these sacraments are made up of the three elements: namely, things as the matter, words as the form, and the person of the minister who confers the sacrament with the intention of doing what the Church does. If any of these is lacking, the Sacrament is not effected.”<sup>27</sup>
- The Cardinal likewise regarded himself as superior to the fathers of the Council of Trent regarding his understanding of the priesthood. Again, in his support of the protestant position from which the Council was protecting the true Faith, he wrote, “The Council of Trent did not attempt here a comprehensive treatment of the problem as a whole. Therein lies the weakness of the text it promulgated, the effect of which was all the more disastrous.”<sup>28</sup> Yet again, it is the Catholic adherence to orthodoxy, not the protestant heresy, that is at the root of the problem. It is simply an insufferable hubris that a man who was a key player in a Council which led to the absolute demolition of the Church on every level abrogates to himself the role of chastising the fathers of a council, along with their infallible documents, who strengthened and preserved the Church for centuries from the very heresies that the Cardinal now suggests were in fact correct.

Pope Pius XI wrote that “It is in these heresies (begotten by the reformation) that we discover the beginning of the apostasy of mankind from the Church, the sad and disastrous effects of which are deplored, even to the present hour, by every fair mind.”<sup>29</sup> According to Cardinal Ratzinger, the pope has reality completely reversed, and it is our resistance of these heresies that was “disastrous,” not the heresies themselves.

Likewise noteworthy is the modernist predilection for the word “problem.” The same word used by John Paul II in speaking of the doctrine of the Papacy, the word used by Paul VI when writing about procreation and minor orders; the Catholic position is somehow always a “problem,” rather than the problem lying in the rejection of these things.

- Pope John Paul I demonstrated this mentality as well, stating “He is Father. Even more, God is Mother, who does not want to harm us.”<sup>30</sup> Even more? Given that no pope or saint ever asserted this, is he claiming a more profound understanding of the essence of God? Was Jesus, then, incorrect in His understanding of God when He said His *Name* is **Father**, Son, and Holy Spirit? Is the implication that “Fatherhood” *does* entail a desire to harm?
- Pope John at the Council: “The business at hand is not to make a careful study of some old museum or of some school of thought of the past. No doubt this can be helpful – just as a visit to ancient monuments can be helpful – but it is not enough. We live to advance, appreciating at the same time whatever the past has to offer us in the line of experience. But we must move ever further onward along the road which our Lord has opened up before us...The Christian life is not a collection of ancient customs.”<sup>31</sup> The shallowness of such an estimation of the Church’s history and traditions (which, like a museum or monument, John regarded as dead) is only equaled by the self-satisfaction manifest in this statement. This presumed superiority to the past would lead to the alteration and annihilation of virtually every single act of piety, worship and belief handed down from the past. This is precisely the opposite of what, by the Papal oath, popes swore to do, in defending and preserving all of the Church’s traditions.
- Paul VI was not to be outdone in manifesting a shallow estimation of the past and his imagined superior sense of the spiritual life. “We have doubtless intended to talk of the severity of the saints toward the ills of the world. Many are still familiar with the books of asceticism that contain a globally negative judgment upon the earthly corruption. But it is also certain that we do live in a different spiritual climate, having been invited, especially by the recent council, to bring upon the modern world an optimistic look for its values, its achievements...The celebrated Constitution ‘Gaudium et Spes’ is in its whole an encouragement toward this new spiritual approach.”<sup>32</sup>
  - Even Cardinal Ratzinger would have to concede that the document in question was Pelagian, i.e. heretical, as will be discussed later.
  - How is it that a council, by mere words, can change the intrinsic nature of the world?
  - Is Paul including Jesus in his dismissal of those with an outdated spirituality, since He declared the devil to be the “prince of the world”? Did Paul think that the devil had retired? Or that he was so in awe of the Council he would concede his power in the world and surrender his principality?
  - Is St. John also a proponent of Paul’s outdated worldview, as he wrote that the “entire world is under the power of the evil one?”
  - His condescension towards saints whose lives and writings converted and sustained untold thousands is even more obnoxious when juxtaposed to the council he states had rendered

them obsolete, a council which led to an unprecedented dissolution of the Church's life in every dimension and the loss of countless souls.

- In promulgating his new Mass which would shortly decimate the ranks of the clergy and empty the pews of once thriving churches, Paul condescended to virtually every Catholic who had ever lived by confidently stating that his Mass would bring people out of the “usual torpor”<sup>33</sup> from which they usually assisted at Mass. I suppose he was right – you actually have to *go* to Mass to sit through it in a state of torpor, a precondition he helped to largely eliminate.

### Evolution:

#### The Superiority of Modern Man and the Modern Church:

The subject will be investigated in a subsequent chapter, but for now we will look at the post-Vatican II Church's assumption of the theory of evolution. To evolve means not only to become something different (development would be the proper word to describe something which has remained essentially the same, while improving in a given dimension), but to become something superior as well. Bear in mind, evolution has no legitimate scientific basis; it is a theory based on an ideology. It is an argument for which this book is not intended, and which would require too many pages. The reader may find more than ample facts on the matter from both Christian groups and honest scientists. For now, the scope is limited to the facts that a sign of the apostasy is the belief that those presently living are superior to those of the past, and evolution attempts to give legitimacy to this claim. Pope Pius XII warned that this school of thought had more to do with a godless ideology than true science:

“There are those who contend that the so-called system of evolution, not yet irrefutably demonstrated within the scope of material science, and admitted imprudently and indiscreetly, extends to the origin of all things, and who boldly entertain the monistic and pantheistic theory that the whole world is subject to continuous evolution. Indeed, supporters of communism gladly employ this theory, to bring out more efficaciously and defend their ‘dialectic materialism,’ casting out of mind every notion of God.”<sup>34</sup>

[It is noteworthy how the evolution movement turns on it head, and deliberately so. The same scientists who promulgated this piece of science fiction are also the leading eugenicists, those committed to depopulating the earth. In the first instance, evolution grants individuals a sense of enlightenment, in terms of their imagined intellectual superiority over “backwards” creationists, and also the past, which they have evolved beyond. Yet, with a little slight of hand, this self-exultation of humanity is short-lived, as evolution brings man to the level of an animal, not the culmination of creation. Hence, it becomes the foundation for de-humanization, as these same scientists have now fabricated the “environmental movement” by which humanity is convinced it is the planet's enemy, not overlord, and needs to be drastically diminished by both prevention and elimination. It is precisely for this reason that communist regimes insisted on evolution being taught in their schools, to lend “scientific” credence to their massacre of humanity].

Pope Pius went on to warn of the consequences of this vein of thought: “Such fictions of evolution, by which whatever is absolute, firm and immutable, is repudiated, have paved the way for a new erroneous philosophy which...has obtained the name of ‘existentialism,’ since it is concerned only with the

‘existence’ of individual things, and neglects the immutable essence of things.”<sup>35</sup> Thus, children are conditioned to believe that the essence of man is no longer “the image of God,” but merely an animal with opposable thumbs.

We have already noted how the Vatican II Church reflects this notion of nothing having a fixed essence, for example, the very foundations of the Papacy. In later units, we will see how it has sought to change virtually everything it possibly could of the Church’s past, to the point of eliminating or obscuring its essence to the extent that the Church is no longer recognizable as the Church of the past, while conditioning people to accept any change for the “Church of the Future.” Note also that evolution dissolves the supernatural into mere materialism, as we will soon read how it is on material grounds alone that modern man is imagined to be superior to his predecessors.

It was only a century earlier that Pope Leo XIII wrote, “If any sensible man in our day will compare the age in which we live, so bitterly hostile to the religion and Church of Christ, to those blessed ages when the Church was honored as a mother by the nations, he will surely find that the society of our day, so convulsed by revolutions and destructive upheavals, is moving straightaway and rapidly toward its ruin.”<sup>36</sup> Alas, Holy Father, sensible men were on the brink of extinction. During the intervening century all of those elements which rendered the present *inferior* to the past only gained in strength and diffusion, as Pope Pius XII would acknowledge in a quote already cited. Yet, quite literally out of the blue, “optimism” was mandated and a world teetering on the brink of ruin was now superior to all that had come before it, as the Vatican II Church clearly held that the theory of evolution applied to society in general, meaning a state of necessary improvement.

First, the evidence which clearly establishes that the post-Vatican II Church subscribes to evolution:

1. “The human race is moving over from a static to a dynamic and evolutionary idea of the order of things.”<sup>37</sup>
2. It was Cardinal Koenig, a Mason, who recommended to the council to “finally take into consideration the ideas of Teilhard de Chardin on evolutionism.” A member of “The Kingdom of Satan” recommends the ideas of banished heretic and, as the future Pope Benedict acknowledged, an entire document became based on his “impetus.”
3. “The Church has entered the movement of a history that evolves and changes.” - Paul VI
4. “The Church attempts to adapt to the language, customs, and tendencies of the men of our time, all absorbed by the rapidity of the material evolution and so demanding of their individual particularities. This opening is the spirit of the Church.” - Paul VI [as Archbishop Montini], Milan, Sept. 1958
5. The future John Paul II wrote: “The Church, with the consciousness of the history of salvation that is her own, goes out to meet that multiform evolution and the consciousness of today’s man, which is linked to it...The paschal mystery of Jesus Christ is as open to eschatology (in fact, it awakens ‘the desire for the future world’) as it is to the evolution of the world, which the Council understands above all as a commitment to make the life of humanity and of men ‘more humane.’

Vatican II stressed the ethical meaning of evolution...According to the doctrine of Vatican II, the Church participates in the evolution of the world..." He goes on, "By emphasizing the participation of the Church in the evolution of the 'world,' even by means of her own evolution; and, moreover, by proclaiming its necessity, Vatican II takes a stand in regard to the past and, simultaneously, to the future."<sup>38</sup>

- The world is now presupposed as being superior to the Church, as it is the Church which merely participates in the world's evolution, rather than inviting the world to participate in the eternal life only she can bring. He labels this a *matter of doctrine*.
- The Church *must necessarily* evolve, that is, become something different and superior.
- The future pope writes that the Council was a secular affair, as "*above all*" the Council adopted a commitment to make the life of humanity "more humane," not more Christian.
- Even as Pope, John Paul's feeble attempt to "rehabilitate" evolution and make it compatible with doctrine showed a fundamental flaw in his thinking. "Creation represents itself in the light of evolution as an event extending through time..."<sup>39</sup> Yet, this is precisely the opposite of the only acceptable manner in which a Christian could consider evolution: It is *evolution that must be seen in the light of Creation*, as the means chosen by God to create the world according to His pre-ordained designs. John Paul makes "creationism" a component of evolution, not vice versa.

#### A superior Church for superior man

John Paul II wrote that Vatican II brought about a new, "full and universal awareness of the Church," giving Christianity "a more complete awareness of the mystery of Christ."<sup>40</sup> This demonstrates a convergence of these elements of the apostasy; a spiritually superior Church is now more "aware" of itself than in ages past and our knowledge of Christ has likewise eclipsed that of our poor unenlightened ancestors.

#### Why is modern man superior?

Regarding the modern world's march towards apostasy, Pope Leo XIII made these observations: "Nor is that to be esteemed liberty whose wretched progress is marked by the unrepressed propagation of error, by the unbridled gratification of evil desires, by the impunity allowed guilt and crime, and by the oppression which weighs on good citizens of every rank. All these are wrong, are bad, are absurd, and cannot, therefore, avail to perfect the human race or bless it with prosperity, for 'sin maketh nations miserable' (Prov 14:34). On the contrary, they must, by corrupting both minds and hearts, drag down by their very weight nations into every crime, ruin all order, and at length bring the condition and peace of a commonwealth to extreme and certain destruction."<sup>41</sup>

Yet, not even a century later, this exact same scenario had progressed exponentially. The Faith was being abandoned in an unprecedented fashion, every manner of perversion and immorality is now

available around the clock in the privacy of virtually each and every home, even out of thin air straight into your child's hand. The intervening century was the *most murderous in the history of the world*, and this is not including the *tens of millions of babies murdered* in the womb, the ever dwindling number of practicing Catholics cannot provide even an elementary explanation of the simplest doctrines, Catholic institutions are being closed a break-neck speed, and yet, in a utopianism that is as buffoonish as it is baseless, we are told time and again that the world is *superior to the past*! What possible justification could someone who measures the world by any kind of moral or religious standard give for this belief that mankind has collectively evolved into something superior, a "new humanity?" There could only be one possible reason for believing we are superior to the past, and the answer is itself a sign and a fruit of the Great Apostasy:

## Materialism

Pope Pius XII rightly warned that subscribing to the evolutionary view of the world would end in materialism, in perfect conformity with the "nothing is sacred" slogan of modernity. As the Church openly embraced this evolutionary view of the world, the resulting materialism became apparent. Ultimately, this would lead the Church to seek an earthly utopia rather than heaven, to be covered in depth shortly. For now, however, let's look at some excerpts which demonstrate the worldliness of the Vatican II era, and its equating of material progress and technical advances with an advance in the human condition.

- From Cardinal Ratzinger we read, "The impetus given by Teilhard de Chardin exerted a wide influence [on the Council]. With daring vision [note the self-satisfied language - *daring*, they were!] it incorporated the historical movements of Christianity into the great cosmic process of evolution from Alpha to Omega...this means evolution takes place now in the form of technical and scientific development in which, ultimately, matter and spirit, individual and society, will produce a comprehensive whole, a divine world. The Council's 'Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World' took the cue: Teilhard's slogan, 'Christianity means more progress, more technology,' became a stimulus in which the Council fathers from rich and poor countries found concrete hope."<sup>42</sup> Teilhard de Chardin had his works condemned under Pope Pius XII and again under John XXIII in 1962, one year before the council, because his work contained "grave errors."
- As with the false order John Paul ascribed to evolution, note that Christianity is reduced to a mere *historical movement*, absorbed by the greater movement of the *cosmic process of evolution*.
- *Concrete hope* is now found in the promise of technological advancement and the writings of a heretic; was the hope Christ offered merely theoretical?
- Materialism is again evident in that more technology is equated with more progress and even Christianity itself. Has materialism brought us true progress? Have the benefits of health care, travel and technology made the world better, or given us more ways to make the human condition worse? Have the diminishing I.Q.'s and ever eroding verbal and composition skills of our youth been a reasonable price to pay, as they become a race of techno-zombies, social



miscreants, and moral degenerates? Is not technology responsible for the loss of so many souls and the non-existence of so many others due to contraception? Would abortions have numbered in the tens of millions a year anyway, even if technology had not made surgical abortion possible? Is the ease of obtaining information (and the ease with which we are now dis-informed) on the internet enough to throw into the scales against the race of pornography addicts that same medium has created? Do the benefits of technology counter-act the effects of a sixty percent divorce rate, fueled by contraception and infidelities that often begin through the means of telecommunication? Will the increased capacity for food production be a genuine benefit in the long-term scheme of human history, as those same technologies have decimated fertile lands after only a few decades, rendering them useless for the future? In the long run, will the absorption of agriculture, the most fundamental industry to man, into a hand full of mega-conglomerates which control the world's food supply and have largely eradicated local-based farming and food supplies be a benefit? Does this technology not provide the potential for the food supply to fall under the control of globalist forces which have already shown themselves hostile to Christianity? Has technology gained anything for us when the increase in life span in the past fifty years is exceeded by the amount of time the average American will spend watching television?

[The above scenarios are not theoretical. In his written plan to depopulate 13 specific countries, Henry Kissinger counseled the United Nations to use starvation as a weapon, and food as a means to instigate wars. In the U.S., mega-agricultural businesses bribed politicians with hundreds of millions of dollars to pass "The Food Safety Act," which has as its aim the criminalization of local, independent farms. Third world countries have already had their water supplies bought by foreign corporations, which in turn sell it back to them. America is following this model; the Bush family has bought the largest aqua-fir in the world, while fellow Texan T. Boone Picket now owns the largest one in America. 1500 municipalities in America have sold their water supplies to private corporations. China cuts off the water supply of problematic towns and regions, perhaps the fate awaiting anyone who resists the New World Order.]

My apologies for belaboring the point, but it is an important one. Firstly, because we have superior technological capabilities, not only our societies but mankind in general is regarded as superior: secondly, there is certainly ample room to debate, on the sociological as well as spiritual planes as to whether or not the net effect of these capabilities is positive; thirdly, it is the unquestioned assumption that technology is a manifestation of our personal, scientific, and global evolution that have fostered the apostasy, since it gives the impetus to our presumed superiority to the past which touches upon every level of the Church's life, not just the material.

The trajectory from Christian faith to materialistic apostasy can be delineated in the course of the Council. Before the council, in its preparatory phase, "there appeared the idea that growth in the scientific understanding of nature, that is, an extension of that kingdom of technology which is modern culture, was also an extension of human dignity and happiness; but this was rejected by the majority, who insisted on the indifferent nature of technical progress: it extends the possible field of moral activity, but the latter is not intrinsically assisted by it." Yet, as Mr. Amerio noted,

and the above quote by Cardinal Ratzinger confirms, the materialists eventually won out and “the theme of domination of the earth by means of technology attained sacral status and came to pervade all post-conciliar thinking.”<sup>43</sup>

“The impetus” which the future Pope Benedict found so praiseworthy in de Chardin can perhaps be best expressed in the heretic’s own words: “I think the great religious fact of the present time is the awakening of a new religion which, bit by bit, is leading to the worship of the world...”<sup>44</sup> The apostate longed for “An unknown form of religion, a religion which nobody could imagine or describe hitherto.” The future Pope was not alone in his praise this pantheistic apostate; in 1981 the centenary of his birth was being celebrated, and Cardinal Casaroli, Vatican Secretary of State, sent a letter praising the heretic and saying how much the Church owed him.

- While “L’Osservatore Romano” is the official Vatican newspaper, its writings and editorials do not bear doctrinal weight, nor even the gravity of a future pope writing a serious theological work, as cited above. Nonetheless, it remains the Pope’s official newspaper and presumably reflects his mind. Consider the utterly stupid gushings of this publication on the event of the moon landing: “The display of man’s scientific and technical capacities has been a major religious, not to say Christian event...The first explorers of the moon did not materially plant the Cross in the soil of their new conquest, but did so spiritually...Never before has the divine image set by the Creator within human nature shone forth in all its grandeur as it has in this marvelous undertaking.”<sup>45</sup> By exactly what calculus does a man walking on the moon qualify as a “major Christian event?” Even more so, but what criteria does this become the supreme manifestation of the divine image in human nature? One would think this distinction could be reserved for something that actually had to do with Christ.
- Pope Paul VI (March 27, 1960) explicitly stated that scientific progress would lead to a new religion. “Shan’t modern man, one day, as his scientific studies progress and discover realities hidden behind the mute face of the matter, come to prick up his ears to the wonderful voice of the Spirit palpitating in it? Shan’t it be the religion of tomorrow? Einstein himself perceived the spontaneity of religion today...Isn’t the work already in progress along the trajectory leading straight up to religion?”<sup>46</sup> Did he really think the Holy Spirit “palpitated” in matter? Is materialism the “religion of tomorrow” he is visualizing? It must not be Roman Catholicism, as he cites Einstein as one who shares his vision.

## **History**

Since modernism began, the Church’s enemies have always sought to cast her as the villain of history: the oppressor of peoples, distorter of true religion, enemy of progress, and corrupter of the true Gospel. Pope Leo XIII eloquently summarized the state of affairs: “As to the cause of all these evils, we are persuaded that it lies principally in this; that men have despised and rejected the holy and august authority of the Church, which in the name of God, is placed over the human race and is the avenger and protector of all legitimate authority. The enemies of public order were fully persuaded of this when they found no means of destroying society to its foundations so efficacious as persistent attacks on the Church of God, by assailing her with the weapons of shameless calumny, by odiously accusing her of

being the enemy of true civilization, by daily damaging her authority and influence in some new way, and subverting the supreme power of the Roman Pontiff, who is the asserter and protector on earth of the eternal and unchangeable interests of goodness and righteousness.”<sup>47</sup> .

Yet, none of these attacks constitutes Apostasy. What Pope Pius XII foretold, however, that part of the apostasy he knew was coming, the apostasy bound up with the Apparitions of Fatima, would be revealed in the Church’s accepting of her enemies’ version of her past. A high level Communist defector testified before Congress that it was part of the Communist plan to instill in the Church a “guilt complex,” to label the “Church of the past” as being “oppressive, authoritarian, arrogant, and responsible for the divisions of religion throughout the world.”<sup>48</sup> This was most evident in the endless series of apologies offered by Pope John Paul II to virtually every person or group which demanded one. Taken in their totality, one can look at all of these apologies and recognize a trend:

- Pope John Paul oftentimes apologized for things which never happened. Instead, he was apologizing for the distorted version of history promulgated by the Church’s enemies. One example was on his first trip to the Czech capital in the Spring of 1990, when he referred to John Hus as “a man of infallible personal integrity...”<sup>49</sup> Religious indifferentism is also manifest in this statement; condemned heretics who incite people to rebellion against the Church and rightful authority suffer, in fact, from very grave defects in personal integrity, not the infallibility imagined by the Pope.
- John Paul likewise expressed “profound sorrow” at the execution of the heretic Bruno Giordano, and even offered his approval of a grass roots movement to have him canonized. Like Galileo, the reason for his condemnation is categorically misrepresented as part of the campaign to have the Church seem unenlightened and the enemy of free thought, progress and intelligence. It was for his theories about God, not the universe, that he was condemned. He taught that Christ was not divine, but merely a skilled magician. He was a pantheist who believed God and the world were one, and likewise believed that the devil would be saved.<sup>50</sup>
- He never apologized for anything that could not be categorized as a sin against liberalism. John Paul often gave the impression of groveling to his enemies, and they rightly took this as a sign of weakness (it takes no courage to confess the sins of others). Usually, his apologies were met with complaints that he had not gone far enough. As Joe Sobran wrote, “his list of sins and transgressions was indeed incomplete, from a Catholic point of view; it seems to have been composed with an eye to what modern liberalism regards as evil. In short, it has a fatal whiff of trendiness about it. It’s easy to condemn sins of excessive zeal in the past, to which few are now tempted. But what might Catholics of the past (or the future) condemn in the Church today? They certainly wouldn’t accuse us of excessive zeal. They might be shocked by our lukewarmness, our cowardice masquerading as tolerance, our laxity, our willingness to countenance heresy, sacrilege, blasphemy, and immorality within the Church itself, our eagerness to ingratiate ourselves with the secular world – of which the papal statement itself is a symptom.”<sup>51</sup>

- Whether conscious or not, these apologies embodied a subtle arrogance cloaked in a veneer of humility, as well as the “dimming of the intellect” foretold at LaSalette. In apologizing for so many of his predecessors, he was obviously stating that his judgment was superior and he would never have done such things. Yet, he never once apologized for his own actions. ‘The American Spectator’s’ Tom Bethell had this to say: “The Pope has excused St. Catherine of Siena’s involvement in the Crusades by saying that she was a daughter of her times. Well, so is he of his, and his list of errors resembles nothing so much as a catalogue of the things that modern liberals accuse the Church of. They include, to quote The New York Times, ‘religious intolerance and injustice towards Jews, women, indigenous peoples, immigrants, the poor and the unborn...’ We now have bishops who have receded to a point where they are inconspicuous in national life, and the Pope might apologize for that. Instead, he apologizes for a time when the Church tried to evangelize the world. But tried too hard.”<sup>52</sup> One priest noted that, if the Pope was so enamored with offering apologies, he should have apologized to the elderly and conservative priests and nuns who were living out their lives in the wreckage that they found around them. Of course, there were none. This Pope reigned for over a quarter century and presided over the Church in a time of unprecedented sacrilege, a near-total failure in Catholic education, more statements of heresy than could ever be known, and the relentless dissolution of her institutions. Even his most ardent defenders had to concede that he indulged in a baffling apathy in the face of all these realities. Yet, even towards the end of his papacy, he entertained the question, “have I done all that I should?” arriving at the conclusion, “I have made *every right decision*.”<sup>53</sup> I cannot comment as to any lack of humility in that statement, but the lack of a grasp on reality is undeniable.
- The apologies also embody a decided anti-Catholicism. By way of a parallel, the Vatican II Church has frequently reiterated that “corporate guilt” is unjust. Specifically, this has been highlighted in terms of the Jews’ collective responsibility for the Crucifixion of Jesus. The Church has upheld that the responsibility falls on those Jews, at that time, who concretely took part in the act, and that no responsibility could be imputed to future generations. Then why is it acceptable to apply this mentality to Catholics? Why is the Pope apologizing for things he never did to people who never suffered them? Apparently, in the Orwellian Church of Vatican II, corporate guilt does have its legitimate applications after all.
- Catholic writer Joe Sobran offered these useful insights: “We must ask: What is the fruit of the hundred or so apologies this Pope has now uttered? Is there any evidence that they have drawn any souls to the Church? Do they not, on the contrary, confirm every malicious common belief about the Church, while discouraging faithful Catholics and confusing weak ones? What is the point?”<sup>54</sup> Sadly, Mr. Sobran, the point is that our enemies are winning as we now subscribe to their anti-Catholic version of history, and the Church Militant has been reduced to the Church Groveling.

Even in John XXIII, however, we see the pattern emerging. Regarding the schismatic Orthodox Churches, he wrote, “Can the responsibility of the split be attributed entirely to our separated brothers? It is, in part theirs, but, for a great part, it rests with us.”<sup>55</sup> The ones in schism bear *a* part of the

responsibility, and those who have maintained the true Church now bear a *great* part? True to liberalism on every level, and the Church in an ever-increasing way, we see the mindset that the person who is in the wrong is somehow less responsible than those in the right. This Orwellian introversion of concepts which is endemic of the Vatican II Church will be discussed at greater length in the chapter “Love Will Turn to Hate.”

Likewise, John abandoned the actual facts of history during the time of the centenary of the unification of Italy, a time when the Church was robbed and persecuted in a multitude of ways. Yet, eager to grovel for secular approval, these truths were forgotten and the Pope denied that any such conflict ever existed. Not only is he basically denying that the life of Leo XIII ever happened (for decades as a bishop and then as Pope he was relentlessly fighting against fresh attacks on the Church and her rights by the proponents of unification), he pitifully misrepresents the role of Pope Pius IX in this period of history. Not only are his observations untrue, but they are posited in the all-too-familiar embarrassing effusiveness that has become the hallmark of Vatican II groveling: “The beneficent star and luminous sign inviting the triumph of the magnificent ideal was Pope Pius IX, who understood it in its most noble sense.” Yes, he understood it – that’s why he condemned it and was made “a prisoner of the Vatican” as a result of it.

In this excerpt from Cardinal Ratzinger, he assures us that it is Catholicism that is to blame for all of the ills of the world. “The problem of tradition as it exists in the Church...The Church is tradition...into which – let us admit much human pseudo tradition has found its way; so much so, in fact, that even, and even precisely, the Church has contributed to the general crisis of tradition that afflicts mankind.”<sup>56</sup>

### Summary

This chapter has given some examples that, true to the symptoms foretold about the great apostasy, the past decades have certainly been colored with an attitude of being superior to all that has come before, both in terms of humanity in general, and the Church in particular. It is precisely this belief of evolving towards an earthly perfection, rooted in both an individual and a collective narcissism, that the Church condemned as a sign of the advent of the antichrist in the Catechism, even as she so often indulges in it. Yet, Scripture clearly demonstrates that the world will dissolve into lawlessness and godlessness before the end of time. Do the proponents of secular and ecclesial evolution truly believe that they have the power to cancel this process? Either the answer is “yes,” which is a sign of the Apostasy, or the answer is “no,” and they truly don’t grasp the incoherence of their position, also a sign of the apostasy (the dimming of the intellect).

---

<sup>1</sup> Augustine, St. “The Literal Meaning of Genesis,” Book I, Chapter 20, par. 41.

<sup>2</sup> Hildegard of Bingen, St. “Scivias,” trans. Mother Columba Hart and Jane Bishop. New York: Paulist Press, 1990, Book 3, Vision 11, no. 30.

<sup>3</sup> Pius X, Pope St., Pascendi

<sup>4</sup> Davies, “The Eternal Sacrifice,” p. 21.

- 
- <sup>5</sup> Amerio, p. 102, note 8.
- <sup>6</sup> Dulac, Raymond. "Episcopal Collegiality at the Second Vatican Council." Paris: Cedre, 1979, pp. 9 – 10.
- <sup>7</sup> Pope Julius II refused to move into the traditional Papal living quarters because he was disgusted by the prospect of having to see frescoes of the Borgias (Alexander VI) every day of his life.
- <sup>8</sup> 30 Giorni, no. 5, May 1992, p. 54. Cited in Villa, John XXIII, 18.
- <sup>9</sup> Villa, p. 24.
- <sup>10</sup> Amerio, p. 174.
- <sup>11</sup> L'Osservatore Romano, Sept. 8 1977, cited in Villa, Paul VI, p. 64.
- <sup>12</sup> Ratzinger, Principles of Catholic Theology, p. 380.
- <sup>13</sup> L' Osservatore Romano, July 3, 1974,
- <sup>14</sup> Ratzinger, "Principles of Catholic Theology," p. 380.
- <sup>15</sup> Amerio, p. 65.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid, p. 66.
- <sup>19</sup> Villa, Paul VI, p. 22.
- <sup>20</sup> From "Die Sacramentale Berundung Christliker Existend," p. 43.
- <sup>21</sup> Ratzinger, "Principles of Catholic Theology," p. 43.
- <sup>22</sup> Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal. "God and the World." San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000, p. 401.
- <sup>23</sup> Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal. "In the Beginning." P. 72.
- <sup>24</sup> Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal "Introduction to Christianity," p. 326.
- <sup>25</sup> Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal. "Feast of Faith"
- <sup>26</sup> Ratzinger, Co-Workers of the Truth, p. 318.
- <sup>27</sup> Denzinger, no. 695.
- <sup>28</sup> Ratzinger, Principles, 247-48.
- <sup>29</sup> Pius XI, Pope. Encyclical "Rerum Omnium Perturbation." Vatican City State: Jan. 26, 1923, no. 4.
- <sup>30</sup> John Paul I, Pope. Angelus address of September 17, 1978.
- <sup>31</sup> Wiltgen, 40.
- <sup>32</sup> Paul VI, Pope. General Audience of July 3, 1974.
- <sup>33</sup> Paul VI, Pope. General Audience of November 26, 1969.
- <sup>34</sup> Denzinger, no. 2305.
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid., no. 2306
- <sup>36</sup> Leo XIII, Pope. Encyclical "Inscrutabili," cited in O'Reilly, p. 325.
- <sup>37</sup> Second Vatican Council. "Gaudium et Spes," no. 5.
- <sup>38</sup> Wojtyla, Karol Cardinal. "Alle Fonti del Rinnovamento," Italy: Rubbettino, 2007.
- <sup>39</sup> (L'Osservatore Romano, April 27, 1985, p.4)
- <sup>40</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Encyclical Redemptor Hominis. Vatican City: March 4, 1979, sec.11 no. 3.
- <sup>41</sup> O'Reilly, p. 326.
- <sup>42</sup> Ratzinger, Principles of Catholic Theology, p. 334.
- <sup>43</sup> Amerio, p. 52.
- <sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. 69.
- <sup>45</sup> Ibid., pp. 486 – 87.
- <sup>46</sup> Documentation Catholique, n. 133, June 19, 1960, Cited in Villa, Paul VI, p. 39 – 40.
- <sup>47</sup> Leo XIII, Inscrutabili, cited in O'Reilly, p. 323.
- <sup>48</sup> Kramer, p. 48.
- <sup>49</sup> 30 Giorni, Issue No. 7 – 8 , 1995, p. 19.
- <sup>50</sup> An amusing artifact of liberal revisionist propaganda can be seen in the statue of Giordano found in the Campo de' Fiori. It depicts an ominous, hulking figure, tranquil yet strong, with the hood of his cloak drawn over his head. An actual portrait of Giordano portrays an effeminate, pasty-skinned waif who would most likely have snapped like a twig in a stiff wind.
- <sup>51</sup> Ferrara and Woods, p. 142.
- <sup>52</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>53</sup> John Paul II, Pope. "Rise: Let Us Be on Our Way," Vatican City State: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, trans. Walter Ziemba.
- <sup>54</sup> Ferrara & Woods, p. 142.
- <sup>55</sup> Hebblewaite, p. 374.

---

<sup>56</sup> Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, p. 100.

## Chapter XI

### **“The Church Will Doubt”**

In a bizarre vicious circle, evocative of the diabolical disorientation spoken of by Sr. Lucy, it is precisely the Vatican II Church’s imagined superiority to the past that led it to regard the Church as inferior to the convictions of the past (just as evolution does to humans). Ironically, part of what they thought made them superior was their conception of the Church, as many quotes have already demonstrated. Yet, their “superior” conception was of an “inferior” Church; no longer the One True Church of Jesus Christ, no longer called to gather the nations into her fold, no longer the Pillar and Bulwark of Truth. “He who exalts himself shall be humbled,” (Mt 23:12) and in their self-exaltation, the leaders of the Vatican II Church have brought her lower than in any age past, as ours is the first (and last) age in which the Church would question the need for her very existence. The title of this chapter is taken from the mystic vision of Cardinal Pacelli (Pius XII) cited at the beginning of this book. Part of the Apostasy is that the Church would begin to doubt herself, her very essence, as taught, defined and believed by the Church in ages past. To begin, let’s take a brief look at the nature of the Church as infallibly held by the Catholic religion.

- The Necessity of only One True Church: Since there is one God and one Savior, and that Savior established one Church, that One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church is necessary for salvation. There is no salvation apart from Christ, and the Church is His Body. The necessity of one true Church is the logical extension of there being only one Savior and one true Faith. As Pope Leo the Great wrote, “The integral and true Faith is a great bulwark to which nothing can be added or taken from by anyone; if the Faith is not single, it does not exist at all.”

Centuries later, his namesake Pope Leo XII likewise expressed the logical necessity of only one true Church, not a multiplicity of competing churches. “It is impossible for the most true God, who is Truth Itself, the best, the wisest Provider, and the Rewarder of good men, to approve all sects who profess false teachings which are often inconsistent with one another and contradictory, and to confer eternal rewards on their members.”<sup>1</sup>

- Outside the Church there is no salvation: Following the same logical trajectory, it is irrational to believe that one can be saved in a religion apart from, and competing with, the one established by God Himself. As Pope Eugene IV wrote, “No one, whatever almsgiving he has practiced, even if he has shed his blood for the name of Christ, can be saved, unless he has remained within the bosom and unity of the Catholic Church.”<sup>2</sup>
- Pope Leo XIII: “To recognize what is the true religion is not difficult for whomever would judge the matter in prudence and sincerity. In fact very numerous and striking proofs, the truth of the prophecies, the multitude of miracles, the prodigious speed of the propagation of the Faith, even amongst its enemies and despite great obstacles, the testimony of martyrs and other similar



arguments prove clearly that the only true religion is that which Jesus Christ Himself instituted, and which He charged the Church to guard and propagate.”<sup>3</sup>

- Closer to the current apostasy, Pope Pius IX said, “Not without sorrow we have learned that another error, no less destructive, has taken possession of some parts of the Catholic world, and has taken up abode in the souls of many Catholics, who think that one should have good hope of the eternal salvation of all those who have never lived in the true Church of Christ.”<sup>4</sup>
- The Roman Catholic Church is the one Church of Jesus Christ: These two realities completely and exclusively are to be identified with each other. “The Church of Jesus Christ is The Roman Catholic Church, because She alone is One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, which He willed” (Catechism of St. Pius X). The “Church” is not merely a larger, intangible confederation of all Christian denominations, of which Catholicism is merely a subset, but they are one and the same. This has been taught for nearly two thousand years without deviation, and was explicitly affirmed by Pope Pius XII shortly before the Council.

## Sources

- Our Lady of LaSalette: “Great numbers of priests and religious orders will break away from the true religion; among these people there will be even bishops.” Note that The Blessed Mother foretold that they would break from the true *religion*, not the true *Church*. It is quite possible that they remain in the Church, while no longer believing.
- Ven. Anne Catherine Emmerich: “I saw many pastors cherishing dangerous ideas against the Church...They built a large, singular, extravagant church which was to embrace all creeds with equal rights: Evangelicals, Catholics, and all denominations, a true communion of the unholy with one shepherd and on flock. There was to be a Pope, a salaried Pope, without possessions. All was made ready, many things finished, but, in place of an altar, were only abomination and desolation. Such was the new church to be, and it was for it that he had set fire to the old one; but God designed otherwise.”<sup>5</sup>
- Freemasons: Already cited, the Masons planned to infiltrate the Church and fill her with members who no longer believed in her singular, exclusive, divine charter, but rather put her on par with other churches. The triumph of this Masonic initiative was proclaimed from the pages of the Vatican’s newspaper: “The Council has ruled out once and for all the assumption that only Catholics possess the truth.”<sup>6</sup> This contradicts the teaching of Pius XI in his encyclical, “*Mortalium Animos*” which stated: “The Catholic Church possesses the fullness of Christ,” that is, did not need to acquire things that go to make up the fullness of Christianity, truth included, from other denominations.

## **Part I: Vatican II**

As already cited, the fathers of Vatican II wrote of a new, evolving Church for a new, evolving world. The Church began to doubt, and joined the current of apostasy which demanded that the Church cease to insist that her origin and prerogatives were superior to any other religion's, and join the ecumenical, spiritual melting pot of the new world order. An early sign that Vatican II intended to water down the Church's identity was its preferred description of the Church as "people of God," an expression as unworthy as it is inadequate. Politicians may refer to their constituents as "my people," as a C.E.O. may his employees, but what father ever introduced his wife and children as "my people?" It is, obviously, a term too sterile and removed to define a family. Yet, the Catholic Church is the "Mystical Body of Christ," and "The Bride of Christ." The phrase "people of God" is likewise anemic in comparison. This vague definition of the Church also prepares the way for a synthesis with a one-world, pluri-confessional church; a direct union with Christ is no longer necessary to be a member of the Church, only to be a "person," and, since God created all people, all people are "people of God," hence all humanity is the church (as explicitly taught by John Paul II).

The Church as "The People of God" is a preparation for the Great Apostasy on many levels. Just as in subscribing to evolution, this "new and superior" conception of the Church ends in her diminishment. As the "superior" understanding of man via evolution reduces him to his merely physical, animal existence, "The People of God" likewise eliminates from membership in the Church Jesus in His Divinity, The Head of the Church, as well as the angels. The Church now only defines herself by her "people," and now is entirely human. Just as St. John wrote that denial of the incarnation was the precursor to the antichrist, there is a dimension of this denial in severing Christ from the Body; The Church is no longer His Body, a continuance of Himself, but His people, something completely distinct from Himself. I am getting ahead of myself, but the inevitable (and desired) end at which ecumenism arrives is already well in sight.

### The One Church is not the Roman Catholic Church

Previous popes had condemned the proposition that the Church was not truly One, a fulfillment of the prayer of Jesus that "all may be one." Instead, modernists, not identifying the One Church of Christ with Catholicism, insisted that this "One" Church was not a reality, but only something to be worked towards. Pope Pius XII wrote, "It is to depart from the divine Truth to imagine one Church which cannot be seen nor touched, which would be only spiritual, into which the numerous Christian communities, even though separated by faith, could nonetheless be reunited by an invisible bond."<sup>7</sup>

In "Mortalium Animos," Pope Pius IX condemned the "false opinion" that the prayer of Jesus, "that all may be one," had yet to be fulfilled, but only expressed a desire. Its fulfillment exists in the One True Church of Christ.

This was reiterated by Pope Leo XIII: “There is one God, and one Christ: and His Church is one and the faith is one; and one people, joined together in the solid unity of the body in the body of concord. This unity cannot be broken, nor the one body divided by the separation of its constituent parts.”<sup>8</sup> Therefore, people are not capable of dividing the Church; they only succeed in separating themselves from it. In the same document Pope Leo wrote, “The Church in respect of its unity belongs to the category of things indivisible by nature, though heretics try to divide it into many parts.” According to Vatican II, however, this is exactly what heretics did, as the Church is now broader than the Catholic Church and heretics and schismatics remain a part of it. Paul VI explicitly stated this in his greetings to the Patriarch of Constantinople in July 1972, referring to “the moment when you assume a heavy charge in the service of the Church of Christ.”<sup>9</sup>

Pope John Paul II also asserted the position labeled “false” and “a departure from the divine Truth” by his predecessors: “When we pray together, we do so with the longing that there may be one visible Church of God, a Church truly universal.”<sup>10</sup> Yet, the word Catholic means “universal.” Is he saying this Church does not exist, but must be “evolved into?” The Holy Father was stating that, when He prayed in the Creed, “I believe *in* One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church,” he really meant, “I believe there *should be* One...”

Likewise, Cardinal Ratzinger stated that he did not believe there was One Church. “We all recognize objectively that the Church *should be one*, and we should all desire to find ourselves in a renewed Catholic Church on the road toward the future.”<sup>11</sup> [Where does he think the present one is going?] Do the Cardinal and Holy Father remain silent at that point in the Creed? Do they change the words to match their beliefs? Have they ever consciously considered their incoherence in so grave a matter, even as they profess an article of the faith they do not actually believe?

Vatican II expressly rejected the previous doctrine that the One Church of Christ *is* the Catholic Church, by stating that the One Church of Christ merely *subsists* in the Catholic Church. This is obviously a redefinition of the Church, a deliberate step towards apostasy. The nature of the word “subsist,” its insufficiency in conveying Catholic doctrine, as well as the defense of the word by those who maintain it does not represent a contradiction with the pre-conciliar understanding, has been written about exhaustively. I will only cite Cardinal Ratzinger who, as head of the CDF for twenty years before becoming Pope, can rightly be regarded as an expert as to the Council’s intention and the word’s meaning: “When the Council Fathers replaced the word ‘is’ with the word ‘subsists’ they did so for a very precise reason. The concept expressed by ‘is’ (to be) is far broader than that expressed by ‘to subsist.’ ‘To subsist’ is a very precise way of being, that is, to be as a subject, which exists in itself. Thus the Council Fathers meant to say that the being of *the Church as such is a broader entity than the Roman Catholic Church...*”<sup>12</sup>

The admission of apostasy could not be any more clear. First, we have seen that the doctrine of the Papacy has been denied; Christ’s Church is allegedly built simply on a profession of faith, not a visible head. Secondly, the Church itself is no longer a concrete, visible entity (as Pius XII taught it must be), but rather is *broader* than the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church is no longer the true Church,

merely a subset of it. According to Vatican II and the post-Vatican II popes, churches established precisely to rebuke the Catholic Church and in bitter hatred for her nonetheless comprise the One True Church of Christ. Christ is both for and against Himself! The incoherence of liberals could not be more apparent. Also, these false teachings (and teachers) will pave the way for “even the elect” to be led astray when the Apostasy reaches its height, as will be discussed in a later chapter.

Yet again, we find proof that “*liberals are liars.*” The quotation from Cardinal Ratzinger was taken from a German interview in the newspaper “Frankfurter Allgemeine” and translated in the October 8, 2000 edition of L’Osservatore Romano. However, in the original German, the Cardinal acknowledged that the word “is” was “used by Pius XII.” The Vatican paper omitted the reference to Pope Pius, thus concealing from the reader that it was not only a Pope himself, but the last pope before the council, who defined the Church that way, and the council had explicitly refuted his teaching. The agenda and desire to deceive behind such an omission are obvious.<sup>13</sup>

Vatican II endorsed apostasy: “For several reasons the Church recognizes that it is joined to those who, though baptized and so honored with the Christian name, do not profess the faith in its entirety or do not preserve communion under the successor of St. Peter.”<sup>14</sup> This is nothing less than an endorsement of religious indifferentism and an explicit rejection of the Church as founded by Christ. Now, both those who accept and reject the Papacy are part of the Church, as well as those who accept and reject “the faith in its entirety.” The Catholic position, pre-apostasy, is summed up by Pope Leo XIII: “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 of doctrine* proposed by her authoritative Magisterium.”<sup>15</sup>

Pope Pius IX likewise taught the Catholic teaching on the matter in words which clearly juxtapose the Vatican II document as heretical: “There are other, almost countless proofs, drawn from the most trustworthy witnesses which clearly and openly testify with great faith, exactitude, respect and obedience that all who want to belong to the true and only Church of Christ must honor and obey this Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff.”<sup>16</sup>

## **Part II: Is It the Same Church?**

According to the man who would become Pope John Paul II, the answer is an explicit, unequivocal, “No!” He wrote in “Sign of Contradiction,” “Through the Second Vatican Council, she [the Church] succeeded in redefining her own essence!” So, no longer retaining the essence Christ gave her, the essence she retained for 2,000 years, the Church has doubted herself, but not churchmen, who felt it was their place to redefine, not preserve, the very essence of the Church as given by God Himself.

The goal of the agents of Apostasy had been to have an entity called the Catholic Church still existing, but not the same Church. This has already been cited from the Masonic plan; likewise, Bella Dodd, the aforementioned former communist, testified that the changes the communists were about to inflict on the

Church would leave her unrecognizable from her former self. It would seem they succeeded. How can it be the same Church when:

1. It now has a different foundation, and
2. The Church acquires a new definition of herself, to express that the Catholic Church is only a piece of the “broader” Church? If the definition of a thing has changed, then so has the thing defined.

Even as other leaders of the post Vatican II Church (and in some instances the same ones!) would insist that it is the same Church, they could not but recognize the gravity of the situation. Cardinal Dario Castrillon Hoyos conceded, “one of the pastoral emergencies of our time and which everyone is having to address is to show that the Church today is the same Church it has always been.”<sup>17</sup> Has there ever been a time in the Church’s history when such an “emergency” existed? No, because there had never been a time before when the faithful had such just cause to fear this.

Cardinal Ratzinger likewise conceded this in his 1988 address to the Bishops of Chile. He was speaking specifically to the repudiation of the ancient Mass and the openness and impunity with which people were allowed to espouse heresy: “All this leads a great number of people to ask themselves if the Church of today is really the same as that of yesterday or if they have changed it for something else without telling people.” In a book he authored, the same Cardinal conceded, “My impression is that, tacitly, one is losing the authentic Catholic view of the reality ‘Church,’ without rejecting it expressly.”<sup>18</sup> Even while recognizing the reality, the Cardinal seemed unable to grasp the source: there was nothing “tacit” about it – it was enshrined in a Church Council and had been proclaimed by popes and the Cardinal himself.

Pope John Paul II also weighed in, stating that Vatican II led to “the awareness of the Church in an utterly new way, quite unknown previously, thanks to the Second Vatican Council...”<sup>19</sup> Is it at all sensible to insist that it is the *same* Church, but that same Church now views itself in a *new, previously unknown way*? No, and that is why, under the Infallible Canons of Vatican I, excommunication is the result of this erroneous application of “the development of doctrine.” That Council taught “the Holy Spirit was not promised to the Successors of Peter that by His revelation they might disclose new doctrine, but that by His help they might guard the revelation transmitted through the apostles and the deposit of faith, and might faithfully set it forth.”<sup>20</sup> The same council continued, “Hence, also, the understanding of its sacred dogmas must be perpetually maintained, which Holy Mother Church [not “The People of God”] has once declared; and there must never be a recession from that meaning under the pretext of a deeper understanding.”

Church documents: The fact that Vatican II no longer believed in the One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, but rather a Church “broader than” the Catholic Church, and that, as John Paul II stated, there really is not a true Catholic Church – that is merely a goal – is evident in post Vatican II writings.

- The Pontifical Council on Interreligious Dialogue, the council responsible for forging the “future Church” along with those other denominations which form the One Church within which the Catholic Church now merely subsists, issued a key document in 1991 entitled “Dialogue and Proclamation.” Not one time does it use the word “Catholic” to describe the Church.
- This is only following upon the example of Pope John Paul II. His encyclical “Redemptor Hominis” uses the word “church” one hundred and fifty times. It uses the word “Catholic” to describe that Church zero times.
- The Vatican’s newspaper overtly heralded the dawning apostasy, publishing that “the present groaning of the Church are not those of death but of birth, since a new being, in fact a *new Church*, is about to appear in the world.”<sup>21</sup>

### **Part III: Christ is Divided Against Himself?**

The state of apostasy had not only become so advanced, but had acquired such a sense of normalcy that, in one of his last Lenten retreats, Pope John Paul listened to his own household preacher state that Christ “positively willed” other denominations. On Good Friday, 2002, Fr. Raniero Cantalamessa preached to the Pope that other religions “are not merely tolerated by God – but positively willed by Him as an expression of the inexhaustible richness of His grace and His will for everyone to be saved.”<sup>22</sup> Yes, the Vicar of Christ sat idly by, as he had done at Assisi (that comes later), while heresy was preached to him, probably not recognizing it as such. The Pope, the Successor to the Apostle Peter, on whom Jesus built his Church (although he no longer believed that), was being told that Martin Luther, who called the Pope the Antichrist and his god the devil, was actually building a religion to oppose his own according to the *positive*, as opposed to merely permissive, *will of God*. This statement amounts to blasphemy as well: God *positively willed* religions which hold devotion to Mary in utter contempt? God *positively willed* religions to teach against the Blessed Sacrament and the need for sacramental confession? God *positively willed* for heretics without Holy Orders to nonetheless masquerade as bishops, preaching in favor of abortion and sodomy in the name of Christ? Did God *positively will* religions which reject Christ altogether, and equate Christianity with satanism?

Alas, in the Vatican II Church, this was nothing new, as the Council stated that “The Spirit of Christ has used other churches as means of salvation.” This was reiterated in the Catechism of the Catholic Church, #819. This is not saying that some within those churches can nonetheless be saved, but that the churches themselves are the means.<sup>23</sup> Likewise, the same Council teaches that schismatics actually “build up the Church of God.” People who separate themselves from the Church build up the Church? What more can be said about so dim-witted a statement? The words relativism and indifferentism obviously apply to this incoherent manner of thought, but the preferred term giving sanction to these errors is...

## Part IV: Ecumenism

*“Charity without Faith, quite soft on misbelievers,  
which opens up to anyone, unfortunately, the road  
to eternal ruin.”*

- St. Pius X on Ecumenism

The ecumenical movement was begun around 1920 by protestant sects, seeking a way to unify in the face of increasing irrelevance and diminishing numbers. Catholics, however, belonging already to the One Church of Christ, had no need for such a movement. Therefore, in 1928, Pope Pius XI warned the faithful that “beneath these enticing words and blandishments lies hid a most grave error, by which the foundations of the Catholic faith are completely destroyed...”<sup>24</sup> He went on to condemn “a certain false opinion, on which this whole question, as well as that complex movement by which non-Catholics seek to bring about the union of the Christian churches depends. For authors who favor this view are accustomed, at times almost without number, to bring forward these words of Christ: ‘That they all may be one...And there shall be one fold and one shepherd,’ with this signification however: that Christ Jesus merely expressed a desire and prayer, which still lacks its fulfillment...”

It is truly amazing that, less than a century later, a Pope would be one of those “writers” to whom Pius XI referred, giving an encyclical that very name (*That All May Be One*), and espousing that very opinion here labeled “a most grave error, *by which the foundations of the Catholic faith are completely destroyed.*”<sup>25</sup>

The Vatican II Church was already well on the way to destroying the Church’s foundations both in the Papacy and the definition of the Church. As Pope Pius XI rightly observed, Catholic participation in this movement would work towards that same end. To the Catholic, involvement in such a movement would be completely irrational. The Catholic Church *is* the true Church founded by Christ, possessing the fullness of truth, and the grace of the Sacraments. Catholicism is the goal, not the starting point from which the quest for a new, unified world religion would begin.

Following the dictates of logic and the demands of Faith, the Popes prior to Vatican II all stated the obvious: if all Christians wanted to be united, it would have to be in the Church Christ established, not a manmade substitute. To consider any other option would be apostasy, abandoning the Church founded by Christ for a church founded by men. Therefore, just as the Popes always taught that the One Church of Christ was the Catholic Church, so the oneness of Christians could only occur within that same Church:

- [Work for reunion] “will be in vain unless first, and above all, they (the Eastern Orthodox) hold the true and whole Catholic Faith as it has been handed down and consecrated in Holy Scripture, the tradition of the Fathers, the consent of the Church, general councils and the decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs.” Pope Pius X continued that he prayed God would, “hasten the day when the nations of the East shall return to Catholic unity and, united to the Apostolic See, after casting away their errors, shall enter the port of everlasting salvation.”<sup>26</sup>
- From the same Pope we read, “This triumph of God on earth, both in individuals and in society, is but the return of the erring to God through Christ, and to Christ through the Church, which We announced as the program of our pontificate.”<sup>27</sup>
- A far more ancient source, Pope St. Celestine I, at the Council of Ephesus in 431, gave the true Catholic program for uniting humanity under one religion: “Pray that the faith may be granted to infidels; that idolaters may be delivered from the errors of impiety; that the light of truth may be visible to the Jews, and that the veil of their hearts may be removed; that heretics may come to their senses through a comprehension of the Catholic Faith; that schismatics may receive the spirit of renewed charity...”
- Pope Pius XI: “The union of Christians can only be promoted by promoting the return to the one true Church of those who are separated from it...Let none delude himself with obstinate wrangling. For *life and salvation are here concerned*, which will be lost and entirely destroyed, unless their interests are carefully and assiduously kept in mind.”<sup>28</sup>
- Pope Pius XII, little more than a decade before the Council which would declare his ecclesiology “obsolete:” “The Catholic *doctrine* [not a pastoral approach, but something fixed] will have to be proposed and exposed totally and integrally: what the Catholic Church teaches about the true nature and means of justification, about the constitutions of the Church, about the primacy of the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, about the only true union which is accomplished with the return of the dissidents to the only true Church of Christ will not at all be obliged to be passed over in silence or covered over in ambiguous words.”<sup>29</sup>
- Perhaps more incredible in light of their subsequent revolt within the Church is the pastoral letter of the Bishops of the Netherlands of July 31, 1948, prohibiting participation by Catholics in the Ecumenical movement. “The dissidents are so far away from and so foreign to the Church that they no longer understand her language.” They echoed the teaching of Pope Pius XI that if Catholics participated in meetings with dissidents, “she would by that very fact concede that the unity which Christ willed has not endured in her, and that strictly speaking *the Church of Christ does not exist*.” In only a few years popes would teach these very things, and the bishops of this same region would be on the cutting edge of the apostasy.
- Only a few years before the Council, Pope Pius XII warned against the very approach inaugurated by Pope John XXIII: “Another danger is perceived which is all the more serious



because it is more concealed beneath a mask of virtue. There are many who, deploring disagreement among men and intellectual confusion, through an imprudent zeal for souls, are urged by a great and ardent desire to do away with the barrier that divides good and honest men; these advocate an ‘eirenism’ according to which, by setting aside the questions which divide men, they aim not only at joining forces to repel the attacks of atheism, but also at reconciling things opposed to one another in the field of dogma.” He went on to conclude that such an approach “would bring about the union of all, but only to their destruction.”<sup>30</sup>

## **Vatican II**

As with virtually every other manner in which pre-conciliar Popes safeguarded the faithful from error and defended the true nature of the Church, the Council and future popes would contradict them, at times using the very words by which the same actions were condemned, leading to the precise results that their successors had predicted, not the “new springtime” they envisioned.

### **Pope John XXIII**

Pope John uttered the oft repeated mantra of ecumenism that he would focus on what united us, rather than what divided us, from other religions, precisely the mentality Pius XII wisely warned against. As he said on the day of his arrival as Archbishop of Venice, he “always rather cared about that which unites than about that which separates and generates contrasts.”<sup>31</sup> This was only four years after The Holy Office, in its “Instruction on the Ecumenical Movement” of Dec. 1949 wrote to bishops that, “They will also guard that, under the false pretext by which one is to consider that which unites over that which separates us, a dangerous indifferentism be not encouraged.” Yet, indifferentism is the next logical step, as we will soon explore.

The faithful Catholic may ask, “why is that so terrible? Simply beginning a conversation based on what you have in common does not mean the rest is considered unimportant, or is to never be addressed.” This is certainly true enough. However, bear in mind how this attitude so easily lends itself to what it in fact has become; relativism, by making essential matters of salvation secondary in a dialogue. Fr. Dr. Luigi Villa observed of this mentality, “And what does unite us? Human reasons. And what does separate us? The different Faith. Consequently, it is aberrant to place purely human, natural values on a higher standing than the supernatural ones. It makes no sense, therefore, the clarification Roncalli [John XXIII] makes of it: ‘safe is the steadfastness to the principles of the Catholic Creed and Morals,’ since that which divides us are in fact the principles of the Catholic Creed and Morals.”<sup>32</sup>

Also, bear in mind that the Ecumenical Movement was decades old at this point. It was not a matter of simply beginning a conversation on a pleasant tone, rather, joining a movement condemned by prior popes, and from the outset agreeing not to speak on anything we disagreed upon; in other words, total silence about the Catholic position. The falseness of this type of “charity” will be discussed in the unit, “Love Will Turn to Hate.” For now, just one example will show the wisdom of the pre-conciliar popes,

and the futility of this barren movement. In 2001, the Vatican issued “Dominus Iesu” to reassert the Church’s position on the nature of the Church as relates to other churches, stating genuine Catholic teaching in a manner quite rare since the Council. The response from other religions with whom we have been dialoging for forty years at this point was utter indignation. The obvious question is, what had they been talking about for the better part of four decades that any of this was a surprise? Only about what united them, of course, i.e., the protestant position and all of the compromises Catholics were supposed to make. However, let’s back track a bit and see the process by which this condemned movement and mentality invaded the Church and gave birth to modern indifferentism.

It is in John XXIII that the erosion of faith which ecumenism brings (and desires) began. He once said to Roger Schultz, the founder of Taize, a non-Catholic monastery, “You are in the Church, be at peace.” Schultz replied, “But then, we are Catholics!” John’s response, “Yes; we are no longer separated”<sup>33</sup> The culmination of this indifferentism was at the funeral of Pope John Paul II, where Mr. Schultz received Holy Communion from the hand of the next Pope, Cardinal Ratzinger. Once he became Pope, Br. Schultz was the recipient of an impromptu canonization courtesy of Benedict XVI. Upon his death, the Pope manifested an overt presumption in stating, “Brother Roger Schultz is in the hands of eternal goodness, eternal love; he has arrived at eternal joy.”<sup>34</sup> He likewise ensured those at the 2005 World Youth Day, “He is now visiting us and speaking to us from on high. I think that we must listen to him...”<sup>35</sup> Yes, perhaps we can name him “The Patron Saint of Indifferentism.”

#### Cardinal Wojtyla (John Paul II)

At the council, he contributed the following intervention on October 21, 1964: “It is not the role of the Church to lecture unbelievers. We are engaged in a search along with our fellow men – let us avoid moralizing or the suggestion that we have a monopoly on the truth.”<sup>36</sup>

- Evangelization is spoken of with derision, as the mere lecturing and moralizing of unbelievers. What would he have had Sts. Peter & Paul do?
- It is not the role of the Church to teach unbelievers? Again, we see that John Paul believed in a very different Church than had existed for 2000 years, the Church commanded by Christ to “teach all nations.”
- Are not, on some level, a personal crisis of the very notions of Faith and Truth evident?
- This renounces the doctrine that the Church possesses the fullness of Faith and Truth. Now, not only is the Church in no way above humanity, it is on equal footing, “searching;” for what is anybody’s guess.
- The “search” advocated by the future Pope is meaningless, as it has no conclusion. Tomorrow’s man will reject today’s consensus (precisely what the council was doing to Pius XII and the Church’s entire past), even if such a consensus could be had, and begin again.<sup>37</sup>

#### Voices of Logic & Faith

Some fathers of the council did rightly see the wisdom of the popes, and warned the ecumenism would lead to indifferentism and the loss of the Catholic identity:

- Bishop Luigi Carli of Segni, Italy, spoke at the Council and warned, already at this early stage, it was being taken to excess (just as the Popes and Holy Office had warned). He said it was no longer possible to speak about Our Lady; no one might be called heretical; no one might use the expression “Church Militant:” and it was no longer proper to call attention to the inherent powers of the Catholic Church.”<sup>38</sup> Ecumenism has, in fact, become a type of institutionalized cowardice. By placing ourselves on par with other religions, we place ourselves beneath them. Protestant sects have rendered no apologies, and altered no doctrines or their liturgies to please Catholicism, rather, we are the ones always groveling and concealing our identity. (One anecdotal example: In all of his public ecumenical services and news interviews following 9/11, not once did Cardinal Edward Egan mention the name Jesus. Jesus could be divisive in New York, so for the sake of focusing on what unites us, He had to remain concealed).
- At least one Father at the Council saw the false charity and the true cowardice in the ecumenical movement and spoke up: “Does ecumenism consist in confessing or in hiding the truth? Ought the Council to explain Catholic doctrine, or the doctrine of our separated brethren?...Hiding the truth hurts both us and those separated from us. It hurts us because we appear as hypocrites. It hurts those who are separated from us because it makes them appear weak and capable of being offended by the truth...Let us profess our faith openly. Let us be the teachers we are in the Church by teaching with clarity, and not hiding what is true.”<sup>39</sup> Servite Bishop Giocondo Grotti

Alas, his wisdom was not heeded, and the path of compromise, cowardice, concealing and denying the truth was set as a mandate for the “future Church.” As Yves Marsaudon proudly noted, “One can say that ecumenism is the legitimate son of freemasonry,”<sup>40</sup> and it was their council, after all. So, there can be little doubt that the words of Our Lady of LaSalette foretelling the great Apostasy, as well as Pius’ prediction that the Church will doubt herself, were fulfilled and enshrined in the documents of Vatican II. St. Paul, in the first century, boldly wrote of the Church as being “the pillar and bulwark of truth.” One thousand nine hundred years later, his successors would promulgate a document stating, “The truth must be sought...by means...of exchange and dialogue, by which some set forth to the others the truth that they have found or think that they have found, in order to help each other reciprocally in the search for truth” (*Dignitatus humanae*, n.3). And so two thousand years after the Son of God declared “The truth will set you free,” His Bride and His Body feebly offer to engage in a type of ongoing roundtable discussion with heretics, schismatics and non-believers, in the hopes that they can tell us exactly what that truth is. This tragic relativism has advanced so far that Pope John Paul II could assert in an encyclical that the Church’s new “self-awareness is formed ‘in dialogue.’”<sup>41</sup> The narcissism is impossible to ignore: “self-awareness;” we are both the subject and the object. Just as the Vatican II Church believes in a man who perfects himself, so also in a Church which defines itself by its own awareness, not God’s objective designs (as Modernity denies revelation), and we need to dialogue with non-believers to discover exactly what that awareness should be.

As discussed in the section “Superior to the Past,” denigration of the Church was the necessary precondition to convince people that it had to become something different. As it has been demonstrated that Vatican II popes either did not understand or simply did not believe in the mark of “One-ness” which we pray in the Creed, Paul VI extended this disbelief to the mark of holiness: “The Church ought to be holy and good, it ought to be as Christ intended and designed it to be, and sometimes we see that it is not worthy of the title.”<sup>42</sup> The Pope manifests the following symptoms of apostasy:

- A purely secular, modernist view of the Church; it is Christ the Head, the angels and saints in Heaven, the fullness of grace in the Sacraments and the purity of her doctrine that make the Church holy. Paul clearly limits the Church to those living human beings who, at that given moment, call themselves Catholic (The People of God).
- Anti-Catholicism: Was the Pope actually saying that there were no holy Catholics in 1972? Or, is he rather engaging in a form of discrimination which he would not tolerate towards any other group or class of people, yet, like his liberal compatriots, regards the Church as the only fair game for bigotry? Paul was saying that the Church should be defined by her worst elements, and therefore is unworthy to be called “holy.”
- The dimming of the intellect: As we would read and hear time and again after the Council, the Church had a Pope who did not grasp the most basic elements of the Faith. As Mr. Amerio observed, “It is indeed true that Christians *ought* to be holy, and they are inasmuch as they live in a state of grace, but the Church *is* holy. It is not Christians who make the Church holy, but the Church that makes them holy.”<sup>43</sup>

## Post Vatican II

The attitudes and actions in the field of ecumenism give clear evidence that the Church doubted herself, and decidedly defined herself in a way that had never been known, that is to say, un-Catholic. I do not think that it would be overly-dramatic to regard the following statement as disturbing coming from any Cardinal, let alone one who would become Pope [Ratzinger]. “The end of all ecumenical effort is to attain the *true* unity of the Church. For the moment, I wouldn’t dare to venture to suggest any concrete realization, possible or imaginable, of this future Church. We are at an intermediate stage of unity in diversity.”<sup>44</sup> [Let me help you imagine your “future Church,” eminence – empty.]

Pope John Paul repeatedly spoke of the need to thoroughly dilute the Church in obedience to the Council’s “mandate” for Ecumenism. In his encyclical “Ut Unum Sint” he wrote that ecumenism “is not just some sort of appendix which is added to the Church’s traditional activity. Rather, ecumenism is an organic part of her [the church] life and work, and consequently *must pervade all that she is and does...*” This is both an admission of and a mandate for both religious indifferentism and apostasy.

- Something condemned by previous popes as “*eroding the very foundations of the Catholic Faith*” must now *pervade all that the Church is and does!*

- It is an admission that the post-Vatican II Church is not the same Church, as she possesses an “organic” part, that is, part of her very being which, prior to the Council, not only did she not possess, but popes identified it as a cancer seeking to destroy her.
- In short, the Pope is mandating the Church as she exists today: not a single element of her life is simply “Catholic.” Religious indifferentism pervades everything. Education is watered down, the Sacraments are profaned on a regular basis, Mass now parrots a protestant communion service, errors flourish freely in every dimension of the Church’s life, popes regard themselves and their clergy as interchangeable with protestant ministers. This very Pope gave Holy Communion to a pro abortion protestant and assures protestant “bishops” of the validity of their office. Yes, ecumenism has indeed pervaded everything, leaving the faithful defenseless sheep against the final falling away.
- This “mandate” is a preparation for the “One World Church” sought by the agents of the Apostasy. Every dimension of the Church’s life, including her own “self-awareness,” must somehow be permeated by the beliefs of those who reject our own teachings.

As Popes have taught, ecumenism is nothing less than religious indifferentism, which is “atheism minus the name.” Part of the Church’s perpetual “evolution” into Cardinal Ratzinger’s “future Church” is that nothing of her essence or life is fixed; existentialism, named by Pius XII as a symptom of the apostasy. The Vatican II Church insists that every slate be wiped clean and rewritten only after consulting protestants and non-Christians. Hence, the expression of the cancer of ecumenism is the Church’s mania for “dialogue.” The Church is no longer “Teacher,” as she no longer believes in herself. Rather, she is merely a “seeker,” dialoging with other seekers. A pope has now mandated, in accord with the Council, that this indifferentism permeate the entire Church. Ecumenism is the process by which every dimension of the Church’s life is immersed in a haze of relativism and incertitude, thus preparing the elect to be led astray; it is nothing less than a mandate for death. Romano Amerio offers this summary of the Vatican II Church’s monomaniacal obsession with the word “dialogue”:

“The word was completely unknown and unused in the Church’s teaching before the Council. It does not occur once in any previous Council, or in papal encyclicals, or in sermons, or in pastoral practice. In the Vatican II documents, it occurs 28 times, twelve of them in the decree *Unitatis Redintegratio*. Nonetheless, through its lightning spread and an enormous broadening in meaning, the word, which is very new in the Catholic Church, became the master-word determining post-conciliar thinking, and a catch-all category in the newfangled mentality. People not only talk about ecumenical dialogue, dialogue between the Church and the world, ecclesial dialogue, but by an enormous catecheses, a dialogical structure is attributed to theology, pedagogy, catechesis, the Trinity, the history of salvation, schools, families, priesthood, sacraments, redemption – and to everything else that has existed in the Church for centuries without the concept being in anybody’s mind or the word occurring in the language.”<sup>45</sup>

It seems that few remember that the first “dialogue” in history was between Eve and the serpent, the result of which was her abandonment of God’s revelation in favor of her own designs.

### No more conversions

The popes prior to the Council upheld the only Catholic possibility for the unity of Christians; returning to the one Church which Christ founded. Pope John Paul rejected this need, thus rejecting the Church as the only means of salvation. In his encyclical “Ut Unum Sint,” he wrote that thanks to “radically altered perspectives and thus attitudes” engendered by Vatican II, the Catholic Church will train new priests “to pave the way for future relations between the two Churches, passing beyond the outdated ecclesiology of return to the Catholic Church.”<sup>46</sup> The implications are obvious:

- The word “radically” means, literally, at the root; it is an entirely new Church the Pope envisions.
- This Church he envisions is not the Catholic Church, as he explicitly writes that the idea that every Christian should be united in the One Church as “outdated ecclesiology.”
- The term “outdated ecclesiology” also betrays the belief that the Church is not the same Catholic Church of the past. Ecclesiology is the science of the Church; if the science is outdated, so is the Church studied.
- The Pope offers another manifestation of his not truly believing in his own office, as he explicitly writes that Christ did not intend for him to be the shepherd of all Christians.

### A Church among churches

The Vatican’s Balamand Statement also gives witness to “Rome losing the Faith,” and “the Church doubting herself.” In it we read, “the Catholic Churches and the Orthodox Churches recognize each other as sister Churches, responsible for maintaining the Church of God in Fidelity to the divine purpose...”<sup>47</sup>

- “Catholic Churches?” In the creed, we pray that we believe in One. How many does the Vatican believe in?
- In saying that the Catholic and Orthodox Churches “recognize each other,” this is stating that we accept their theology, which is that the Pope is not what the Church has infallibly taught.

- “Fidelity to the divine purpose?” The Divine purpose, according to authentic Roman Catholicism [and Jesus], is that His Church is built on Peter and His Successors, not “one sister is built on Peter, and the other is built to reject him...”
- Again, the Church of God (singular this time) is not the Roman Catholic Church in the mind of John Paul, as this clearly states that the single Church is the combination of these two sisters, one of whom is unabashedly pope-less.

### The Slippery Slope

Recall at the onset of this chapter the quote from Pope Leo the Great, “If the Faith is not single, it does not exist at all.” This is the course of the Vatican II Church. The Faith is no longer single, and is on its way to non-existence, i.e., apostasy. Ecumenism is the road by which the modernists longed to have Catholicism dissolved into the world, so that their one world order could have its one world religion, without the perennial thorn-in-the-flesh of a Catholic Church and its Pope claiming a type of supremacy due to her superior origin and sole possession of the fullness of both truth and the means of salvation.

We have already seen, in the words of the Council and popes themselves, the rejection of the divine origin of the Papacy, his divinely appointed authority over all Christians, the need of the Catholic Church for salvation, the Oneness of the Church and the identity of the Catholic Church as the One Church of Christ. This is only the beginning. These are not the rantings and hypotheses of the writer, rather this is exactly the end of the slippery slope of ecumenism wisely foretold by Pope Pius XI in “*Mortalium Annos*.”

“Conventions, meetings and addresses are frequently arranged by these persons, at which a large number of witnesses are present, and at which all without distinction are invited to join in the discussion, both infidels of every kind, and Christians, even those who have unhappily fallen away from Christ or who with obstinacy and pertinacity deny His divine nature and mission. Certainly such attempts can nowise be approved by Catholics, founded as they are on that false opinion which considers all religions to be more or less good and praiseworthy, since they all in different ways manifest and signify that sense which is inborn in us all, and by which we are led to God and to the obedient acknowledgment of His rule. Not only are those who hold this opinion *in error and deceived*, but also in distorting the idea of true religion they reject it, and little by little turn aside to naturalism and atheism, as it is called; from which it clearly follows that one who supports those who hold these theories and attempt to realize them, is *altogether abandoning the divinely revealed religion*.” I am sure that the Pope could not have dreamed that one day his successor would not only attend, but convene just such a meeting; and that, not only to converse, but to pray together. Is there any greater sign of apostasy than a Pope who not only commits himself, but indeed consecrates the entire Church to a pursuit which his predecessor described as “*altogether abandoning the divinely revealed religion?*” The next step down the slippery slope, the logical offspring of ecumenism...

## Part V: Indifferentism

*“Indifferentism is atheism minus the name.”*

*-Pope Leo XIII*

Indifferentism means “one religion is as good as another.” This is the next logical step after ecumenism by which, as we have read in their own words, the Council Fathers and popes made the Catholic Church equal to other denominations as “fellow searchers” looking for a way to build a “future church” different from the one established by Christ. The powerful Masonic Cardinal Bea, during the Council, explicitly stated that protestants are no worse off than Catholics in terms of salvation.<sup>48</sup> Obviously, during the nineteen hundred plus years when the Church was not afflicted by this identity crisis, popes who believed in the divine origin of their office also believed in the divine origin of their Church, and therefore rejected the notion that it could be held as equal with any other.

### Condemnations

- Pope Gregory XVI: “Now we come to another very fertile cause of the evils by which, we are sorry to see, the contemporary Church is being afflicted. This is indifferentism, or that wicked opinion which has grown up on all sides by the deceit of evil men. According to this opinion, the eternal salvation of the soul can be attained by any kind of profession of faith, as long as a man’s morals are in line with the standard of justice and honesty.” He goes on, “You [bishops and priests] must drive out from the people entrusted to your care this most deplorable error on a matter so obviously important and so completely clear. For, since the Apostle has warned that there is one God, one Faith, one baptism, those who pretend that the way to [eternal] beatitude starts from any religion at all should be afraid, and should seriously think over the fact that, according to the testimony of the Savior Himself, **they are against Christ** because they are not for Christ, and that they are miserably scattering because they are not gathering with Him; and that, they are most certainly going to perish forever, unless they hold the Catholic Faith and keep it whole and inviolate.”<sup>49</sup>
- Pope Pius VII: “By the fact that the indiscriminate freedom of all forms of worship is proclaimed, truth is confused with error, and the Holy and Immaculate Spouse of Christ is placed on the same level as heretical sects and even as Jewish perfidy [half belief]. Besides, when aid and protection are guaranteed to heretical sects and their ministers, not only are their persons tolerated and favored, but even their very errors. This attitude involves that awful and ever lamentable heresy referred to by St. Augustine in the following terms: ‘This heresy affirms that all heretics are on the right path and that all teach the truth. This is so monstrous an absurdity that it seems to me to be incredible.’”<sup>50</sup>
- Pope Pius IX: “We must mention and condemn again that most pernicious error, which has been inhibited by certain Catholics who are of the opinion that those people who live in error and have not the true Faith and are separated from the Catholic unity, may obtain life everlasting. Now



this opinion is contrary to Catholic Faith, as is evident from the plain words of Our Lord (Mt. 18:17, Mk. 16:16, Lk. 10:16, Jn. 3:18)...To entertain opinions contrary to this Catholic Faith is to be an impious wretch.”<sup>51</sup>

## Vatican II

A sign of things to come was described by Guido Gusso, the personal attendant of the future Pope John XXIII when he was Patriarch of Venice. In an interview, he said, “When I realized that the cardinal invited Protestants, Jews and Muslims, without distinction, at his table, I was astonished. He saw my astonishment and, smiling, explained to me that all men were children of God, independently of the religion they professed. All that mattered was to be honest and faithful to one’s consciousness and, therefore, to one’s own faith...One day, as though to explain his conduct, he told me, ‘If I were born a Muslim, I would have surely made a good Muslim, faithful to my religion.’”<sup>52</sup>

- This is the very mentality which Gregory the XVI called a “wicked opinion,” and Pius VII labeled “absurdity.”
- By this statement, Cardinal Roncalli was saying he would surely have persecuted Christians and regarded the Christian Faith as deserving of hellfire.
- He wrote, “Also among man’s rights is that of being able to worship God in accord with the right dictates of his own conscience, and to profess his religion both in private and in public.”<sup>53</sup>

With an incoherence and absence of logic that were not atypical of his statements, Pope Paul VI once remarked, “The more modern man is averse to the supernatural, the more he is disposed towards it.”<sup>54</sup> So, is there *anyone* really averse to it, or are we all on our way? According to the Vatican II Church, everyone was on their way. Consider the following...

- In the Vatican document “Dominus Iesu,” Cardinal Ratzinger announced an initiative by which all other religions “if and in what way the historical figures and positive elements of these religions may fall within the divine plan of salvation.” In another context, an interview which became a book, we read from the Cardinal, “But could we not also accept that someone can be saved through a faith other than the Catholic?...This *undoubtedly happens on a large scale*.”<sup>55</sup> Indifferentism and presumption would seem to be equally manifest.
- We have already noted some ways in which the Vatican II Church took steps towards this indifferentism. ..
  - The Council explicitly stated that other religions are a means of salvation. Even if one were to still hold that some things are lacking in these religions, what would it really matter if they can nonetheless get you to Heaven?
  - For the first time ever, Christian burials and Holy Communion are open to non-Catholics, thus underscoring that their non-membership in the Church is not an impediment to salvation.

- This type of indifferentism towards religions was extended to individuals as, in short, the Council declared all thoughts to be equal. Contrast the following:
  - Pope Gregory XVI: “From this most rotten source of indifferentism flows that absurd and erroneous opinion, or rather insanity, that liberty of conscience must be claimed and defended for anyone.”<sup>56</sup> At least he was in safe in Heaven when Vatican II gave insanity the force of law and errors the same rights as truth...
  - “Religious freedom must be given such recognition in the constitutional order of society as will make it a civil right.” *Dignitatis Humanae*. Here, the Church is putting herself on par with snakehandlers, devil worshippers, and anti-Catholic religions in terms of the rights due to them.
  - Consider the words of Pope Pius XI: “Then, indeed, little by little the religion of Christ was placed on the same level as false religions, and was put in the same class most shamefully...”<sup>57</sup> Could he have ever imagined that an Ecumenical Council itself would “shamefully” do the same? In its decree of ecumenism, Vatican II decreed that Catholics, in discussing theological problems, were on “equal footing” with other religions. Are truth and error equal, or does truth no longer exist?
- Whichever he may hold the case to be, both as Cardinal Ratzinger and as Benedict XVI the Pope endorsed this indifferentism. In “Principles of Catholic Theology” we find “It means that the Catholic Church does not insist on the dissolution of the Protestant confessions, rather, that they will be strengthened in their confessions and in their ecclesial reality.”<sup>58</sup> This means that people who do not believe in the Real Presence, Confession, Priesthood, devotion to the Blessed Mother, or the Church as established by Christ, however *do* believe in contraception, abortion, divorce and gay rights should be “strengthened” in these errors. He reiterated this indifferentism and relativism as Pope at the 2005 World Youth Day: “And now we ask; what does it mean to restore the unity of Christians?...This unity does not mean what could be called ecumenism of the return; that is, to deny and to reject one’s own faith history; absolutely not!”<sup>59</sup>
- This indifferentism is likewise expressed in his book “Co-workers of the Truth.” “When we raise the question about the foundation and meaning of our Christian existence, there slips in a certain false hankering for the apparently more comfortable life of other people who are also going to Heaven. But what a strange attitude it is to find the duties of our Christian life unrewarding just because the denarius of salvation can be gained without them!”<sup>60</sup>

### **Syncretism**

The belief that all religions are a means of salvation, and therefore the Church directly established by Christ is in no way superior to them and should seek the “broader church” of the future, was never more

apparent than at the Assisi prayer meeting of Pope John Paul II. Absolutely any pope, at any time in the Church's history before Vatican II, would have condemned such an event as blasphemy, sacrilege and apostasy. In the Vatican II Church, it is a sign of things to come. Pagans, devil worshippers, people who preach abortion, sodomy and contraception and uphold the abuse of women, people who believe human beings are reincarnated as animals and that it is their religious duty to persecute and kill Christians gathered together, as equal partners, at the Pope's invitation. Not only did The Vicar of Christ present Catholicism as simply one religion among others, it was given a lesser status. The official prayer book contained prayers for peace from every religion represented, except Catholicism. It only included a generic "Christian" prayer, and that at the end of the list.

- Sacred places, consecrated to God, were instead handed over to unbelievers. Islam was allowed to pray in a chapel dedicated to Fr. Elias. Voodoo was given a room in the convent for prayer. One can rightly ponder the possible fulfillment of Jesus' prophecy of the "Abomination of Desolation" as African animists were allowed to kill two chickens on the altar of St. Claire (La Stampa, Nov. 21, 2005).
- Blasphemy preached: Didi Talwakar, Hinduism's representative said in her speech, attended by the Vicar of Christ, "Not only am I divine in essence, but also everyone else is equally divine in essence."
- Sacrilege: A statue of Buddah was placed upon a tabernacle. Any genuine Catholic would recognize this is an abomination.
- Indifferentism: At the opening of the event, Cardinal Roger Etchegaray declared each religion's contribution to the world to be "irreplaceable."
- Our Lady dishonored: As noted earlier, Our Lady of Fatima gave Heaven's solution and a promise of a period of peace in the world; she was rejected in favor of Pope John's own designs. Likewise, Pope John Paul convoked pagans to come and pray with him to obtain that same end which Our Lady promised by entirely Catholic means – repentance and conversion. As yet another rebuke to our Lady of Fatima and manifestation of the apostasy, in the same church with a Buddah statue and the Dalai Lama sitting with his back to the Blessed Sacrament (which had been removed to the side – Jesus had to make way for a pagan idol), a statue of Our Lady of Fatima was denied entrance.<sup>61</sup>

Even many devout Catholics, inclined towards a genuine sense of the Faith to defend The Holy Father in some suspect acts or questionable writings, could not bring themselves to defend such an abomination. For example, Vito Messori is the journalist who collaborated with the Pope to produce "Crossing the Threshold of Hope." He opined that the Assisi event, "sent the message that one religion is as good as another...The appearance of relativism eroded the Pontiff's authority on moral issues like divorce and abortion." He stated, "If the doctrine of every religion is acceptable to God, why persist in following the Catholic one, which is the most severe and rigid of all?"<sup>62</sup> A devout Catholic himself, Messori's experience of John Paul in the course of his interviews already had left him with grave misgivings about the state of the Pope's Catholicism, as he remarked, "I did not reveal all [in the book]. I thought that for the few remaining Catholics, the shock would be too much."<sup>63</sup>

The question Mr. Messori posed rhetorically was asked in a positive way by Cardinal Ratzinger: “The question that really concerns us, the question that really oppresses us, is why it is necessary for us in particular to practice the Christian faith in its totality; why, when there are so many other ways that lead to heaven and salvation, should it be required of us to bear day after day the whole burden of ecclesial dogmas and of the ecclesial ethos?”<sup>64</sup> Again, not only is Catholicism brought to equal status with other religions, it is something less, as it is more demanding and burdensome than the other “ways to heaven.”

Pope John Paul promulgated his “Decalogue of Assisi” to commemorate the event and spread its intent. The title itself can reasonably enough be regarded as offensive if not sacrilegious. The Decalogue refers to the Ten Commandments given directly by God; to appropriate that sacred title to promote an event which contradicted the first of those commandments, “You shall not have strange gods before Me,” certainly exceeds the merely “inappropriate.” These “commandments” are nothing less than a call for what others popes had condemned as an impossible Utopianism yearned for by “insane dreamers and miscreants,” the naïvete of which malignant forces would surely exploit. John Paul called this syncretism “an anticipation of what God would like the developing history of humanity to be: a fraternal journey in which we accompany one another towards the transcendental goal which he [not He] sets for us.”<sup>65</sup> Is that goal Christ anymore, Holy Father? Is it not presumption to claim we are all going to the same “goal,” as Christ Himself explicitly stated otherwise? Is their arrival at this goal contingent upon their repentance, conversion and Baptism, as Christ stated it indeed is? Again, the unquestioned assumptions of evolution, our superiority to the past, our superior conception of God, even of those things *God has directly revealed about Himself*, are manifest. This “anticipation” of what God would like to see realized was also what “the kingdom of satan” would like to see realized, as on Oct. 27, 1986 the Masons offered their praises of John Paul’s initiative and the message of Assisi.

John Paul again nullified the First Commandment in his address to Cardinals on Dec. 22, 1986: “The meeting of religions in Assisi was meant to be a clear confirmation of the fact that ‘every genuine prayer is inspired by the Holy Spirit, who is mysteriously present in the heart of every man!’” Therefore, it does not matter to which god one’s ‘genuine prayer’ is addressed, and the Sacred Scriptures are false when chastising those who “pray to gods that cannot save,” and when they say of pagans that their gods are devils. Is the convergence of several subversive and corrosive elements not manifest in such initiatives? Rather than undertake the labor of seeking to convert the erring, we simply give divine sanction to those errors. I no longer have to try to convert those who worship false gods, because I have declared the worship of every god to be true. Hence, when the antichrist proposes himself for worship, on what grounds could we refute him, since every other form of worship has been given papal sanction?

The Pope himself once wrote, “The prayer meeting in the sanctuary at lake Togo was particularly striking. There I prayed for the first time with animists.” Animists are devil worshippers. In “Redemptor Hominis 6(16) the same pope recommended prayer with non-Christians. Rome has indeed lost the faith, as no Pope can ever render void the teachings of St. Paul in Sacred Scripture, “For what partnership have righteousness with iniquity? Or what fellowship has light with darkness? What accord has Christ with Belial? Or what has believer in common with unbeliever? What agreement has the temple of God with idols?” (2 Cor 6:14 – 16). At John Paul’s day of prayer for peace, they were one

and the same; however, according to Pope Pius XII, none, as he appealed to this same verse in forbidding Catholics to do the very things his successor did and encouraged others to do.

“Do not give what is holy to dogs...” (Mt. 7:6)

Leading up to the invasion of Iraq, Tony Blair, Prime Minister of England visited the Vatican. Pope John Paul gave Blair, not only a non-Catholic but a man who affirmed his own protestant religion’s acceptance of abortion and active homosexuality, Holy Communion. This is the capstone of the indifferentism which gives birth to syncretism, sacrilege, and apostasy.

- “Lawlessness”: The Pope’s staff, when confronted with outrage over this scandal, pointed to a newly contrived article in Canon Law which allows a protestant to receive Communion when he is unable due to the non-availability of his own church’s services. Yet...
- The incoherence of liberalism: How is it that a man, when he can’t receive the bread he normally receives in his own church, becomes entitled to The Body of Christ in ours?
- Relativism: Clearly, this law is saying the two are equal. And..
- Liberals are Liars: There are Anglican churches in Rome, and I am sure a minister could have easily been procured for the Prime Minister of England.
- “The Mockery of Martyrdom:” During the English “reformation” thousands of Catholics were martyred defending the Faith; now, the spiritual descendants of their killers are given Christ Himself in the Blessed Sacrament, by the Pope, as a sign of their victory.
- “My Will Is Enough:” Simply concocting a new “law” to allow yourself to do whatever you want only works for the secular relativist. John Paul himself reiterated that the true conditions for Communion (a Catholic in the state of grace) are Apostolic (dating back to the Apostles) and indispensable. The incoherence defies description.
- Catholicism as the least desirable religion: All of the things which prohibit a Catholic from receiving Holy Communion do not apply to one who rejects Catholic teaching; only we are “burdened” and bound by the truth (which are now merely our prevailing opinions).
- “Lest they turn on you and tear you to pieces.” This is the conclusion of Jesus’ injunction to not give what is holy to dogs: we will see the price the Church continues to pay for ignoring Jesus in this in the section “How the Devil Treats His Friends.”

## **Part VI: Non-Evangelization**

*“When Jesus finished these sayings, the crowds were astonished at his teaching, for He taught them as one who had authority, and not as their scribes.” -Matthew 7:28 – 29*

Take heart, ye scribes; two thousand years later Jesus’ bishops would follow your example, not His. Following the logical path of the dissolution of the Church, it would stand to reason that the Vatican II Church would no longer evangelize and engage in authentic missionary activity. When the Church believed that she was the One true Church, and that membership in her was necessary for salvation, she likewise felt a grave moral imperative to labor to bring others into her fold. However, since the Vatican II Church has forfeited such convictions, now convinced that every religion is a means of salvation, and

that she is merely seeking truth along with everyone else, the new Church would have no real grounds on which to base the assertion that others should embrace her own, ever more nebulous, creed. Jesus gave the Great Commission to “go out and teach all nations.” Vatican II stated that they have just as much to teach us, so at best a mere dialogue would be in order. Archbishop Varela gave this summary:

The mammoth evangelizing and educational task of religious orders...has altogether disappeared in some areas and sectors. There can be no doubt that the reasons for this alarming situation are numerous and complex. Nonetheless, it is certain that its deepest roots are to be found in secularization within the Church, that is, in the diminishing or abandonment of the Truth of faith in our own lives and pastoral commitments.<sup>66</sup>

In *Humani Generis*, Pope Pius XII warned of this symptom in the impetus of those who embraced the errors contributing to the current apostasy; fear of being rejected by progressivists. For this reason, the systematic denigration of the Church extended to the Faith itself. Liberalism had no tolerance for a religion declaring it possessed the fullness of truth and had a divine mandate to preach this truth to the world, and to the liberals within the Church, adhering to these propositions became a source of embarrassment. Liberals cast the Church as history’s villain, and liberal Catholics believed it and felt embarrassed by that past. Liberals held in contempt anyone who did not subscribe to the atheistic creation account, evolution, and so liberal Catholics were embarrassed that their Creed still imposed creationism on them. Because liberalism is Satan’s ideology, the Church has always refuted it, and to liberal Catholics this was an insufferable backwardness imposed upon them. Pope Paul voiced this sentiment on December 24, 1965: “The Church, with its demanding and precise attitude to dogma, impedes free conversation and harmony among men; it is a principle of division in the world rather than of union. How are division, disagreement and dispute compatible with its catholicity and its sanctity?” He sought to respond to his own rhetorical question, but only ended by revealing his own indifferentism: he speaks of the Church being a source of distinction, not division, “of the same sort as that involved in the case of language, culture, art or profession.” Here, the Pope reduces the Faith to the realm of subjectivism: as Mr. Amerio wrote, “there is no true or absolute language, art or occupation; there *is* a true and absolute religion.”<sup>67</sup> Yet, the rebuke of Jesus remains: “Whoever is ashamed of Me and My words, of him will the Son of man be ashamed when He comes in His glory and the glory of the Father and of the holy angels” (Luke 9:26).

In so much of the Church’s life, with the Assisi abomination being perhaps the most poignant example, we see how the members of the Vatican II Church place themselves above the faith. We are no longer so interested in what people believe about God, as in the age of faith; in the age of man which is the Great Apostasy, we only care what they think about us. I will outline this mentality, this “diabolical disorientation,” in a subsequent unit, a mentality summed up in the pitiful statement of a Vicar of Christ groveling for a godless world’s approval, “We more than anyone subscribe to the cult of man.”<sup>68</sup>

Jesus commanded His disciples to go out to the whole world, to preach, teach and baptize in His Name. His Vicar would reject this mandate as incompatible with the Masonic mandate of indifferentism, and so prohibit it. Pope John Paul II stated that proselytism compromised “the fundamental right of religious

liberty.”<sup>69</sup> In the encyclical “Redemptor Hominis,” John Paul wrote a section on the subject of “mission,” yet made no mention of the requirement to believe and be baptized. Instead, he defined conversion, not as discovering Christ, but as “Man must fully find himself again.” Hence, conversion is simply a matter of man as man. Just as the Church now “realizes” itself and “defines” itself, man now “converts” himself by “discovering” himself. You no longer need to become something different, you only need to recognize what you are.

“The Devil’s Final Battle” retells these accounts: Fr. Linus Dragu Popian had been raised in the Romanian Orthodox religions. In 1975 he risked his life to escape Communist Romania and presented himself as a seminarian to the Vatican, expressing his wish to convert to Catholicism. The then Secretary of State, Cardinal Villot, and other Vatican Cardinals were horrified. They told him that he must not flee Communism and must not become Catholic, because this would damage the Vatican’s relations with Communist Romania and the Romanian Orthodox Church. An Orthodox bishop who wanted to become Catholic likewise approached the Vatican. Panic ensued and the following day Cardinal Neves, Prefect for the Congregation of Bishops, said to the schismatic bishop, “Your excellency, it is not necessary to convert. Since the Council, things have changed! There’s no need to convert anymore.”

Vatican II’s new message of non-conversion and salvation through any religion would continue to digress into salvation without religion altogether; universal salvation. In the age of Faith men and women, convinced that the privileged position they enjoyed as members of the Catholic Church was something Christ intended for all, gave their lives to evangelize the nations. St. Isaac Jogues gave beautiful testimony to this conviction of the need for the Faith. Knowing that in the “New Land” there were natives who knew not Christ or His Church, he left France to bring them to the Church and salvation. He was eventually captured by a hostile tribe, and mutilated by having three fingers cut off each hand. (While not understanding the Mass, the natives knew that, somehow, those fingers were essential to St. Isaac). He was eventually freed and returned to France, but only long enough to recover. His resolve to bring the American natives to the harbor of salvation could not be squelched, and so he returned, this time laying down his life. Today, the Church produces no such missionaries, as she has lost the conviction that what she has to offer is in fact necessary to anyone else. Instead, what calls itself missionary activity is simply a combination of welfare and a cultural exchange program. Even as the Church honors Isaac as a saint, her leaders now regard his zeal as misplaced, his theology of the “One Church” as “outdated ecclesiology,” and his sacrifice as unnecessary. Now, the Church does not produce missionary martyrs, she mocks them.

### **“Subtlety and Mockery”**

- Paul VI’s persecution of Cardinal Slipyi: Fr. Villa, in his masterpiece on Paul VI, conceded that “It is difficult to find the words to stigmatize Paul VI’s shameful silence and inaction”<sup>70</sup> regarding the Cardinal. He was arrested shortly after being ordained Bishop in 1940. He spent eight years in the harshest Soviet labor camps, he was again sentenced to exile in Siberia, and an additional seven years of imprisonment and forced labor, and yet another incarceration in the

harshest prison of Mordovia. When released, he endeavored to tell the free world about the horrible murders and persecutions of his countrymen, and it was the Vatican that silenced him, placing him under house arrest.

However, before this silence was imposed, this heroic Confessor of the Faith spoke about his betrayers: “Out of fifty four million Catholic Ukrainians, ten million have died as a consequence of persecutions. The Soviet regime has suppressed all dioceses. There is a mountain of dead bodies and there is no one left, not even in the Church, to uphold their memory. Thousands of the faithful are still detained or deported. But the Vatican Diplomacy [i.e. Paul VI] has chosen silence, not to upset its dealings. The times of the catacombs are back. Thousands and thousands of faithful of the Ukrainian Church are deported to Siberia and as far north as the Polar Circle, and yet the Vatican ignores this tragedy. Have the martyrs, perhaps, become incommodious witnesses? Could we have become a drag to the Church?”<sup>71</sup>

Paul had always played the willing patsy to the communists, and it was for assisting them that Pius XII had removed him from his post. Even more disgraceful was his treatment of Cardinal Stephen Trochta. Most of his life as a bishop was spent in Soviet prisons and labor camps. During his final arrest and interrogation in 1974 he suffered a break down, and this great hero of the faith and worthy successor to the Apostles died the next day. His less than heroic Pope said nothing. However, on the very same day, he did find the time to send a telegram to the wife of justice Sossi, abducted by the Red Brigade.

- Pope John Paul II and the Koran: The Koran is the sacred book of Islam. By its authority, Muslims have persecuted and martyred untold thousands of Christians, and consigned their own women to lives of misery and degradation. It renounces the Divinity of Christ, and teaches that belief in the Trinity is worthy of hellfire. Catholics have been martyred rather than give into the demands of Muslims that they kiss the Koran as a sign of acquiescence, rightly acknowledging this as an act of apostasy. Pope John Paul II did this very thing and, unlike the martyrs who died for their refusal to do so, there was no coercion or duress; he just wanted to. In so doing, he mocked every Catholic past and present ever oppressed and murdered on that book’s authority, and also allowed Muslim governments to mock their own miniscule, downtrodden Catholic populations, as the image was run on television around the clock.
- At the Mass to beatify the martyrs Juan Bautista and Jacinto de Los Angeles in Guadalupe, four women in Indian garb performed a pagan healing/exorcism on Pope John Paul II. The martyrs he was beatifying were tortured and killed in 1700 for reporting these same clandestine practices to Catholic authorities. Not only is the Sacrifice of the Mass mocked, as pagan rituals are now woven in, even as these martyrs are honored, they are simultaneously mocked for their sacrifice, with the clear message that, rather than reporting these pagan practices and suffering torture and death, they should have merely participated in them as the Pope would one day do. This act likewise stands as a mockery of every Catholic martyr from the Roman persecutions, who could have easily spared their lives by performing a simple pagan ritual, such as throwing a handful of



incense to a pagan statue. The message from John Paul; you should have. What's the difference, after all? We are all 'means of salvation.'

- Roman Catholics of China: The Chinese government persecutes the true Church, harassing, imprisoning and torturing priests and faithful alike who maintain their allegiance to the true Church in Rome. The government has established a counterfeit, substitute Chinese Catholic Church, which denies the Papacy and is pro-abortion. Pius XII condemned the church in two encyclicals in 1956: "Under the appearance of patriotism, which in reality is just a fraud, the [Chinese Catholic Patriotic Assc.] aims primarily at making Catholics embrace the tenets of atheistic materialism, by which God Himself is denied and religious principles are rejected."<sup>72</sup>

Then Archbishop Levada of San Francisco confirmed that the Vatican granted faculties for members of this church to function in the United States. While genuine Roman Catholic priests languish and suffer to maintain their loyalty to the Apostolic See, the Apostolic See is not so loyal to them; instead it mocks them, by granting the pro-abortion defectors free passage to America along with employment and financing.

## **Part VII: Universal Salvation**

*"One day we shall joyfully greet him again..."*

*-Final Condemnation at a Novus Ordo funeral*

The words above are a sin, a sin which is prayed at every Novus Ordo funeral. We *hope* to greet him again; to say we know that we will is presumption. Presumption is a sin against hope; it is when one takes their entry into Heaven as being a foregone conclusion. It would seem that Pope John XXIII indulged in this line of thought. Shortly before his death he said, "And if He does not allow me to finish [the council] then I shall watch its joyful conclusion from Heaven, where I hope – rather, where I am certain – the Divine Mercy will draw me."<sup>73</sup> Not only was he certain, but he was apparently confident that no time in Purgatory would be imputed to him, as he expected a heaven's eye view of the council's end.

Recall that St. Anthony foretold that the end would be at hand when the Church and the world were one. Part of the ongoing apostasy is the belief that the Church is no longer necessary for salvation because, in fact, it is all of humanity which comprises the Church. This process of dissolution has been touched upon already. Membership in the Church was always regarded as requiring being a baptized Christian, in communion with the Pope, who believed all that the Church taught. Now, those who reject the Papacy and Catholic teachings have been assured that they nonetheless are part of the Church as well. In the encyclical "Redemptor Hominis" Pope John Paul completed this liquidation of the Church by dissolving Catholicism into Unitarianism. The Masonic occultist Eliphas Levi predicted this very state of affairs in "Le Grand Arcane:" "There will no longer be, on one part humanity, on the other part the Church. Because the Church will embrace humanity, and anyone within humanity will not be able to be outside the Church." According to Pope John Paul II, this day has arrived via Vatican II.

### From Catholicism to Unitarianism

“The different religions are all reflections of the one truth.” John Paul II, *Redemptor Hominis*

In ‘Sign of Contradiction,’ John Paul (as Cardinal Wojtyla) commented on ‘Lumen Gentium’ which called the Church the “Sacrament of Unity,” by summarizing, “All men are included in this sacrament of unity,”<sup>74</sup> and “the Church of the living God unites all men.”<sup>75</sup> In the encyclical we read of a muddled concept of Church while distorting and misusing terms, as he wrote of “the Church of the new advent, the Church that is continually preparing for the new coming of the Lord...”<sup>76</sup> Does he mean the second coming? Apparently not, as he never mentions the reality of judgment or the prospect of damnation, only the evolution of the “new Church.” He describes this “new Church” thus: “Likewise the Church, which has struck root in many varied fields of the life of the whole present-day humanity, also acquires the certainty and, one could say, the experience of being close to man, to each person, of being each person’s Church, the Church of the People of God.”<sup>77</sup> Hence, it is by explicitly equating Vatican II’s preferred expression for the Church with all humanity that we arrive at the Unitarian conception of the Church. As Fr. Dormann observed, John Paul’s description of the Church is true “only if all mankind is the invisible Church.”<sup>78</sup> He stated as much to the Roman Curia on June 28, 1980: “The diverse ecclesial communities constitute the sphere of membership in the Church as People of God.”

Again, the contradictions abound so overwhelmingly that they can seem impossible to completely synthesize and articulate, as they are an endless, multi-layered phenomena. Consider the following statement by Pope John Paul: “The Eucharist is the sacrament of the covenant of the Body and Blood of Christ – of the covenant which is eternal. This is the covenant which embraces all. This blood reaches and saves all.”<sup>79</sup>

- When Jesus foretold the Blessed Sacrament in the Gospel of John chapter six, He explicitly stated that one had to *eat* His Body and *drink* His Blood. It was precisely because of this that many followers abandoned Him. Yet now a Pope declares that, simply the fact that the Eucharist exists saves all, whether you receive it or not, whether you reject it or not.
- This heresy is clearly condemned by the Council of Trent session VI: “But although Christ died for all, yet not all receive the benefit of His death, but those only to whom the merit of His passion is communicated.”<sup>80</sup>
- Likewise we see the superficiality, if not the falsehood, of the “Religious Liberty” promulgated at the Council. John Paul taught that you are a member of the Church, even if you reject it, and now, you receive the merits of the Blood of Christ even if you reject that. Hence, the only “freedom” is type of self-delusion: rejection is, in the final analysis, not a possibility. You are Christian, whether you want to be one or not, or even if you want to kill them all.

Following the trajectory rightly foretold by Pope Pius XI, once the Church came to doubt herself and deny that she was the One True Church, the road would be open to indifferentism. Once the belief that

“Outside the Church there is no salvation,” was downgraded to other religions’ being means of salvation, a little further down the slippery slope comes the belief that there is no more “means” required for salvation than being human. This is the heresy of “Universal Salvation,” the belief that everyone goes to Heaven. This mindset will become further developed in the chapter which deals with the “One World Religion” as being a man-centered, man-glorifying enterprise. In the end, the simple fact that one is a man makes heaven his rightful reward, contrary to the words of Jesus, that we must renounce ourselves, pick up our crosses, and follow Him. (Recall that, in describing the current apostasy, Pius X wrote specifically of “enemies of the Cross of Christ”). On more than one occasion, Pope John Paul II clearly indicated that he held this position:

- “Eternal damnation remains a possibility, but we are not granted, without special divine revelation [is Sacred Scripture not special enough?], the knowledge of *whether or which* human beings are effectively involved in it.”<sup>81</sup>

While affirming the possibility of Hell, his conditional qualifier “whether” shows he was equally willing to consider the opposite, universal salvation. However, both before and after his election to the Papacy, he stated his belief with total conviction:

- “All men from the beginning to the end of the world have been redeemed and justified by Christ through His Cross.”<sup>82</sup>
- In his encyclical “Evangelium Vitae” the Pope assured mothers of aborted children that their babies are now “living in the Lord.” This is presumption, as even his advisers must have recognized, as it was later struck from the definitive Latin text.<sup>83</sup>
- “Christ, the Word who took flesh by the power of the Spirit, ‘so that as perfectly human He would save all human beings and sum up all things...’ the universal presence of the Holy Spirit is inseparable from universal salvation in Jesus.”<sup>84</sup>
- “Time after time with renewed faith the Church repeats her desire for the final encounter with the One who comes to bring his plan of universal salvation to completion.”<sup>85</sup>
- “Christ won universal salvation with the gift of His own life.” Not only is the Church not necessary for a salvation that is guaranteed, the Pope goes on to make the ridiculous assertion, “It is mysterious for those who receive the grace [salvation], because they do not know the Church and sometimes outwardly reject her.”<sup>86</sup>

Compare this with the words of Jesus concerning His Church, “Whoever receives you receives Me, whoever rejects you rejects Me.” In the age of religious indifferentism, acceptance and rejection bring you to the same end.

- “In proclaiming the Risen Lord, Christians present the One who inaugurates a new era of history and announce to the world the good news of a complete and universal salvation which contains in itself the pledge of a new world in which pain and injustice will give way to joy and beauty. At the beginning of the new millennium marked by a clearer awareness of the universality of salvation...”<sup>87</sup>

Also resonant with the Apostasy’s symptom of a sense of superiority to the past is the Pope’s assertion that somehow the “awareness” is now clearer. His predecessors were only “aware” of the heretical nature of this proposition.

- “We are dealing with ‘each’ man, for each one is included in the mystery of the Redemption and with each one Christ has united Himself forever through this mystery.”<sup>88</sup>

Since Hell is eternal separation from God, his clear belief that each man is *forever* united with Christ obviously belies a belief that Hell is empty (of humans, at least).

- “By means of this ‘humanization’ of the Word-Son the self-communication of God reaches its definitive fullness in the history of creation and salvation.”<sup>89</sup> This is simply not true. This is not the only occasion on which John Paul appealed to the Incarnation as the source of universal salvation. The fullness of God’s revelation is in His passion, cross, resurrection and ascension, with revelation extending to the death of the last apostle. John Paul’s seriously deficient notion of the “fullness” of revelation is likewise at the root of his deficient notion of salvation as, in places cited elsewhere, he repeatedly insists that man is saved independent of his own conversion, repentance, baptism, faith and sacraments. Here is one such instance...
- In *Redemptor Hominis* he cites, “‘God so loved the world that He gave His only Son’ (Jn 3:16). As this link was broken in Adam, so in the Man Christ it was reforged (Rom. 5:12-21).” Yet, this is left in isolation, with no qualifiers, just as his belief that universal salvation is rooted in the Incarnation. Hence, as Fr. Dromann noted, “we are missing – not unintentionally! – the completion of the Scripture quotation which is so important for the justification of the sinner: ‘...that whosoever believes in Him may not perish, but may have everlasting life.’”<sup>90</sup> In the encyclical Pope John Paul continues his muddled notion of salvation without conversion:
- He cites the Council, “He who is the image of the invisible God (Col. 1:15), is Himself the perfect man who restored in the children of Adam that likeness to God which has been disfigured ever since the first sin. Human nature, by the very fact that it was assumed, not absorbed, in Him has been raised in us also to a dignity beyond compare.”<sup>91</sup> Yet, are we not still conceived in the same state of sin as everyone since Adam? Is baptism not necessary to share in this new dignity? No mention is made of this. This is in line with his book, penned before becoming Pope...
- “The birth of the Church at the moment of Christ’s messianic death was basically also the birth of man, independently even of whether man knows it or not, accepts it or not. At this moment man’s

existence received a new dimension, which is briefly and tersely called by Paul ‘being in Christ.’”<sup>92</sup> As Fr. Dormann observed, “What is true for the redeemed and justified Christian believer holds true for all, without any conditions, whether they know it and want it or not. The indelible seal in the mystery of the Redemption is, then, universal salvation.”<sup>93</sup>

- Returning to the encyclical: “In the mystery of the redemption man becomes newly ‘expressed’ and in a way, is newly created. He is newly created! ‘There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus’ (Gal. 3:28).”<sup>94</sup> Yet, St. Paul was writing to Christians; John Paul is including all of humanity, independent of repentance, conversion, baptism, or even knowing the name of Jesus. Hence, the “Baptism of desire,” now becomes a “Baptism of non-desire,” as, by virtue of being human, you have no choice.
- His most explicit statement of universal salvation is: “Man as ‘willed’ by God, as ‘chosen’ by Him from eternity and called, destined for grace and glory – this is ‘each’ man, ‘the most concrete’ man, ‘the most real’; this is man in all the fullness of the mystery in which he has become a sharer in Jesus Christ, the mystery in which each one of the four thousand million human beings living on our planet has become a sharer from the moment he is conceived beneath the heart of his mother.”<sup>95</sup> Fr. Dormann noted, “The text formulates the axiom of universal salvation with surprising clarity.”<sup>96</sup>
- Moving through the encyclical we read more of the same, again with some misuse of Scripture involved: “Christ’s union with man is power and the source of power, as St. John stated so incisively in the prologue of his Gospel: ‘(The Word) gave power to become children of God.’”<sup>97</sup> This is a deliberate misuse of the text, as in its entirety it reads ‘But to them that received Him, to them He gave power to become children of God...’ “Logically, the Pope leaves out the subjective element of the Redemempton: the reception of the Logos and faith in Jesus Christ. Why this omission? Because he teaches universal salvation.”<sup>98</sup>

And so it is that, from the words of Jesus, “strive hard to enter by the narrow gate,” for that Heaven at which few ever arrive, comes the contradiction, in His Name, that the gates are in fact as wide as all of humanity. “Striving” is no longer necessary, as your entry was guaranteed upon your conception. John Paul said as much soon after his election: “He is the Second Person of the Holy Trinity become a man: and therefore in Jesus’ human nature, and therefore the whole of humanity, is redeemed, saved, ennobled to the extent of participating in ‘divine life,’ by means of grace.”<sup>99</sup> On another occasion he said, “By means of participation in this Truth in this love, He makes us, in Himself, once more sons of the Eternal Father. He obtains, once and for all, the salvation of man; of each man and of all.”<sup>100</sup> As St. Pius X warned about the emerging apostasy striving for a one world church, his successor taught that the world is the Church. This process of dissolution warned about by previous Popes as the logical end of ecumenism is so amazing in its incoherence and total introversion of every concept so as to virtually defy description:

- Membership in The Roman Catholic Church, clearly defined, was always believed to be necessary for salvation...
- Then, the belief came to be promulgated that you *could* be saved outside the Church...

- Next came the belief that *there is no such thing* as being outside the Church, since the Church is all of humanity...
- Finally, it was always taught that belonging to the Church only gave you the *possibility* of salvation, which still had to be worked out “in fear and trembling.” Now, merely being a member of the new church of all humanity *guarantees* salvation...

## Part VIII: Denial of Hell

The next logical misstep is to deteriorate from the belief that all men are being saved to the belief that they have nothing from which to be saved, i.e. Hell. While no Church document will ever formally deny this truth of the faith, the implicit attitude and even overt statements are difficult to deny. First, the importance of Fatima must be revisited. In a startling vision of Hell, The Blessed Mother gave the seers an experience of exactly from what she came to save men. As already noted, Vatican II was Pope John XXIII's enterprise, at the price of denying the commands and messages of the Blessed Mother. As Pope John had little use for “prophets of doom,” he certainly had no use for warnings about hell; even when coming directly from the Mother of God. Here are some relevant points:

- Vatican II was allegedly called to address the most serious concerns of modern man. Historical evidence demonstrates that this was a lie; the greatest earthly threat to humanity was Communism, and Communist Russia had already bought the Council's silence on the matter.
- This was only the first dimension; the natural. Likewise, the council would remain mute on the greatest threat to every man, modern or otherwise; the eternal loss of his soul. If you look up “Hell” in the index of the Council's documents, you will find no entry. In an almost comical fashion, you can, however look up “Satan,” where the index will redirect you to “see devil.” When you look up “devil,” again, you will find no listing. I guess they were counting on the apathy of the reader so as to not go through with the cross reference.

After the Council, Pope John Paul attempted to explain away the article of the Creed which reads, “He descended into Hell.” He stated that in His descent into Hell “Jesus experienced the state of death, that is ‘the separation of the body and soul,’ as in the case of all people. This is the primary meaning of the words, ‘He descended into Hell.’”<sup>101</sup> The Holy Father equates descending into Hell with merely the death of the human body; and most “Catholics” agree. Statistics given in *L'Osservatore Romano* on November 19, 1970 stated that half of the Roman citizens who identified themselves as Catholic believed in neither Hell nor Heaven.

The French bishops as a body confirmed these pseudo-Catholics in their heresy: “Hell is simply a manner of speaking that Christ used when addressing people whose religious outlook was somewhat primitive; we have developed further since.”<sup>102</sup> The French bishops also regard themselves as more developed than Christ, whom they all but call a liar, calling Hell “a scandal for God himself, a source of suffering for him, a block to his saving love.”<sup>103</sup> Likewise the most influential modernist theologian, Karl Rahner, maintained “That the denial of the eternity of punishment and the assertion of universal

salvation are a new development due to Vatican II, and constitute a milestone for the faith of the Church.”<sup>104</sup>

Once more Our Lady of Fatima was rebuked by the Church she came to spare from the misery it was determined to inflict on itself. At Fatima, she instructed the children to add the “Fatima Prayer” to the end of each decade of a Rosary, in which we prayed “save us from the fires of Hell...” On October 8, 2000, an “entrustment” ceremony was held at the Vatican, a sad caricature of the consecration Our Lady of Fatima requested. Likewise she was disobeyed as the Rosary was prayed at this “entrustment,” as the prayers she ordered to be inserted were omitted. Incredibly, the very Pope who had the hubris to change the Rosary according to his own whims felt perfectly free to censure the Blessed Mother when it came to the very devotion both given by and prayed to her.

Of course, there is no need for a Savior once we have determined that there is nothing from which we need to be saved. The slippery slope continues; from the One Church of the One Savior, we now have the belief that that Church is optional. From the Church being optional, we arrive at the premise that the Church is an obstacle; and once the Church believes she is optional, it won’t take long for that same Church to believe that...

---

<sup>1</sup> Leo XII, Pope. Encyclical “Ubi Primum,” Vatican City State: May 5, 1824, no. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Euguen IV, Pope. “Cantate Domino,” Vatican City State: February 4, 1441.

<sup>3</sup> Leo XIII, Pope. “Immortale Dei,” Vatican City State: Nov. 1, 1885.

<sup>4</sup> Pius IX, Pope Bl., allocution “Singulari Quadem,” Dec. 9, 1854, see Denzinger 1646 – 48.

<sup>5</sup> Schmoger, Very Rev. Carl E. “Life of Venerable Anne Catherine Emmerich.” Rockorde, IL: Tan Books, 1976, Vol. 2, pp. 352-53.

<sup>6</sup> L’Osservatore Romano, January 11, 1972:

<sup>7</sup> Pius XII, Pope. Encyclical “Mystici Corporis,” Vatican City State: June 29, 1943.

<sup>8</sup> Leo XIII, Pope. Encyclical “Satis Cognitum,” Vatican City State, June 29, 1896, no. 5.

<sup>9</sup> L’Osservatore Romano, July 27, 1972, p. 12.

<sup>10</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Homily of Dec. 5, 1996.

<sup>11</sup> Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal. Press Conference of Sept. 7, 2000. Cited in Ferrara & Woods, p. 374.

<sup>12</sup> See Kramer, p. 67.

<sup>13</sup> See Ferrara & Woods, p. 357.

<sup>14</sup> Second Vatican Council. “Lumen Gentium,” no. 15.

<sup>15</sup> Leo XIII, “Satis Cognitum,” no. 9.

<sup>16</sup> Pius IX, Pope Bl., Encyclical Letter “Ammantissimus,” April 8, 1862, no. 3.

<sup>17</sup> Ferrara, Christopher, “Behind the Great Façade.” Una Voce of Washington, April 30, 2001.

<sup>18</sup> Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal. “The Ratzinger Report.” San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1985, p. 43.

<sup>19</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Encyclical “Redemptor Hominis.” Vatican City State: March 4, 1979, No. 6.

<sup>20</sup> Denzinger, No. 1800.

<sup>21</sup> L’Osservatore Romano, July 23, 1972.

<sup>22</sup> Ferrara, Christopher. “Papal Theologian Utters Heresy.” Fatima Perspectives, No. 472.

<sup>23</sup> See Denzinger 1677, Pope Pius IX’s encyclical on indifferentism, for the Church’s teaching on the possibility of salvation outside the Church. The conditions and admonitions he attaches to this possibility show the post-Vatican II teaching to go well-beyond a distorted emphasis on this authentic teaching, but something essentially different.

<sup>24</sup> Pius XI, Pope. Encyclical “Mortalium animos,” Vatican City State: June 1, 1928.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., No. 4.

<sup>26</sup> Pius X, Pope St. Encyclical “Ex Quo,” Vatican City State: June 29, 1910.

<sup>27</sup> Pius X, Pope St., Encyclical “Communium rerum.” Vatican City State, April 21, 1909.

<sup>28</sup> Pius XI, “Mortalium Animis.”

<sup>29</sup> Pius XII, Pope. “On the Ecumenical Movement,” December 20, 1949.

- 
- <sup>30</sup> Pius XII, "Humani Generis," No. 12.
- <sup>31</sup> Villa, John XXIII, p. 11.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>33</sup> Accattoli, Luigi. "When a Pope Asks Forgiveness," p. 19.
- <sup>34</sup> Benedict XVI, Pope. Audience of August 17, 2005.
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid., Address of August 19, 2005.
- <sup>36</sup> Radecki, Frs. Francisco and Dominic. "Tumultuous Times," citing Carl Bernstein and Marco Politis, "His Holiness," p. 102-103.
- <sup>37</sup> Translations of this intervention have slight nuances. Some indicate he was speaking of the best pragmatic approach to take in engaging atheists, while journalists of noteworthy credentials have rendered it as cited. Given that his speeches as Pope reiterate these same points, it seems reasonable to accept the accuracy of this citation.
- <sup>38</sup> Wiltgen, p. 57.
- <sup>39</sup> Ibid., p. 95.
- <sup>40</sup> Maursadon, Yves. Oecumenisme vu un par un Macon de Tradition, pp. 119-120. English translation in "Peter, Lovest Thou Me, Instauratio Press, 1988, p. 170.
- <sup>41</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Redemptor Hominis, 11,1.
- <sup>42</sup> L'Osservatore Romano, Feb. 28, 1972.
- <sup>43</sup> Amerio, p. 128.
- <sup>44</sup> Droleskey, Thomas. Christ or Chaos, April 7, 2008.
- <sup>45</sup> Amerio, p. 347.
- <sup>46</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Encyclical "Ut Unum Sint," Vatican City State: May 25, 1995, no. 60.
- <sup>47</sup> Cited in Ferrara & Woods, p. 197.
- <sup>48</sup> L'Osservatore Romano, April 27, 1962
- <sup>49</sup> Gregory XVI, Pope. "Mirari vos." Vatican City: August 15, 1832.
- <sup>50</sup> Pius VII, Pope. "Post Tam Diuturnas," Vatican City: April 29, 1814.
- <sup>51</sup> Cited in Muller, Fr. Michael. "The Catholic Dogma," Benzinger Brothers, 1888, p. xi.
- <sup>52</sup> Allegri, "The Pope Who Changed the World," cited in Villa, John XXIII, p. 31.
- <sup>53</sup> John XXIII, Pope. Encyclical "Pacem in Terris," Vatican City: April 11, 1963.
- <sup>54</sup> Amerio, p. 6.
- <sup>55</sup> Ratzinger, Joseph. "Salt of the Earth," San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1997, p. 24.
- <sup>56</sup> Gregory XVI, Pope. Mirari Vos.
- <sup>57</sup> Pius IX, Pope Bl., "Quas Primas." Vatican City: Dec. 11, 1925.
- <sup>58</sup> Ratzinger, Cardinal Joseph. "Principles of Catholic Theology," p. 202.
- <sup>59</sup> Benedict XVI, Pope. Address of August 19, 2005.
- <sup>60</sup> Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal. "Co-Workers of the Truth," p. 217.
- <sup>61</sup> Reported in Il Giorno, Oct. 28, 1986
- <sup>62</sup> Ferrara & Woods, p. 213.
- <sup>63</sup> Grise, Gilbert. "The Case of the Catholic Church versus John Paul II," taken from a letter written by Mr. Messori.
- <sup>64</sup> Ratzinger, Co-workers of the Truth, 217.
- <sup>65</sup> Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, "Dialogue and Proclamatins," Vatican City: May 19, 1991, no. 79. Citing "Insegnamenti," 1986, IX/2, p. 1262.
- <sup>66</sup> Varela, Cardinal Antonio Maria Ruoco, address at European Synod of Bishops as published by L'Osservatore Romano.
- <sup>67</sup> Amerio, p. 129.
- <sup>68</sup> Paul VI, Speech at the Closing of the Council, Dec. 7, 1965, sec. 11.
- <sup>69</sup> John Paul II, Pope, to the Bishops of Indonesia, June 3, 1999.
- <sup>70</sup> Villa, Paul IV, p. 145.
- <sup>71</sup> Ibid., p. 151.
- <sup>72</sup> Pius XII, Pope. Ad Apostolorum Principis, Vatican City: June 29, 1958.
- <sup>73</sup> Wiltgen, p. 73.
- <sup>74</sup> Wojtyla, Cardinal Karol, "Sign of Contradiction," p. 37.
- <sup>75</sup> Ibid., p. 27.
- <sup>76</sup> John Paul II, Pope, "Redemptor Hominis," 22:6.
- <sup>77</sup> Ibid.



- 
- <sup>78</sup> Dormann, Fr. Johannes. "Pope John Paul II's Theological Journey to the Prayer Meeting of Religious in Assisi." Kansas City: Angelus Press, 1996, Part II Vol. I.
- <sup>79</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Address of June 6, 1985.
- <sup>80</sup> Denzinger, no. 795.
- <sup>81</sup> John Paul II, Pope. General Audience of July 28, 1999.
- <sup>82</sup> Wojtyla, "Sign of Contradiction," p. 101.
- <sup>83</sup> See Ferrara & Woods, p. 241.
- <sup>84</sup> John Paul II, Pope. "Post-synodal Exhortation Ecclesia in Asia." Vatican City: Nov. 6, 1999.
- <sup>85</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Address for 'World Mission Sunday,' 2004.
- <sup>86</sup> John Paul II, Pope. General Audience, May 31, 1995.
- <sup>87</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Post-synodal Apostolic Exhortation "Pastores Gregis," Vatican City: October 16, 2003.
- <sup>88</sup> John Paul II, Pope. "Redemptor Hominis," 13,5.
- <sup>89</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Encyclical "Lord and Giver of Life," 50:3.
- <sup>90</sup> Dormann, Pt. 2, V. 1, 114.
- <sup>91</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Encyclical "Redemptor Hominis," 8:2.
- <sup>92</sup> Wojtyla, Cardinal Karol. "Sing of Contradiction," p. 108.
- <sup>93</sup> Dormann, V2, P1, p. 129.
- <sup>94</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Encyclical "Redemptor Hominis," 10:1.
- <sup>95</sup> Ibid., 13:3.
- <sup>96</sup> Dormann, work cited, 187.
- <sup>97</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Encyclical "Redemptor Hominis," 18:2.
- <sup>98</sup> Dormann, 214.
- <sup>99</sup> John Paul II, Pope. General Audience of Dec. 27, 1978.
- <sup>100</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Address of April 27, 1980.
- <sup>101</sup> John Paul II, Pope. General Audience of January 1, 1989.
- <sup>102</sup> Amerio, p. 696.
- <sup>103</sup> Ibid., p. 699.
- <sup>104</sup> Ibid., p. 697.

## Chapter XII

### **Christ Is Optional**

*“We do not wish to make of our faith a motive of polemic” - Paul VI*

We have already made mention of Pope John Paul’s personal preacher, Fr. Cantalamessa. In support of indifferentism, he preached to the Vicar of Christ in St. Peter’s Basilica, “Christ is more concerned that all people should be saved than that they should know who is their Savior.”<sup>1</sup> A cursory reading of the Bible will make it apparent to anyone that Jesus and St. Paul felt otherwise. Yet, Fr. Cantalamessa in his preaching, and John Paul in his pontifical patronage of him, were simply following down the road to apostasy set out by John XXIII decades earlier.

At Venice’s city hall, the future Pope John XXIII had this to say to the crowd gathered: “I’m happy to find myself in the midst of active people, for only those working for a worthy cause are authentic Christians. The only way of being a Christian is to be good. That is why I’m happy to be here, even though in your midst are some who call themselves non-Christians, and yet may be recognized as such on account of their good deeds.”<sup>2</sup> The “dimming of the intellect” and the resultant errors manifest in this statement are quite overt.

- Being a Christian amounts being a “do-gooder,” even if you do not profess the Christian Faith.
- Pelagianism: The heresy that states salvation depends upon a man’s work, not God’s grace is obvious, and will be further explored in the chapter on an earthly Utopia.
- As Fr. Villa commentated, “Christianity is reduced into pure natural ethics; good deeds are equivalent to supernatural ones, and Faith becomes superfluous.”
- “Non-religious freedom:” As in the example cited earlier, this suggests that one cannot choose to not be a Christian. In a similar vein, if a Muslim told me I was in fact a Muslim, whether I chose so or not, I would take exception to his presumption. I have made an explicit choice to follow Christ; yet, those who have made an explicit choice not to are told their choice is of no avail. Hence, the religious freedom trumpeted by Vatican II is, by this line of reasoning, a farce.

Paul VI likewise spoke of the “Christ-optional” nature of his beliefs: “They [Judaism, Islam, Christianity] are three expressions professing an identical monotheism, through the three most authentic avenues.”<sup>3</sup>

- *Identical monotheisms* would imply an *identical* God. (In speaking of the conflict in the middle-east, he explicitly stated that the three religions “recognize the true God”).
- The God Who is the object of Catholic monotheism is Trinitarian; any Muslim or Jew would agree that this is not “identical” to the object of their monotheism.
- Indifferentism could not be more apparent; he regards these religions as equal roads.
- His indifferentism obviously extends beyond this, as *most* authentic implies that there are *other*, albeit ‘less authentic,’ avenues.

In the end, only one conclusion is possible: once the Church is declared optional she will come to be seen as an impediment. Paul VI professed as much on December 24, 1965: “The Church, with its demanding and precise attitude to dogma, impedes free conversation and harmony among men; it is a principal of division in the world rather than of union.”<sup>4</sup> In only a few short years, that Church that believed she was the One True Church had gone from placing herself on par with other religions, then beneath those religions, for the same reasons she once regarded herself as superior.

In his daily life, Paul often reflected this belief that Catholicism, at least the dogmatic variety, was an object of repulsion to him. He claimed his openness to all and even warmly greeted and hosted those who persecuted the Church, and was known to especially dote over athletes and celebrities. Traditional Catholics, that is, those Catholics who lived, believed and prayed as every Catholic had until only a few years earlier, were always refused. One example: On May 30, 1971, traditionalists on pilgrimage from all over the world requested an audience. They were denied, but on the same day special audiences were granted to two soccer teams and the anti-Catholic American Jewish Masonic Association of the ‘B’nai B’rith.’ Both the symbolism and the reality of this incident demonstrate the blueprint for the Church’s dissolution into a new world order: ‘I’m popular! Athletes and people who want to destroy the Church like me! Don’t ruin it by trying to interject the Faith!’ It is the same pitiful groveling for cheap popularity seen in the endless apologies of John Paul, and embodies the same message to the world: ‘You are right; Christ and His Church are impediments to the harmony of mankind, but now we are ready to play along. We have given up our claims of special privilege, our absolutist beliefs, even about Jesus Himself.’

If the Church deems herself optional for salvation, Christ will soon be declared so as well, even though anyone who reads the Gospels will see that Jesus believed Himself to be quite necessary towards this end. Modernists had long since been toiling to overcome this obstacle by teaching that the Gospels are not authentic, but rather reflect the beliefs, the ‘self-understanding,’ of the early Christian community, to which they regarded themselves as superior. We will now see the next step towards total apostasy: from the Church as optional for salvation to Christ as optional for salvation.

## **Part I: Judaism**

### Sources

- “Who is the antichrist but him who denies Christ come in the flesh?” 1 John 4:2
- “Whoever believes in Him (God’s only Son) will not be condemned, but whoever does not believe has already been condemned, because he has not believed in the name of the only Son of God.” John 3:18
- “There is no salvation in anyone else, nor is there any other name under Heaven given to men by which we are to be saved.” St. Peter, Acts 4:12

- In this discourse, St. Peter was addressing the Sanhedrin when he had been ordered to stop trying to convert Jews. His response was, “We must obey God rather than men. It is impossible for us not to speak about what we have seen and heard.” During the Great Apostasy, Peter’s actions would be condemned as ‘theologically unacceptable.’ He can take heart, however, as Jesus and St. Paul likewise fall under this censure of the Vatican II Church.
- “I was sent only to the lost sheep of Israel.” Jesus, Matthew 15:24

Prior to Vatican II the Church always took Jesus and the Apostles at their word, upholding the belief that Jesus’ mission was primarily to the Jews, but that the entire world needed Him and His Church for salvation. Accordingly, during the Apostasy, this would be completely reversed, and it would be promulgated that, not only did Jesus not come only for the lost sheep of Israel, but that the lost sheep of Israel weren’t lost after all and never had need of Jesus, as one saint prophesized...

- “In the last period...many will doubt whether the Catholic faith is the true and only saving one and whether the Jews are correct when they still expect the Messiah.”  
- St. Methodius of Olympus, 250 – 311

This is the next logical step in John XXIII’s minimalist slogan about focusing on what unites us rather than divides us. It is Christ as the Messiah which divides us from Jews, so the Church in the throes of Apostasy would concoct a new banal theology to eliminate the obstacle that is Jesus, as they had already done for His Church. We will now read a number of quotes from the post-Vatican II Church espousing precisely this heresy:

- Cardinal Walter Kasper: “God’s grace, which is the grace of Jesus Christ according to our faith, is available to all. Therefore, the Church believes that Judaism, i.e. the faithful response of the Jewish people to God’s irrevocable covenant, is salvific for them, because God is faithful to His promises.”<sup>5</sup> The number of errors and the manifest “dimming of the intelligence” in this one statement are considerable. First of all, this teaches “universal salvation” for Jews. Simply because they were once called, it cannot be revoked. Secondly, the covenant was to find its fulfillment in the Messiah; how can rejecting that Messiah be regarded as a faithful response to that covenant? Thirdly, we see the relativism manifested in indifferentism: it is “salvific for *them*,” in other words, salvation comes in the terms we believe it should, not as decreed by God.
- The trajectory of this inane line of thought arrives at the absurd position that another Messiah will come for the Jews. In 2001, the Pontifical Biblical Commission released a book entitled “The Jewish People and the Holy Scriptures in the Christian Bible.” The book proposes that the Jews are right to expect a Messiah. Papal spokesman Joaquin Navarro-Valls explained, “if the Old Testament keeps its value, then it keeps that as a value, too. It says you cannot just say all the Jews were wrong and we are right.”<sup>6</sup> Amazingly, the spokesman for the Vicar of Christ is saying, whether or not Jesus is the Messiah is completely up to you; but it is unacceptable to suggest anyone else is wrong for denying it. He compounds this totally relativistic approach to Jesus by stating, “It means it would be wrong for a Catholic to wait for the Messiah, but not for a

Jew.”<sup>7</sup> Yet, one may object that, while a papal spokesman has no place spouting heretical drivel, he does just remain a spokesman. So, let’s hear from a future Pope, Cardinal Ratzinger...

- “The difference consists in the fact that for us, he who will come will have the same traits of that Jesus who has already come.”<sup>8</sup> Is there more than one Jesus? Will this one who is to come replace or supersede the salvation of the original Jesus? Is it a different savior for the Jews, or does the same Jesus come twice? The relativism and indifferentism are apparent: Jesus is the Messiah “for us,” because we accept Him; if you don’t, another with “the same traits” will come.
- This book, endorsed by a soon-to-be Pope, seeks to formally impose the sin of doubt on Christians: “Christians can and ought to admit that the Jewish reading of the Bible is a possible one.” This is a verbatim fulfillment of the prophesy of the end times given by St. Methodius. A Christian is now told that part of being a Christian is the duty to admit that we may be wrong in calling Jesus the “Christ.”
- From indifferentism, we go down the slope to Judaism apparently being the superior avenue. Cardinal O’Connor of New York, alleged to be one of the champions of orthodoxy in the post-Vatican II Church, actually gave his blessing, on television, to a Catholic who apostatized to become Jewish, offering assurances that “God is smiling on the whole thing.”<sup>9</sup> Another Cardinal, Francis George of Chicago, agreed, writing, “the Church has also sinned against the Jewish people, first of all, in teaching that God’s covenant with Israel is no longer valid for them.”<sup>10</sup>
- Perhaps the best icon for this Jesus-as-Messiah-or-not mentality in the time of Apostasy is Benedictine abbot Jean-Baptiste Gourion. He is a Jewish convert (sort of) who stated, “for me, Christianity and Judaism are the same. I didn’t have to leave Judaism to come to Christianity. The Jew and the Christian form the same body. The Catholic Church has no intention of converting Jews to Christianity.” In the pre-Vatican II Church this man would have been recognized as a heretic and apostate, in the Church of the Great Apostasy, he was made a bishop.
- Liberals often give the impression of competing with each other in displays of foolishness, so on February 3, 1981, Cardinal Lustiger, the Archbishop of Paris stated: “I am a Jew. For me the two religions are one.” Jews, however, have a firmer grasp on their religion than the Vatican II Church has on Catholicism, and rebuked this dim-witted assertion. The Chief Rabbi of France at the time retorted, “For us, it is impossible to be a Jew and a Christian at the same time. His successor agreed, “One cannot, without abusing language, talk about a Judeo-Christian religion. You are either a Jew or a Christian.” With his usual succinct clarity, Mr. Amerio noted, “There is an obvious contrast between people who have lost their grip on the essence of things, and those who have retained it.”<sup>11</sup>
- Members of the United States Bishops Conference can be numbered among those who have not retained their grip on the essence of the Christian faith, as witnessed in its document “Reflections on Covenant and Mission.” Under the leadership of William Cardinal Keeler, the document stated, “campaigns that target Jews for conversion to Christianity are no longer theologically

acceptable in the Catholic Church.”<sup>12</sup> When even comparatively moderate voices in the Church recognized the apostasy in this statement, the Cardinal offered a muddled non-retraction, contradicting statements made at the time of its release. Most significant is the fact that the term *theologically*, not *pastorally* unacceptable is used. This clearly implies a *new* theology, one quite different from that of Jesus and St. Peter. Regarding the Jews as the principal recipients of the Salvation of Christ was once taken as a sign of esteem for the world’s only other divinely instituted religion; now, such deference to the Children of Abraham is “unacceptable.”

## **Part II: Islam**

*“Romanticizing orientalism has put together a picture of the East and of Islam that doesn’t always do justice to the realities.” - Cardinal Ratzinger*

*“Between fear and political correctness, it is not possible to say anything other than sugary nonsense about Islam.”  
-A Middle Eastern scholar quoted in the New York Times*

The manifestation of the Great Apostasy which proclaims that Christ is optional for salvation extends to Islam as well. First, however, we will take a brief look at this religion, its founder, its teachings, and its perennial hostility towards Christianity in order to put the words and actions of the post Vatican II Church into their proper perspective.

### **Mohammed - his character**

- A “revelation” allowed him to have all the wives he wanted, in addition to sex with slaves and prisoners. Likewise, a revelation gave him permission to marry his step-son’s wife.
- Mohammed’s wife Hafsa once found him in bed with a Christian. She got Aisha and confronted him, but he immediately had a “revelation” in which Allah scolds the two women and gives his blessing to Mohammed’s fornication. Sura 66:1- 5
- Aisha had a marriage contract with Mohammed, then over fifty years of age, when she was six. She was given to him at the age of nine.
- Sura 65:4 gives instructions for divorcing a prepubescent wife.

### **Islam**

- The religion was conceived in violence and murder, was thus spread, and has thus remained.
- Mohammed claimed he was told in a revelation to rob the caravans of his enemies.
- The Koran instructs Muslims to “kill them [unbelievers] wheresoever you find them.”
- While the Koran alleged that originally no one could be compelled by force to convert, once Muhammad had sufficient numbers, a new “revelation” gave him permission to use violence to force conversions.

- After defeating an army of resisting Meccans, Mohammed spent the next three days slaughtering the prisoners.
- Next, he killed the Jews of Medina.
- The hedonism of its founder is manifest in the Muslim vision of heaven, which amounts to sex and gluttony.

### The Koran

- To give divine sanction to prostitution and fornication, the Koran allows for “temporary and conditional marriage.” In Iran, this can be for one hour.
- Sura 23:1 gives permission to rape slave girls.
- Sura 4:34 recommends beating women “from whom you fear disobedience.”

### Its intrinsic hatred of Christianity

- Jews & Christians in southern Palestine were forced to convert.
- The Koran refers to Christians as friends of Satan, and commands Muslims to be ruthless towards them.
- Mohammed sent orders to his governors that Christian churches & Jewish synagogues should be demolished and mosques built on the site.

### Its history:

Is one of murder, rape, pillage and hatred of Christ and his followers.

- A contemporary account of the Muslims’ arrival in Nikiou, an Egyptian town, in 640 reads: “There was not on single soldier to resist them. They seized the town and slaughtered everyone they met in the street and in the churches – men, women, children, sparing nobody. Then they went to other places, pillaged and killed all the inhabitants they found...But let us say no more, for it is impossible to describe the horrors Muslims committed when they occupied the island of Nikiou.”
- An eyewitness of the Muslim conquest of Armenia in 642 wrote what happened when they took the town of Dvin: “The enemy’s army rushed in and butchered the inhabitants of the town by the sword...After a few days’ rest, the Arabs went back whence they had come, dragging after them a host of captives, numbering 35,000.”
- In Amorium in Asia Minor in 838, “there were so many women’s convents and monasteries that over a thousand virgins were led into captivity, not counting those that had been slaughtered. They were given to the Moorish slaves, so as to assuage their lust.”

- Upon conquering Constantinople, “At the sultan’s banquet, the image of our Crucified Redeemer was dragged through the mire and spat upon, while they shouted ‘This is the God of the Christians.’”<sup>13</sup>
- When the Italian city of Otranto was invaded in 1480, 12,000 of its 22,000 inhabitants were killed, with the rest carried off into slavery. The Archbishop was sawn in two.
- In the eighteenth century in South India the Sultan of Mysore, Tippoo Sahib, undertook forcible conversion to Islam of all his subjects. He had countless Christians hanged, the women with their children clinging to their necks; others were trampled to death by elephants or dragged along by them until mutilated to death. Others had their noses cut off. He killed about thirty thousand Christians.
- The Armenian genocide: The murderous winter of 1895 thus saw the decimation of much of the Armenian population and the devastation of their property in some 20 distinct districts of eastern Turkey. The total number of victims was between fifty and one hundred thousand. In Urfa the Armenians asked for protection from the government. In response, the Turks slaughtered all the men in the town. One group of Armenian youths was taken to a sheikh, who “had them thrown down on their backs and held by their hands and feet. Then he recited verses of the Koran and cut their throats after the Mecca rite of sacrificing sheep.” A contingent of troops stormed the Cathedral, where a large crowd had gathered for sanctuary. Crying, “Call upon Christ to prove Himself a greater prophet than Mohammad,” they murdered the men and burned the women and children alive in the cathedral. 8,000 were killed that day.

### The Present

#### Women in Islam:

- Women have no rights. A Muslim man can divorce his wife for any or no reason, while in many Muslim nations a man is free to kill his wife.
- “Divinely sanctioned pedophilia” is in no way limited to the past. In 2002 researchers in refugee camps in Afghanistan & Pakistan found half the girls married by the age of 13.
- A Muslim woman who is raped is often afraid to file a complaint with the police, for in the absence of four corroborating male witnesses, her testimony can be taken as admission of adultery or fornication. There are women in prison all over the Muslim world who are actually rape victims. In the absence of male witnesses, their complaints were taken as admissions of guilt. Some estimate that as much as 75% of the women who now populate Pakistani prisons are there through such circumstances.



- On May 31, 1994, Kifaya Husayn, a 16 year old Jordanian girl, was lashed to a chair by her 32 year old brother. He gave her a drink of water and told her to recite an Islamic prayer. Then he slashed her throat. Immediately afterward he ran out into the street, waving the bloody knife and screaming, “I have killed my sister to cleanse my honor.” Kifaya’s crime? She was raped by her 21 year old brother. Her judge and jury? Her own uncles.<sup>14</sup> This is not an aberration: this is Islam.
- Female circumcision is so barbaric and sadistic it can truly be classified as satanic. In this still very common practice, Muslim women have their genitalia removed, oftentimes with crude cutting objects and no effort to dull the pain via anesthetic. This is inflicted on them to ensure that they never enjoy sexual relations, and is so animalistic that western governments grant asylum to those who escape their countries before being mutilated. This is how they treat *their own women; their own wives and daughters*. It is frightful to imagine the fate of Christian girls under their dominion. If their own “loved ones” are given animal status, then Christians are less than animals...

#### Persecution of Christians

- From The American Anti-Slavery Group’s reports about the treatment of Christians by Muslims in Sudan: “Women and children abducted in slave raids are roped by the neck or strapped to animals and then marched north. Along the way, many women and girls are repeatedly gang raped. Children who will not be silent are shot on the spot. In the north, slaves are either kept by individual militia soldiers or sold in markets. Boys work for livestock herders, forced to sleep with the animals they care for. Some who try to escape have their Achilles tendon cut to hamper their ability to run. Masters typically use women and girls as concubines, cleaning by day and serving the master sexually by night.”<sup>15</sup>
- If a priest is found saying Mass in Saudi Arabia, even if locked in his own hotel room, he can be put to death.
- “It’s horrible for Christians in Pakistan. The Muslims take our land, rob our homes, and try to force us to accept Islam. Young girls are kidnapped and raped. Then they’re told that if they want a husband who will accept them after that defilement, they must become Muslim.” Cadherine, a refugee in the United States
- A former U.S. Foreign Service officer, Tim Hunter, served in Saudi Arabia from 1993 to 1995. He recounted, “On occasion they beat, even tortured, Americans in Jeddah for as little as possessing a photograph with a star of David in the background or singing Christmas carols...The Muttawa [Saudi religious police] chained, beat and cast clergy into medieval style dungeons.”

- The Saudis still [1995] hold at least 8 foreign nationals, ignoring all inquiries from their governments about their status. All were employees in good standing at Saudi companies, but they committed the crime of holding Christian worship services in private homes. Their fate remains unclear.

### **The Response of Catholicism**

Given the origin, teachings, and perpetual history of Islam as well as its role as the enemy of Christ and His Church, it should go without saying that the Catholic Church's response has always been condemnation.

- St. Peter Maveminus: "Whoever does not embrace the Catholic Christian religion will be damned, as was your false prophet Mohammed."
- St. George the Deacon, before being martyred by Muslims : "Mohammed was a disciple of the devil, and his followers are in a state of perdition."

Such quotes could go on forever, but the fact is that, in the age of Faith, the Church saw the religion for what it was and spoke plainly about it.

- Pope Calixtus III: "I vow to deliver the Christians languishing in slavery, to exalt the true Faith and to extirpate the diabolical sect of the reprobate and faithless Mahomet in the East."
- Pope Pius II: "Mahomet will never lay down his arms until he is either wholly victorious or completely vanquished. Each success will be only a stepping stone to the next until he has mastered all the western monarchs, overthrown the Christian Faith and imposed the law of his false prophet on the whole world." It is truly incredible that this Pope, dead for centuries, understands the year 2012 better than his most recent successors. Yet, such is the enduring power of faith, intelligence, and a capacity for logic.
- Only thirty five years before the council, Pope Pius XI promulgated an act of consecration of the world to the Sacred Heart, which offers a petition for the deliverance of souls from "the darkness of idolatry or of Islamism," and that they enter "into the light of the kingdom of God." According to Vatican II, however, they were already there...

### **Surrender**

The instigators of the French Revolution had as their symbolic goal the tearing of the tiara from the head of the Pope. As they failed in that goal in the immediate instance, would they have ever dreamed that one day a Pope would simply surrender the tiara, along with all that it symbolized, of his own

accord? Likewise, Muslims of the world must be in a type of delirious disbelief at the surrender of the West. For centuries they tried to take the nations of Western Europe by force, only to be repelled. Yet, as Pius II knew, they would never surrender; that was for us to do. Today Muslims are, literally, being handed the countries they once could not take by force. As once Catholic nations are now contracepting and aborting themselves into non-existence, Muslims are moving in by droves to fill the void. Cardinal Biffi rightly observed, “The Muslims come to us, well determined to remain what they are, waiting to be in sufficient numbers to force us to become like them.” There is nothing prophetic in this; it is the simple history of Islam, a history the West is determined to ignore and repeat, as the purpose of liberalism is the annihilation of any remnant whatsoever of a Christian society, and the once Christian members of those societies both embrace and long for their own “death by diversity.” To date, entire sections of numerous European cities are under Muslim control, and the police make no effort whatsoever to stop the onslaught of violence and arson they bring, so fearful are they of stepping foot in the invaders’ turf.<sup>16</sup> Even as members of his own flock are murdered, raped and imprisoned for trying to live their faith, Pope John Paul voiced approval for a mosque to be erected in Rome. To further mock the Church’s emasculated surrender, from that very mosque anti-western rhetoric is now preached. Yes, the Vicar of Christ invited a religion, which has as a central tenet the murder, rape and subjection of Christians, into the Capital of Christendom, when once popes felt it was their duty to keep the Church’s enemies at bay. What concession did the Muslim world offer in return? None; why should they? You do not negotiate with an enemy bent (literally, hell-bent) on unconditional surrender. Still, the greatest concession that Muslims extracted from the pusillanimous, dim-witted agents of the apostasy had nothing to do with real estate; it was getting us to lay down our faith along with our arms...

### **Blasphemy**

“But the plan of salvation also include 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 adore the one merciful God,  
mankind’s judge on the last day.”

-Lumen Gentium, #16

- Christians worship The Holy Trinity, a belief that the Koran calls worthy of hellfire. We do not worship the same God, and to identify the God of Christians with the god of Muslims, in whose name and under whose direction all of the above perversions and atrocities have been committed is nothing short of blasphemy. Any Muslim would say the exact same thing to compatriot who claimed they believed in the same God as Christians.
- Again, as the opening of this chapter offered a quote from John XXIII watering down Christianity to mere natural ethics, it would seem that being a monotheist who believes in creation is sufficient for salvation.

- It is beyond inane to say that God has made a part of His plan for salvation a religion which despises Christ and murders Christians. Again, universal salvation is clearly the mindset, and indifferentism is in full swing. Catholics who are pro-Christ, Jews who are non-Christ and Muslims who are anti-Christ are all on the road to salvation (Most authentic avenues...).

The religion which popes recognized as irreconcilable enemies of the Church, in need of deliverance from their darkness, now share equal status as one of “the three main ways” to salvation. Pope John Paul II would further praise Islam, making it equal to the Church of Christ: “The two religions can be signs of hope, making the world more aware of the wisdom and mercy of God,” even beseeching St. John the Baptist to “protect Islam.” Perhaps John the Baptist could better spend his eternity protecting the young Christian girls being raped in the name of Islam.

John Paul further praised Islam, saying that the Catholic Church “regards Muslims with respect, convinced that their transcendent faith in God contributes to the construction of a new human family, based on the highest aspirations of the human heart...”<sup>17</sup>

- The highest aspiration of the human heart is no longer Jesus Christ.
- The highest aspiration of Muslims, i.e. their vision of heaven, is sex with virgins and gluttony.
- Their highest aspiration for this world is the total dominance and elimination of Christians. The Pope is either:
  - being untruthful, knowing full well what Islam is all about,
  - wavering in courage, telling them what they want to hear for fear of repercussions,
  - ignorant, having no idea of the history, teachings, and current policies and practices of *every* Islamic state,
  - an existentialist, believing he has the power to create reality via his own subjective ideas,
  - advocating apostasy, believing that every religious obstacle must be set aside (by us, not them) to arrive at an earthly Utopia.

If these options sound pedantic in their simplicity, I would propose that they are clearly implicit in the Pope’s own words, as well as in evidence to be introduced later. The simple truth of the historical record is, however, that the Pope could not lay claim to ignorance of the reality of Islam even as he praised it and made it equal to the religion it despises. Placed in his hands directly by the Bishop of Torit, Paride Taban, on behalf of the entire Bishops’ Conference prior to his 1993 visit to the Sudan was a letter which read: “Holy Father, do not be dazzled by the red carpet that the Khartoum government will extend in your honor Wednesday. Know that the hand that you will grip [shake] are dripping with the blood of Sudanese Christians. These are the same people who have unleashed the “Jihad,” or holy war, against the Christians of the Sudan, who do not hesitate to persecute, torture, and kill priests, nuns and catechists. They are the same people who practice still slavery, capturing and selling the children of Africa.”<sup>18</sup>

In the age of the “mockery of martyrdom,” this letter was of no avail. John Paul repeatedly placed the two religions on equal terms, insisting we worshipped the same God. “I had the opportunity to reaffirm the sincere and open way in which the Church turns to the believers of Islam, to whom we are united by

the adoration of the one God” and, “Today I would like to repeat what I said to young Muslims some years ago in Casablanca: We believe in the same God.”<sup>19</sup> This is blasphemy, as any honest Muslim would agree, albeit for a diametrically opposed reason.

The examples of acts of apostasy and groveling seem to go on forever. In a sermon a few months after 9/11, I was present when a Cardinal preached on the event, assuring the listeners that we had a right to be angry because “a religion of peace” had been hijacked. The stupidity in the statement is too obvious to be described with a milder adjective: you are not supposed to be angry that people (Muslim or not) hijacked planes and killed thousands of innocent Americans, rather, you are supposed to be angry because in doing so they gave Islam a bad name. Again, anyone who would call Islam a religion of peace is either lying or ignorant of reality. Just a couple of years later, and only a few miles down the road, another Cardinal would conclude a prayer with, “In the name of Allah, the merciful and compassionate God, we pray. Amen.”<sup>20</sup> Only fifty years earlier such men would have been regarded as unfit to teach pre-school catechism; during the great Apostasy this is the caliber of men who rise to become “Princes of the Church.”

The logical trajectory of the disintegration of the Church into apostasy marches on. Once the Church is regarded as optional, Christ will become optional and, ultimately, an obstacle. In the end, it is an agreement with the tenet militant liberalism that religion is an obstacle to mankind’s true goal; an earthly utopia. Only a century ago, Pope Leo XIII wrote the beautiful sentiment, “The greatest misfortune is never to have known Jesus Christ.”<sup>21</sup> How could any Christian feel otherwise? How can anyone read all of the above passages, and not concede that Leo’s successors no longer felt that way?

---

<sup>1</sup> Cantalamessa, Fr. Raniero. Homily at the Vatican, Good Friday, 2003, cited in: Vennari, John, “From Pentacostalism to Apostasy.”

<sup>2</sup> Hebblethwaite, Peter. “John XXIII, the Pope of the Council,” cited in Villa, John XXIII, p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> Paul VI, Pope. August 9, 1965, cited in Villa, Paul VI, p. 125.

<sup>4</sup> Amerio, p. 129.

<sup>5</sup> Address at the 17<sup>th</sup> meeting of the International Catholic-Jewish Liaison Committee, New York, May 1, 2001.

<sup>6</sup> Ferrara & Woods, p. 206.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 207.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 206.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., citing: Cardinal Francis George, “The Sins of the Church: God’s Forgiveness and Human Memories,” *The Catholic New World*, March 19, 2000.

<sup>11</sup> Amerio, p. 578, note 79.

<sup>12</sup> USCCB, “Reflections on Covenant and Mission,” Sept. 12, 2002.

<sup>13</sup> Pius II, Pope, Speech at Mantua, cited in Pastor, V. 3.

<sup>14</sup> Chicago Tribune reporting, May 3, 1998.

<sup>15</sup> Cited in: Spencer, Robert. “Islam Unveiled,” New York: Encounter Books, 2002.

<sup>16</sup> See *The American Conservative*: “L’Intifada: Multiculturalism Comes to France,” Dec. 5, 2005.

<sup>17</sup> John Paul II, Pope. General Audience of May 5, 1999.

<sup>18</sup> Chiesa Viva, “Preoccupante Presenza Islamica in Italia,” Feb. 2006, p. 14.

<sup>19</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> The Catholic University of America, Office of Public Affairs. Remarks of Cardinal Theodore McCarrick following the address of King Abdullah II of Jordan.

<sup>21</sup> Cited in, Doyle, Rev. A.P. “Leo XIII: The Great Leader,” Aug. 1903, “*The Catholic World*.”

## Chapter XIII

### **A Man-Centered Religion**

*“We have trust in man. We believe in the store of goodness in everyone’s heart.” Pope Paul VI, Dec. 2, 1970*

*“Jesus did not trust Himself to them.  
He needed no one to testify to Him about man.  
He knew all too well what was in the heart of man.” John 2: 24 - 25*

Whether one is inclined to agree that the current apostasy and the great apostasy are one and the same or not, both feature a man-centered religion seeking an earthly utopia as one of their symptoms:

#### **Sources**

- 2 Thessolonians spoke of “the son of perdition,” the antichrist, as a man exalting himself as the supreme object of worship.
- St. Anthony of the desert wrote that, when the Church and the world become one, the end is at hand. The Church’s dissolution into the world, even placing herself beneath the world, has already been documented. Likewise, the Church in the great apostasy will set God aside, place man in the center, and seek purely earthly goals.
- Pope Pius XII stated that the modern apostasy had, among other things, materialism and scientific atheism as its roots.
- Likewise, while still a cardinal, Pius XII prophesied the day “She [the Church] will be tempted to believe that man has become God.”
- The Catechism of the Catholic Church teaches that the end of time will be marked by the deception of the antichrist by which “man glorifies himself in the place of God.”
- Pope St. Pius X: “[It] is the distinguishing mark of Antichrist, man has with infinite temerity put himself in the place of God...”<sup>1</sup>

That the Church has arrived at this state is difficult to deny, given that Paul VI boldly proclaimed it at the end of the Council, and repeated this assertion frequently. First, however, let’s look to the council itself where the glorification of man in the place of God is apparent in numerous instances.

#### **Part I: Manifestations of Apostasy in Vatican II and Beyond**

The Council Document “Gaudium et Spes:” Pope Benedict XVI, as Cardinal Ratzinger, conceded that the language in this document was “downright Pelagian,”<sup>2</sup> that is, heretical. The Council’s own words, not a misrepresentation of them or their context, put man in the place of God.

- “By the almost universal consent of believers and non-believers alike, all things on earth should be directed towards man as their *center and culmination*.”<sup>3</sup> This is the belief of modernists,

communists and freemasons; in the age of apostasy, it is the Church's as well. The Catholic belief, pre-apostasy, is that God is the center and end of all things, as St. Paul taught: "Whatever you do, work at it with your whole being. Do it for the Lord rather than for men" (Col. 3:23).

- "Man is the only creature on earth that God willed for its own sake."<sup>4</sup> The Catholic teaching is that God created man for *His* own sake (Proverbs 16:4 – "The Lord has made all things for Himself"); in the man centered Church, man is created for man, a statement with which any modernist, hedonist or atheist would agree. It is beyond amazing that, prior to the Council, *any Catholic child*, taught as they were with the Baltimore Catechism would have recognized this statement of the Council as false, knowing that man was willed "to know, love and serve God," not to exist for his own sake.
- This misrepresentation of the place of man in creation is likewise extended to the Gospel, with a rewriting of the Great Commandment: "For this reason, love for God and neighbor is the first and greatest commandment."<sup>5</sup> This is a direct contradiction of the words of the Lord that the first commandment is to love God with our whole heart, mind and soul, and the second commandment is to love our neighbor as ourselves.
- The heresy of pelegianism is unabashedly expressed in the following man-glorifying statement: "The activity of man, as it has its origin in man, has man also as its end. Man through his work not only introduces change into things and into society, *he also perfects himself*."<sup>6</sup> The Council believes in a very different type of man than Jesus did, as he told His disciples, "apart from me you can do *nothing*" (John 15:5). The new, "evolved" man of the Council, building the "new humanity," can not only do *something* without Christ, he can perfect himself without Christ. Yet again the Council has displaced Christ and inserted man in his place, as St. Paul wrote that we should do everything for the Lord rather than men. The Council tells us to do everything for man as man, with the Lord as neither the origin nor the end of our works.
- As the "Novus Ordo" embodies the man-centered orientation of the post Vatican II Church, here is but one example: The prayer over the gifts for the twenty fifth Sunday in Ordinary Time reads, "May the worship of each one here bring salvation to all." It is now "my worship," not Him Whom I am about to worship and Whose Sacrifice is about to be made present that will bring salvation. The corresponding prayer in the former rite was, "...grant we beseech Thee, that as we know Thy truth, so we may follow it by worthy lives."

#### Separation of Church and State & Religious Freedom

"Under the seductive name of freedom of cult, they proclaim the legal apostasy of society."

-Pope Leo XIII

Pope Leo wrote: "From the very first days of our pontificate, and from the elevation of the Apostolic Chair, we turned our eyes toward the society of our day, to ascertain its condition,

investigate its needs, and to counsel the remedial measures...”<sup>7</sup> He regarded the source of society’s ills as “The waning of Truth – not only of the truths of the supernatural order which are known by the light of faith, but of natural truth, both speculative and practical; the prevalence of the most baneful errors...disorders everywhere increasing...The most potent cause of such moral ruin is the separation, the attempted apostasy, of actual society from Christ and from His Church, in which alone resides the virtue sufficient to repair all the enormous evils done it.”

Leo observed, as all of his predecessors knew, that the Church’s rightful place in society was an important element in her work of saving souls and, logically, the Church’s exclusion from her just prominence would result in the loss of souls. “Nor is any other purpose to be found for the usurpation of the civil principality conferred many ages ago by Divine Providence, on the Bishop of Rome, to enable him to exercise freely, without let or hindrance, the power given him by Christ for the eternal salvation of the race.”<sup>8</sup> Pope Pius XII made the logical observation that “souls are affected for better or for worse by the form given to society, depending on whether it is in harmony with divine law or not.”<sup>9</sup>

Pope Leo understood true humanism, even as his successors would regard the downgrading of Catholicism to equal status with other religions as a great step forward for the humanitarian cause. True humanitarians seek the salvation of souls, and true Catholics realize that it is for this reason that there is nothing more humanitarian than protecting the Church’s the right and freedom to accomplish this: “Whenever there is a question of the temporal principality of the Holy See, then the interests of the public good and the salvation of the whole human society are involved.”<sup>10</sup>

To the Christian it is a simple equation; the knowledge that Jesus Christ is the Son of God followed by the most rudimentary capacity for logic could only lead to one conclusion: the ideal for society is that it be modeled on the teachings and laws of God, being centered upon the only Savior of each and every member of that society. Yet, once we surrender our claims to being the one true religion founded by the one true Savior, we would likewise have to surrender the notion that society is best served in this way. As Bl. Pius IX wrote: “Many today apply to civil society the impious and absurd principle of naturalism, and dare to teach that the best political regime and the progress of civil life demand absolutely that human society be established and governed without any more taking into consideration of religion, as if it did not exist, or at least without making any distinction between the true and false religions.”<sup>11</sup>

As he and other pre-Apostasy Popes taught, it is simply the right of God to have the very people He created, for whom He died, and who are totally dependent upon Him offer Him worship and order their societies according to His laws. Again, Pope Leo teaches us, “It is indeed here, without any doubt, among all the duties of man, the greatest and the holiest, that which orders man to render to God a worship of piety and of religion. And this duty is only a consequence of the fact that we are perpetually in dependence on God, governed by the will and the Providence of God, and that, having come from Him, we must return to Him.”



However, in the age of indifferentism, since man is the center of society, and all religions contain men, it would stand to reason that every religion should have an equal place in society. Since the Vatican II Church placed itself on par with other religions, it only stands to reason that she could no longer insist that the Church or Christ should be the foundation of any society. That this can only lead to a society's ruin was succinctly observed by Pope Pius XI in 1925: "With God and Jesus Christ excluded from political life, with authority derived not from God but from man, the very basis of that authority has been taken away, because the chief reason of the distinction between ruler and subject has been eliminated. The result is that human society is tottering to its fall because it has no longer a secure and solid foundation."<sup>12</sup> Yet, this model of a society tottering towards its destruction is precisely what was advocated by the Council, true to the Masonic vision which inspired them.

This separation of societies from God extended to every individual under the Council's adoption of "freedom of conscience," labeled by Pope Gregory XVI as a "poisoned source of indifferentism" and "delirium."<sup>13</sup> This is not a question of telling people what to think, rather, putting truth and falsehood on equal planes, asserting that one has no right to recognition above and beyond another. This is relativism, but also reveals deism, the belief that God is separate from the world. Implicit in this teaching is the belief that God is indifferent to whether or not He is worshipped in "spirit and truth," or whether one is a snake-handler or devil worshipper or atheist. This heresy promotes the idea that a society's fortunes are in no way dependent upon whether or not they are pleasing to God, or assumes that God, like the Vatican II Church, subscribes to indifferentism and believes one religion's worship is as good as another's (or none at all).

As Pope Leo labeled indifferentism "atheism minus the name," so the indifferentist societies advocated by Vatican II are likewise a mandate of atheism. This is not simply a matter of recognizing that Catholic states were vanishing and the Church would need to adapt to this new reality; it was put forth as the ideal. Pope Leo XIII, when asked about the restoration of the Papal States to the Church, responded that almost no one thought about it anymore, and that no one thought of it less than the Pope. Yet, this was simply a prudent pragmatism, recognizing that history was not moving in that direction. He acknowledged it as reality, but nonetheless regarded it as negative. The Vatican II Church saw the usurpation of her influence as entirely positive. In fact, in Columbia the Holy See asked for the suppression of the Christian constitution of the State to facilitate the godless one world order. Likewise, in the Valais (France) Bishop Adam (of Sion) wrote to the faithful of his diocese instructing them as to why they should vote for a law revoking their Christian charter and implementing the separation of Church and State.<sup>14</sup> Pope Pius XI once offered the censure that, "At the last judgment, Christ will accuse those who have expelled Him from public life and will have the most terrible vengeance from such an outrage."<sup>15</sup> Yet, it is the Council and the Holy See who have, in their own words and actions, inflicted this outrage and await the corresponding vengeance.

But, it was not God's judgment that the Council had in mind; it was the world's approval they sought. As Pope John XXIII said at a Mass on his eighty-first birthday, "This is a sacred kind of liberty for which the Church, especially in these circumstances, has proved its respect. Through this,

it has won profound and universal admiration.” Profound and universal admiration? Yet again, “Good Pope John” demonstrated that he was not as proficient at “reading the signs of the time” as he perhaps imagined himself to be. The decades to follow would show exactly how “profound” was the world’s admiration for the Church. A pitiful exclamation point would come years later, when the “European Union,” the continent born of the Church, was drafting its charter. Despite pleas from Pope John Paul, it included no mention whatsoever of Europe’s Christian heritage. The bishops of Vatican II succeeded in their goal of the godless state, they just didn’t quite reap the “profound and universal admiration” Pope John had imagined. The European Union’s role as an agent of the anti-Christ has become so apparent that, in a recent ruling, its “Human Rights Court” ordered the removal of Crucifixes from classrooms. While lay-Catholic leaders resisted, it is a difficult thing to do when it is the very documents of the Church which state Catholicism should not receive this singular privilege. In fact, at the Vatican and in many other places (the seminary I attended for one), Crucifixes have been covered over so as to not offend non-Catholic parties at ecumenical prayer services. “Enemies of the Cross of Christ”<sup>16</sup> indeed.

#### Pope Paul VI

- “Will it not be said that the thought of the Church in the Council has deviated towards the anthropocentric [man centered] positions of modern culture? Deviated – no! Turned – Yes!”<sup>17</sup>
- This is an open admission that the Council was allowing the Church to be molded according to the culture which, a few years earlier, Pius XII described as being in its worst state ever.
- Since the Church now has turned towards a new center, that can only mean she has turned away from an old one, namely, God. The humanistic, worldly, and utopian goals of the Vatican II Church will show this to be no aberration.
- What Paul declared a triumph, and what “Gaudium et Spes” clearly taught, his canonized predecessor rightly described as an “enormous and detestable wickedness, so characteristic of our time: the substitution of man for God”<sup>18</sup> The Apostasy has indeed begun at the top.
- “You can be grateful to it [the council] for this merit at least, you modern humanists who deny the transcendence of the supreme things, and learn to recognize our new humanism: we too, we more than anyone else, subscribe to the cult of man.”<sup>19</sup>
- *More* than anyone else: Paul is declaring that the Church is now more worldly than the world itself.
- Catholicism is profoundly humanistic, as it strives to bring Christ’s salvation to all men. Yet, since the council’s humanism is a “new” humanism, Paul is stating that the Council has adopted modernity’s version of humanity and humanism, not the perennial Catholic understanding. Paul

would gush even more effusively about his “modern humanism” to the United Nations, as we will read later.

- “This Council...in conclusion, will give us a simple, new and solemn teaching to love man in order to love God.” Also, “To know God, one has to know man.”<sup>20</sup>

Here is plainly revealed the logical digression of Pope Paul’s new worldview in which man has displaced God as the center. Paul has used it to controvert the Great Commandment of love. Christ taught that loving God was the first, and man the second. As noted by Mr. Amerio, “Catholic doctrine teaches that the motive for loving one’s neighbor is the love of God...The Council says nothing about this.”<sup>21</sup>

- In speaking of his new “Cult of Man,” Pope Paul substituted man for Christ as ‘the Prince of Peace:’ “A peace that is not born of the real cult of man, is not essentially a peace.”<sup>22</sup>
- As the Christian would say, along with Sacred Scripture, “Let the last word be: God is all in all.” This divine prerogative as well has been transferred to man, as Paul said to the Diplomatic Corps, “We have trust in human reason...One day, reason must come to be the ultimate word.”<sup>23</sup> When the French Revolution persecuted the Church and desecrated the Cathedral of Notre Dame, it was the goddess reason (in the form of a prostitute) they placed upon the altar.
- Paul’s worship of his self-described “cult of man” and the world were perhaps never more exuberant and pathetic than on the occasion of a space mission (this resonates with the previous chapter which discussed materialism, as manifested in technological advances, serving as the basis for the agents of the apostasy assuming that they were superior to the past, placing material criteria over religious ones).

“Honor to man; honor to thought; honor to science; honor to the synthesis of scientific and organizing ability of man who unlike other animals, knows how to give his spirit and his manual dexterity [our thumbs rank up there with our spirits?] these instruments of conquest. Honor to man, King of the Earth [should someone tell Christ the King He has been displaced by His Vicar?]. Honor to the living being that we are, wherein is reflected the image of God and which in its dominion over things, obeys the biblical command: increase and rule.”<sup>24</sup>

In all of this honor man is heaping upon man, it would seem that little would remain to obey St. Paul’s admonition in 1 Timothy 1:17, “To the King of ages, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory forever and ever, Amen.”

- “Man...knows atrocious doubts...We have to convey to him a message that we believe liberating. And we, we believe all the more authorized to propose it to him because wholly human. It is the message of man to man.”<sup>25</sup>
- It is no longer the Word of God to man, it is *wholly* human, which can only mean not at all divine.

- It is being human that Paul thinks gives him the right to speak; he is no longer a man speaking on God's authority as The Vicar of Christ, but man speaking on his own authority as man. As Jesus said, "He who speaks on his own authority seeks his own glory" (John 7:18). Yes, man speaking on man's authority seeks only to glorify man, "the center and culmination of all things."
- "You are a sign. You are an image. You are a mystery of the presence of Christ. The Sacrament of the Eucharist offers us His hidden Presence, live and real; but you too are a Sacrament, a sacred image of the Lord in our midst."<sup>26</sup>
- Man as man is now "sacred;" a phrase previously reserved to those men set apart and consecrated to the Lord in Holy Orders and religious vows.
- Man is a sacrament? "If anyone says that the sacraments...are more or less than seven...let him be anathema;" Council of Trent ,Canon I, Decree on Sacraments.<sup>27</sup>
- Even as he affirms the Real Presence, he seems to assure man that he is the same type of presence without distinction
- "A saint for our times; that which characterizes, indeed, our times, is the humanitarian aspect, social and organized, marked by the cult of man."<sup>28</sup>
- The purely secular, banal criteria which substitute themselves for the supernatural virtues which had formally been the measuring stick for sainthood, as well as the worship of man as the object, are apparent. I do not think you will find a bull of canonization prior to 1960 listing being "social and organized" as heroic virtues.
- I am fairly certain that this saint or any other would have assured us that they were laboring for the cult of God, not the cult of man.
- "When all is said and done, if man can, at length, do nothing without man, one can, with him, do anything and succeed in anything so much so that are indeed spirit and heart to first carry off the real victories."<sup>29</sup> Again, Christ finds Himself displaced by man. Jesus, who said, "Without Me you can do nothing," was wrong. Instead, according to Paul, it is "with man you can do anything." All in all, we see in these statements a two-fold incompetence; a failing of both faith and intelligence. First of all, there is the error of desiring to merge the Church with the world, with Christ as superfluous if not an impediment to the pursuit of earthly goals. Secondly, the world with which he wants to merge the Church does not exist apart from his own utopian delusions, precisely like the world which Pope John thought held the Church in profound esteem.
- Paul's man-centered worldview had hints of pelagianism when it came to the moral life as well. On December 8, 1965 he said, "It is in the expression of moral conscience that man frees himself [just as, in *Gaudium et Spes* a man can perfect himself, now he can likewise free himself, rather

than being freed by the grace of God] from temptations...It is out of this moral conscience that the interests corrupting of his dignity are overcome, the fears that render the heart base and inept are vanquished, the sentiments that generate the worthy, the honest, nay, the strong, are generated. It is in his conscience the great characters of the human drama, the innocent, the heroes, the saints, draw their strength..." The need for the sacraments, prayer and grace are excluded from the equation.

- There is a poignant footnote to Paul's crisis of Faith and man-centered vision; his new "faith," his faith in the "Cult of Man," would also fail him. Aldo Moro was an Italian politician and a friend of Pope Paul. He was kidnapped and brutally killed. At his funeral, Pope Paul said, "A sense of pessimism has annihilated so many calm hopes and shaken our trust in the goodness of the human race."<sup>30</sup> It is the death of his political messiah that shakes his faith in the cult of man; why not the death of Christ? If he spent a lifetime believing in the goodness of man despite the Crucifixion, why would the death of a politician have this effect? Because this politician was the embodiment of Paul's "cult of man" that was going to bring about the political utopia he dreamed possible, for which he had renounced the "Christ-centered" world. Mr. Amerio summarized, "The man laments, but the Pope laments still more, close to the shadowy line (the Pope himself would die in three months' time), and confronted with the shattered assumptions of his whole pontificate."<sup>31</sup>

### Pope John Paul II

As already noted, the encyclical "Redemptor Hominis" reduces the faith to Unitarianism, as man is saved simply because he is a man; likewise, the exaltation of man is made manifest:

- "In reality, the name for that deep amazement at man's worth and dignity is the Gospel, that is to say, the Good News. It is also called Christianity. This amazement determines the Church's mission in the world and, perhaps even more so, 'in the modern world.'"<sup>32</sup> Christianity is defined as 'man amazed with himself,' as the 'Gospel' now has man as both the subject and the object of faith.
- In the same section, he goes on, "It also fixes Christ's place – so to speak, His particular right of citizenship – in the history of man and mankind." He is no longer Christ the King, but Christ the Citizen; a man among men.
- Even more explicitly we read, "Man is the way of the Church." And so it is that Jesus, "The Way, the Truth, and the Life," has been replaced by man, the way of the Church of the "changed essence" of Vatican II.<sup>33</sup>

In 1914, Pope Benedict XV wrote: "For ever since the precepts and practices of Christian wisdom ceased to be observed in the ruling of states, it followed that, as they contained the peace and stability of

institutions, the very foundations of states necessarily began to be shaken. Such, moreover, has been the change in the ideas and morals of men, that unless God comes soon to our help, the end of civilization would seem to be at hand.”<sup>34</sup> Yet, a half century later, it would be determined that God did not have to come after all; the man who can perfect himself can now perfect society, precisely by abandoning Christ as the foundation. Likewise, the end of civilization feared by Pope Benedict was in fact the eve of “A New Springtime,” courtesy of the “New Humanity,” proclaimed by the “New Church,” with her newly minted essence, joining the world in its drive towards...

## **Part II: An Earthly Utopia**

*“A great undertaking, well worthy of reuniting every man of good will into an immense and irresistible conspiracy toward this integral development of man this concurrent development of humanity, to which We have dared exhort him in the name of an ‘integral humanism,’ in our encyclical ‘Populorum Progressio.’”*

*Paul VI, October 4, 1970*

The Council’s desire to dissolve into the world for the sake of earthly ends was wrong as a matter of religious principle, but also fatally flawed in the unjustified rosy picture of the world that existed only in the minds of those involved. It was a flaw that preceded the Council itself. A lengthy excerpt from one Father on the preparatory commission would be in order here, as it gives a true portrait of the world with which the council wanted to dialogue, merge, seek truth, and build utopia:

I do not approve of the description of the state of the Church given here with such exuberance, more in hope than in truth. Why, and in comparison with what period, do you speak of an *increased religious fervor*? Should not statistical facts, as they are called, be kept before us, from which it is clear that the worship of God, Catholic belief and public morals are, among many people, collapsing and indeed almost in ruins? Are not men’s minds generally alienated from the Catholic religion, the state being separate from the Church, philosophy from the dogmas of faith, the investigation of the world from reverence for the Creator, technical discoveries from conformity with the moral order? Does the Church not labor under a shortage of workers in sacred ministry? Are not many parts of Holy Church cruelly trampled underfoot by the Giants and Minotaurs who strut about the world, or fallen into schism, as among the Chinese? Has not the enemy devastated our missions among unbelievers, which had been planted and watered with such zeal and such charity? Is not atheism lauded no longer merely by private persons, but (what is altogether unheard of) by whole nations, and upheld by the laws of the state? Are not our numbers diminishing proportionally every day, while Mahommedanism and Paganism increase greatly? We are now a fifth part of the human race, who recently were a quarter. Are not our morals turning pagan, by divorce, abortion, euthanasia, sodomy and the pursuit of Mammon?<sup>35</sup>

Dreaming that an earthly utopia is possible and the pursuit of this should constitute the Church’s mission is patently contrary to the Faith, as Pope Pius X taught. Here he summarizes well the Catholic position: “Jesus did not announce for future society the reign of an ideal happiness from which suffering would be

banished; but, by His lessons and by His example, He traced the path of the happiness which is possible on earth and of the perfect happiness in Heaven: the royal way of the Cross. These are teachings that it would be wrong to apply only to one's personal life in order to win eternal salvation; these are eminently social teachings, and they show Our Lord Jesus Christ something quite different from an inconsistent and impotent humanitarianism.”<sup>36</sup>

It is a basic tenet of the Gospel that Christianity will always be, in some manner or another, in opposition to the world. This refers to the individual's struggle against worldly temptations, as well as the fact that world will always retain its fallen state and put up obstacles to the work of God. Even when nations professed Catholicism, leaders and movements always rose up from within who challenged the Church and undermined the Faith; more than one “Catholic” leader invaded Rome, plundered the Lateran and the Vatican, menaced and even kidnapped the Pope. While the Catholic position is not one of Quaker-like silence and resignation, it does mean accepting the fact that this world will never be perfect, even as we attempt to improve it in whatever way the age and circumstances allow.

Yet, the fundamental tension will always remain. The devil remains “The prince of this world,” so, as St. James wrote (4:4), “Do you not know that friendship with the world is enmity with God? Whosoever, therefore, will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God.” Pope Leo XIII wrote eloquently of this opposition destined to endure until the end of ages: “The race of man...separated into two diverse and opposite parts, of which the one steadfastly contends for truth and virtue, the other of those things which are contrary to virtue and to truth. The one is the Kingdom of God on earth, namely, the true Church of Jesus Christ...The other is the kingdom of Satan.”<sup>37</sup>

The dissolution into worldliness began by renouncing Catholicism as that true Church of Jesus Christ. As Vatican II removed this distinction from the Church, and gave it to every religion without distinction, that one “true Church” is nothing less than the whole of mankind as delineated in *Redemptor Hominis*. Hence the desired result of this process is a dissolution into one world religion embracing all mankind.

Perhaps the turn of the post Vatican II Church from a God-centered, heaven seeking enterprise to a man-centered, politically orchestrated Utopia seeking entity is best made manifest, both in symbol and in reality, by Paul VI's restructuring of the Vatican Curia. In 1967, the Holy Office, that which was responsible for the maintaining of the purity of faith and doctrine, was made subservient to the Secretary of State, the political arm of the Vatican. The meaning behind this reversal was obvious. In fact, the architect behind this triumph of politics over the Faith was Cardinal Jean Villot, whose name could be found in the Masonic registry required by Italian law. Upon his death, a hand written note was found from the Grand Master of Villot's Masonic Lodge, praising him for his efforts on behalf of freemasonry. As with the Mass, the Masons yet again found themselves “gathered around the chair of Peter,” destroying the Church under his nose and by his authority. However, before reading the evidence of the Utopia-seeking agenda of the politically driven Church, let's refresh our souls by hearing the Catholic vision of the world as described by a non-masonic pope, St. Pius X:

“No, venerable brethren...the city of the world shall not be built otherwise than as God has built it; society shall not be set up unless the Church lays the foundations and supervises the work; no, civilization is not something yet to be found, nor is the New City to be built on hazy notions; it has

been in existence and still is: it is Christian civilization, it is the Catholic City. It has only to be set up and restored continually against the unremitting attacks of insane dreamers, rebels and miscreants. Omnia Instaurare in Christo.”<sup>38</sup>

It is no misuse of the sainted Pope’s words to conclude, unmistakably, that he is calling future popes insane dreamers and miscreants, as this is precisely the road they have travelled. It is not a matter of addressing political reality from different historical contexts: the Pope was writing of timeless principles based on God and His Truth. Compare his words with the brutally naïve, sappy Utopianism of Paul VI :

“Beware, dear friends, that we are ready, today, to deliver you a message of hope. Not only is the cause of man not lost, but also it is in a privileged and safe institution. The great ideas that are like the beacons of the modern world shall not die out. The unity of the world shall be accomplished. The dignity of the human person shall be recognized in its actuality and not only formally...The unjust social inequalities shall be suppressed. The relations between the peoples shall be founded upon peace, reason, and brotherhood...This is not a dream, or utopia, neither is it a myth: it is evangelical realism”<sup>39</sup>

Exactly where in the Gospel (the root word of evangelical) would the Holy Father find this syrupy “realism” proposed? No, it is the Masonic gospel to which Paul referred, as his “foundations” did not include Jesus, only their own humanistic pillars. Christ and all of Scriptures clearly foretell that the world will always suffer and, quite the opposite of growing towards utopia, will disintegrate to such a miserable state that, if Christ does not cut short the days of tribulation, no one will be saved. As even Cardinal Ratzinger had to concede, such utopian ideas based on the evolutionary presupposition that things must necessarily be progressing for the better plainly contradict Scripture, which assures believers that the end will be marked by an unprecedented dissolution into sin and misery. As St. Paul wrote, if our hopes are confined to this world alone, we are the most pitiable of men. Indeed, “insane dreamers, rebels and miscreants” are to be pitied, but not nearly as much as those they leave behind to live in the aftermath of their monomaniacal pursuit of destruction.

As already discussed, the Vatican II Church has widely disseminated, both implicitly and explicitly, the falsehood of universal salvation. Once Heaven is presumed to be everyone’s destiny, that leaves little impetus to “strive to enter by the narrow gate.” Instead, an earthly Utopia becomes the goal, since you are either an atheist who doesn’t believe in Heaven or a modernist who is convinced everyone goes there. The slippery slope from the age old belief of the Church to the advocacy of a godless society has followed this trajectory:

- The Catholic position was that of Pius X as written above, and it was a position based on logical necessity. If Christ is the Savior of the World, and He has left His Church with His Vicar as the head as the sole guide to salvation, that Church should be the guide to building a true civilization, as only that Church can lead society and its citizens to their true goal; eternal life in Heaven.
- With the onset of liberalism, societies began to reject and attack the Church, and therefore the necessary means of salvation (true doctrine, the Sacraments, membership in the Church).



- For centuries, liberals portrayed the Church as the enemy of true civilization and the villain of all history.
- Finally, the Church began to subscribe to her enemies' version of her own history and theology of salvation, and to renounce her privileged position as the one true Church. This was clearly foretold in the Prophecy of Cardinal Pacelli (Pius XII).
- Now, those same churches, lacking what Catholic doctrine has always held to be necessary for salvation, are likewise deemed to be means of salvation, as are religions which don't even acknowledge Christ.
- With this relativism and indifferentism as its basis, the Vatican II Church began to proclaim her own irrelevance, instead of her necessity. If the Church is not what she has always claimed to be, then she certainly can claim no privileged place in society. And, if every religion is a means to salvation, no religion can claim a special prominence, so the only true society is the one built by man upon man, with purely earthly goals.
- In the age of Apostasy, the Church no longer sees Christ as the foundation of the most desirable world, with all mankind gathered under the banner of the One True Faith in the One True Church; rather, the Church merely seeks to form one piece of the global puzzle, side by side with other religions, for the greater goal of a "united mankind" oblivious to the fact that it will be a unity of misery and enslavement, the "harvest of misery"<sup>40</sup> foretold by Pope Leo XIII; disunity of Faith is no longer an issue. Mr. Romano Amerio summed up one such display of this mentality found in Pope John Paul II's speeches in Nigeria in 1982:

"There is no mention of conversion to Christ, but in a special message to Muslims, which was not actually received by any Muslims or in any way replied to, the Pope hoped for cooperation between the two religions 'in the interests of Nigerian unity,' and 'to make a contribution to the good order of the world as a new civilization of love.' As we have noted, harmony in the world is no longer presented in terms of a single religion, but of a single civilization."<sup>41</sup> This represents more than a different position or policy; it is a different belief about Catholicism itself, the type of world it seeks, her place within that world, and necessity in saving its people. Only a few decades early Pope Pius XI ordered the truly Catholic plan for the unity of the world to be prayed publicly on the Feast of Christ the King: "Be Thou King of those who are deceived by erroneous opinions, or whom discord keeps aloof, and call them back to the harbor of truth and unity of faith, so that soon there may be but one flock and one shepherd."<sup>42</sup>

Likewise, contrast this to the wisdom of St. Pius X in recognizing the betrayal to our faith and to our past, as well as the self-defeating naiveté in such Utopian enterprises as that described by John Paul and the Vatican II Church: "When we consider the forces, knowledge and supernatural virtues which were necessary to establish the Christian State, and the sufferings of millions of martyrs, and the light given by the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, and of the self-sacrifice of all the heroes of charity, and a

powerful hierarchy ordained in heaven, and the streams of Divine Grace - the whole having been built up, bound together, and impregnated by the life and spirit of Jesus Christ, the Wisdom of God, the Word made man – when we think, I say, of all this, it is frightening to behold new apostles eagerly attempting to do better by a common interchange of vague idealism and civic virtues. What are they going to produce? What is to come out of this collaboration? A mere verbal and chimerical construction, in which we see, glowing in a jumble, and in a seductive confusion, the words of Liberty, Justice, Fraternity, Love, Equality, and human exaltation, all resting upon an ill-understood human dignity. It will be a tumultuous agitation, sterile for the end proposed, but which will benefit the less-Utopian exploiters of the people.”<sup>43</sup> What the sainted Pope so clearly foretold a century earlier, his successors could not discern even as it happened, and they advocated its advance.

### Part III: The Evidence

The following excerpts speak for themselves, demonstrating a new vision of the Church’s mission seeking a future which is no different than the one any mason or socialist would describe as their own goal.

#### Pope Paul VI

- Regarding liberalism’s advance, he said, “Something great and new is in the works and it is coming about, which might change the face of the earth.”<sup>44</sup> So many of the elements of the apostasy are made manifest in this one statement: being superior to the past, evolution, and a grossly inflated estimation regarding the pelagian potential of mankind.
- “The Church, although respecting the jurisdiction of the nations, must offer her help to promote a global humanism, I mean to say, an integral development of man as a whole and of each and every man...Placing herself at the forefront of social action, she must direct all of her efforts to sustaining, encouraging, and driving the initiatives that operate toward the integral promotion of man.”<sup>45</sup>
  - This marks quite a departure from the mandate of Christ to spread the Gospel to the whole world; now we are to reach *each and every man* for the clause of a *global humanism*, not the universal religion.
  - The Church *must* direct *all* her efforts towards this end; that no measure of effort would be retained for genuine Catholic missionary activity has already been noted.
- “All this doctrinal wealth points but to one direction: to serve man...The Church has, so to say, declared Herself the servant of humanity.”<sup>46</sup> Now, not only the Church’s human resources are to be directed towards a humanistic goal, even her doctrine points to man alone, rather than pointing man towards God.

- Pope Paul described his vision of a worldly Utopia using the exact buzzwords as Masons: “The Catholic Church urges all her sons to undertake, together with all men of goodwill of every race and nation, this peaceful crusade for the well-being of man...in order to establish a global community, united and brotherly.”<sup>47</sup> On another occasion he stated, “Isolation is no longer an option. The hour has come of the great solidarity among men, toward the establishment of a global and fraternal community.”<sup>48</sup>
  - Recall that Pope Benedict XV said that this global society so desired would lead to a reign of unheard of terror.
  - “Isolation is not possible” would also seem to indicate that it is not permissible for nations to retain their sovereignty, and thus resist the movement for globalization.
- “We ourselves have no other intention on our various journeys to all points of the globe. What we try to do with all our poor strength is to work for the bettering of men, with the aim of bringing about the reign of peace and the triumph of justice, without which no peace is enduring.”<sup>49</sup> He has “*no other intention*,” thus omitting converting to Christ or seeking eternal life.
- “Citizens of the world, as you salute the dawn of this new year 1970, take a moment to think: Whither is mankind’s peace leading? Today we can take an overall view, a prophetic view. Mankind is traveling forward, that is, progressing toward an ever-greater mastery of the world...And how does this mastery help mankind? It helps it to live a better and fuller life. Mankind seeks fullness of life and obtains it. It strives for that unity, justice, balance and perfection, which we call peace...Peace is the logical aim of the present world; it is the destiny of progress; it is the ultimate order the great strivings of civilization are headed for...We proclaim peace as the dominant idea in the conscious life of man, who wants to see the prospect of his immediate and more distant journey. Once more we proclaim peace, for peace is, at one and the same time, under different aspects, both the beginning and the end of the development of society.”<sup>50</sup> Peace Day Message, 1970
  - Shouldn’t Christ be the beginning and the end of the development of society, Holy Father?
  - The “dimming of the intelligence:” The Pope again declares mankind superior to the past due to techno-pelagianism. Yet, this is on the eve of that same technology leading to the legalization of abortion, as Paul’s “progressing” mankind was about to build the future which is its “destiny” on the corpses of tens of millions of murdered children. The same technology gave the world an unprecedented power for mass destruction, the annihilation of the family and morals due to artificial contraception, and the advent of mass-pornography and the epidemic addiction thereto which no one could have ever fathomed.
  - In the same vein, Christ is no longer the source of the fullness of life, rather it is obtained through man’s ever greater mastery of the world.

- Finally, while in Bethlehem, an anemic attempt to seem relevant to a world which we no longer believes it needs the salvation which only the Church can bring: “The mission of Christianity is a mission of friendship among the peoples of the earth, a mission of understanding, of encouragement, of promotion, of elevation, and, let us say it one more time, a mission of health.”<sup>51</sup> In the very place where the mission of Christ to save mankind started, His Vicar can only speak of a mission in terms of vague, banal, modernist slogans, goals which in no way require Christ, and which the world has no need of the Church to pursue.

#### Pope John Paul

- “Dialogue leads to a recognition of diversity and opens the mind to the mutual acceptance and genuine collaboration demanded by the human family’s basic vocation to unity. As such, dialogue is a privileged means for building the civilization of love and peace that my revered predecessor Paul VI indicated as the ideal to inspire cultural, social, political and economic life in our time...The different religions too can and ought to contribute decisively to this process.”<sup>52</sup>
- Stated more succinctly, “The unity of Christians is open to a unity even more vast, that of all humanity.”<sup>53</sup> The Masonic conception of global unity is the goal, and we are merely a subset of it, willing to take our assigned place within the globalist cage. And that globalist cage, precisely the tyranny foretold by Benedict XV when this longed-for world order was established, is already under construction by...

---

<sup>1</sup> Pius X, Pope St. “E Supremi,” Vatican City: October 4, 1903.

<sup>2</sup> From a 1969 commentary, cited in Allen, John: “Pope Benedict XVI: A Biography of Joseph Ratzinger.” London: Continuum Press, p. 81.

<sup>3</sup> Second Vatican Council: “Gaudium et Spes,” no. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., no. 24.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., no. 35. The Vatican Website currently renders the English translation “develops himself” while the most common English translation of the Council documents (Eerdmans, 1992) renders it “fulfills himself.” Neither of these is tenable, as the original Latin text reads “seipsum perficit,” which is properly translated “perfects himself,” just as it reads in The Liturgy of the Hours, Saturday, 4<sup>th</sup> week of Ordinary Time.

<sup>7</sup> Leo XIII, Pope. Encyclical Letter “Inscrutabili.” Vatican City: April 21, 1878,

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., no. 3.

<sup>9</sup> Pius XII, Pope. Radio Message of June 1, 1941.

<sup>10</sup> Leo XIII, Inscrutabili, cited in O’Reilly, p. 328.

<sup>11</sup> Pius IX, Pope Bl., Encyclical Letter “Quanta Cura.” Vatican City: Dec. 8, 1864, no. 3.

<sup>12</sup> Pius XI, Pope. Encyclical Letter “Quas Primas.” Vatican City: Dec. 11, 1925.

<sup>13</sup> Gregory XVI, Pope. Encyclical Letter “Mirari Vos.” Vatican City: Aug. 15, 1832, no. 14.

<sup>14</sup> LeFebvre, Uncrowned, p. 99.

<sup>15</sup> Pius XI, Pope. No. 32.

<sup>16</sup> Pius X, Pope St. Encyclical Letter “Pascendi Dominici Gregis.” Vatican City, Sept. 8, 1907, no. 1.

<sup>17</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Speech at the close of the Second Vatican Council, Dec. 7, 1965.

<sup>18</sup> Pius X, Pope St. Encyclical Letter “E Supremi Apostolatus.” Vatican City: Oct. 4, 1903.

<sup>19</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Amerio, p. 96.

<sup>22</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Speech of Dec. 6, 1971.

- 
- <sup>23</sup> Paul VI, Pope. *Le Courrier de Rome*, April 20, 1970, cited in: Villa, "Paul VI," p. 75.
- <sup>24</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Angelus address of Feb. 7, 1971.
- <sup>25</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Address at Bethlehem, Jan. 6, 1964, cited in Villa, p. 48.
- <sup>26</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Speech delivered in Bogata, 1968, cited in Villa, p. 51.
- <sup>27</sup> Denzinger, no. 844.
- <sup>28</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Canonization of Therese de Jesus Jornet Edibards, Jan. 27, 1964, cited in Villa, p. 51
- <sup>29</sup> Paul VI, address to FAO, Nov. 16, 1970, *Ibid.*, 81.
- <sup>30</sup> Amerio, p. 68.
- <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>32</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Encyclical Letter "Redemptor Hominis." Vatican City: March 4, 1979, 10:2.
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 14:4.
- <sup>34</sup> Benedict XV, Pope. Encyclical Letter, "Ad Beatissimi Apostolorum." Vatican City: Nov. 1, 1914, no. 5.
- <sup>35</sup> Amerio, p. 53.
- <sup>36</sup> Pius X, Pope St. "Letter on Sillon." Vatican City: August 25, 1910.
- <sup>37</sup> Leo XIII, Pope. Encyclical Letter "Humanum Genus." Vatican City: April 20, 1884.
- <sup>38</sup> Pius X, Pope St., *Ibid.*
- <sup>39</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Easter Message of 1971.
- <sup>40</sup> Leo XIII, Pope. Encyclical Letter "Graves de Communi Re." Vatican City: Jan. 18, 1901, no. 21.
- <sup>41</sup> Amerio, p. 578.
- <sup>42</sup> Pius XI, Pope. "Consecration of the Human Race to the Sacred Heart of Jesus."
- <sup>43</sup> Pius X, Pope St. *Ibid.*
- <sup>44</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Speech of July 19, 1971, cited in Villa, "Pau VI," p. 166.
- <sup>45</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Dec. 20, 1970.
- <sup>46</sup> Villa, p. 35.
- <sup>47</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Address to Australians, Nov. 30, 1970.
- <sup>48</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Speech of Dec. 3, 1971, cited in Villa, p. 78.
- <sup>49</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Speech in Indonesia, Dec. 3, 1970, cited in Villa, p. 48.
- <sup>50</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Peace Day Message of 1970.
- <sup>51</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Jan. 6, 1964 in Bethlehem.
- <sup>52</sup> John Paul II, Pope. World Day of Peace, 2001.
- <sup>53</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Angelus of January 17, 1982.

## Chapter XIV

### The United Nations

*“Advice about the purpose of life is sought from  
the promoters of death.”*

*-Pope Gregory the Great*

We have read the testimony of Popes that the Vatican II Church willfully placed itself at the service of purely human objectives, setting the faith aside for the sake of not offending our fellow-utopia builders. The Church now regards her mission as being subservient to building the “one global community.” This is the same goal that the enemies of the Church have envisioned, as already detailed in the beginning of this book. The reason these enemies have always sought to destroy the Church is because she is the one entity with a global presence and the authority to resist such a movement. However, as the Church has “surrendered to the spirit of the age,” she now has cast in her lot along with her enemies, willingly reconfiguring the Church according to their designs, which was precisely their goal. The Church, at Vatican II, gave herself a “new definition,” and taught that those outside the Church are still part of it. This “new Church,” by its very definition, has no centralized authority, since it is “broader than the Roman Catholic Church.” By conceding that there is an authority greater than itself, the Church and the Papacy have prepared the way to surrender and subject themselves to an authority that does encompass the entire “new Church.” This one world order with its one world religion must have a true center and a global agency able to bring this about. In fact, Vatican II explicitly stated as much, calling for:

*“the establishment of a universally acknowledged public authority  
vested with the effective power to ensure security for all, regard for  
justice, and respect for law.”<sup>1</sup>*

Exactly whose laws would be respected, under what conditions this security would exist and this “effective power” exercised (tyrants can just as well bring about order as anyone else) is not stated. We can only assume it is not according to the Roman Catholic idea of the just society since, as already noted, they abandoned the idea of Christ as the model and foundation of the ideal society. In the words of Pope Pius XI, “There can be no peace worthy of the name without the Social Kingship of Christ over every man and every nation.”<sup>2</sup> Vatican II disagreed. During and after the Council, Cardinal Ottaviani was regarded as one of the few remaining churchmen who was truly Catholic in every way, and completely aware of the perilously un-Catholic road down which the Church had deviated. Yet, at the Council, he was greeted with prolonged, loud applause when he stated, “From among the nations of the world there be formed one World Republic, in which there would no longer be found that strife which exists among nations. Instead, the whole world would be at peace...”<sup>3</sup> The true power-brokers of this “World Republic” had no such delusions. Brock Chislm, the head of UNESCO, wrote of the need “for gently putting aside the mistaken old ways [referring specifically to religion, morality, and the notion of right and wrong] of our elders if that is possible. If it cannot be done gently, it may have to be done roughly or even violently.”<sup>4</sup> One of countless examples of this observation becoming a reality was a 2003 meeting of the U.N. attended by its secretary general Kofi Annan. At this meeting Roman

Catholicism was singled out as an impediment to their strategy, a strategy entitled “Showdown with Religion.”

The Vatican II Church’s embracing of pacifism is discussed further in this work, but is relevant to this specific topic. In a statement at the opening of the Council Pope John gave a glimpse of the re-writing of history and the denial of inconvenient facts that are part and parcel of the liberal program. He espoused the pacifist party line that war was never justified, and this less than twenty years after Hitler was prevented from conquering Europe precisely because nations were willing to oppose him. Consistent with this line of reasoning is the expulsion from the Church’s calendar of “Our Lady of Victory.” No longer do we celebrate the fact that Christian forces repelled hostile invaders; instead we apologize for those armies not letting Christian nations be overrun, or for trying to liberate them once invaded. Again, the rejection of Mary at Fatima is crucial; peace was the gift she offered, and the Church rejected her terms. Now, the godless world offers its version of peace, and we accept, *even as they openly state that we and our Faith must be eliminated*. This global authority, to which Popes have already promised to surrender, at present would seem to be best represented in The United Nations. Pope Paul VI’s groveling acquiescence towards the United Nations is as stunning as it is shameful:

“This organization represents the obligatory path of modern civilization and of world peace...Thus, we renew our confidence that your organization would be able to respond to the immense hope of a brotherly global community, where anyone might experience a truly human life.”<sup>5</sup>

- The Church which once regarded herself as the obligatory path for all who desired eternal life has abandoned this claim, yet transferred this imperative to the United Nations for the cause of Utopia. We won’t tell you what religion you should be, but we can tell you which godless political entity you are *obliged* to follow.
- “A truly human life?” Have we been animal, vegetable or mineral to this point? Perhaps the Pope was referring to conditions of hardship and privation which are incompatible with basic human dignity; yet, this oversimplification again betrays a hint of materialism as the measure of humanity. Christians of all ages have lived in states of poverty, want, and injustice, yet lived the supreme human life – one of sanctity – not only despite these conditions but because of them. It is *because* Lazarus was deprived in this life that he was comforted in the next. The Church has always sought to aid those living in material hardship, but never regarded such people as living something less than a “truly human life” for that reason. Otherwise, it would be illogical to honor St. Francis, who willfully sought this very state, and instead he should be criticized for having sacrificed his “true humanity” rather than having perfected it.

On this same date in 1965 his address to this same institution was even more overt in his substitution of The United Nations for Christ: “We bring to this organization the suffrage of our recent predecessors, that of the entire Catholic episcopate, and our own, convinced as We are that this organization represents the obligatory path of modern civilization and of world peace...The peoples of the earth turn to the United Nations as the last hope of concord and peace. We presume to present here, together with Our own, their tribute to honor and of hope.”<sup>6</sup>

- Our hope for Christ is exhausted: the U.N. is our last hope for peace. Again, the rebuke of Our Lady of Fatima is manifest, as her promise of peace is deemed more tenable by obeying a godless institution than God's plan delivered by His own Mother.
- As with the surrender of his tiara, Paul VI likewise used the symbols of his office to demonstrate his subservience to the world. He gave his ring, "The Fisherman's Ring," symbol of the pontifical authority derived in the Petrine succession, to the Bermese Buddhist U'thant, Secretary General of the United Nations.

Paul's efforts towards apostasy and the subjugation of the human race to this institution rather than Christ was delineated in his encyclical "Populorum Progressio," in which he advocates for a world bank backed by a "World Government" which would be bound up with a "synthetic and universal religion." Incredibly, even after the manifest evil intent of every single supra-national institution conceived in recent decades, Pope Benedict XVI has likewise called for a global economic authority. How could it possibly end, to have the global economy completely controlled by a single, godless institution? Can we not reasonably ponder the book of Revelation, in which "The Beast," whatever form that actually takes, has the power to withhold all economic resources from those who refuse his mark, and they will not even be able to buy bread? And yet it is popes themselves who call for this very state of affairs.

Not to be outdone, John Paul II had to heap praise upon the U.N. as well. He even offered his accolades in a more solemn forum, a papal encyclical: "In any case here we cannot not remember with esteem and profound hope for the future, the magnificent effort, accomplished to give life to the United Nations, an effort that tends to define and stabilize the objectives and the inalienable rights of Man, obliging reciprocally the member nations to a rigorous observance of these. This work has been accepted and ratified by nearly all the nations of our time, and therefore should constitute a guarantee that the rights of man become, throughout the whole world, the fundamental principle of action for the good of man."<sup>7</sup>

- The Masonic tone is undeniable. The Church once took to heart the words of Christ that it was for us to permeate the whole world, proclaiming "the Good News to all the nations." Now, this is the U.N.'s mandate.
- The rights of man, not the glory of God, are the fundamental principle for human action. As discussed in the section on the death of missionary activity, it would seem that God does not have the right to have every man know Him.

Pope Paul voiced his desire that "this lofty institution" increase in its own power, and the subservience of humanity it commanded: "May unanimous trust in this institution grow; may its authority increase..."<sup>8</sup> Your wish has been granted, Holy Father, to the great sorrow of the world.



## The Culture of Death

The United Nations, the long desired global authority, strongly warned against *before* the Council, highly sought *by* the Council, unreservedly praised *after* the Council, has long since proven Pope Benedict XV right. The U.N. is a global promoter of abortion and reeks of corruption. Its members have been caught using third world girls as sex slaves, and whatever good it does provide comes with the caveat of accepting “reproductive rights,” with strong evidence that they even inflict forced abortions upon women they are “aiding.” In fact, it was during his tenure as The United States’ ambassador to the United Nations that George H.W. Bush, under Nixon’s direction, advised China on the formulation of their one child policy (at about the same time the federal government was directed to forcibly sterilize about forty percent of the Native American Women living on reservations).<sup>9</sup> Here are but a few facts:

- The London Telegraph reported more than twenty cases of child sex slavery involving U.N. staff in southern Sudan.
- A BBC investigation found that children as young as eleven have been subjected to rape and prostitution by U.N. peacekeepers in Haiti and Liberia, where it was uncovered that teenage refugees were forced to have sex to get food.
- In 2003 AP reported that U.N. officials were identified using a ship chartered for ‘peacekeepers’ to traffic young girls from Thailand to East Timor to be forced into prostitution.
- In 2002 a massive pedophilia scandal within the U.N. was uncovered involving the sexual abuse of refugee children in Sierra Leone, Liberia and Guinea. U.P.I. reported that senior U.N. officials were aware and covered up the atrocities.
- In 2004 the New York Post reported that the U.N. was trying to block the publication of a book by three U.N. field workers that detailed sex, drugs and corruption within U.N. missions.
- Twenty-five percent of the women returning from Pakistan reported that they were subject to abortion or sterilization in refugee camps. Not one woman stated that she wanted this. The United Nations did not provide pre- or neo-natal care.<sup>10</sup>

Apart from the rampant crimes they commit and conceal, their formal policies of evil are a matter of public record. The recent draft copy of the U.N.’s “Global Bio-diversity Assessment” states that the world’s population must be reduced to one billion. In fact, the U.N. accepted one billion dollars from Ted Turner to enforce his belief that there should be a ninety-five percent reduction in population. Yet, these things are not deviations from the original intent of the United Nations; from its inception its members have been quite overt about their goal of enslaving the human race under its authoritarian, godless dominion. Again, the rejection of Our Lady of Fatima is so crucial in that she warned that the spreading of the errors of Russia would be the wages of this disobedience. This not only applies to

communist governments, but communist techniques being used in “free” nations to condition their populations for future enslavement. Dear reader, if I have not already come across as a raving “conspiracy theorist,” perhaps it is at this point I begin to seem so. I truly must resist the urge to have this chapter become a book unto itself, and can only implore you to read the works cited in the bibliography for the incontrovertible documentation regarding the success of this plan through psychology and education.

One of those works is “The Child Seducers,” which asserts, “The U.N. has had total control of your children and all education in this country since Oct. 24, 1946, but most Americans don’t know it.”<sup>11</sup> The author cites this date because it was when the U.N.’s “Rights of the Child” was issued, in which we read “The child shall be protected from practices which may foster racial, religious and any other form of discrimination. He shall be brought up in a spirit of understanding, tolerance, friendship among peoples, peace and universal brotherhood, and in full consciousness that his energy and talents should be devoted to the service of his fellow men.”<sup>12</sup>

Nobel prize winner Bertrand Russell was among those who spoke openly about this preparatory phase towards enslavement and global governance. “Diet, injections and injunctions will combine from a very early age to produce the sort of character and the sort of beliefs that the authorities consider desirable, and any serious criticism of the powers that be will become psychologically impossible. Even if all are miserable, all will believe themselves to be happy, because the government will tell them it is so.” He was also instrumental in carrying out experiments to help perfect this type of brainwashing via public education. “When the technique has been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for a generation will be able to control its subjects without the need of armies or policemen. Fichte laid down that education would aim at destroying free will so that, after pupils have left the school, they shall be incapable throughout the rest of their lives of thinking or acting otherwise than as their schoolmasters would have wished.”<sup>13</sup>

Brock Chisholm was a highly influential architect of the plan for global enslavement, and was the first director general of the U.N.’s powerful ‘World Health Organization.’ He described the goal of his organization as such: “For a cause we must seek some consistent thread running through the weave of all civilizations we have known, and preventing the development of all, or almost all, the people to a state of true maturity. What basic psychological distortion can be found in every civilization of which we know anything? It must be a force which discourages the ability to see and acknowledge patent facts, which prevents the rational use of intelligence, which teaches or encourages the ability to dissociate and to believe, contrary to and in spite of clear evidence, which produces inferiority, guilt and fear, which makes controlling people’s personal behavior emotionally necessary, which encourages prejudice and the inability to see, understand and sympathize with other people’s points of view.

“Is there any force so potent and so pervasive that it can do all these things in all civilizations? There is – just one. The only lowest common denominator of all civilizations, and the only psychological force capable of producing these perversions is morality, the concept of right and wrong. We must get rid of morality.” The means he proposed? Psychology, sensitivity training, and group therapy. “If the race is

to be freed from its crippling burden of good and evil it must be the psychiatrist who takes the criminal responsibility.”<sup>14</sup>

Again, this was the plan from the beginning. The branch of the U.N. responsible for this mass manipulation of humanity is “U.N.E.S.C.O” – The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Its first director, Julian Huxley, explained its purpose as such: “Taking the techniques of persuasion and information and true propaganda that we have learnt to apply nationally in war and deliberately bending them to the international tasks of peace, if necessary utilizing them – as Lenin envisaged – to ‘overcome the resistance of millions’ to desirable change.”<sup>15</sup> And what, according to Huxley, are these ‘desirable changes?’ “The lowest strata are reproducing too fast. Therefore they must not have too easy access to relief or hospital treatment lest the removal of the last check on natural selection should make it too easy for children to be produced or to survive; long unemployment should be a ground for sterilization.” Again, “The task before U.N.E.S.C.O...is to help the emergence of a single world culture, with its own philosophy and background of ideas, and with its own broad purposes.”<sup>16</sup>

Given the Vatican’s extensive diplomatic presence and information channels, it is absolutely impossible that they have not always been aware of these overtly expressed evil designs for the human race. I would never dare think that a Pope has actually agreed with any of this, which makes their responses all the more a source of apoplexy. Simply stated, what could they possibly have been thinking? You must be weary of my perpetual recourse to the phrases “dimming of the intelligence” and “incoherence of liberals,” as I am indeed wearied of seeing so much evidence which warrants their invocation.

In “Caritas in Veritate” Pope Benedict XVI calls for a global authority “to manage the global economy; to revive economies hit by the crisis...to bring about integral and timely disarmament, food, security and peace; to guarantee the protection of the environment and to regulate migration; for all this, there is urgent need of a true world political authority. Such an authority would need *to be universally recognized* and to be vested with the effective power to ensure security for all, regard for justice, and respect for rights. Obviously *it would have to have the authority to ensure compliance* with its decisions from all parties...”<sup>17</sup> Could this not have been written by the most malicious globalist as well? In the name of “the environment” and “peace” a single global entity must be given complete tyrannical power and the force to demand compliance from the rest of disarmed humanity? Will they be free to dissolve any remaining Christian enclave through their global authority to regulate immigration, clearly implying that individual nations or regions have no right to determine grounds for entry, citizenship, or even their continued existence?

I do not want to misrepresent the words of the Holy Father, as he did likewise write “In order not to produce a dangerous universal power of tyrannical nature, the governance of globalization must be marked by subsidiarity, articulated into several layers and involving different levels that can work together. Globalization certainly requires authority insofar as it poses the problem of a global common good that needs to be pursued. This authority, however, must be organized and stratified way, if it is not to infringe upon freedom and if it is to yield effective results in practice.” So an all-powerful global

authority (and he explicitly named the U.N. as the best candidate), with control over every dimension of the life of every individual, and the force to ensure compliance, will somehow be held in check by the “principle of subsidiarity?” This is no more than a feeble straw man and a statement of the obvious; such a global institution would need a global bureaucracy infecting every dimension of society; no such thing as a “check and balance” could ever exist, or is even called for. Finally, dear reader, on the most practical level, is there anybody among the architects of globalism who would share the Catholic idea of “common good” or who will ever care one iota what any Pope says needs to be incorporated into this atheistic “globalism,” the necessity and desirability of which the Pope does not even question? Of course not; it only means that when it comes they can say, “See, even your own Pope says we need to have the authority to impose our will on you – for your own good, of course.”

Yet, as unconvincing, untenable, and hazily described as it was, at least Pope Benedict did make some allowance for the possibility of tyranny (would that he had guaranteed its triumph in such an enterprise, as the last Pope Benedict so clearly foresaw a century before it arrived). Pope John Paul’s effusive endorsement of this evil institution was unequivocally positive. He expressed the “esteem of the Apostolic See and of the Catholic Church for this institution,” calling it “a great instrument for harmonizing and coordinating international life.”<sup>18</sup> Harkening yet again to the “dimming of intelligence” foretold at LaSalette and the relentless incoherence of liberals, the very Pope who so often decried the “Culture of Death” entrusted to its architects the task of “harmonizing life.” He charged the U.N. with “the historic, even momentous, task of promoting this qualitative leap in international life, not only be serving as a center of effective mediation for the resolution of conflicts, but also by fostering values, attitudes and concrete initiatives of solidarity...” You must have read their minds, Holy Father – they had the same intention...

### **The U.N. gets into the Religion business**

At the inception of the U.N., the already cited Julian Huxley foresaw the need to synthesize all religions under one umbrella. Sorry to belabor the point, but it is again apparent that the U.N. is the Devil’s antithesis to Our Lady of Fatima. She promised to end those errors, and those who rejected her sought to infuse the Church with those same errors. Hence, it only stands to reason that the U.N. would be employed in this task: “Can these opposites [Christianity and Marxism] be reconciled, this antithesis be resolved in a higher synthesis? I believe not only that this can happen, but that, through the inexorable dialectic of evolution, it must happen.”<sup>19</sup> Eventually, this organization tired of waiting on this organic “synthesis” brought about by evolution, and decided that the dissolution of religions needed to be quickened along.

As cited earlier in this work, Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations Robert Muller revealed the organization’s goal: “We must move as quickly as possible to a one world government; a one world religion; under a one world leader.” When the United Nations decided it was time to gather world religious leaders together to discuss the role they would be given in this New World Order, they charged Ted Turner with heading up the effort, a man who called Christianity “a religion for stupid people.” At

the conference they discussed the “United Religions Initiative,” an effort with footholds in fifty eight countries to create a one world religion. The conference was predictably liberal, and focused on the Masonic dream of an earthly utopia, and offered many condemnations for any religion which evangelized or believed itself to be distinct from others. It was, in the final analysis, one more step further along the path of John Paul II and his Assisi days of prayer. But, not to be outdone, the Vatican II Church had to join the party and take it one step further; Apostasy....

---

<sup>1</sup> Second Vatican Council. “Gaudium et Spes,” no. 82.

<sup>2</sup> Pius XI, Pope. Encyclical Letter “Quas Primas.” Vatican City: Dec. 11, 1925.

<sup>3</sup> Wiltgen, p. 285.

<sup>4</sup> Chisolm, Brock. “The Psychiatry of Enduring Peace and Social Progress.”

<sup>5</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Address to the U.N., October 4, 1970.

<sup>6</sup> Paul VI, Pope, cited in Villa, p. 85.

<sup>7</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Encyclical Letter “Redemptor Hominis.” Vatican City: April 3, 1979, no. 17.

<sup>8</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Address to the United Nations, Oct. 4, 1965.

<sup>9</sup> One of infinite examples of their policy of evil: UNICEF has an absolute monopoly over pharmaceuticals and vaccines distributed in the third world. When Italy pulled Hexavac and Morupar off the market due to the grave harm it caused, UNICEF sold it to poor nations.

<sup>10</sup> EWTN News, Aug. 16, 2002

<sup>11</sup> Steinbacher, John. “The Child Seducers.” Educator Publishers, Inc. 1970, p. 145.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 146.

<sup>13</sup> Russell, Bertrand. “The Impact of Science Upon Society.” New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. Cited in Iserbyt, p. 45.

<sup>14</sup> Chisolm, Brock. Psychiatry: Journal of the Biology and the Pathology of Interpersonal Relations, Feb. 1946, Vol. 9, no. 1.

<sup>15</sup> Huxley, Julian. Preparatory Commission of UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy, 1946, p. 60.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 61.

<sup>17</sup> Benedict XVI, Pope. Encyclical Letter “Caritas in Veritate.” Vatican City: June 29, 2009.

<sup>18</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Address to the United Nations, Oct. 5, 1995.

<sup>19</sup> Huxley, Julian. Work cited, p. 59.

## Chapter XV

### Return to Fatima

*“Let us remember that Jesus Christ is a very good Son  
and that He does not permit that we offend and despise  
His Most Holy Mother.”  
- Sister Lucy*

While this is certainly true of Christ, it would seem that we have good reason to question if this was true of His recent Vicars. From rejection to sacrilege, from conversion to apostasy: just as the events at Fatima and the subsequent rejection of the Blessed Mother’s commands represent the nexus of all of the forces building up towards the great apostasy, it is at Fatima where we see, in symbol and reality, those same forces flaunt their triumph. The very place where the Blessed Mother appeared to offer the Church a heaven-sent solution to her troubles would become the place where the Church would mock Mary and her message, and celebrate the birth of the new-world religion. The Church obdurately refused to consecrate Russia to Mary, and instead consecrated her shrine to the world. In light of the events about to be narrated, in no way can these be considered histrionic overstatements.

Already documented is Pope John’s hubris in rejecting Mary’s commands and promises while regarding his own solution to peace in the world as superior. Paul VI likewise was overt in his contempt for Fatima and all that related to it. In his book, Mr. Socci relates the account as described by Andrea Tornielli, describing Paul’s encounter with Lucia during his visit to Fatima: “Sister Lucia is on her knees, she is seen to say something to the Pope, but here ‘the attitude of the pontiff changes, it is perceived from his gestures that he has said no and has invited the religious not to insist. Lucia had wanted a face to face meeting; Montini invited her courteously but firmly to address herself to her bishop.’ In substance the pontiff ‘did not want to speak in private with her’ and ‘the refusal of the Pope was fixed forever on the films of the cameramen.’ Everyone can see the annoyed refusal of Pope Montini.”<sup>1</sup>

### Liberals are Liars

Paul VI’s perpetual championing of the causes of “openness” and “dialogue” were never more clearly revealed as, at best, inconsistent, than by his actions surrounding Fatima. As with his refusal of any traditional organization at the Vatican, his actions at Fatima likewise showed his “openness” to be towards anything *but* authentic Catholicism. As Fr. Villa related about his trip to Fatima, “Paul VI did, to be sure, travel to Fatima on May 13, 1967, fifty years after the celestial Apparitions, but he did not go there to see, but to be seen; not hear the message of the Virgin Mary, but to take the stage; not to kneel down, but to dominate before an endless entreating crowd; not to receive celestial commands, but to impose his earthly schemes; not to implore the peace from the Holy Virgin, but to demand it of man, to impose, right there, in the domain of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the “schemes” of the Masonic World of Manhattan; in a word, to stay faithful to himself. It was clear right from the outset...With a childish and impolite pretext, he humiliated the President of Portugal, Salazar (one of the most prestigious political leaders of the century, and one of the major authors of the Christian civilization); first by not taking the

time to meet him at his office; then, by receiving him as any other Portuguese citizen, without suite, without photographers, without any apparatus of the President's dignity would have required. And so, by humiliating the Head of State, Paul VI humiliated Portugal – the most faithful country of the Catholic Faith – paying no consideration to the nation or her leader. Even the progressive press underscored that act of contempt, flaunted, which Paul VI had toward that still deeply Catholic people.”

“He then went on to celebrate, in the Portuguese language, a hasty and cold Mass, impossible to follow, so much so that even Laurentin defined it ‘stammering.’ It was noted, then, that his speeches made but brief allusion to the apparitions of 1917, and, even these, were superficial and detached. Concerned for his political and ecumenical chimeras, Paul VI had organized a series of audiences that were to take up all of his time; particularly, an ‘ecumenical meeting’ with the ‘representatives of the non-Catholic communities.’ But the Lord humiliated him. Of all the invited, none but two showed up, Presbyterians, with whom, besides, as these did not understand Paul VI’s speech in the French language, he could only exchange a few meaningless words, while so many good Catholics would have been more than willing to pray and speak with him.

“Moreover, having no wish to visit the places of the Apparitions, at Cova da Iria, in spite of its proximity, he gave everyone the impression he did not believe in them. But ever since his arrival at Fatima, he had not found the time to salute, first, Our Lady of Fatima, as he immediately climbed onto the platform, saluting the people. He had passed before the Virgin Mary without as much as raising his eyes toward Her, just as, afterwards, he declined to recite the Rosary with the crowd. Even the TV showed, and the newspapers noted, that Paul VI had not even recited a ‘Hail Mary.’”<sup>2</sup>

### Liberals are Liars II

As John before him, Paul was less than forthright with his liberal proclamation that writers would no longer be censured nor silenced. Just as John Censured Our Lady of Fatima and relegated the message she ordered to be promulgated to be locked in a Vatican vault, Paul too was selective in his “liberalism,” as Sr. Lucy was the one exception to his “tolerance” of anything and everything. Again, I defer to Mr. Socci’s skillful summary:

“Sister Lucia had to live 45 years of her life (from 1960 to death) in a condition that is not imposed on anyone in the civilized world, not even the most dangerous prisoners. In the Vatican, starting from the time of Pope John XXIII, they had more than enough of hearing the testimony of Sister Lucia. So much so that they did not content themselves with simply impeding her from speaking and from meeting whoever would retain what she said, but from the ambient of the Vatican Curia – I have personal testimonies of what took place in the decade of the 1980’s – they went so far as to discredit this little cloistered nun [with a future Pope joining in the conspiracy] and made it impossible for her to defend herself [what of the ‘rights of man’ you so endlessly proclaim, Holy Fathers?]. They defined her as a ‘graphomaniac, a person obsessed with writing things down, and ‘obsessed with being the center of attention’ because of the pressing appeals, never made public, that she had continued over the years to send to the Vatican.”<sup>3</sup>

The intervening decades certainly demonstrated the validity of the Blessed Mother's warnings about the price of disobedience. Nations were annihilated, Catholic nations in particular. Mentioned elsewhere in some detail are the sufferings and exterminations of those in the Communist Bloc nations. Also, we look to Spain where, on the anniversary of the Miracle of the Sun in 1931, Prime Minister Azana declared to the Parliament, "Today Spain has ceased to be Catholic."

Also fulfilled were the Blessed Mother's words that Russia would spread her errors. Catholic Central and South America were decimated by "Liberation Theology," a replacement of the Catholic Faith with Communist doctrine. In this instance as well, John Paul suffered firsthand the fruits of the apostasy Our Lady of Fatima had come to prevent. The humiliation to which he was subjected when visiting one such nation is truly stunning in light of its vast "Catholic" population. Ironically, it was the very "theologians" responsible whose disapproval kept John Paul from invoking the Queen of Heaven to rid the Church of these open enemies.<sup>4</sup>

First of all, however, it is useful to review the proof that The Blessed Mother's solution would have been successful (as though any proof is required beyond her word). It was noted earlier how Portugal escaped the ravages of World War II due to its "micro" consecration, whereby the country was consecrated to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. Likewise, Popes Pius XII and John Paul II both carried out consecrations of the world to The Immaculate of Mary, in an effort to carry out her commands at Fatima yet, circumventing her explicit intention in order to appease the very people Mary was going to convert. Still, these incomplete efforts brought great blessings from Heaven.

It was in May of 1952 when the Blessed Mother appeared again to Lucia, telling her: "Make known to the Holy Father that I am still awaiting the consecration of Russia to My Immaculate Heart. Without this consecration, Russia will not be able to convert, nor will the world have peace." For reasons unknown (in any public venue), Pius tried for "a middle road" between the explicit, non-negotiable terms of the Blessed Mother, and the voices of those who feared worldly retribution. On July 7, he published an Apostolic Letter to the people of Russia. He committed the consecration to writing in this document, but it is not the formal act, in union with the bishops of the world, ordered by Mary. Yet, our Heavenly Mother gave a partial reward to this partial obedience. On October 14, 1952, Stalin gave a speech in preparation for an imminent military offensive in Western Europe. He was determined to conquer Europe in his lifetime, but soon after he was struck down by a brain hemorrhage and died.

Likewise, Sister Lucia testified that she was assured in an apparition that the act of John Paul spared the world a catastrophic war that would have erupted in 1985. Russia had made plans for the military action that would provoke this war when, on May 13, 1984, the anniversary of the first apparition of Fatima and less than two months after John Paul's act of consecration, one of their missal arsenals inexplicably caught fire. Without these weapons, a military action was no longer possible. Yet, Lucy also confirmed that this act, while accepted in Heaven, did not fulfill Mary's request at Fatima, as Russia was not mentioned by name. If an incomplete act won us such a merciful reprieve (28 years and counting!), it is truly heart-rending to think what the actual fulfillment of her command would have won for the world.

As with his entire pontificate, Pope John Paul's actions surrounding Fatima remain enigmatic and incoherent: on one hand a model of Catholic piety and devotion, on the other a fully committed



modernist. He credited Our Lady of Fatima with saving his life when he was shot on the anniversary of her first apparition and, upon leaving the hospital, told his aid “I understand that the only solution to save the world from war, to save it from atheism, is the conversion of Russia according to the message of Fatima.”<sup>5</sup> Yet not convinced enough to actually do it!! A bishop testified that the Pope told him firsthand that this omission burdened him, and others said the same.

A sadder irony still is embodied in this; the Secret of Fatima, as John Paul knew, warned of apostasy at the top of the Church. Yet, *it was due to the fruit of this apostasy that he refused to apply the remedy!* Msgr. Hncla recalls saying to the Pope “I had occasion to greet him a few days after the election, and I said to him: ‘God has called you because your first work must be the consecration and conversion of Russia.’ He answered me: ‘I am willing to do it even tomorrow. If you convince the bishops’” (Andrea Tornielli, *The Secret Revealed*). The fact that bishops would not obey a mandate from the Pope and the Mother of God Herself is all the more proof that the apostasy is advancing. The same Msgr., years later, told John Paul directly that his “entrustment” was not enough, to which the Pope responded, “I know, but many theologians are opposed.”<sup>6</sup> By this digression, we see the feebleness and impossibility of “the middle road.” In only three years time the Pope had digressed from fearing opposition from bishops to fearing the disfavor of pedantic theologians preventing him from obeying Our Lady and freeing the world from the scourge brought about by this decades old refusal. Yet, not only did he acquiesce to the enemies of the message in this regard, he contributed to the subsequent efforts to stifle the true message and “cover the tracks” of this staggering Papal omission of the past half century.

### **The original events and message attacked**

As contrary as the events and message of Fatima are to the liberal agenda, the modernist refutation of revelation, and the cowering posture desired by the Church’s new architects, their authenticity has always been attacked by the liberal elements in the Church. As already noted, in the 1960 Vatican release which stated that the Blessed Mother would not be obeyed and the message would not be revealed, we read that the Church “does not pledge Herself to guarantee the veracity of the words which the three shepherds claim to have heard from Our Lady.” The apparition, already approved, is now downgraded to a “claim.”

Yet, in 2000, all of the sudden the events were given factual status yet again, and the Vatican did, in fact, want to reveal the secret to the world. The explanation given was that the events had been fulfilled, culminating in the assassination attempt against Pope John Paul, and that the promised conversion of Russia had been achieved by the “fall of Communism.” The facts, however, would indicate otherwise, and the revealing of the secret was yet another step by which the Vatican sought to bury it forever. First of all, by exactly what calculation or criteria does one consider Russia to now be converted?

- Catholicism, the religion to which Mary promised Russia would convert, remains the subject of persecution. Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism have all been sanctioned as Russia’s “traditional religions,” while Catholic parishes must obtain approval from the government.
- Russia has the highest abortion rate in the world, with the average Russian woman procuring eight in her lifetime.

- Russia has the highest alcohol consumption in the world.
- Homosexuality and child pornography are rampant in Russia.
- Communism still rules: Vladimir Putin systematically shut down all independent media, with the last independent television station closing on Jan. 11, 2002 (London Times reporting). At present, they have an ever-escalating military partnership with China.
- The Russian Orthodox Patriarch, Alexy II, has “decried the spiritual degeneration of Russian society into occultism, Satanism, and assorted non-Christian sects since Communisms ‘fall,’”<sup>7</sup> the same “fall” which is alleged to be the sign of the “conversion” promised at Fatima.
- Muslims outnumber Catholics by roughly ten to one.
- True to the new orientation of the Church in which the Secretary of State is over the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, a mere change in political regimes, and a very superficial one at that, is now what qualifies as “conversion” in the Vatican II Church.

### **The Secret revealed?**

That duplicity may be involved and that the Church’s new politically oriented mission was driving the train when the secret was allegedly disclosed is not a very far-fetched theory. In fact, the only theological “expert” cited in the statement was already on record as believing that Lucy lied. Even Mother Angelica of EWTN, sincere in her devotion to Pope John Paul and the Papacy, and perhaps too eager to defend the indefensible on his behalf, had to concede that she did not believe the Vatican was telling us everything. She may be right; consider the following:

- The task of composing the Vatican’s official translation and commentary of the secret was given to Cardinal Sodano, the head of the Vatican’s political wing. Why would this not be done by the Pope himself or the Congregation for the Deposit of Faith?
- The Pope in the vision is killed, not wounded, as was John Paul, which is put forth as the fulfillment of this prophecy. Given that the Pope was shot on the anniversary of the first apparition, it is not unreasonable to speculate that his love of the Blessed Virgin and devotion to Fatima, with all his inconsistencies, led to a lesser fulfillment of this prophecy. Still, it is not a very strong argument, and it is not the greatest of the inconsistencies in the official version of events.
- In rebuking the Blessed Mother’s mandate to publish the third secret by 1960, the Vatican spoke of the letter in which Sister Lucy wrote the *words* of the Virgin Mary. The secret, as revealed, contains no words.
- Likewise, it is public knowledge that the “secret” portion of the revelation followed immediately upon the promise that Portugal would keep the faith, followed by an “etc....” The “etc....” indicated the secret, and clearly implies other words followed.
- Msgr. Capovilla, a man with firsthand knowledge of the secret, confirmed that it contains two parts; a vision, and a written message.<sup>8</sup>

- Even in the official text, Cardinal Bertone spoke falsely of the known portion of the message, referring to the “so-called ‘Consecration of the world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary.’” It is a matter of public record that it was Russia, not the world, that Mary ordered to be the object of this consecration, while his derisive “so-called” tells betrays his estimation of the veracity of the apparitions.

### **The Message Under Attack**

There are so many pedantic statements on record as the Vatican sought to discredit both Lucy and the Blessed Mother that it is difficult to choose some of the best candidates. Consider the following:

- The communication stating the Pope John’s refusal to obey Mary explained, “She [the Church] does not wish to take upon herself the responsibility of guaranteeing the veracity of the words that the three shepherds say the Virgin Mary revealed to them.”<sup>9</sup>
- The Blessed Mother stated that “in the end, my Immaculate Heart will triumph.” Yet, according to Cardinal Ratzinger, Mary had either her verb tenses or the historical sequence of events confused. According to the Cardinal, this statement meant that Mary’s Immaculate Heart had *already* triumphed when she agreed to be the Mother of God. In other words, Mary came to Fatima repeatedly, showed the children a vision of hell and thousands the miracle of the sun, only to convey to them something which had in fact transpired 2,000 years ago.
- In retelling her vision of Hell, Sr. Lucia stated that, had Mary not already promised to take them to Heaven, “I think we would have died of fear and terror.” Cardinal Ratzinger, however, keeping alive the decades-old Vatican campaign to discredit her, surmised that what Sister Lucia remembers as being a vision of hell may instead be memories of images she “may have seen in devotional books.”<sup>10</sup> Yes, the man who would be Pope is really trying to have us believe that a firsthand experience of the horror of hell and eternal damnation is so innocuous that it can be confused with a drawing one saw in years past (or is Sister Lucy the only one he is alleging to be this scatter-brained and untrustworthy?).
- The above quote also seeks to discredit Mary by implying that, when wanting to convey something by way of an apparition, she is only capable of producing so feeble and unreliable an impression that the seer forgets whether it actually happened or she saw a picture in a book.
- He seeks to discredit Mary more directly by discrediting prophecy altogether: “A person who foretells what is going to happen responds to the curiosity of the mind, which wants to draw back the veil on the future.”<sup>11</sup>
- Truly inane is the assertion of Cardinal Castrillon that “the Blessed Mother appeared to the three little visionaries in the Cova da Iria at the beginning of the century, and marked out a program for the New Evangelization which the whole Church finds itself engaged in...”<sup>12</sup> Even though the Blessed Mother’s “program” has not been implemented at all, as she herself has complained,

and even though she said nothing of the “New Evangelization,” we are to believe that the events of Fatima were nothing more than endorsement of a silly modernist cliché to be implemented sixty years down the road to shepherd the faithful down the road of indifferentism and apostasy.

### **Fatima consecrated as a shrine to syncretism and indifferentism**

- In October, 2003, the Vatican and the United Nations sponsored an interfaith congress at the shrine of Fatima. That the purpose of this event was to develop the “one world religion” sought by the U.N. is implicit in the obnoxious name of the conference, “The Future of God.”
- As yet another display of open contempt for the Blessed Mother, the congress was held in the meeting hall named after Pope Paul VI, the pope so instrumental in setting the Church on its course for a Masonic, worldly goal, and whose disrespect for the events of Fatima was apparent.
- In the words of the shrine’s rector, Msgr. Luciano Guerra, Fatima “will change for the better...The future of Fatima, or the adoration of God and His mother [yes, a msgr. in the Church of the great Apostasy thinks we *adore* the Blessed Mother] at this holy shrine, must pass through the creation of a shrine where different religions can mingle. The inter-religious dialogue in Portugal, and in the Catholic Church, is still in an embryonic phase, but the Shrine of Fatima is not indifferent to this fact and is already open to being a universalistic place of vocation.”<sup>13</sup>
- That the Monsignor would use the word “indifferent” in regards to the shrine is fitting, as it was to become a temple of religious indifferentism.
- The Blessed Mother was the recipient of further condescension, as Msgr. Guerra assured the listeners, “we must assume that it was the will of the Blessed Virgin Mary that this comes about this way.” It is *presumption* to assert that he knows the will of the Mother of God, *blasphemy* to say that she wills her shrine to be desecrated and made a temple of indifferentism, and a *hypocritical arrogance* worthy of the Devil to state that his intuitive understanding of the will of the Mother of God must be carried out, while her explicit will expressed to the visionaries at that same place had been ignored.
- A sign of things to come: As the Monsignor proudly described how the United Nations’ vision for a one world, syncretist church would be advanced at Fatima, he also gave clear indication of the only religion which would find no place there: Catholicism of the pre-apostasy sort, as those who were opposed to the Congress, as any Catholic would have been before 1963, were described as “old fashioned, narrow minded, fanatic extremists and provocateurs.” The apostate Cardinal Patriarch of Lisbon told the media that the shrine would become a modern pagan pantheon, “a center where all the religions of the world gather to pay homage to their various gods.”<sup>14</sup>

- Should the reader suspect that I am overstating the intentions of the congress, the words of one of their keynote speakers, Fr. Jacques Dupuis, clearly convey the intent: “The religion of the future will be a general converging of religions in a universal Christ that will satisfy all.” His vision of the Church’s dissolution into syncretism and indifferentism fits in perfectly with what had been described in previous chapters: “The other religious traditions in the world are part of God’s plan for humanity and the Holy Spirit is operating and present in Buddhist, Hindu and other sacred writings of Christian and non-Christian faiths as well. The universality of God’s kingdom permits this, and this is nothing more than a diversified form of sharing in the same mystery of salvation. In the end it is hoped that the Christian will become a better Christian and each Hindu a better Hindu.”
- True to the Post Vatican II Church’s denial of the Church’s true nature, an official statement put out by the Congress repudiated evangelization. “No one religion can irradiate another or strengthen itself by downplaying others and an open dialogue is the way to building bridges and tearing down walls of centuries of hate. [Note the recourse to the perennial liberal tactic of name-calling; if you disagree with us, you are guilty of ‘hate,’ precisely the tactic used in society to enforce ‘diversity’ and tolerance’ and protect themselves from any criticism]. What is needed is that each religion be true to its faith integrally and treat each religion on the same footing of equality with no inferior or superiority complexes.” As the Blessed Mother promised peace by conversion, the Congress called to defy her said peace would be achieved by indifferentism. Of course, they could not resist the tired Masonic mantra of John XXIII that peace would be achieved by concentrating on what unites them as opposed to what separates them. Again, all religion is reduced to a human, earthly, materialist enterprise as Jesus is excluded.
- One of the meeting’s sponsors is directed by Mikhail Gorbachev (The World Conference on Religion and Peace), a rabid proponent of abortion throughout the world. The groups stated purpose is to unify the world’s religions into a single “spiritual branch of the United Nations.” This was openly declared at the group’s 1993 meeting in Chicago.
- Pope John Paul supported this group, and at his invitation 1,000 representatives gathered at the Vatican in 1994, representing fifteen different pagan and Christian religions. “Rome will lose the Faith, and become the seat of the antichrist...”

### **Another insult to the Mother of God**

In the chapel built on the very spot where the Blessed Mother appeared and offered the world Heaven’s directives for peace, a Hindu priest led prayer sessions from the altar. As a further affront to Mary, the very place where she offered the peace plan which the Church rejected, the Hindus offered their prayer for peace. After the prayer service, the bishop of Leiria – Fatima, D. Serafim Ferreira e Silva, was clothed in a Hindu prayer shawl by their high priest.

The works of Mr. Socci and Fr. Kramer listed in the bibliography are the definitive texts for a fuller investigation for all of the contradictions and attempts to discredit the monumental events of Fatima. Sr.

Lucy once had another apparition: “The Blessed Virgin told me that the devil is in the mood for engaging in a decisive battle against the Virgin. From now on we must choose sides. Either we are for God or we are for the devil. There is no other possibility.” Even though we are guaranteed Mary’s triumph in the end, in light of the facts and events summarized above, who would you say is winning for now? Furthermore, we who see through this abomination still have good reason for “fear and trembling” regarding our own salvation, as Jesus warned us...

---

<sup>1</sup> Socci, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> Villa, “Paul VI,” pp. 153-54.

<sup>3</sup> Socci, p. 82.

<sup>4</sup> See Malachi Martin’s book “The Jesuits” for a full history and account of these events.

<sup>5</sup> 30 Giorni, March, 1990, cited in Socci, p. 20.

<sup>6</sup> Tornielli, Andrea. “The Secret Revealed,” cited in: Socci, p. 138.

<sup>7</sup> Ferrara & Woods, p. 117.

<sup>8</sup> See Socci, p. 107.

<sup>9</sup> See Kramer, p. 52.

<sup>10</sup> Kramper, p. 141.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 138.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 125.

<sup>13</sup> The Portugal News. “Fatima to Become an Interfaith Shrine,” Nov. 1, 2003.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

## Chapter XVI

### “Even the Elect...”

In His discourse on the Great Apostasy and the advent of the antichrist, Jesus gave the disconcerting warning that even the elect might be led astray. Every apostasy, by definition, involves the falling away of Catholics from the faith. Yet, in the scenario spoken of by Christ, in the final apostasy even the elect, those who, while sincerely wanting to stay, could be deceived and fall away, unbeknownst to themselves. Christians who sacrificed to the Roman gods knew they were apostates, and that they had to repent or die separated. Likewise, despite any superficial constructs or feeble circumlocutions, those who left the Church for the auspices of a national church, orthodox or protestant, knew that they had broken away from the Church built upon Peter, that they now formed part of a different entity. During the French Apostasy, 24,000 of 29,000 priests apostatized<sup>1</sup>, as did a quarter of all bishops; yet, despite the staggering numbers, they did so by signing the “Civil Constitution of the Clergy,” making public their separation from the Church. Yet, just as people could hate while believing they were loving (still to come), could one fall away while believing he had held his ground?

In the post-Vatican II apostasy, many left the faith, or stopped practicing it, in an overt fashion. Many who insist they have remained Catholic and perhaps still come to Mass have fallen away as well. These are the “majority” in the Vatican II Church: they support abortion, use contraception, reject tenets of the Faith and deny the precepts of the Church. (Sinning in these regards does not remove one from the Faith; it is a matter of a free, conscious rejection of them. Even though the Church has largely abandoned her role as shepherd and rarely admonishes such people, they nonetheless know that they are contrary to the Church’s teachings, and cannot plead ignorance). Yet, what of those Catholics who truly want to be so; faithfully attending Mass, upholding and living her moral teachings, and diligently trying to increase their knowledge of the Faith? How is it that these could nonetheless be deceived? In the following unit, I will delineate the process (or at least one way of viewing it) by which the faithful, despite their own sincerity, are weakened and made vulnerable to such a menace. It can be thought of as a lethal, incremental process occurring in concentric circles: a weakening of the supernatural protection of grace, a weakening of the natural, ecclesial protection of the shepherds of the flock, and that weakening to which every man is prone due to original sin. First, the preparation for the elect to be led astray that has occurred on the supernatural level...

### **Part I: The Restrainer Removed**

Source: 2 Thess: 2:3ff – “Since the mass apostasy has not yet occurred nor the man of lawlessness been revealed – the son of perdition and adversary who exalts himself above every so-called god proposed for worship, he who seats himself in God’s temple and even declares himself to be God...You know what restrains him until he shall be revealed in his own time. The secret force of lawlessness is already at work, mind you, but there is one who holds him back until that restrainer shall be taken from the scene.”

In this prophecy regarding the apostasy which precedes the advent of the Antichrist, St. Paul wrote of the symptom of self-exaltation. As has been discussed already, this mentality is manifest in the Vatican II Church by:

- Its derision of the past and presumed superiority to it.

- Its turning towards a man-centered religion.
- A self-satisfaction bordering on self-worship.

In this chapter I will offer some thoughts regarding the form of this “lawlessness” and the meaning of the “restrainer” whose removal will give this “force of lawlessness” free reign.

### **Background**

To appreciate the importance of this restrainer and the catastrophic results of his removal, it is necessary to bear in mind the importance of *mediation* in Roman Catholicism. While all grace comes from God, God has His chosen means through which He dispenses that grace. In the Old Testament, the leper Namaan could only be cured in the waters of the Jordan. In healing the man born blind in the temple, Jesus certainly had no need to smear mud on his eyes and have him wash in the pool of Siloam. It would have been enough for Him to “just say the word,” and he would have been healed. Yet, as is obvious in these two accounts, this type of mediation is God’s will, and if the means through which the grace is offered had been rejected, the grace would not have been conferred.

If God has chosen to use lifeless matter as channels of His grace, how much more so does He employ people. An obvious example would be the consecration at Mass. God does not *need* a priest to change bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. He certainly has the power to bring this about directly, but *He never would*. Where the means of mediation are lacking, the grace will not be received, because God has willed it so.

Therefore, this “restrainer,” is God’s chosen means to restrain the “man of lawlessness” from ascending to his full power. Yet, as St. Paul warned, that restrainer will be taken from the scene. Please note, he will not leave of his own accord, but rather be *taken* away by those who want to facilitate the reign of the man of lawlessness. Once this restrainer has been removed, so will the grace of God’s protection that He provides through this means.

Modernity and liberalism either deny the supernatural altogether, or diminish its importance, depending upon the extent to which one is infected by these errors. Therefore, part of the current apostasy is centered upon destroying the bridges between the natural and the supernatural, or simply concealing the ones which can’t be destroyed to prevent the faithful from availing themselves to the grace and protection God offers through each particular means. This was foreshadowed at Vatican II, which mentions neither angels nor demons, as its secular, humanistic emphasis has been duly noted.

### **Who is the “Restrainer?”**

I will now make the case that this “restrainer” written of by St. Paul is St. Michael the Archangel. So powerful did St. Francis of Assisi understand St. Michael’s intercession and protection to be, that he devoted forty days a year as an additional “Lent” in his honor, teaching that “Each person should offer God some special praise or gift in honor of such a great prince.” Before looking at the recent history of St. Michael’s role as the “restrainer,” it is worth noting his perennial role in the Church and the honor accorded to him. Here are a few important examples:

- God Himself employed St. Michael to cast Satan out of Heaven, and will again dispatch Him to cast Satan into Hell at the end of time.



- Among the titles given to St. Michael by the Church in the litany dedicated to him, he is:
  - The fortress of the Church militant
  - The bulwark of orthodox believers
  - The strength of those who fight under the standard of the Cross
  - Our most sure aid
  - Our help in all adversities
  - Him whom the Lord has charged to receive souls after death
  - Our prince and our advocate
- In the ancient Mass in his honor, he was invoked to “defend us in battle, that we may not perish in the dreadful judgement”
- There are numerous examples of the graces God has bestowed on the world through his intercession. Here are but two:
  - Under the pontificate of Gregory the Great, the plague was ravaging Rome. He organized a city-wide procession to seek divine intervention. As the great procession was concluding, the Pope saw St. Michael standing atop the tomb of Hadrian (which is actually a castle) with his fiery sword drawn in defense of the eternal city. The plague ended at that moment. To this day an enormous statue of St. Michael adorns the spot where St. Gregory the Great saw him.
  - While a bit more pedestrian of an example, this one demonstrates St. Michael’s intercessory role in the protection of each Christian soul. While itself a repugnant distortion of the facts, the movie ‘The Exorcist’ was based on a true case of demonic possession. The demon possessing the young boy had assured the exorcist that he would not leave the boy until he uttered a certain word. In the end, it was St. Michael who came, identified himself, said the word “Dominus,” and personally freed the boy from his torment. St. Michael immediately appeared miles away to some Jesuits (whose confrere was the exorcist) as they were praying, again with his sword drawn, so that there would be no mistake as to whom God sent to expel the demon.

That St. Michael is the restrainer who keeps the devil at bay really is not a difficult case to make, as Pope Leo XIII has already made this clear. One morning during Mass, the Pope fell into ecstasy and his attendants thought him to be dead. Upon reviving, he related that he had had a vision of Satan being given unprecedented liberty to attack the Church. In response, Pope Leo composed his famous prayer to St. Michael and ordered it to be prayed after every Mass. As the evil one attacked, the restrainer was invoked to protect us, as he has been doing since the world began. Suddenly, with the advent of the Second Vatican Council, it was determined by the Church’s authorities that his help was no longer needed, and that he should be marginalized to the point of exclusion from the Church’s liturgical life.

Here are some ways in which the Vatican II Church has sought to remove the restrainer by eliminating invocations of St. Michael, especially during Mass:

- His name was removed from the “Confiteor,” where he had been invoked for well over a thousand years.

- The prayer said during the blessing of incense asked St. Michael to intercede for us; this prayer has been expunged from the Mass.
- The Feast of The Apparition of St. Michael (May 8<sup>th</sup>) was removed from the Church's calendar. This feast commemorated the Archangel's appearance on the summit of Monte Gargano in Italy in 525, where he directed that a sanctuary be built there in his honor. The many miracles that have occurred there led to its placement on the universal calendar.
- The prayer composed by Pope Leo and ordered to be prayed after every Mass was suppressed.
- During the offertory at funeral Masses, the following was prayed: "Let the standard-bearer, holy Michael, lead them into that holy light..." This, too, has been removed.

The Second Vatican Council stated that only those changes would be made to the Mass which genuinely benefited the faithful. Yet, who benefits from all of the graces and protection denied to the Church and the faithful by our ceasing to invoke St. Michael's protection? The one he is restraining.

## **Part II: Other restrainers removed**

### The New Rite of Exorcism

There are other ways in which Satan has been given greater power over the Church and over souls by the Vatican II apparatus. One of the most grievous means was by the suppression of the Rite of Exorcism, and then its replacement by a completely ineffective rite. This matter has been treated in greater length by the rightful experts, so here I will only inform the reader of the following:

- The committee which fabricated the new rite contained no exorcists, and no exorcist was consulted.
- It was the consensus of practicing exorcists that the new rite was totally ineffective and left the possessed helpless against the Devil and his demons.
- Only at the insistence of some exorcists did the Vatican give permission to use the former, ancient rite. It would not be unrealistic to consider that their request was granted only due to the exposure of this gross misconduct in the Catholic media.

### The Minor Order of Exorcist

When Jesus sent out His disciples in pairs, the first power He gave them was "authority over unclean spirits" (Mark 6:7). Accordingly, on the path to priesthood a man always received the minor order of exorcist, as the Council of Trent taught that this order along with the duties proper to it have been in use "from the beginning." Pope St. Cornelius I (251 – 53) wrote that, during his pontificate, Rome had fifty two exorcists along with lectors and porters (the other two minor orders). During the rite, the bishop presented the candidate the book of exorcisms, saying "Take, and commit to memory, and have the power of imposing hands over the possessed, whether baptized or catechumen." These same ancient words, codified at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, were used to confer this office on each perspective priest, until this order was nullified in 1972 by Pope Paul VI. Ironically, or perhaps fittingly, this

Vatican II pope took it upon himself to abolish a rite which has existed from the Church's beginning on August 15th, the Solemnity of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The reading proscribed for Mass this day is taken from the Book of the Apocalypse, describing Satan's war against "The Woman clothed with the sun," and St. Michael the Archangel taking up the battle and casting him out of Heaven. It is on the day that we hear of heavenly warfare with the Devil and his demons that the pope "removed the restrainer," and withheld from future priests the power given by this minor order to combat those same "unclean spirits."

The reason for the suppression of this office, with its corresponding authority and divine grace, which has been in existence "from the beginning of the Church?" In the pope's own words, his purpose was "eliminating what is obsolete."<sup>2</sup> Obsolete? The very use of this word should appall any Catholic, and please any demon. What exactly is obsolete? The authority to cast out demons? The belief that demons exist? Indeed, Paul's bizarre choice of words raises even more disturbing questions, as he explained that his decision followed upon, "having given due consideration to every aspect of the problem." *Problem?! What problem?* The fact that, for two thousand years the Church has conferred upon her priests the same authority Jesus gave to His disciples? Is this the *problem*? Rather, is the problem not that the spirit of modernism had finally triumphed, and for the first time in two thousand years the Church had a pontiff who regarded such authority as "obsolete?" A spiritual weapon conferred upon priests since the beginning of the Church is now denied them; another restrainer has been removed.

### The Divine Office

The Divine Office has formed an essential part of the Church's life of prayer from the beginning. It is centered on praying the psalms, with its roots in Judaism and the practice of praying at fixed hours throughout the day. In the early Church, the Jewish custom was retained, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles that the apostles indeed continued to go the temple at the appointed hours for prayer. The early monks continued this practice and enhanced it, making the praying of the psalter (The Book of Psalms) a central part of their lives. St. Benedict, in his Rule for Monks, enjoined his monks to take care that the whole psalter be prayed every week, calling the failure to do so "slothful." He wrote, "we read that our holy fathers strenuously fulfilled in a single day what I pray that we lukewarm monks may perform in a whole week."<sup>3</sup> By the fifth century the number of hours (the times in a day that every monk and priest prayed the proscribed psalms) was firmly established.

A couple of examples of the power and importance of these sacred prayers would be in order. St. Gertrude the Great once related that, on one occasion, "as she was reciting her hours without much attention, she perceived our ancient enemy mocking her at the psalm 'Mirabilia' (118), cutting each word short in an exaggerated imitation of her. He taunted her: 'Your Creator, your Savior, your Redeemer has well bestowed on you the gifts of speech, since you can recite so glibly that even in a single psalm you have omitted so many letters, so many syllables and so many words!' She knew from this, that if this treacherous enemy counted so exactly even the least letter or syllable of the Psalm which she had omitted or uttered carelessly, what terrible accusations he would bring after death against those who were in the habit of reciting their Office hurriedly, without any intention."<sup>4</sup>

St. Catherine of Siena, recorded these words of God to her: "Clerics and religious are obliged to say it [the Divine Office], and sin if they do not say it. They must say their Office right up to the time of death. If they feel their mind drawn by desire and lifted up at the time appointed for saying the Office,

they should arrange to say it either earlier or later so they will not fail in their duty regarding the Office.”<sup>5</sup>

As was so eloquently written by a priest summarizing the Rule of St. Bridget of Sweden, “The psalter increases the faith of the Christian, illuminates like the sun, cleanses like water, extinguishes all inordinate desire, raises the love of God in the heart.” Amazingly, yet perhaps predictably, the Vatican II Church could not let this ancient practice be.

First of all, it is telling that, after the Council, the “Divine Office” became known as “The Liturgy of the Hours.” While a simple change in name may seem trivial, can we not clearly see the modernist agenda permeating yet another element of the Church’s life, as the word “Divine” itself was seen as something that needed to be eliminated? As with the Mass, it betrays that same agenda which seeks to make the Church’s liturgical life a horizontal exercise, preoccupied with the secular, rather than a pious exercise in reaching up towards the Divine, uniting earth to heaven. As already noted, the mentality which summarizes modernity is “nothing is sacred,” so accordingly the Office cannot be named “Divine.”

In the wake of the Council, as with every other ancient tradition, violent hands were laid upon the Divine Office and it was mutilated so as to not retain its ancient form. Four hours of the Office, four times a day when every priest, nun, and monk, for well over 1400 years had taken a moment’s pause from their day to direct their hearts and minds towards God, were eliminated, and the remaining hours markedly shortened. There are countless examples in the Church’s history when efforts were undertaken to reform the clergy and religious, purify them of an encroaching laxity, and restore them to the full and proper exercise of their office. You will never find a time when priests and religious were *ordered to pray less*.

As with many of its mutilations of the Church’s ancient traditions, the Vatican II Church offers numerous citations of past Popes and Councils to create the impression that such a change is nothing but the latest in a long line of similar actions. This is dishonest. True, the Divine Office, through the ages, has undergone numerous rearrangements, modifications, and codifications; but, the flat-out nullification of prayer itself had never happened. The ancient arrangement of the number of hours was seen as sacrosanct and unalterable. Indeed, for all of the variations and adaptations the Divine Office had undergone, there is no indication that anyone ever considered that one of these changes should be to simply eliminate prayers.

The reason given for this suppression of hours of the Office again is well suited to the modernist mentality. The official news bulletin of the Council Press Office stated that the reason given by the Council Fathers for shortening the Divine Office was “to give priests the possibility of dedicating themselves more to apostolic activities.”<sup>6</sup> In other words, priests today are somehow busier than priests of centuries past, and unlike their predecessors, can’t have pre-appointed prayer times impeding their superior work load. Again, we detect the mentality of being superior to the past. Priests and nuns, for centuries, in the midst of labors, privations, and hardships that most modern priests can’t fathom, were always able to faithfully pray the full compliment of hours of the Divine Office, yet the modern priest, somehow more apostolic and engrossed in his labors, needs to be freed from this “burden.”

Even the Council itself deflates this feeble reasoning. In its document on “The Life of Priests,” it states, “By the Office they pray to God in the name of the Church for the whole people entrusted to them and in fact for the whole world.”<sup>7</sup> There is no more “apostolic” labor than this. In this mentality, one can detect traces of the Pelagian heresy. Pelagius was an early heretic who contended that human efforts

and human nature were sufficient for salvation, without the aid of divine grace. Likewise, we now find ourselves in an era where the Church herself decrees that the Divine Office, and the divine grace conferred by the recital thereof, may impede the priest's human labors, rather than give them a divine aid and spiritual blessing, bringing those same labors to greater fruition. It is no wonder that, in many parishes where once a Catholic could find adoration, devotions, and a variety of prayer apostolates on a daily basis, now only committees, meetings and other barren human endeavors can be found. It is a sad irony that, as parishes shrink and shrink, as Mass attendance and school enrollments dwindle, parishes more and more clamor about the need for "meeting space." Why do churches which care for fewer and fewer souls need more and more space for banal human activity? Because pelagianism has taken hold, and like those who deemed modern priests too busy for the full recitation of the Divine Office, so the laity as well are too caught up in their petty bureaucratic endeavors to see the obvious result of not putting God first.

### Sacramentals

Sacramentals may be defined as "any object set apart and blessed by the Church to excite good thoughts, to increase devotion and thus remit venial sin." They are like Sacraments because they are *means of grace*; but they differ from Sacraments, because they only produce grace indirectly through the suffrage of the Church and by causing devotion in the mind of the user.<sup>8</sup> That simple objects are used by God to confer grace has been established directly by God Himself, as a woman was healed by Jesus simply by touching the hem of His garment. Likewise, the Bible tells of people being healed by swatches of St. Paul's clothing, as well as the shadow of St. Peter.

One of the most important sacramentals is holy water. Its power to heal and protect from evil has been a given in the history of the Church. St. Philip Neri once raised a man from the dead using holy water. At Lourdes, the Blessed Mother herself provided a spring of water, already holy by her who gave it, which has cured countless bodies and souls over the past one hundred and fifty years. As the former blessing of holy water read, its purpose was to "put to flight all of the power of the enemy...(and) become an agent of divine grace in the service of your [God's] mysteries, to drive away evil spirits and dispel sickness, so that everything in the homes and other buildings of the faithful that is sprinkled with this water may be rid of all uncleanness and freed from every harm."

Tragically, the faithful are now deprived of all these benefits, as the new rite of "blessing" for holy water does not confer a blessing at all. Nor is the water blessed which is used in Baptism. The "new" Book of Blessings is, in fact, a book of non-blessings, as its prayers bless no object. All of the means which were just described as channels of God's grace and protection are denied to the faithful. Yet more "restrainers" have been removed.

### Further graces withheld

The Last Rites offer a striking example of how protestantized and minimized the Church's rites have become. The former rite had a prayer of exorcism, in light of the "final struggle," that last spiritual assault, that comes near death. The new rite omits this. The old rite wields the powerful Catholic weapon of intercessory prayer, calling on "The glorious and holy Mother of God, the Virgin Mary," along with St. Joseph, all the holy Angels, Archangels, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, virgins, and all the saints. In the new rite, this has all been eliminated, keeping in line with the protestant repudiation of devotion to saints and intercessory prayers.

The former rite explicitly offered the forgiveness of sins, the new rite does not. Likewise, the Apostolic Blessing at the Hour of Death in the former rite included the remission of all the punishments due to sin; that is, the plenary indulgence, which expunged any time due in Purgatory. The new rite does not. The loss of grace through this mutilation can only be fathomed by those consigned to Purgatory due to its omission. I encourage the reader to compare the old rites side by side to better recognize how impoverished the new rites are in regards to conferring on the faithful the grace of heavenly intercession.

### **Part III: Lawlessness**

As we have explored the ways in which contemporary Catholics are now denied grace from many channels (heavenly intercession, prayer, sacramentals and devotionals) and thus left more vulnerable to sin and evil, now we will look at the ways in which this same “removal of restrainers” also carries over to the Church’s life of discipline. St. Paul, in the verse cited at this chapter’s beginning, wrote how the “removing of the restrainer” was tied in to the rise of “lawlessness.” The ways in which Catholics are weakened by lessening the reception of graces, so are they weakened by removing the strength gained by the Church’s proscribed life of discipline. Consider the following...

#### Source 1

The mystic St. Hildegard of Bingen described the Antichrist thus: “He will acquire for himself many peoples, telling them to do their own will and not restrain themselves by vigils or fasting. He will tell them that they need only love their God, whom he will pretend to be, and then they will be delivered from Hell and attain life. And they, being deceived, will say, ‘Oh, woe to the wretches who lived before these times! For they made their lives miserable with dire pains, not knowing, alas, the loving kindness of God!’”<sup>9</sup> [St. Hildegard attested that her visions and prophesies were not intuitive, but were a direct revelation by God, no different than speaking directly to another person].

From this source, we see that the antichrist will discourage discipline and self-control. Note also the air of modernism with derision for the past both in their piety and in their conception of God, with an unquestioned superiority of their own false notions. This has already been discussed in the context of Vatican II and does not need to be further explored here.

#### Source 2

Pope Pius X: He wrote of “The great movement of apostasy being organized in every country for the establishment of a One-World-Church which shall have neither dogmas, nor hierarchy, neither discipline for the mind, nor curb for the passions...”<sup>10</sup>

Some of the symptoms of apostasy are explored in other sections of this book, but for the purposes of this discussion please note:

- He is not theorizing; the apostasy *is* happening.
- The absence of discipline and self-control is one of the goals of those fostering this apostasy.

Why will the simple absence of discipline facilitate the great apostasy and be favorable to the antichrist? Because it will be yet another restrainer removed. Let us consider the benefits of fasting:

- St. Ambrose: The mystic table is obtained by fasting, is acquired at the price of hunger. To that venerable Table holy fasts lead us, by that hunger we purchase the things which are eternal.
- Pope St. Clement: “Fasting is better than prayer.”
- St. Augustine: “Fasting cleanses the soul, raises the mind, subjects one’s flesh to the spirit, renders the heart contrite and humble, scatters the cloud of concupiscence, quenches the fire of lust, kindles the true light of chastity.
- St. Thomas Aquinas: “Fasting is not contrary to the liberty of the faithful, but serves instead to impede the slavery to sin.”
- Pope St. Leo the Great: “By fasting we extinguish the concupiscence of the flesh.”

Likewise, Sacred Scripture gives numerous examples of, not only the value of fasting, but its necessity in contending with the evil one. Jesus fasted in the desert before being tempted by the Devil. Perhaps even more relevant is the occasion when His apostles were unable to cast out a demon. When they asked Jesus why this was so, He told them that some demons could only be cast out with prayer and fasting. Therefore, it is an obvious conclusion that the absence of fasting and other forms of discipline leaves us powerless in the face of certain evils. That is why those fostering apostasy seek to rid the Christians of this powerful defense, and this is why the antichrist will find people receptive to him.

Perhaps this is the sense in which St. Paul wrote of “The man of lawlessness.” In every period in history there have been people who broke the law and many places where barbarism and lawlessness were predominant. It is not unreasonable that this type of lawlessness is unique because it refers not to the breaking of laws, but rather the absence of laws. This was the reference of St. Pius X: the church of the apostasy will have no moral laws which one need obey, and the absence of laws of fasting and self-denial will prepare the faithful to accept this deception of the antichrist.

It has always been the law of the Church that the faithful arm themselves spiritually through the discipline of fasting in order to receive all of the graces and benefits already described. It stands to reason that the antichrist wants just the opposite, and so would have Christians unarmed and self-indulgent that they may be easily won over at his coming.

Prior to Vatican II, the Church enjoined the following fasts on her children:

- Complete abstinence (no meat or meat-based soups or gravy) on all Fridays, Ash Wednesday, the Vigils of the Assumption and Christmas, and on Holy Saturday.
- Partial abstinence (one meat dish with the principal meal) was observed on Ember Wednesdays and Saturdays, and on the Vigils of Pentecost and All Saints Day.
- No eating or drinking, except water, from midnight until the reception of Holy Communion.
- Fasting (One principal meal and two smaller meatless ones) was observed on the weekdays of Lent, Ember Days, the Vigils of Pentecost, Assumption, All Saints and Christmas.

[Ember days marked the beginning of each of the four seasons, and were definitively arranged and prescribed for the entire Church by Pope Gregory VII (1073 – 85). Their purpose was to thank God for the gifts of nature, to teach men to make use of them in moderation, and to assist the needy. The abandonment of this ancient observation is yet another sad example of the deliberate impoverishment of the Church's devotional life and the explicit attempt to sever every possible tie with the past].

St. Pius X had this to say about the dawning of an age of self-indulgence, in which asceticism was “at a discount in the modern world. For the old heroic motto ‘abstine et sustine,’ new slogans have been substituted, better suited to a generation that has lost its hold on spiritual ideals and sunk into the materialism of a neopagan world. Pleasure has become nowadays the supreme end of life; the one god deserving of adoration.” This “neopagan” world found that the line was drawn at the Church, where the laws of fasting remained in effect, and the graces procured were still received. Yet, as with all of the Church's others enemies, all neopaganism needed was a little patience; its triumph was soon at hand.

Now, consider the following from Pope Paul VI: “We are headed toward a period of greater freedom in the life of the Church, and, consequently, for each of her children. This freedom shall mean less legal obligations and less inner inhibitions. Formal discipline shall be softened, every arbitrariness abolished...Every intolerance and every absolutism shall similarly be abolished.”<sup>11</sup> *Every* absolutism; is it any wonder that twenty five years later a Pope would have to write an encyclical trying to convince even Christians that absolute moral truths exist? But, as St. Pius knew, to forsake discipline will lead to the forsaking of morality. The shallowness of the understanding of the spiritual life and basic human nature manifest in this statement defies description. Fasting, which even Jesus Himself observed for the fulfillment of His mission, is “intolerant” and an “absolutism?” Would any hedonist not agree with this estimation of self-discipline and self-denial?

Now, the only fast days are Ash Wednesday and Good Friday, while abstinence is only prescribed on the Fridays of Lent. Obviously, the loss of the far greater majority of these days has led to a commensurate loss in the graces of fasting described above, as well as that habitual self-control and mastery over our impulses that gives the Christian the moral strength to resist temptation. Our Lady of Fatima stated that more people go to hell for sins of the flesh than any other; and it is the Pope who declares that the “intolerant” defense against this fate will be surrendered, as he wants to help remove the “inner inhibitions” of Catholics. The restrainer has been removed, and the fact that the moral state (and standards) of modern Catholics differ little from their secular contemporaries bears obvious witness to the results, the results which Pope Pius X warned were desired by the authors of the ongoing apostasy.

“Therefore, take up the whole armor of God that you may withstand in the day of evil, and having done all, to stand” (Eph. 6:13). If it is with the *whole* armor of God that we *may* withstand, what is to become of the elect once that armor has been surrendered? The armor of the intercession of St. Michael and so many other saints has been surrendered; again, I would encourage the reader to do a comparative reading of the old and new missals to get a sense of how many instances there are of intercessory prayer being expunged, true to the protestant impetus of the Novus Ordo. The armor of grace received by the devout use of holy water and other blessed objects has been surrendered by defective rituals (such a blatant omission, on so consistent a basis at so high a level cannot be anything but deliberate). Likewise, the armor of fasting, by which we gain moral fortitude, self-control, the remission of sins,



power to overcome evil, and the mastery of sensuality has been surrendered. The Pope who stripped the faithful of so much armor regarded it as “arbitrary” and “intolerant;” indeed, it was holy armor intolerant of the forces within and without us seeking to lead us to ruin. By order of The Vicar of Christ, the restrainers are removed. It was not the only way in which the elect would be weakened and unprotected.

---

<sup>1</sup> Amerio, p. 180.

<sup>2</sup> Paul VI, Pope. “Ministeria Quaedam.” Vatican City: Aug. 15, 1972.

<sup>3</sup> Benedict, St. “Rule for Monks,” Chapter 18.

<sup>4</sup> Moriarity, Right Rev. Dr. “The Life and Revelations of St. Gertrude, Virgin and Abbess. London: Burns & Oates, Ltd., p. 210.

<sup>5</sup> Catherine of Siena, St. “Dialogue on Divine Providence.” Trans. By Suzanne Noffke, O.P. Mahwah, N.Y.: Paulist Press, 1980, p. 126.

<sup>6</sup> Wiltgen, p. 42.

<sup>7</sup> Second Vatican Council. “Presbyterorum Ordinis.” Vatican City: Dec. 7, 1965, Ch 2, no. 5.

<sup>8</sup> Ripley, Canon Francis. “This Is the Faith.” Rockford IL: Tan Books and Publishers, reprinted in 1999.

<sup>9</sup> Hildegard of Bingen, p. 504.

<sup>10</sup> Pius X, Pope St. “Notre Charge Apostolique,” Vatican City: Aug. 15, 1910.

<sup>11</sup> Paul VI, Pope. General Audience of June 9, 1969.

## Chapter XVII

### **“Love Will Turn to Hate”**

The title of this chapter is an enigmatic phrase found in the Didache (The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles), a first century Christian writing. It never achieved canonical status, but was among those books proposed for inclusion in the New Testament. It describes the symptoms of the end of time, the fact that “love will turn to hate” numbering among them. This phrase has always struck me as curious. It would not merely be a question of the world becoming hateful, that has always happened, or even love growing cold, as Jesus said would precede the end. My thought has always been that it refers to a phenomena by which what people genuinely believe to be love will in fact be hate. Whether or not I am correct in the original intent of the Didache, this is a reality Jesus Himself confirmed, saying, “a day will come when they will kill you and think they are serving God” (John 16:2). People who thought they were loving Christ would, in fact, be doing just the opposite. As “God is love,” to confuse love with hate would be the ultimate apostasy, the complete contradiction of the very essence of God. In this manner people who believe to be serving Christ will instead by serving the antichrist.

Historically, it is a bitter irony that “humanitarian” regimes are responsible for the greatest mass murder of humans. There is a reason that love of God precedes love of neighbor in the Great Commandment: not only is God greater and deserving to be our first love, but it is only in loving God that we will truly understand what it means to love our neighbor. We do not need to think in terms of the Communist menace to demonstrate the tragic end of godless humanitarianism; it is in our own neighborhoods. How many parents scar and stunt their children for life, if not ruin them altogether, by their poor parenting, even as they genuinely thought they were doing right by them? People, so-called Catholics among them, think they are being loving parents by giving their teenage children alcohol, putting their daughters on the pill, and bringing them to church twice a year. What we think is love can be hate and what we imagine to be life can end in death when we live according to a humanism that circumvents the primacy of God.

Religiously it is no different. We have already demonstrated by the Council’s own words that it promulgated a humanism not rooted in the love of God, but simply in “man as man,” as manifested by their rewriting of “The Great Commandment.” Where has this “humanism” brought us? Fewer and fewer humans believe the Faith, practice the Faith, die in the Faith; this is not love. More and more humans pay to have their own children aborted, are professed atheists, and both come from and create broken families. These are the “fruits” of the Masonic humanitarianism upon which the West is built, and into which the Church wants to engraft herself. This is not love; true humanitarianism, true love of humanity means wanting each and every human to know and love God – as He truly is, not however you want to imagine Him to be – to believe His Truth, receive His sacraments and live in His grace. To possess these things and yet conceal them from humanity or deny their importance is to hate humanity,

not promote it. Love of humanity would have compelled the Church to spare those nations about to be annihilated by obeying our Lady's message at Fatima. I do not believe the millions of victims of the Church's new-found humanitarianism felt loved from Siberian gulags and their early graves by the fact that the Church of the "new humanity" withheld the means by which they, their nations and their children would have been spared and instead lived in Mary's promised era of peace. Nor do I believe aborted babies feel "loved" from beyond (I can't even write beyond the grave, as they were denied even this mark of human dignity), as the people who legislated their murder are still honored by the Church and given Holy Communion and Christian burials; two things they never had the privilege of receiving.

I have already made reference to the same exchange between Jesus and Peter which Fr. Micelli commented upon thus: "Peter had attempted to dissuade Christ from accepting the passion and death awaiting Him. Certainly, subjectively, Peter thought he was advising Christ in kindness, sympathy and love, hoping to save Him from that terrible fate. Peter never saw himself as doing Satan's work."<sup>1</sup> Likewise, this is applicable to the current Apostasy. The work of Satan is being done by those within the Church; what they believe to be love is hate, as it comes from the Author of Hate and is a scandal to the Author of Love. My own assertions about the meaning of the Didache aside, Sr. Lucy, relating what she was told by The Blessed Mother, described this very state of affairs.

"Diabolical disorientation" is the now famous phrase Sr. Lucy employed to describe the Church's current woes. In the early 1970's she was able to write to two of her nephews who were priests, and her explicit phrases refer to churchmen "being fooled by false doctrine." She referred to "priests and consecrated souls" who "are so deceived and misled" because "the devil has succeeded in infiltrating evil under cover of good...leading into error and deceiving souls having a heavy responsibility through the place they occupy...They are blind men guiding other blind men..."<sup>2</sup> Likewise, the message of LaSalette foretells an apostasy due to the neglect and malice of shepherds, culminating in Rome losing the faith "and becoming the seat of the antichrist." While a person's culpability can certainly be mitigated by his intention, to the victim, the lack of intention does nothing to make the consequences any less real or any less destructive.

In fact, this is the thread that runs through all of the symptoms of apostasy in this book. This chapter, seeking to demonstrate how the Vatican II Church's understanding of love is anything but, only amounts to a recapitulation of all that has preceded. The two greatest loves are the glory of God and the salvation of souls. The Vatican II program has denied God glory by debasing the Sacred Rites of the Church, fostering religious indifferentism in an affront to His truth, denying the need to accept The Son of God for salvation, placing the work of men as equal to His by putting their churches on the same level (or above) His Church, advocating a civil society separate from His laws, in short, by seeking to empty His Cross of its meaning. Likewise, the perpetual message we offer to the world is an effort to deny them the knowledge and grace necessary for salvation, by refusing to challenge their errors, withholding from them the fullness of the Gospel, indulging them in the delusion that they are actually priests invested with sacramental authority, and offering repeatedly, *explicit assurances that they have no need of Christ and his Church*. This is not love, even as the churchmen who behave in such a way are quite convinced

that they are superior to their predecessors who believed, acted and spoke in the exact opposite way. Which group truly loves, and which is deceived?

### Who loves God?

The one who promotes knowledge of Him or the one who placates and even commends ignorance of Him? Is it the one who dedicates, even sacrifices his life, that the fruits of the Sacrifice of Christ may reach as many souls as possible, or the one who denies a person's need to have knowledge of God's supreme act of love? St. Paul wrote that whoever receives Holy Communion unworthily "is guilty of profaning the Body and Blood of the Lord." Is the one who loves God the one who does everything in his power to prevent this, [the pre-Vatican II Church], or the one who sits idly by as it happens millions of times over, and even promotes it [post-Vatican II Church]?

### Who loves his neighbor?

"For when the pastor refuses to rebuke those that sin, there is no doubt that in holding his peace *he slays them*" (Gregory the Great)<sup>3</sup>. "For in failing to speak out against the evil of those in your company, you are certainly not rejecting evil. Rather, you are kissing it" (St. Hildegard to Pope Anastasius)<sup>4</sup>. Does a doctor love his patient when, upon realizing he has advanced pancreatic cancer, only compliments his healthy skin tone and sends him on his way? Does a wealthy man love a poor man when, seeing him decimated by starvation, commends his steady water supply and offers him nothing from his warehouse of food? Likewise, does the Vicar of Christ or anyone else love a man who thinks he is a bishop, advocates the murder of the unborn, simulates the forgiveness of sins, promotes legitimizing sodomy, and instead of offering a word of reproof offers signs of honor and acts of acquiescence? Are Catholics loving non-Catholics when, possessing the unsurpassable treasures of the Body and Blood of Christ and the forgiveness of our sins, we assure those who lack these that they remain nonetheless "means of salvation" that are "positively willed by God?" Do we love God when we make no effort to extend these treasures, bought at the price of His own life, and insist there is no true distinction, eternal or otherwise, between having and lacking them?

Pius XII, like his predecessors, understood true love. "Love rejoices in the truth (1 Cor. 13:6)," and so he wanted that truth taught to his neighbors, for the glory of God and the salvation of their souls. "We must grieve that by no means a few of these, the more firmly they cling to the word of God, that much more diminish human reason; and the more they exalt the authority of God who reveals, the more sharply they spurn the magisterium of the Church, instituted by Christ the Lord to guard and interpret the truths revealed by God. This indeed is not only in open contradiction of Sacred Scripture, but is proved false from actual experience. Often the very ones who disagree with the true Church openly complain about their own discord in matters of dogma, so that they unwillingly confess to the necessity of the living magisterium."<sup>5</sup>

How different in tone is Pius' lament from the superficial affirmations of indifferentism. He "grieves" that people who love Christ nonetheless reject what is essential, rather than glibly dismissing it as paltry in light of what unites them. The fullness of truth that flows from love is clearly contradictory to the

“lowest common denominator” sought by ecumenism. It is no small irony that St. Augustine would have been rebuked by the Vatican for his “outdated ecclesiology” in his letter to Donatus: “Indeed, as long as you remain outside the Church and severed from the fabric of unity and the bond of charity, you would be punished with everlasting chastisement, even if you were burned alive for Christ’s sake.”<sup>6</sup>

Evangelization was the measure of the Catholic Church’s love for those who did not possess the fullness of grace and the Gospel. Indifferentism is the Vatican II Church’s substitute for this act of love and it is, in fact, an act of hate. In light of what the Church has always taught to be necessary for salvation, possessing all of these things and yet convincing others they don’t need them, in favor of focusing only on what unites us, amounts to saying, quite literally, “go to hell.” This is not hyperbole, but a reiteration of St. Pius X’s definition of ecumenism: “Charity without Faith, quite soft on misbelievers, which opens up to anyone, unfortunately, *the road to eternal ruin*.”<sup>7</sup> This is the diabolical disorientation which St. Hildegard prophesied would be promulgated by the antichrist: “He will declare the road to Hell is the way to Heaven.”

In a twisted, diabolically disoriented way, this is precisely the hateful “false love” embodied in both intercommunion and the near total silence regarding Catholics receiving Communion in an unworthy state. The Church’s requirements for Communion were always the same as those for eternal life; incorporation into the Catholic Church, believing all she taught, obeying her rightful authority, and being in a state of grace. Not admitting a person was an act of love; it was forcing them to recognize that, given their current state, they do not possess good hope of eternal salvation. To nonetheless admit such a person to Holy Communion amounts to dulling their mind to their true state, removing the impetus for conversion, and creating complacency, even self-satisfaction, in their inadequate state. We are imputing to them the guilt told by St. Paul, of “profaning the Body and Blood of the Lord” and we are consigning them to the recompense of “eating and drinking condemnation upon themselves” (1 Cor 11:27ff). This is hate. However, leaving people in their sins was a part of Vatican II’s “civilization of love” in other ways as well.

#### Who loves the erring?

In Roman Catholicism, it was the person who sought to free them from that error. “He who winks at a fault causes trouble, but he who frankly reproves promotes peace” (Proverbs 10:10). Pius XII likewise understood that those who possessed truth could only love the erring by trying to bring them to it, rather than concealing it from them: “Indeed, Catholic theologians and philosophers, upon whom falls the serious duty of protecting divine and human truth, and of inculcating these in the minds of men, may not ignore or neglect these opinions which more or less stray from the right road. Moreover, they should thoroughly examine these opinions, because diseases cannot be cured unless they have been rightly diagnosed.”<sup>8</sup> Quite a contrast from Pope John, who thought diseases should be shown mercy by being left alone, while Pius was more concerned for the health of the person bearing the disease than the cheap popularity gained by silence. Which is love and which is hate?

Pope John believed that leaving people in their errors, and giving those errors free reign, was an act of love, and he all but explicitly congratulated himself on being more “merciful” than his “severe” predecessor. Likewise, Paul VI gave voice to his relativism in 1958, while Archbishop of Milan: “The boundaries of orthodoxy do not coincide with those of pastoral charity,”<sup>9</sup> thus declaring tolerance of falsehood both pastoral and charitable (as he would demonstrate by abolishing the index). Yet, as St. Paul related in his famous discourse, “love rejoices in the truth,” so, can it at all be considered love to be content with error and renounce your responsibility to protect the faithful from it and seek to recall to truth the one who errs?

Who loves Muslims and other non-believers? Is it St. Catherine, who wanted to claim “the souls of unbelievers,” referring to them (specifically Muslims) as “our brothers and sisters, ransomed by Christ’s blood,” longing to “take their souls from the hands of the devil and of their own unbelief,” or is it John Paul, who apologized for Catherine’s zeal, instead assuring those who reject Christ and persecute Christians that they are on the right path as we worship the same God?

#### Who loves the sinner?

Reproving the sinner is one of the Church’s seven works of mercy; yet, in vain will you seek it in the Catechism of the Vatican II Church. Incredibly, it has been omitted in accord with the liberalized Church in which modernity has triumphed. This is hate; this is the Church of Vatican II, where errors flow freely uncorrected, and sinners run amok unchallenged. It would be truly comical if the reality manifested were not so tragic. Not only is “reproving the sinner” expunged from the “Spiritual Works of Mercy,” the ones that remain have been mutilated by a type of shorthand quite curious in so verbose a book. While the corporal works list the objects of the actions (feeding *the hungry*, e.g.), the already truncated list of spiritual works only contains the verb, not the corresponding recipient of the action. In the Church of “positive thinking” not only can we not suggest that there might be a sinner in need of reproving, but to suggest that someone may be “ignorant” might imply my truth is better than theirs, and suggesting that someone is “doubting” may mean that I actually think there is an objective truth to which they must adhere. (Also removed from the works of mercy is praying for the living and the dead: in the Church of universal salvation, the latter is no longer needed, and including the former may have made the omission all the more apparent).

#### Who loves the sheep?

The one who fulfills their duty to teach them the truth, or the one who allows them to be warped by a heretic in praise of the liberal virtue of “academic freedom?” Is it the one who teaches them the truth about Heaven and Hell and how narrow the road to eternal life is, or the one who insists that regardless of what they do or believe Heaven is guaranteed? Is it the one who lets the wolves know that they are not welcomed in the sheepfold and that the shepherd will use all the means at his disposal to protect his sheep from them, or the one who shows “mercy” to the wolf and gives him a bill of free passage into the sheepfold, not only failing to protect his sheep, but willfully feeding them to the wolf? Who is the true

“alter Christus?” Is it the “severe” Pius XII and all that he represents, or the “merciful” John XXIII and all that he unleashed? The answer can’t be both; they are mutually exclusive, as each of them well knew.

St. Catherine of Siena wrote to Pope Gregory XI: “A shepherd such as this is really a hireling! Not only does he fail to rescue his little sheep from the clutches of the wolf, he devours them himself! And all because he loves himself apart from God...How dangerous then, for oneself and for others, is this perverted love!”<sup>10</sup> Indeed, so perverted it is in fact hate. Yet, Catherine wrote of the potential pitfall true of every shepherd at all times due to the weakness of human nature, its inclination towards self love and disinclination towards unpleasant tasks. With the Vatican II Church, it is an explicit program. St. Catherine warned a Pope that this false love is rooted in a self-love removed from the love of God, just as the Vatican II apparatus has sought to love humanity apart from God, as revealed in the “re-writing” of the Great Commandment. What Catherine warned of in microcosm as a possible failing common to the individual shepherd the apostasy has advocated in macrocosm, taking positive steps to leave the sheep vulnerable and insisting that those outside the fold are in no need of entry. So St. Catherine likewise wrote, “My unhappy soul!...Their love is mercenary. They love themselves selfishly. They love God selfishly. They love their neighbors selfishly. So pervasive is this perverse love it really ought to be called *mortal hatred* because death is its effect – I say it weeping!”<sup>11</sup>

### Carla Brucia and “The Civilization of Love”

Carla Brucia was an eleven year old girl whose abduction, recorded on the surveillance camera of a nearby carwash, was rebroadcast nationally around the clock. After being raped, she was murdered and her body was later discovered. Her killer, Joseph Smith, had been previously arrested an incredible *thirteen times*. In the past he had been charged with kidnapping and false imprisonment. A month before killing Carla he violated his probation, but was not sent back to prison. The same judge who handled that complaint did, however, give a man a year in prison for abusing an animal.

This is liberalism; people who believe they are “humanitarians” allow the guilty to run free, and the innocent are the guinea pigs for their experiment. After thirteen arrests, liberalism secured the freedom of Smith so that he could create more victims. Yes, there was a considerable expression of outrage on Carla’s behalf, but nothing changed. Liberals don’t care about the innocent victims of their “humanitarianism,” their concern is to protect the “rights” of evil; the good can fend for themselves.

This same mentality translates into the “Civilization of Love,” the Church’s endeavor at a liberal Utopia, promoted incessantly by Pope John Paul. Exactly what definition of “love” this civilization would be built upon, or whose laws would govern it, is anybody’s guess; he never gave a very profound analysis, as none is possible for so vapid a term. The only thing that was clear is that it was not the Catholic civilization that had forged the West, rather a Masonic type enterprise built on their insincere pretense of “love and fraternity,” of precisely the variety condemned by St. Pius X, who was wise enough to know it would actually amount to tyranny and enslavement. John Paul professed the Church’s willingness to

dissolve into such an enterprise, by stating that the Church's unity was subject to an even *greater unity*, that of all mankind,<sup>12</sup> a unity that could only be achieved if the Church denied her very essence, as he explicitly wrote the Council had done. In Catholicism, the greatest unity to be sought for mankind, the one true love labored for, was unity in the One Church of Christ, the Harbor of Salvation.

This warped sense of love and the displaced compassion of liberalism can be seen in the Church's recent, increasingly vocal opposition to the death penalty. "The Great Façade" offers an analysis of how John Paul both exceeded his rightful authority in respect to objective doctrine, and misunderstood the subjective context which he sought to address. However, my only concern here is a matter of emphasis and the hypocritical nature of liberal "humanism," even though liberals do a fine job of concealing this from themselves.

A hallmark of liberalism is its warped sense of compassion that seeks for the rights of the guilty (even rights they don't genuinely have), as it maintains a silent indifference for the legitimate rights of the innocent. I simply cannot count the number of times I have heard from popes, churchmen, religious, diocesan papers, people in the pews, and any of countless rallies, people advocating for the end of the death penalty. *Not once in my life*, in any context, have I heard of a Pope (post-Vatican II) or any single bishop, group, or wing of the Church calling for laws that protect the Carla Brucia's of the world. There may be a generic call to "end the violence," yet never a mention of who those violent people are; people with a history of violence set free by liberal "humanitarianism." If she, like her killer, had been a murderer and a criminal, sitting on death row for her crimes, from the Vatican to her local bishop to every pedantic school teacher in her diocese, people would have cried out in sanctimonious hypocrisy on her behalf. Instead, she is just another raped, murdered, eleven year old victim of liberalism. Many individual Catholics were outraged and prayed on her behalf, but no formal group within the Church will ever hold a rally to effect legislation on her behalf; that act of "love" is reserved for the Mr. Smiths of the world. If you so desired, you could find countless photographs of Catholic prelates and organizations walking behind their placard or banner which reads: "End the Death Penalty." If you find one that reads: "Stop Paroling Rapists and Killers," please let me know. The central point in all of this, however, is not specifically about the death penalty; it is about an attitude, priorities, a warped sense of love and a sick sense of compassion, wrapped in a mantle of self-satisfaction, which leaves the innocent helpless and the malicious at liberty. This is liberalism, this is modernity, this is the Great Apostasy, and it plays itself out day after day in a thousand ways in the Church of Vatican II...

---

<sup>1</sup> Micelli, p. 147.

<sup>2</sup> Kramer, p. 34.

<sup>3</sup> Gregory the Great, Pope St. Epistle XXI to the Bishop Venantius. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. XII. Grand Rapids: WM. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1997.

<sup>4</sup> Hildegard of Bingen: "Letters of Hildegard of Bingen, Vol I." Trans. By Joseph Baird & Radd Ehrman. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994, p. 42.

<sup>5</sup> Pius XII, Pope. Encyclical Letter "Humani Generis." Vatican City: Aug. 12, 1950. Cited in Denzinger, 2307.

<sup>6</sup> Augustine, St. Epistle CLXXIII, To Donatus. Cited in The Loeb Classical Library, Ed. By T.E. Page. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1930, p. 293.

<sup>7</sup> Villa, "Paul VI," p. 79.



---

<sup>8</sup> Pius XII, Pope. Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Villa, Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Caterina da Siena, St. "Le Lettere." Milano: Figlie Di S. Paolo, 1987, no. 185.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., Ad Angelo da Ricasoli, vescovo di Fiorenza.

<sup>12</sup> John Paul II, Pope. Angelus of Jan. 17, 1982.

## Chapter XVIII

### “I Will Not Lead”

*“In this supreme moment of need of the Church, the one who should speak will fall silent.” -Our Lady of Good Success*

In a previous section some thoughts were presented as to how the faithful may be rendered more susceptible to the final deception which will bring about the final apostasy. As we looked at the means of grace, the benefits that the faithful receive through them, and the peril we face once denied them, we now will look at the human means of protection which have also been surrendered. As the Vatican II Church has withheld from the faithful the protection of many avenues of grace, she has also failed to protect the faithful in a more direct manner by abdicating her sacred duty, as shepherd and teacher, to instruct and protect the flock. As Cardinal Seper observed, “The crisis in the Church is a crisis of bishops.”<sup>1</sup>

Satan’s declaration when he revolted against God was, “I will not serve!” It would seem that the contrary assertion, “I will not lead!” has become a type of mandate for the Vatican II apparatus. Yet, while contrary on the surface, these two statements amount to the same sentiment, as leading and protecting are precisely among the services which the shepherds of the Church owe to the faithful.

#### Sources:

- “The Chiefs, the leaders of the people of God have neglected prayer and penance, and the devil has bedimmed their intelligence.” – Our Lady of LaSalette  
( Note that it is the removing of the spiritual defenses discussed in the preceding section that have given the devil entryway into the mind).
- Cardinal Mario Luigi Cappi, Pope John Paul II’s personal papal theologian, in a personal correspondence to a professor Baumgartner in Salzburg, stated that part of the third secret of Fatima was that “The great apostasy in the Church will begin at the top.”
- Pius X wrote that an element of the current apostasy was the desire for a Church without a hierarchy. The Great Apostasy would entail that the hierarchy itself agreed, and sought to deny its essence as teacher and guardian and its duty to correct, reprove and protect.

Leadership has oftentimes been poor or lacking in the many segments of the Church, including the highest, throughout the course of history. Yet, what makes the current dearth of leadership unique is that it is not only a question of weakness, neglect, or even sinful self-interest: rather, it is a matter of policy. It is a deliberately chosen course of action, or non-action, that is supposed to be a sign of the “New Springtime,” but is, in reality, a preparation for the final falling away. The beginning of the Council is likewise the beginning of our discussion:

#### John XXIII’s opening speech at Vatican II

While stating that the Church would still oppose error, Pope John said, “she prefers today to make use of the medicine of mercy, rather than the arms of severity.” The Church will now resist errors, “by showing the validity of her teaching rather than by issuing condemnations.”<sup>2</sup>

- The condemnation of error is itself an act of mercy: both to the one in error, and to those who risk being infected by it. This is why, among the “Spiritual Works of Mercy” the Church has always, until Vatican II, listed correcting the erring and reproving the sinner. An item of remedial catechesis such as this, in the context of an ecumenical council, from the lips of the Pope is indeed a fulfillment of the prophecy of LaSalette.
- This is indicative of both relativism and indifferentism, two other symptoms of the apostasy. The Pope is stating that the Church will now simply set her truth side by side with error (uncondemned error), and leave the faithful to figure it out. This also implies that error has the same rights as truth, that is, to be disseminated unimpeded.
- The Pope stated that the Church would treat errors with mercy. An error cannot be the object of mercy; only the person in error can be so. Again, failure to grasp a very rudimentary concept.
- Liberal incoherence: There was one writer condemned and silenced by John: Sister Lucia, writing on behalf of the Mother of God. John had no trouble silencing the Blessed Virgin Mary, who instructed that the message be revealed to the world in 1960. True to the title of this section, John demonstrated an Orwellian style of “leadership.” The wolves could now run free, but the Mother of God, who came to protect the faithful from those wolves, was consigned to a vault deep in the Vatican archives.

To even further exasperate this incoherency, it was compounded by blatant injustice. As writers silenced by Pope Pius as dangers to the faith were now freed by the mercy of “Good Pope John” and invited to participate in the council, John’s mercy seems to have been randomly applied. Many in the Church, like John, began to discredit the nun and call into question her honesty in the matter. They were all free to write anything they liked; John’s police of “mercy towards error” applied to the detraction and slander of anyone who cared to opine on the events of Fatima and even the character of the seer, but Lucia herself was silenced by the Vatican and unable to defend herself. John’s “mercy” towards opinions of all kinds was akin to Pope Paul’s “openness” to all comers: it only extended in one direction. In a similar vein, John’s unjust persecution of Padre Pio will be detailed later.

### The renunciation of authority

In explaining his decision to no longer identify error and correct those responsible for it, Pope John explained that these people were about to abandon their errors anyway [manifesting both a naïve utopianism and a dimming of the intelligence]. For this reason, the Church’s role as “Mother and Teacher” was no longer necessary, and formally abandoned. This abandonment expressed itself most concretely in the dissolving of The Holy Office.

This renunciation of authority was also manifested in John’s refusal to obey The Blessed Virgin regarding the secret of Fatima. In explaining this act of defiance, the Vatican stated that the magisterium “does not want to take upon itself the responsibility” of confirming the veracity of the third secret. Then whose responsibility is it? Thus, the magisterium refuses to carry out its duty, even regarding something so apocalyptic as the message of Fatima. However, true to liberal incoherence, their desire to “not meddle” in the affair was arbitrary, as the Vatican had no problem rediscovering its authority in its unjust silencing and persecution of Sr. Lucy.

Pope Paul was so eager to distance himself from the duties intrinsic to his office that he explicitly stated that in his encyclical “*Ecclesiam Suam*” he did not “propose to make this encyclical a solemn proclamation of Catholic doctrine or of moral or social principles,” but merely “to send you a sincere message, as between brothers and members of a common family.”<sup>3</sup> Even in an encyclical, we find a pope regarding himself as equal to his audience with no intention of imposing a teaching, and apparently disbelieving he has the authority to do so in the first place.

Even more telling of his loss of conviction about the authority of his own office were Paul’s words upon the promulgation of his profession of faith: “We are about to make a profession of faith, and we are about to repeat the formula that begins with the word “Creed,” which, without being a dogmatic definition in the strict sense of the word...”<sup>4</sup> Hence, even a profession of faith has to be preceded by a disclaimer about its unbinding nature; it is more of a suggestion.

### Vatican II and the Index of Prohibited Books:

The Church has always treated with due gravity the responsibility of protecting the flock from heretical writings. Pope St. Gelasius (492 – 96) wrote in his decretal, “Things which have been written or published by heretics or schismatics, the Catholic and Apostolic Church in nowise receives.”<sup>5</sup> This duty became more codified over the centuries, until a curial office at the Vatican was formed for this sole purpose. As St. Pius X wrote, the office in the Curia responsible for the index of forbidden books had as its purpose, “to remind bishops of their sacred duty to combat the publication of pernicious writings.”<sup>6</sup> Apparently, Pope John and the Council deemed it “sacred duty” whose time had past. Now, “nothing is sacred,” not even the duty of protecting the faithful from errors. Hence, Vatican II abolished this special section of the Sacred Congregation.

This renunciation of leadership was continued by Pope Paul VI. He abrogated the Canons (1399 & 2318) prohibiting books and censuring authors of immoral books supporting false doctrines. His decree stated that those in violation of these Canons “are absolved by effect of the abrogation of the said Canons.”<sup>7</sup>

- As St. Pius X wrote, modernity is the synthesis of all heresies. This act by Paul was its triumph within the Church. In this single statement we see the synthesis of the renunciation of the sacred duty to protect the faithful from error, the renunciation of the work of mercy which mandates that the shepherd warn those who are in error, and the promotion and blessing of indifferentism and relativism.
- Writers who held and promulgated immoral books and false doctrines, with neither repentance nor the retraction of their errors, now find themselves “absolved,” and relativism is consecrated.
- As one scholar rightly noted, “Paul VI, by abrogating all instruments of control over ecclesial writers and any accountability on their part gave sanction to heresy, ended the rule of law [another sign of the great apostasy] and ecclesial authority, and gave full rights of citizenship to error.”<sup>8</sup>
- This is another example of the Orwellian Papacy of the Vatican II Church; renouncing an authority that is his sacred duty while consigning to himself a power he does not possess. It was St. Anthelm (d. 1178) who chastised Pope Alexander III when he took it upon himself to raise the excommunication which Anthelm had placed upon Humbert III, the Count of Maurienne.

The saint had to explain to the Pope that he was acting ‘Ultra Vires,’ beyond his power, as St. Peter himself would not have the authority to release the impenitent from censure.

In abdicating its sacred duty and giving error a “right of free passage” into the Church by cancelling the Index of Banned Books, it was explained by Cardinal Ottaviani that the Council “has acknowledged to the secular a greater maturity and higher responsibilities in the Church.”<sup>9</sup>

- Again, the renunciation of the authority and duty to protect are apparent. It is now for the layman to figure it out with the “greater maturity” he allegedly possesses.
- The dimming of the intellect: How is it that a Council can bestow maturity on a person? Maturity is acquired by an individual, not conferred by a written document.
- The presumed superiority to the past is apparent, as the contemporary Catholic is deemed more responsible and able to detect the errors which his unenlightened predecessors had relied upon his superiors to warn him about.
- The deliberate weakening of the hierarchy is also manifest: the layman can now do it himself, hence, the Church’s role as teacher and shepherd is unnecessary, true to the protestant principles to which Vatican II sought to conform the Church.
- Our Lady of LaSalette foretold this moment: “Evil books will be abundant on earth and the spirits of darkness will spread everywhere a universal slackening in all that concerns the service of God.” It is precisely this slackening of service by the magisterium that gave these evil books the sanction of law within the Church and her schools and seminaries.

Finally, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith had this to say about the cancellation of the Index: “The index no longer carries the force of ecclesiastical law with the censures associated with it. The Church has confidence in the mature conscience of the faithful.” In short, today’s supposedly more mature, more intelligent Catholic will “just know” when something is wrong. Less than forty years later, these Catholics who were supposed to “just know” when something was false, by the millions would be devouring the “Left Behind” series and reading “The DaVinci Code,” giving them the force of Sacred Scripture, and questioning their own Faith (if they ever even knew what their own Church taught in the first place) over their contents. The dimming of the intelligence is obvious in that original assertion, and the resulting loss of countless souls shows whom that mentality was serving. “What death of the soul is worse than freedom for error?”<sup>10</sup>

#### The Logical Digression – From errors being tolerated to errors being rewarded:

The preceding is only one example of how the Vatican II Church, by way of predetermined policy, renounced its responsibility to lead and protect the faithful. The obvious slippery-slope of the “mercy towards error” policy had begun, and continues unchecked to our own time. First, those same heretical writers who once would have been censured by the Church’s leadership find that those same leaders have abdicated their responsibilities and that they can roam free. Soon, they themselves would be the leaders, as people once censured in the Catholic Church for the sake of the sheep are now set up as shepherds over the sheep. Here are but a few examples:

- Cardinal Avery Dulles: He was truly an icon for the Church's decline into indifferentism and an example of how far from her true essence she had drifted. Once regarded as suspect and modernist, by the end of his life he came to be regarded as a standard-bearer for orthodoxy. Yet, he himself never changed; it was the Church that changed to accommodate his school of thought. As a writer, he produced a painfully insipid book, "Models of the Church." It was quite banal, but widely popular because it was anti-Roman, anti-authority. As a prominent liberal theologian, Dulles tried to subvert the Church's authority by proposing a "second magisterium," composed of theologians, to counter the Divine magisterium of the Pope and bishops in communion with him. Of course, in Fr. Dulles' "second magisterium," there would only be room for fellow liberals. During his first trip to the United States, Pope John Paul II actually condemned this notion in a sermon, stating "there is no second magisterium." Such a move was quite unusual in the post Vatican II Church, yet...

Many years later John Paul must have reconsidered his position, as he elevated Fr. Dulles to the Sacred College of Cardinals. The incoherence of this can only leave the few faithful Catholics who remain apoplectic. The same Pope who had to speak out against an error, an error intent on undermining his own office, later used his office to honor the very man who promulgated the error (having never retracted it). This is the post Vatican II Church's message to all heretics and rebels, from Luther to Dulles, "hold your ground, and we will give in eventually. Just give the diabolical disorientation more time to destroy, and your triumph will soon come."

- John Paul also elevated to the Sacred College Hans Urs von Balthasar (who died before the ceremony took place). Upon receiving the "Premio Paolo VI" he stated, "Hell exists, but it is empty." Does this mean he thought the Devil and his demons were likewise in Heaven? No, he had no thoughts on the subject at all; when asked if the Devil were a reality or a possibility, he said, "I have no answer; I don't know!"<sup>11</sup>
- Another modernist theologian elevated to the College of Cardinals by John Paul was Yves Congar. He was quite public about the protestant hermeneutic of his theology: "The aim is to skip thirteen centuries." Mr. Amerio summarizes his modernist contempt for the Church's past: "Fr. Congar repeatedly states that the Church of Pius IX and Pius XII is finished. As if it were Catholic to talk about the Church of this or that pope, or the Church of Vatican II, instead of the universal and eternal Church at Vatican II!"<sup>12</sup>

He gave voice to his indifferentism (and anti-Catholicism) by estimating Martin Luther as "one of the greatest religious in all of history. In this regard I put him on the same level as St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas or Paschal...In a certain sense, he is even greater. He has rethought all of Christianity. Luther was a man of the Church!" Blaspheming the Mass (hence, Christ, His Sacrifice, and His Presence) as "scum and vermin" now qualify as religious genius, and those who admire him now qualify as "Princes of the Church."

- Pope John Paul conferred the honor of Cardinal, along with a Vatican post, upon yet another manifest heretic, Walter Kasper. He is overt in his disbelief in the miracles of Jesus, the historicity of the Gospel, and the doctrines of faith attached to those events. In his own writings, we read of miracles being "a problem, which makes Jesus' activity strange and difficult for modern man to understand...These non-historical stories are statements of belief in the salvific meaning of the person and message of Jesus."<sup>13</sup> He also offered this blasphemous insight on the miracles of Jesus: "They can be interpreted even as the work of a demon. In themselves, then,

they are not so clear and do not necessarily constitute proof of the divinity of Jesus.” This is found in his book “Gesù, Il Cristo,” p. 129, and hence he is formally excommunicated by the Canons of Vatican I. He goes on to opine that Jesus never claimed He was the Messiah, and that early Christians in no way believed this. “The doctrine of Jesus’ divinity and humanity constitutes a development of the original conviction that this man is our divine salvation.” The salvation is divine, but the savior is just a man. He referred to the confession of “Jesus Christ, Son of God” as “the residue of a mythic mentality, passively accepted.” Not even the Resurrection is an historical fact to the flagrant apostate. “The empty tomb represents an ambiguous phenomenon, open to different possibilities of interpretation.” Showing his contempt for the faith of two-thousand years worth of Christians, he wrote of a “grossly erroneous type of assertion that Jesus was touched by their hands and ate at the table with his disciples” as being a belief that “runs the risk of justifying a too coarse Paschal faith.”<sup>14</sup>

In so honoring this unabashed apostate, Pope John Paul advanced the current of apostasy in a number of ways:

- Religious indifferentism: True to the Church watering herself down so as to accommodate her dissolution into a one world Church, in the Church under John Paul both those who believe in the Resurrection and deny it can live side by side, both being equally honored.
  - “I Will Not Lead:” During any papacy before 1958, such a man would have been censured, issued the severest of warnings, and excommunicated if he did not retract his errors and make a profession of faith. In the Church of relativism, he is honored as “Prince of the Church,” even while openly declaring himself a prince of apostasy.
  - Universal salvation: Can the Pope in anyway whatsoever be fearful of his judgment and the accounting he will give for his actions in the supreme office when he empowers an apostate to further undermine the faith?
  - The Incoherence of Liberalism: John Paul devoted a number of his Wednesday audiences to teaching against modernist attacks on the historicity of the Gospels; now, he bestows the Church’s second-highest honor on a heretic who directly contradicts him.
  - The Papacy attacking itself: Kasper would go on to use his office to undermine the authority of the very Pope who gave it to him. This should not have come as a surprise to the Pope, as Kasper also spoke against the doctrine of Apostolic Succession.<sup>15</sup>
  - Moral Relativism: John Paul had to intervene directly when, as a bishop in Germany, Kasper denied church teaching on divorce and communion, and was complicit in the German abortion policy in an unacceptable manner which made the Church’s position seem ambiguous. That he would in turn promote the man to the Sacred College is a clear indication of how high such violations of Church moral teaching rated in the Vatican II Church’s hierarchy of values.
- Bruno Forte wrote in a 1994 essay that the empty tomb was a legend, a myth created by early disciples. As the Vatican II Church now censures no one and instead shows “mercy” to those in error, he was rewarded for his public expression of apostasy by being appointed bishop of Chieti Vasto. It was the future Pope Benedict XVI, Cardinal Ratzinger, who consecrated him bishop.

The high esteem in which John Paul held this apostate is furthermore evident in the fact that, in 2004, he preached the Lenten retreat to The Holy Father.

### In praise of heretics

While perhaps it is more rooted in a desperate attempt to justify the “new springtime” he was always heralding than to promote religious indifferentism, John Paul would lavish praise upon “Catholic” movements that were overtly heretical. Among these were Focolare, Comunione e Liberazione, and the Neo-catechumen way.

- In its annual meeting in Rimini in 1983, Comunione e Liberazione stated to the president of Italy that it was “committing itself to the building of a society that puts man at the center, to dialogue between different cultures and identities, to the rights of every man, and to peace.” This is nothing less than the blueprint for apostasy publicly confessed. The group has been praised by John Paul on more than one occasion.
- True to the narcissism that permeates the attitude of the apostasy, the neo-catechumenal way concocted its own liturgy. It was so sacrilegious and un-catholic that Pope Benedict XVI did, in fact, reprimand them. This is quite a statement given the egregious nature of so many abuses throughout the world which garner no reaction whatsoever. Still, John Paul did nothing and even spoke warmly of this movement which openly endorses heresy in its own catechism. John Paul wrote a letter praising them as a “fruit of Vatican II,” yet, this is the same Pope who warned that many of the “fruits” of the Council originated from the Devil, something he may have failed to discern in this instance.

The delusions of grandeur of its founder, Kiko Arguello, are certainly in accord with the self-satisfied air that is indeed a “fruit” of the Council. He stated that those who opposed his movement would be the Judases, condemned to damnation. He is overtly heretical, stating that Jesus’ Sacrifice on the Cross was not an expiation for our sins, and explicitly teaches universal salvation. This group formally qualifies as a cult; Kiko repeatedly has spoken against sacramental confession, but those who have escaped his cult have reported that public confession within the movement is subsequently used as a tool for blackmail.

The neo-Catechumenal Way holds to the protestant principle that the Catholic Church corrupted and obscured the true church for centuries, and only at Vatican II was it restored. The “Superiority to the Past” which is the calling card of current apostates is certainly evident in this self-satisfied estimation of Church history. Their self-glorifying arrogance is summed up in their own catch-phrase, “We are a power!” So is Satan, ye deceived ones.<sup>16</sup>

- Focolare is a movement whose stated goal is “unity in the spirit.” Which spirit, however, is anyone’s guess. It is comprised of “Catholics,” Christians, Buddhists, Muslims and an assortment of new-agers. It is precisely the type of religion sought by the New World Order, and they have the full support of Pope John Paul: “Your congress can strengthen you in the ecumenical duty to hasten on the road towards that full unity for which Jesus prayed to the Father and for which he offered his very life.”<sup>17</sup> This is nothing less than a complete and uncontestable Papal endorsement of syncretism, indifferentism and apostasy. Christ no longer died for unity within His Church built on Peter, but for the very unity condemned by Popes time and again as the “unity” sought by the precursors to the antichrist. The pope’s remarks were



specifically directed to Catholic bishops within the group; instead of calling them to the true Faith, he is encouraging them to hasten down the road of apostasy. “Rome will lose the faith...”

- Cardinal Ratzinger has likewise expressed his high regard for heretics, stating that he respects the path taken by Hans Kung as he “further distanced himself from the faith of the Church.”<sup>18</sup> Likewise, as seems to be compulsory in the Vatican these days, he is a fan of Martin Luther, “because of the greatness of his spiritual fervor.”<sup>19</sup> Hence, it is okay, even admirable, to hate the Church and the Mass while calling the pope a Devil-worshipper, as long as it is done with fervor!

### Protecting the Wolves

Apropos of the case of Carla Brucia, time and again the should-be-shepherds of the Vatican II Church have not only been remiss in keeping the wolves at bay, they have given them free access to the sheep. Many aspects of the apostasy tie in to this grave act of omission and commission. Religious indifferentism is certainly a component; since there is no true, absolute religion, “diversity” and “tolerance” are the greater goods, so orthodox and heretics, moral & immoral need to learn to coexist. Yet, in line with Sr. Lucy’s “diabolical disorientation,” even this is not really true. The true Catholics who remain, when they insist that their bishops do their jobs, are often told that they, in fact, are the problem. While the modernist may be guilty of heresy as defined by the Church, it is the wider Church of ecumenism that bishops defend, and its heresies include “intolerance,” and an inability to “dialogue” by insisting their position is superior, based on the outdated notion of one true religion and truth itself. Not only do the true faithful not have a privileged place in their own household, they are regarded as the only true enemies.

The deliberate attempts to pervert school children are among the most outrageous manifestations of the lack of leadership and protection and fostering of evil. In “The Great Façade,” one of the authors recounts serving as legal counsel “to Catholic parents whose ten year old daughter was expelled from a ‘Catholic’ school in the Archdiocese of Miami because the parents refused to allow their little girl to study the details of sexual intercourse in the classroom – including descriptions of private parts and sexual actions so explicit that a local TV news reporter *could not read them on the air.*”<sup>20</sup> It is not a question of scanning the globe looking for the one or two aberrations in an effort to distort the extent of the crisis. As noted in another section, were I to recall every example, I would never lay down my pen. I have direct experience of another similar occurrence.

A “Catholic” high school in my archdiocese was “outed” for showing pornography to the students. The action taken against the school and its administration for mortal sins committed against minors and the corruption of their faith and innocence? They were the beneficiaries of a press conference in which a Cardinal announced to the media that there was “no problem” at the school. Disappointed at the cowardice of such a response, at the time I had hoped that at least in private a reprimand was issued; I don’t know if this is the case, I only know that nothing changed. Over a decade later, I was speaking with a Greek Orthodox priest who was completely at a loss as to what to do; his parishioners were attending the same school, and being exposed to pornography, lesbian advocacy, and many heresies, some of which were directed against the person of Christ Himself. “No problem” at this school, says a prince of the Church building the “civilization of love” of the Novus Ordo Church. Sorry, ladies; you are the “Carla Brucias” of the New Springtime, and you just don’t matter. You are the acceptable casualties of our liberal experiment in which the worst run free. Your rights? Your right to be protected from filth, your right to learn Catholic moral teaching, your right to receive

the foundation that will make you good wives and mothers, the rights of your parents who paid an obscene tuition believing they were paying for a Catholic education? ‘You have no rights; I am a law unto myself, and the only “rights of man” I acknowledge are those I find personally convenient.’ The Church and the world are one; as is the farcical nature of the “human rights” we love to publicly proclaim as we perpetually deny them to our weakest members

The Great Façade likewise refers its readers to an article, “The Sodomization of Innocence” to be found at Catholictradition.org, which reveals how deep-seated and pervasive is this effort to destroy the innocence of children and the systemic refusal of the Church’s “shepherds” to intervene. Perhaps overt pornography is the exception, but feeding the sheep to the wolves is the rule. It is beyond the scope of this book, but a simple internet search will provide the reader with more data than he will ever be able to synthesize. Virtually every Catholic high school and college is a school of apostasy, where innocence is lost and the faith is dissolved. The sin of fraud can be added to the neglect and malice complicit in this situation, as parents pay astronomical tuitions in the belief that their child is being given a Catholic education. Bishops will give a token rebuke when the media spotlight is shining on them, but colleges are never flat-out stripped of their Catholic status. Real estate outweighs the Faith as leverage for the role of chaplains to the New World Order.

Abortion provides a stark backdrop highlighting the inversion of priorities. In much of the public’s eye, Catholicism is the world’s strongest anti-abortion advocate. This indicates a couple of things; first of all, that despite all of the failures of her members, the Church cannot fail. Abortion is evil, Pope John Paul stated it hundreds of times, and most bishops will muster a campaign to oppose any new legislation that seeks to advance abortion. At the same time, however, it also demonstrates the Church’s acquiescence to the New World Order and the secondary status of matters of Faith.

Cardinal Ratzinger once referred to the optimism of “The Kennedy Era” as being influential at Vatican II. Perhaps he was saying more than he realized. In an effort to gain office in a nation whose prejudice left it wary of a Catholic president, Kennedy made a speech in which he assured Americans that his faith would not be a factor in his presidency.<sup>21</sup> This relegation of Catholicism to a purely “private matter,” is perfectly in line with the Church’s enemies: “believe what you want, just don’t act upon it.” This, too, is the Vatican II model. Just as the placing of the Secretary of State above the guardian of doctrine demonstrated, political ends supersede religious principles in ways that have already been noted. The Church will speak against abortion, but not act against those who promote it. While there are notable, courageous exceptions among bishops, and some publicly declare pro-abortion politicians prohibited from receiving Holy Communion, they are in the minority, and Pope John Paul was not among them.

### The renunciation of authority

The Church’s history is replete with courageous popes who suffered exile, imprisonment, torture and death, because they refused to compromise on the truth. Yet, while Pope John Paul was tireless in speaking out against this evil, he was equally obstinate in his refusal to actually do anything to its promoters. Again, we see that political considerations, not Christ or the salvation of souls, as the greatest good, as sacrilegious communions multiply, scandal increases, and evil men are placated by their unpunished rejection of Church teaching. Did you eat less than an hour before Communion? Then the Church has no trouble saying you can’t receive. Are you divorced and civilly remarried? Then you can’t receive. Have you passed legislation that has allowed for the dismemberment and murder of tens of millions of babies? Gee, we’re not sure; it’s such a complicated question, after all. As one emasculated Cardinal of the “New Springtime” so cravenly stated, “we don’t need bishops to

get into the act.”<sup>22</sup> “The act?” By that do you mean the murder of babies and sacrilege? Is that the “act” of which you are speaking, Eminence? Yes, the apostasy has begun at the top, the shepherds refuse to lead, love has turn to hate, and this is only the beginning.

If we follow a logical train of thought, it is precisely Pope John Paul’s adamant condemnation of abortion which, while in the specific instance would seem to oppose moral relativism, in a larger concentric circle seemed to give it sanction. If *even abortion*, the evil against which the Pope spoke most frequently and passionately is so “un” absolute that promoting it does not lead to excommunication or any specific sanction, then what is left to actually stand for? [Precisely the pacifism engendered by the globalists in order to stave off any resistance – soon to follow] The Masonic Cardinal Suenens spoke of this type of moral relativism in the most positive of terms: “Morality is first and foremost alive, a dynamism of life, and therefore subject to an interior growth that rejects any kind of fixity.”<sup>23</sup> This is precisely the “faith” sought by the agents of the apostasy, and fostered after the Council: be as passionate as you want, but keep your passion to yourself. Don’t let it stand in the way of political ties and the “new humanity” of the global community. Your Catholicism is a private matter; keep it personal, and we can all get along. Learn to dialogue in a spirit of tolerance and diversity! As with the heretical writers before the council, once you set yourself on the slippery slope of tolerating heretics, you will soon find yourself honoring them...

One pitiful example of this liberal incoherence is New York’s former Cardinal, John O’Connor. He was so adamant in his pro-life efforts that he even founded a religious order devoted to the cause. Yet, he wasn’t so adamant that he could let it interfere with his standing among politicians. He co-authored a book with former mayor, Edward Koch, a militant abortion advocate, along with “gay rights.” He was not alone in his desire to grovel to the men whose evil he spoke against...

On September 27, 2004, Pope John Paul bestowed Papal Knighthood on Julian Hunte, a pro abortion politician from the West Indies who was instrumental in legalizing abortion in his own country (St. Lucia). “I think every woman must have a choice. I am a pro-choice man,”<sup>24</sup> said John Paul’s knight. This was no aberration that flew in under the radar. In 2011 Dr. Miguel Nicolelis, a pro-abortion, pro gay-marriage scientist was appointed to the Vatican’s Pontifical Academy of Sciences.

This type of pseudo-Catholicism, occasionally strong on words, random in application, fearful of any repercussion, is completely conducive with the type of conservatism the liberal world will endure, as in reality it conserves nothing. At a political summit in recent memory, a large group of protestors was expected, so the organizers provided a caged-off “protest section.” Anybody protesting outside the predetermined area was arrested. The irony was as thick as the protestors were pitiful; ‘we are here to protest you – where’s the cage in which you will allow us to do that?’ Likewise, even when the conservative leaders of the Church rebuke the liberal wing, it is often only the terms that they will allow. Liberals themselves don’t live by these rules; they are simply the ones they have created to keep the occasional conservative overlord subservient, even as they entertain the delusion that they are strong and in charge. So, yes, Holy Father, you can write your encyclical; but don’t dream of excommunicating me or denying me a photo-op with you on my next trip to Rome. Yes, local bishop, you can run your mail-in campaign on your pre-printed postcards telling me how all of your Catholics oppose my bill, but don’t tell them not to vote for me or to deny me communion and, by the way, we’ll see you at the luncheon at the governor’s mansion next week, right? Of course; no need to let the faith get in the way of our superficial, non-threatening (to you) coexistence.

In Roman Catholicism, you are excommunicated, with book, bell and candle. You are denied Holy Communion, barred from the church building, and refused Christian burial. Of course, liberals don’t

allow us to have recourse to any of these, and so we don't. Instead, you are granted all of these things, in the full light of the media, showing to the world that we are willing to get along, the weak Catholic that it really doesn't matter all that much, and to the faithful Catholic that there is a frightful crisis upon us, whether you call it the great apostasy or not.

### More on the Renunciation of Authority

Backtracking a few decades, however, this mark of the apostasy, refusing to lead, was manifest from the onset of the Council. This is essential to the larger context of this unit: The Restrainer Removed. Just as the removal of restrainers could precondition the faithful for moral lawlessness, the absence of rightful juridical authority would facilitate the rise of both secular and ecclesial lawlessness. Here are but a few examples:

- When the French bishops issued a catechism containing serious errors, Cardinal Ratzinger at first criticized it. Yet, once politics came in to play, he withdrew his criticisms almost immediately. The French bishops published his withdrawal, so in the end his criticisms became a type of endorsement.<sup>25</sup>
- Cardinal Heenan had to concede in 1968: "The magisterium has survived only in the Pope. It is no longer exercised by the bishops and it is rather difficult to get the hierarchy to condemn a false doctrine. Outside Rome the magisterium today is so unsure of itself that it no longer even attempts to lead."<sup>26</sup>
- This poor caliber of bishop seems to have been elective, as Cardinal Ratzinger conceded: "In the first years following the Council, the candidate to the episcopate seemed to be a priest primarily 'opened to the world,' and indeed, this prerequisite topped the list. After the 1968 movement, with the worsening of the crisis, it was discovered, not seldom through bitter experiences, that what was needed were bishops open to the world, and yet concurrently capable of standing up to the world and to its harmful tendencies."<sup>27</sup>
- To reiterate perhaps the gravest example, we harken back to the perpetual thread of the past century: Fatima. In renouncing both the command of the Mother of God and his own duty as universal shepherd, Pope John stated that he did not think it was his place to meddle in prophecies. Then whose is it? The Church's renunciation of her role as shepherd has led, not only to the annihilation of nations foretold at Fatima, but the loss of faith in so many millions more, because their shepherds absolutely refused to protect them from the wolves given free rein in their schools, universities, seminaries and parishes. Sadly, many of the bishops would have sided with the wolves anyway...

This apathy on the part of churchmen and faithful alike, both by example and in the Catholic subconscious, will lead to another symptom of the apostasy, and another cause for the elect being led astray:

### **Pacifism.**

*The power of evil men lives on the cowardice of the good.*  
-St. John Bosco

Pacifism in this context means more than simply not acknowledging any just cause for an armed conflict, even self defense; it is also more personal. From the secular end of the advancement towards the reign of the Antichrist, engendering total apathy in people has always been part of the program. A Russian defector spoke of his job in “brainwashing” students in Europe. He stated that people who watch spy movies would be disappointed; it was not a matter of dark rooms, tortuous conditions and inducing a total mental breakdown; it was simply a matter of the day-to-day techniques used in the classroom. He said the ultimate point was to “de-moralize” people; to either rob them of a sense of right and wrong (the explicit plan of the U.N.) or at least leave them so lacking in conviction that they would not take action if something they regarded as wrong were happening (i.e., many American youths would simply begin to record the event so as to allow the world to enjoy the victim’s suffering on the internet). The goal was a state of complete apathy in light of government action. When he relented of this dehumanization and defected to the United States, he was amazed to see how much further down that road we had gone. Again, this is an explicit plan, not a conspiracy theory, and the evidence is “hidden in plain sight.” What are the three things for which a man has always been willing to fight and die? His religion, his family, and his country. This is why freemasonry extols religious indifferentism and has always used its political power to legalize divorce; the state is to be your only loyalty, the only “absolute” to which you cling and can never renounce; towards all else, a sense of apathy is fostered.

Aldous Huxley, of the same family of eugenicists as the afore-mentioned Julian Huxley, stated in a speech: “We are in a process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the whole controlling oligarchy to get people actually to love their servitude. People can be made to enjoy a state of affairs which, by any decent standard, they ought not to enjoy. These methods, I think, are a real refinement on the older methods of terror because they combine methods of terror with methods of acceptance.”<sup>28</sup> He explicitly stated that the use of pharmaceuticals to control moods would be a key component. Evolution, psychology, radical environmentalism and sex-education are likewise central elements, as each tends towards a de-humanization which will render humans less indignant, less outraged, less likely to react to the mistreatment of humans, themselves included. Again, these are explicit programs, and I invite the reader to investigate the fine research found in some of the books listed in the bibliography. Now, we return to the religious dimension...

As part of the “diabolical disorientation” ravaging the Church, Orwellian concepts abound. Love has turned to hate, a refusal to lead is considered pastoral genius, an unprecedented dissolution of the Church in absolutely every single element of her life is dubbed “A New Springtime,” heretical sects brandish letters of recommendation from the Pope, not Bulls of condemnation, decimating a Church built by our ancestors makes us superior to them, and them a source of embarrassment to us; in short, in every measure in which we collectively come up as pathetic failures, unworthy of our glorious and heroic ancestors, we fabricate some glib cliché or twist of logic in which the truth of the matter is concealed from ourselves, and we are led to believe in our superiority for precisely those reasons that we are in fact vastly inferior.

A false sense of courage certainly comes into play. Paul VI exhibited some of this self-serving, or at least self-numbing, convolution of concepts in appraising his own failure to lead the Church during this unprecedented crisis of his own creation. His words of June 21, 1972 reveal the following: “Perhaps the Lord has called me to this service not because I have any flare for it, or because I govern and rescue the Church from her present difficulties, but because I suffer something for the Church and because, it appear clearly that He, and not another, guides her and saves her. We confide this sentiment surely not to make a public, thus conceited, act of humility, but so that it be given to you, too, to enjoy the tranquility that we derive from it, thinking that not our weak and inexperienced hand is at the helm of the boat of Peter, but the invisible, and yet strong and loving hand of the Lord.”<sup>29</sup>

So it is precisely the man whose job it is to lead the Church who best exercises that office by not leading, thus allowing Jesus to take all the credit? As Mr. Amerio opined, “In letting his own inclinations take precedence over the demands of his office, the Pope seems to imply that there is more humility in suffering than in working to fulfill his functions. I am not sure the idea is justified: is it necessarily more humble to set oneself the goal of suffering for the Church than to admit that one must work for it?”<sup>30</sup> Likewise, there is an unmistakable air of irony, if not hypocrisy. He was quite convinced he was in charge when he acted in so many ways detrimental to the Church and far exceeding his authority; yet, once the price of his recklessness was made apparent, the Papacy became “God’s job” again.

The Pope speaks of his apathy, his renunciation of responsibility, as a source of tranquility, expressing his hope that others experience this same type of tranquility. Yet, this is by no means the peace of Christ, acquired by laboring in His name; this is the peace of unconditional surrender, renouncing our responsibilities under the pious pretense that Jesus can do it better anyway. This is a commendation of the type of apathy condemned by Pope Pius X, as he rightly saw it as a “restrainer removed,” giving the devil greater inroads. “In our time more than ever before the greatest asset of the evilly disposed is the cowardice and weakness of good men, and all the vigor of Satan’s reign is due to the easygoing weakness of Catholics. Oh! If I might ask the divine Redeemer, as the prophet Zachary did in spirit: ‘What are those wounds in the midst of Your hands?’ the answer would not be doubtful. ‘With these I was wounded in the house of those who loved Me. I was wounded by My friends who did nothing to defend Me and who, on every occasion, made themselves the accomplices of My adversaries.’ And this reproach can be leveled at the weak and timid Catholics of all countries.”<sup>31</sup>

The apathy condemned by Pius has nothing to do with the meekness of Christ, which perhaps we deceive ourselves into believing we possess when we offer no resistance. Christ was led off to slaughter for our salvation, the ultimate act of self-sacrifice; we remain silent as an act of self-preservation despite the slaughter and destruction which surround us, willing to be faithful, but only until we or our comforts are placed at risk. The enemies of Pius XII surrounded the Vatican, threatening to carry him off into exile, a fate suffered by many of his predecessors, and a fate he was prepared to suffer as well. Today, our enemies enter solemnly through the magnificent Bronze Door, are treated like royalty, provided photo-ops by which they can demonstrate that their hatred of us and murder of babies is by no means an impediment to diplomatic ties, and depart with gifts and honors heaped upon them.

One of countless such examples is found in the pages of “The Devil’s Final Battle.”<sup>32</sup> Mikhail Gorbachev, an unabashed atheist who commits all of his energies to promoting abortion and population control, was given a platform at the Vatican, where he addressed Pope John Paul and many high ranking curial officials, along with five thousand guests. He is little more than a polished, cosmopolitan version of his predecessor Stalin but, since we had already given the Communists a Council, I guess they started to feel at home in the Vatican. Now, not only do we not condemn them, we congregate an audience for them and pass them the microphone.

Paul VI said, “We wish to give our life a sense. Life is worth the sense we give to it, the direction we impart to it, the end we direct it to. What is the end? It is peace.”<sup>33</sup> To the Christian, the end is Christ. To the secular relativist, life is worth what we say it is worth and our end is what we decide it is, not given an intrinsic worth and a supernatural end by the God who gives us life. The peace of which Paul dreamed was not the peace of Christ, but the peace of unconditional surrender. Cardinal Biffi said in a speech to Pope Benedict “The Antichrist presents himself as a pacifist, ecologist and ecumenist. He

convokes an ecumenical council and seeks the consensus of all the Christian confessions, conceding something to each one.”<sup>34</sup>

The Antichrist will advocate pacifism as he wants to find a world and a Church which believes there is nothing worth fighting for, and people so subtly conditioned to apathy and decadence that both morally and psychologically resistance is no longer possible. Vatican II popes have repeatedly asserted that there is no longer any such thing as a just war. Hence, even a man of such sober mindedness as Cardinal Ottaviani could not see the peril in all of the nations of the world surrendering their autonomy to a godless global authority, and popes explicitly saying this to the United Nations. While this applies to many levels of the discussion presented in this book, here we see demonstrated the convergence of a number of characteristics which allowed the Church's enemies to gain so much ground and destroy so much of the Church's foundation. The belief that current man had evolved and was superior could not but lead to a diminishing of the awareness of original sin and the evil of which every man is capable, especially when given a mega-measure of mankind's most ancient corrupter – power. Likewise, while the Church has always, like the angel on Christmas, addressed herself to men of goodwill, the Vatican II Church does not like to recognize that there may actually be men of bad will. Hence we have Pope John's overly-positive and, frankly, dishonest portrait of the world stated at the Council's opening. We have Paul VI freeing heretical writers from their censures, certain that their free pass will convince them to never do it again. Pope Paul would also allow Communists to choose his bishops for him, even as they martyred millions of his children. He uttered no protest, and received nothing in return for his acquiescence, except he himself was left unscathed in the comfort of the Vatican. Pope John wants to show mercy to errors, believing that men are about to abandon all of their errors anyway. We have John Paul compulsively apologizing to the Church's enemies for things that never happened, or did happen and are entirely justified, truly believing that our enemies would embrace us for this display of humility, rather than being emboldened by this display of weakness. Politicians who foster abortion are not denied Holy Communion; if we are just “nice,” to them they will allow us to exist. Muslims will stop persecuting Christians, only if they see that we have abandoned every claim to being the True Religion and now declared ourselves co-evangelizers of the world with them, as together we worship “the One True God.” A pope has assured us that the more people reject God the more open they are to Him, and that even those who explicitly reject the Church are somehow a part of it. There are no bad guys, right? Only people who, even if they reject Christ, somehow do form that one Church, even if they hate the Church, and would gladly abandon their errors if only they recognized them as such. Of course, the Church no longer corrects error and has stricken from the Catechism the Spiritual Work of Mercy of reproving the sinner; we are pacifists now. If we reprove the sinner he might not like us, and really, he has no need of conversion anyway. If they don't correct their errors of their own volition, then we need to stop speaking about the truth which juxtaposes them as being in error, because we only want to talk about what unites us rather than divides.

In the end, pacifism is the logical result of a Church who no longer believes in herself. This is not only in the political sense of refusing to acknowledge any just cause for force, but in virtually every element of her being. Ultimately, pacifism allows the Vatican II Church to deceive herself. Rather than acknowledge that we are cowards who fear standing up to the world and losing our tax-exempt status, government assistance, and seats of honor at civic affairs, we try to convince ourselves that our apathy is actually genius, a measure of prudence which our poor martyred ancestors lacked, whereby we only rebuke the world in the gentlest of terms and most confined of contexts, and then proceed to give them the Body of Christ and assure them that there will be no real consequence, eternal or otherwise, for their sins. After all, were not even sure *whether or which* souls go to hell, so why trouble you now when we ourselves remain so unsure?

I don't think it is a very wild speculation to proffer the hypothesis that, as the Church has lost all conviction about herself, her mission and her essence, and is now content to form one element of the amorphous blob that is to be the "new humanity" of the one (enslaved) global community, we actually think others feel the same way. They don't; Muslims have shown no corresponding depletion of their religious convictions. Liberals hate the Church and will not rest until she is extinguished, and the Devil is the same as he has always been, except now finds himself attacking a Church which no longer cares to defend herself against her supra-natural enemies either. The Church's pacifism, perhaps best revealed in her banishment of the phrase "Church Militant," extends to the visible and invisible. Perhaps the Church does so little to defend herself and her children because, in a fantastic deception of the antichrist, she no longer believes they are worth defending, and somehow regards her apathy as heroic, and the extinction of her past form as well-deserved. Instead, the new Church wants to embrace all of humanity under the umbrella of the one-world-order with her supreme governing body, actually dreaming that we would be welcomed, not liquidated.

Consistent with this line of reasoning is the expulsion from the Church's calendar of "Our Lady of Victory." No longer do we celebrate the fact that Christian forces repelled hostile invaders; instead we apologize for those armies for not letting Christian nations be overrun, or for trying to liberate them once invaded. Again, the rejection of Mary at Fatima is crucial. Peace was the gift she offered via the triumph of the Faith, and the Church rejected her terms. Now, the godless world offers its version of peace, via the triumph and rule of men of manifest evil, and we accept.

### **An Apostasy Without Borders**

An element of the current apostasy which differentiates it from all others is the intermingling of apostasy and orthodoxy. In every apostasy, schism, and heresy, either the guilty parties made their separation known by formally renouncing its ties to the Pope, or the Pope formally cut them off by declaring that their heresies had separated them from the Faith. The simple, faithful Catholic, even if not sophisticated enough to detect the subtleties of a prince circumventing the apostolic constitution of the Church, or theologically versed enough to recognize nuanced, corrosive errors in writings or sermons, was always protected from following the road to ruin by these visible, unmistakable distinctions. Today, they don't exist.

In my early days on the "John Paul the Great" train, I was told by my fellow papal sycophants that this was a sign of his genius: by tolerating heretics, he had prevented a formal schism. Yet, whom did this benefit? Those same heretics have access, decade after decade, to the minds and souls of our children. The schools they control far outnumber those which hold to any genuine type of Catholic identity, formation, and education – seminaries included. The same catechism offers both the protestant refutation and Catholic affirmation of the foundation of the Papacy. The Vatican is home to both manifest heretics and true shepherds. The "Culture of Death" is boldly renounced, and then its architects are warmly embraced. A parish Mass is comparatively reverent, and then the next Mass proliferates abuses of every kind, as the priest preaches heresy and alters the words of consecration. A faithful Catholic parent may actually find a semi-Catholic school for his child, but even there, the comparatively traditional teacher offers the liberal version of anti-Catholic history, presents evolution as a scientific fact, and admits that the Church teaches believing in Jesus isn't necessary for salvation. A document states unequivocally that protestants lack means necessary for salvation, and then protestant ministers are assured that they are, in fact, genuine priests. The Pope is the Vicar of Christ whose principal purpose is the salvation of souls, yet the Pope is on record as not being sure that souls even need saving. One day you can witness your Pope as a model of Catholic piety, engrossed in prayer



before the Blessed Sacrament, the next day he is joining pagans and animists in their prayers to false gods. As one writer so succinctly summarized the incoherence that is the Vatican II Church; it is the Mad Hatter's tea party writ large.<sup>35</sup>

It is precisely this intermingling of all ideas and the relativism and indifferentism it embodies that was planned by the Masons: one may *find* Catholicism within the Catholic Church, but the Catholic Church is no longer the Catholic Church. Simply stated, it cannot be trusted. Maybe you are learning the truth, maybe you are not. Maybe the Mass you just attended was valid, maybe it was not. Maybe your children are being formed in the Faith, maybe their innocence is being corrupted. It is a precursor to the one-world-religion where tolerance reigns supreme, the hierarchy is purely ornamental and ceremonial, and one's private convictions are not allowed to impede the greater cause of "the unity of all humanity." Even one trying to be, and sincerely believing himself to be, a faithful Catholic may not be so; this is why "even the elect may be led astray." Their shepherds were "deceivers, themselves deceived," (2 Tim. 3:13) and everything is a hazy shade of Catholic.

<sup>1</sup> Gaudron, Fr. Matthias. "The Catechism of the Crisis in the Church." Kansas City: Angelus Press, 2010, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Amerio, p. 80.

<sup>3</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Encyclical Letter "Ecclesiam Suam," no. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Paul VI, Pope. "Profession of Faith," June 30, 1968.

<sup>5</sup> Gelasius I, Pope St. Epistle "Licet inter varias," July 28, 493. See Denzinger, no. 166.

<sup>6</sup> Pius X, Pope St. Constitution "Sapienti consilio." Vatican City: June 29, 1908.

<sup>7</sup> Decree from the "Acta Apostolicae Sedis," Dec. 29, 1966, vol. 58, no. 16.

<sup>8</sup> Villa, "Paul VI," p. 183.

<sup>9</sup> See Amerio, p. 157.

<sup>10</sup> Augustine, St. cited by Pope Gregory XVI, "Mirari vos."

<sup>11</sup> Cited in "Il Tempo," Sept. 28, 1984.

<sup>12</sup> Amerio, p. 114.

<sup>13</sup> Society of St. Pius X. "Cardinals with No Faith." Nov., 2001 No. 43.

<sup>14</sup> See Villa, "Walter Kasper," Brescia: Editrice Civiltà, 2008.

<sup>15</sup> Ferrara, Christopher. "Kasper Denies the Apostolic Succession." Fatima Perspectives, no. 349.

<sup>16</sup> See Chiesa Viva, Nov. 2002, for a full report.

<sup>17</sup> John Paul II, Pope. "Message to the Bishops and Friends of the Focolare Movement." Nov. 25, 2003.

<sup>18</sup> Ratzinger, "Salt of the Earth," pp. 95 - 96

<sup>19</sup> Ratzinger, "Principles of Catholic Theology," p. 263.

<sup>20</sup> Ferrara & Woods, p. 253, no. 293.

<sup>21</sup> In fairness to the late president, in the same speech he stated he would resign his office if he ever felt an irresolvable conflict between his presidential duties and his faith. Despite his personal weaknesses, he had noble characteristics. Perhaps it was for this reason that Padre Pio had an affection for him and told a friend that, after his assassination, he had indeed reached salvation.

<sup>22</sup> Baltimore Sun, May 20, 2005.

<sup>23</sup> Amerio, p. 339.

<sup>24</sup> Lifesite.net. "Vatican's Cardinal Sodano Awards Pro-Abortion Politician Papal Knighthood." Sept. 27, 2004.

<sup>25</sup> Amerio, pp. 151 - 152.

<sup>26</sup> L'Osservatore Romano, April 28, 1968.

<sup>27</sup> Ratzinger, "The Ratzinger Report," p. 65.

<sup>28</sup> Speech given at The University of California, Berkley, March 20, 1962.

<sup>29</sup> Amerio, p. 144.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 145.

<sup>31</sup> Pius X, Pope St. Discourse at the Beatification of Joan of Arc, Dec. 18, 1908.

<sup>32</sup> Kramer, pp. 119 - 120.

<sup>33</sup> Paul VI, Pope. Speech on Peace Day, Jan. 1, 1972.

<sup>34</sup> The Cardinal's speech was given during the Pope's Lenten Retreat of 2007. The Vatican Radio offered summaries and excerpts, although the Vatican declined to release the text.

---

<sup>35</sup> Rao, Dr. John. "The Worst Pontificate in History." The Remnant Newspaper, Aug. 31, 2004.

## Chapter XIX

### Even The Elect: Part II

Continuing our discussion of the preconditioning of the elect so as to leave them vulnerable for the apostasy, we have to look to “the elect” themselves and their role in this matter. Many people who perhaps would have made fine Catholics were lost due to the fact that they were surrendered to liberals at an early age; such mutations at so formational a period are not insurmountable, but usually they last throughout a lifetime and, sadly, an eternity. Yet, it is even those clergy, teachers and lay-Catholics whom we describe as “conservative” who likewise may leave their charges vulnerable.

#### “The Final Curtain”

I once read an excellent book on the self-inflicted demise of mainline Protestantism. I found it relevant to the ongoing self-destruction of the Catholic Church as the author, a conservative protestant, retraced the trajectory of the dissolution of protestantism into secular liberalism in a manner which greatly resembled the Catholic Church’s mad dash towards obsolescence and extinction. In the end, however, I was saddened that the author could not bring himself to pull back “the final curtain.” He seemed a sincere, Christ-loving man who had a clear vision of the hazy path these church’s had taken, and a gift for articulating complex movements into understandable prose. Yet, as he one by one pulled back the layers of error that led to the current state – moral relativism, liberalism, political advocacy trumping personal holiness, using scripture scholarship as a pretense to empty scripture of its reliability and meaning, etc.. – he stopped short of the final curtain; protestantism itself. Even with so much clarity as to the state of his church, he wanted to believe that these were mutations and contradictions of its source, not the logical digression thereof. Be it his sense of loyalty or a natural disinclination to strike so violently at the foundation of his own faith, it was a step which either consciously or subconsciously he could not make.

The faithful Catholic, the elect, likewise can find themselves staring at this final curtain; at least this one did. One by one we peeled back the layers erected by those who sought to rob us of genuine faith. We saw through the dissenters who teach Catholics that morality is a personal choice; we didn’t believe the priests that told us Sunday Mass was optional and that things were not grave sins when we knew they were. Despite the relentless diet of sappy, self-centered prayer services that were inflicted upon us as children, we arrived at some measure of a serious spiritual life. Despite anemic and oftentimes heretical religious education and Catholic schools that sought to make us atheists, we kept the faith and of our own volition gained a foundational knowledge of it. No matter how many times we were assured that all religions are paths to God, we held firm the conviction that Catholicism is the one true religion. Despite a lifetime of witnessing glib, irreverent and perhaps sacrilegious treatment of the Blessed Sacrament, we found a love for Christ in the Eucharist and seek opportunities for adoration and strive to bring a reverent presence to a sometimes less-than-reverent Novus Ordo Mass. The feminist nun who taught us to hate the Church did not succeed; She is Our Mother and His Bride, and all of the Judases within will never drive us out. The emasculated bishop who left our religious formation in the hands of

heretics, liberals, and degenerates who wanted to rob us of innocence and faith was foiled; he lacked the courage to stand up to them, but we had the grace to see through them. Lifelong protestants, evangelicals and pagans have pulled back the layers and recognized that it was the foundation of their religion itself that was false, and so found the Church and, by the grace of God remained, even as that same Church taught them that their conversion wasn't necessary and sometimes was more protestant and pagan than what they left behind.

We are the elect; but that is not enough, because even the elect may be led astray. How? Perhaps it is our unwillingness to pull back that final curtain and recognize how deeply the Church's crisis runs, even as we believe we have navigated past all of the dangers. Even the people who have helped us remain among the elect may have, unwittingly I'm sure, left a landmine or two along the way that may claim us still.

### The Dimming of the Intelligence

This warning of Our Lady of LaSalette likewise finds its fulfillment in institutions which are regarded as faithful to authentic Catholicism, and in most respects are. Yet, the cracks remain, and they can develop into chasms. Underlying this possibility is the same fatal flaw exhibited in the type of orthodoxy that retains its beliefs, but only acts upon them in the categories permitted by liberals. The same can be true of the current conservative Catholic: even as we are Catholic in our beliefs, we can be liberal in our categories of thought, only expressing our Orthodoxy in the manner deemed acceptable by the prevailing culture. First, however, it is vital to consider that the orthodoxy of the contemporary conservative Catholic, while sincere, is sometimes based on incomplete data.

- Conservative Catholics, in line with Vatican II Popes, do not often appeal to anything preconiliar. Therefore, such Catholics are not aware, at least not in any depth, to the extent to which post-conciliar popes are in complete contradiction of all of their predecessors, and in fact stand condemned by their very words.
- Although most conservative Catholics are aware that the secular version of Church history is oftentimes distorted, if not outright false, their version is tainted by the presumed superiority to the past as underscored by Pope John Paul's endless apologies. Even the history taught in fairly conservative schools offers the unquestioned moniker of "Dark Ages" for that period of history where Faith prevailed, and gives a distorted ratio of the number of "bad popes," and a sometimes unfair critique of just how "bad" they were (e.g. the Avignon Popes).
- Imitating the political correctness of liberals: In secular life, a conservative Catholic knows how difficult it is to have an intelligent conversation with a liberal. As soon as they sense that one of the boundaries of their "religion" is being transgressed, they reach into their bag of conversation-stopping buzzwords; words such as "intolerant," "anti-semitic," "homo-phobic," and of course, the ever popular "racist" are employed to prevent intelligence, facts, and reality from figuring

into the conversation. The fact that these words in no way describe what was said or the person speaking is of no matter; most liberals are truly dense and the scope of their intellectual capacity is in fact reduced to such knee-jerk reactions and sacrosanct clichés. Others realize the bigger picture; their position can't stand the test of true logic, so they have instead created a social and intellectual atmosphere where logic is not allowed to exist and those who challenge their feeble position are stigmatized with a label that is a death knell in our moronic society.

Unfortunately, and probably unbeknownst to them, conservative Catholics employ this same method when logical progression, the teachings of popes, facts and reality stretch their conservative Catholic knowledge to a frontier they dread to cross: the final curtain. Here, all intelligence is suspended and buzzwords take charge, because following the train of logic would take them somewhere they have been programmed to believe is wrong. So many times I have had conversations with good, sincere, conservative Catholics; yet, once I present them with facts that rattle the "house of cards" that is the result of years of propaganda interwoven with orthodox teaching, they recoil and I am dismissed with "That's pre-Vatican II!," or "you sound like a Lefebvrite!" or the oft-entreated, "But John Paul said..." These are the same clichés they learned from their conservative Catholic teachers, and they have taken root.

Recently I was speaking with a conservative, highly educated priest about some of the topics in this book. He cut me off with a friendly but derisive, "you sound like a conspiracy theorist!" Precisely the phrase used in secular parlance to discredit anybody who suggests that less than benevolent forces may actually work together for an undesirable, if not sinister, end. In the secular world this bit of Skinnerian conditioning works, and those you can successfully tag with this label are deemed too crazy to be listened to, let alone believed, despite the mountain of facts they possess. Yet, to not believe there are conspiracies is to be ignorant of both history and the spiritual life, as the devil, the world, and the flesh conspire to lead us to sin. Many Catholics have made this knee-jerk reaction their own, and so refuse to go where logic might lead and contribute to the dimming of their own intellect. Pope Gregory XVI rightly recognized that the current attacks on the Church were indeed "the terrible conspiracy of impious men."<sup>1</sup> Yet, today, the use of this phrase may sound a bit suspect even to a faithful Catholic, as so often, even as we believe like Catholics, we think like liberals, and have our barriers of sacrosanct clichés and slogans that we refuse to breach, and a shaky version of history that we dare not scrutinize.

#### A few anecdotes

A decade ago I first came upon the Pelagian assertion in *Gaudium et Spes* that "man perfects himself." Upon seeing a friend, a well-educated Catholic of formidable intelligence, I said, "Joe, tell me what you think of this sentence I came across. 'Man perfects himself.'" Without a moment's hesitation he answered, "just the typical pap of a self-worshipping modern man." I then told him the source; he was visibly startled and then endeavored to correct himself and explain the context which the council "must have meant" to make it acceptable. Too intelligent and honest to last long in the endeavor, he conceded that there was no such context. Yet, what he did momentarily, other faithful Catholics have done for

decades; since it comes from the Council, truth, doctrine, and the meaning of words are of secondary considerations; if the Council said it, it must be right; John Paul the Great said so.

When Pope Benedict XVI unveiled his coat of arms, the Papal Tiara was removed from its centuries' old place above the "Keys of the Kingdom" and replaced with a miter. A priest I knew immediately opined, "Oh I'm so glad he changed that – they had been doing that for centuries!" His voice even picked up a tone of disdain as he referred to the past. It was amazing how quickly this fine Catholic priest was thinking like a protestant simply because a Pope had done so. The Catholic hermeneutic is, if something has endured for centuries, that is all the more reason to retain it. Protestants, and the Vatican II Church, have had the opposite approach, seeking to eliminate anything that might remind the faithful that the Church actually preceded them. If a week earlier I had said to this priest, "Cardinal Mahoney said that the tiara is outdated and the pope shouldn't have it on his coat of arms," his answer would have been something like my own; a derisive statement about what a shallow, protestant notion that was. While this may seem comparatively trivial (which it is not), it embodies a broader mindset; even faithful Catholics so often can't see and discern based on the truth of a matter and the logical implications; instead, if it is done by a Pope in the name of Vatican II, it *has* to be good. Doctrine and the contrary teachings of previous popes, *even every previous pope*, notwithstanding, intelligence is suspended and the case is closed.

Please bear with me as I offer a few more anecdotes, as they reflect a larger reality, and show how even the finest of the Church's priests oftentimes don't grasp the source and magnitude of the crisis which they acknowledge exists (I do not claim that I do – at best I am a millimeter ahead of the curve). I knew an elderly, wise and holy priest. He was a professor of Church history, and seemed to be a capable one at that. Yet, I myself was discovering more and more about the true origin of the Novus Ordo and shared my concerns with him. He gave me the standard conservative Catholic response that it was merely a furthering of the liturgical reform begun by Pope Pius XII. I knew enough of the history to know this was merely a misleading justification, yet this is the liberalized version of history taught in conservative settings. When I told him the Novus Ordo was written by a mason he shot back with a touch of condescension, "where do you get this stuff!" When I told him that Archbishop Bugnini himself conceded that this was the reason for his exile, he fell into a disturbed silence. He truly had not known; an intelligent man and a fine priest who spent his life in an academic environment, experienced firsthand the loss of reverence and priestly identity as well as the exponential insurgence of impiety and sacrilege, had been given the standard line that was meant to prevent the faithful from pulling back that final curtain. This was the version he believed, and so passed on to other conservative Catholics.

In one parish I had a conversation about the non-blessing of holy water that sounded like a poor caliber comedy routine. In the sacristy I asked the priest if he had ever noticed that the laminated card with the prayer for blessing the water in fact did not bless the water at all. He responded, "that's the prayer in The Book of Blessings." "Yes, I know that," I responded, "but the fact is, it does not bless the water." "That's the prayer from the book of blessings," he responded. "Yes, but read the words! There is no

actual blessing!” “That’s the prayer from the Book of Blessings,” he responded. The Vatican approved it; it must be fine; something as secondary as the actual meaning of words can’t get in the way.

Obedience is a virtue, but not when it is mindless or uninformed. The due limits of authority forge the parameters of the obedience due to that authority, but many faithful Catholics are unaware as to what these limits are, or even that they exist in the case of a Pope and a Council [Saints and Doctors of the Church have testified that such limits can be exceeded]. The Pope and every legitimate authority are to be obeyed, but only when they obey the due limits of their office. Yet, those quarters of the Church which one would regard as conservative have been influenced by a relentless propaganda campaign which ensures us that anything that comes from the Vatican or is done by a Pope cannot be questioned. Here are some examples of how the post-conciliar apparatus has sought to influence minds and predispose Catholics to a false notion of obedience. The Catholic is to pledge undying fidelity to a Faith and a Religion (of which the Papacy is an integral part), not just a Pope and a Council. These concepts are not one and the same; the latter is subject to the former; yet, “the elect” believe them to be interchangeable, because the latter have assured us that they are in fact the ultimate embodiment of the former.

## **The Propaganda Campaign**

### **“Good Pope John”**

Why was he so “good?” Because we have always been told so; because he was jolly and capable of a memorable quip from time to time. The legend of “good” Pope John is a piece of propaganda to which virtually every conservative Catholic subscribes. Yet, ask them why they subscribe to this cliché, and more likely than not they can only answer with another cliché.

- The media blitz: Having found a Pope who so sharply contrasted with Pius XII, the media were quick to promulgate his status as the “kind and paternal pope,” as opposed to the “sever and authoritarian” one who preceded him. To demonstrate to the world that the “Good” Pope had a pastoral sensitivity hitherto unknown in the Papacy, his visits to a local hospital and prison were widely broadcast. In fact, it is precisely these instances which were presented to me in seminary Church History class as proof of his surpassing goodness. After one such visit he was even tagged with the honor of “saint,” so daring did the liberal media portray these common actions as being.

Yet, this was nothing more than media propaganda. John’s predecessors, even his immediate ones, visited those exact same institutions. Although not widely publicized, photographs exist of Pope Pius XII in his blood-stained white cassock comforting and anointing casualties on the streets of Rome after a bombing raid during WWII. Of course, Pius was the ice-cold diplomat never venturing beyond the safety [sic!] of the Vatican walls, according to the secular media. Yet, the “Good” Pope would change all of that, and be pope for the people. The media machinery was in

full tilt, and the faithful followed, believing that “the new face of the Papacy” was superior to the old.

- A more complete picture of John is something less flattering. Perhaps nothing is more revealing of the dark side of the “good pope” as his treatment of a true Saint, Padre Pio. St. Pio was the victim of new persecutions under Pope John, which ended with John issuing disciplinary actions against him. As part of the campaign against Padre Pio, a confession made to him was recorded and ended up in the possession of the Pope.<sup>2</sup> While John was not so much of a modernist that he would listen to this act of sacrilege, he did nothing whatsoever to punish the guilty parties. Only the victim was punished, and so the last true saint was yet another “Carla Brucia” of the civilization of love; the victim of that liberal love which cares little for the innocent in its concern for leaving the guilty at liberty.
- The “Good” pope had further insults to offer the true saint. Padre Pio celebrated his fiftieth anniversary as a priest the same day as two other friars in his monastery. These two received a telegram of congratulation from the Vatican, but there was none for Padre Pio. In addition, L'Osservatore Romano was ordered to make no mention of the anniversary.

The juxtaposition of facts could not shed a more revealing light on the myth of “Good” Pope John. The pope of “mercy towards error” who would not issue sanctions and condemnations like his “severe” predecessor, found room in his liberal incoherence to make three exceptions; Our Lady of Fatima and two of her dearest children, Lucy & Pio. At least amid their unjust persecution they enjoyed the best of company.

- The lesser side of John was also shown in his extortion of Cardinal Cicognani. It has already been noted as a matter of fact that John did not respect the due freedom of the Council fathers. When, as was entirely his right, the Cardinal did not want to sign a schema of the Council, “Good” Pope John had him bullied into signing. “Archbishop Felici, who reported regularly on the progress of the schemas and their distribution to Pope John, explained the difficulty that he was having with Cardinal Cicognani, since without his signature the schema was blocked, even though the required majority of the commission had already approved it. Before the audience was over, a plan was devised to obtain the desired signature.

Pope John called for his Secretary of State and told him to visit his brother and not to return until the schema was duly signed. On February 1, 1962, he went to his brother's office, found Archbishop Felici and Fr. Bugnini in the corridor nearby, and informed his brother of Pope John's wish. Later a peritus of the Liturgical Preparatory Commission stated that the old Cardinal was almost in tears as he waved the document in the air and said, ‘They want me to sign this, but I don't know if I want to.’ Then he laid the document on his desk, picked up a pen, and signed it. Four days later he died.”<sup>3</sup>



- Politicized beatification: Just as the secular world created “Good” Pope John to advance the de-Catholicization of the Church he implemented, the Church of Vatican II would likewise promote the cult of Pope John by beatifying him. By doing so it would create one more layer of sacralization which would render Vatican II and all that was done in its name beyond reproach. Revealed in this act are manifestations of other signs of the apostasy:
  - Lawlessness: In order to rush through the process of investigation, John Paul rewrote the Church laws. The simple fact is, Pope John could never have born up to the scrutiny of the actual process; even the role of “devil’s advocate” was eliminated. It was in response to this flaunting of the Church’s ancient canons that Fr. Villa took this role upon himself and produced the work so often cited in this one, calling the mutilation of ancient canons “illegal and dishonest.”
  - “My Will Is Enough:” This is yet another example of how Pope John Paul regarded nothing as unalterable; the apostolic guidelines for Holy Communion, the Rosary, the sacred proscriptions to be followed before declaring a man blessed – all subject to his momentary whims to suit his personal agenda.
  - Modernity: Not only did John Paul create new laws, he had to invent new virtues to justify this beatification. “Heroic virtues” now include promoting ecumenism, inaugurating a new approach to the Jewish world, and creating a secretariat for the Unity of Christians.<sup>4</sup> Bureaucratic acts and things that any Mason would have desired are now “heroic virtues?” This contrast, and even the comedy, of this catalog of virtues is even more pitiful in light of the true virtues manifested by the saint John persecuted: bearing the stigmata, healing the blind, reading souls, bilocating, conversing with angels - basically a life that was one perpetual manifestation of the supernatural. Which read like the virtues of a Catholic saint and which read like those of a Masonic mascot?
  - The politicization and propaganda underlying this act are also evident in the fact that John’s beatification coincided with that of Pope Pius IX, the enemy of modernity and liberalism. Irreconcilable opposites are now made to seem different but compatible places along the same continuum. Hence, there is one more layer of propaganda veiling the conservative Catholic from realizing that what Popes condemned before the Council Pope John embraced. A symbolic metaphor is the state of their disinterred bodies. John’s was perfectly intact, the result of a megadose of modern science’s best embalming fluids; Pius’ was perfect due to the miracle of incorruption.
  - Another telling juxtaposition between the two popes is the reaction of the world to their funerals. The enemies of the Church impeded the funeral procession of Pius, tried to desecrate his remains and throw his coffin into the Tiber, and were so belligerent and violent that the procession took an incredible nine hours. When John died, the enemies of the Church praised him as one of their

own and paid homage at his coffin. Does not the disparity in the reactions of those who hate the Church tell the true story?

### Vatican II

The propaganda campaign surrounding the Council is itself tribute to its inadequacy. Pope Paul VI said on June 23, 1975 “Vatican II has indeed begun a new era in the life of the Church in our time,” speaking of “the vast harmony of the whole Church with its supreme pastor and its bishops.” This is delusional in light of the unprecedented fallout surrounding “*Humanae Vitae*,” and even contradicts the Pope himself who had already confessed to the self-destruction of the Church. Three weeks later he had apparently sobered up from this delusional episode, forgetting the “vast harmony” of the Church and pleading “Enough of internal dissent within the Church! Enough of Catholics attacking each other at the price of their own necessary unity!”<sup>5</sup>

John Paul II could, like Paul, offer sober and realistic assessments of the aftermath of the Council, but on the whole spoke with an unjustified optimism of unsubstantiated results. Can anyone enumerate the times Pope John Paul spoke the words “The Fruits of the Council,” or “The New Springtime” ushered in by the Council? Has any other council stood in such need of a mercilessly relentless propaganda campaign on its behalf, so insulting to the intelligence of anyone with eyes to see? Yet, what are these fruits? The Holy Father never got very specific and, when he did, only revealed that he was engaging in wishful thinking and not an honest analysis. He once stated that the liturgical renewal was the most widely embraced fruit of the Council. Yet, this is not true, as simple mathematics reveal. You cannot speak of a majority of Catholics embracing the New Mass when, in fact, the majority had stopped going to Mass since its promulgation. In his own principal diocese, Mass attendance is in the single digits (%).

The phrase “The New Springtime” is perhaps the most hollow bit of propaganda in all of Church history. One can only call the state of the Catholic Church after Vatican II a New Springtime if he is delusional or a liar. It is simply impossible to catalog very single “statistic of death,” statement of heresy by a cleric, or case of a once thriving Catholic institution now closed due to the New Springtime. Here are but a few statistics revealing a more honest picture:<sup>6</sup>

- 80% of Catholics over 65 believe that Jesus rose bodily from the dead. Only 29% between 18 – 29 believe the same [They must have had Cardinal Kasper for a teacher]. Source: Zogby Poll – Jan. 21, 2004
- 63% of Catholics in the same survey said Catholicism is one of many faiths that provide paths to God.

- 67% of Catholics over 65 believe there is something special about the Catholic Church that is not found in other faiths. 48% of those between 18 – 29 agreed.
- In American, there were 1,575 ordinations to the priesthood in 1965; in 2002 there were 450.
- In the same time period the number of seminarians fell from 49,000 to 4,700.
- In 1968 there were 338 annulments; in 2002 there were 50,000.
- 53% of Catholics believe you can have an abortion and still be considered a good Catholic.
- In May 1981, only 22% of Romans voted against abortion.<sup>7</sup>

Ultimately, the propaganda campaign surrounding the council can be hazardous to “the elect” because it can establish one of those curtains which can’t be pulled back. Consider the layers: “Good Pope John” called the Council. He did it by the express impetus of the Holy Spirit, and now he is beatified. Also, John Paul the Great has repeatedly praised the council, calling it the “greatest and most transforming event” [true, death is a transformation] of its century. The general consensus among faithful Catholics is that the Council was fine, it was those who misused it as a pretext to do whatever they wanted that caused the crisis. Yet, they may be unaware or not willing to consider the following:

- It was the Pope himself who set this precedent by using the Council as the pretext for the *Novus Ordo*, which directly contradicted it.
- If the Council was free to reject what the Church had always taught and decreed, even up to and including the most recent Pope, then how could the Council declare that anyone in the future wasn’t free to do the same to their decrees? If they renounce the right of future Catholics to contradict them, then they have to admit they had no right to do as they did in the first place. Cardinal Ratzinger once noted this hypocrisy in post-conciliar thought.
- Just as the Catechism can be used to justify both the protestant and Catholic explanations of Peter’s profession of faith, the council documents likewise embody opposite views. The faithful Catholic can find the traditional teaching (e.g., the right to a Catholic society), and the modernist can find the opposite.
- The council was illegal due to its violations of lawful procedures, and because the bishops did not act in a state of freedom, unbeknownst to them, due to John XXIII’s submitting the council to the conditions of Communist Russia.

- Pope Paul VI explicitly stated (as did Cardinal Ratzinger) that the Council did not propose any binding teachings.

Another rationale offered to defend the council and even portray the implosion of the Church in its wake as a sign of its necessity and wisdom is “the fallacy of inevitability.” According to this bit of conservative propaganda, the fact that the Church fell to pieces after the Council only proves that its perceived strength before the Council was a façade. Yet, logic does not bear this out; the Church was far from perfect before the Council, and it was the Popes who openly confessed this. Yet, we are now to believe that it was a stroke of genius to have those same people labeled as enemies empowered to change the Church, and that the very things which popes stated were being advocated to destroy the Church were, in fact, the very things that would save her! The feeble logic that blames the state of the pre-conciliar Church for the post-conciliar crisis would have to blame the original state of God’s creation for its post-Fall condition after the sin of Adam and Eve.

### **A Dangerous Myth: John Paul “The Great”**

The Final Curtain: To a great number of the elect, Pope Paul’s newly instituted “Cult of Man” has become a cult of One Man; this one. If you have read this far, you know that I once believed that John Paul deserved this title, and have since come to be convinced of the opposite. No one changed my mind; the facts did. Like many John Paul devotees, I was won over at a World Youth Day. Then, as I spent the next six years in a modernist seminary which believed neither in the priesthood for which it alleged to be forming men nor the Faith which it claimed to represent, John Paul, along with Cardinal Ratzinger, became my heroes, as I referred to their writings to refute the heresies and immorality advocated in my classes. It was a game I enjoyed; in every class I would submit papers that directly contradicted what my modernist professors taught, and they had to give me good grades because I would cite throughout the writings of the Pope and the head of the C.D.F. Besides, the rector and many faculty members were all but explicit in conveying their disdain for these two men, and there was no greater credential than this in my book.

Yet, the cracks began to show. I never was too caught up in the pro-Vatican II propaganda; it always seemed a verbose, incoherent enterprise to me, even before I realized the graver issues concerned. The “John Paul the Great” light took a little longer to fade. I genuinely loved the man, and I still do, and I was convinced of his genuine love for the world and everyone in it. He was a man incapable of malice but I came to suspect that his sincere love was gravely misdirected. The more I became aware of his words and actions, an awareness that did not come easily, given that most “conservative” Catholic outlets were careful to avoid disseminating the evidence of his heterodoxy, the harder it became to ignore them or explain them away.

As these troubling signs would arise, I would seek the counsel of conservative priests whom I regarded as intelligent and holy. Yet, I was perplexed at how, with all of their knowledge, they could only respond in the same clichés I cataloged on previous pages. Was there no answer? I truly did not, nor do I, regard myself as more intelligent than these men, but I remained unsatisfied with their non-answers. I finally did find the answers, and they were not as obscure as they once seemed. They are nothing less than the history of the Church, her unchangeable doctrines, and the writings of every Pope up to 1958. In the end, I had to leave the “John Paul the Great” society and instead wonder if the age-old question “Is the Pope Catholic?” was so rhetorical after all.

## **The Making of a Myth**

At John Paul’s funeral, the propaganda machine was already firing on all cylinders. Dispersed throughout the crowds were rough looking signs reading “Santo Subito;” a saint right away. Yet, this “spontaneous” outpouring of the people for John Paul’s swift canonization was nothing more than liberal dishonesty. During presidential campaigns, the candidates themselves print professional quality signs which deliberately are made to resemble the homemade effort of a school child. These posters are then given to children to hold to form the backdrop for their speeches. This is precisely what the signs at John Paul’s funeral were; created by one of the heretical sects he endorsed in the hope that his canonization would sacralize their own movement. Yet, the machinery was really under way decades before, during the entire twenty six year pontificate. Here are some ways in which the legend of “John Paul the Great” came to be...

- **Faith:** He is the Vicar of Christ, the Successor to the Apostle Peter, the bearer of the Keys to the Kingdom of Heaven. If he is not above reproach and worthy of our unconditional trust, who is? Likewise, if he should commit some public act that could cause some confusion or even border on scandal, it is the job of faithful Catholics to put it in an acceptable light. Certainly he never meant to give the impression of anything less than staunch orthodoxy, right? Good Catholics defend and obey the Pope, and “great” Popes would never do anything detrimental to the Faith or the flock.
- **Desperation:** Faithful Catholics needed a hero, and in John Paul they found one. After the disastrous papacy of Paul VI, there was once more a virile man on the throne of Peter. He walked with confidence, spoke with conviction, and seemed to be someone that world leaders and ecclesial liberals could not push around. Liberals and the media portrayed him as conservative, even reactionary, leading the elect to think that he was indeed their man. So thoroughly Catholic did he seem in light of his contemporaries and those who had been openly attacking the Church from within with impunity, we never put him in the light of two hundred and sixty three other popes and two thousand years of Church teachings and tradition. We needed a hero too badly to entertain the idea that he might be something less, a child of his age,

just as he had “excused” St. Catherine as being. Yet, Catherine’s was an age of faith, John Paul’s an age of apostasy, and he did not pass through unscathed.

- **Victimhood and heroism:** Had John Kennedy simply lived out his one or two terms as president, it is doubtful he would have become the icon he is today. We love our tragic heroes, yet our society sometimes fails to make a basic distinction. When Kennedy went above and beyond the call of duty and saved the lives of his men during World War II, that was heroism. In Dallas, he was a victim. Simply being struck by a bullet does not make you a hero, but in America victims are our heroes. Likewise, the failed attempt against John Paul’s life sent his image soaring, as he benefited from the sympathy of outraged people and gained status as a hero when he recovered. Also, his genuine example of Christian forgiveness, broadcast throughout the world in his visit to his would-be-assassin, lent him credibility even among his critics. He followed the example of Christ and gave an edifying example to the world. Yet, in all of this, there also arose a greater element leading to the creation of the myth of “John Paul the Great,” as it relies quite heavily upon a...
- **Cult of Personality:** As with the media distorting the uniqueness of routine pastoral work by John XXIII, the proponents of John Paul’s greatness oftentimes point to things that every Pope has done, and many in a far superior fashion: upholding moral teachings, making some good appointments (and enough bad ones as well), and suffering bravely. Yet, that is what popes do; the only distinguishing mark of the Papacy of John Paul is that these were done in the age of media. John Paul liked the camera, and the camera liked him; he knew how to make good use of the media, and made a powerful impression by the massive gatherings of humanity he routinely assembled. No single man, not even the world’s biggest rock star, could do that. Yet, are these really the marks of a great Pope, or just the signs of a great personality? This “cult of personality” is intertwined with...
- **The Mob Mentality:** What John Paul will be remembered for more than anything, and what most bolstered his status as great, are the multitudes which gathered around him. Yet, is this really much of a criteria for judging anything at all? While perhaps any Pope who was privy to modern travel and technology could have drawn large crowds around the world, the personal magnetism of Pope John Paul probably enhanced what those numbers would have been simply for a pope as the pope. Yet, is it not unreasonable that these had a downside as well? Perhaps John Paul felt the need to convince himself as much as anyone else that a genuine “New Springtime” was occurring, and these crowds only placated him in thinking “things are not as bad as they seem.”

Mr. Amerio summarized, “People point to the enormous crowds that gathered for the occasion; but everyone knows what superficial, fickle and deceptive things crowds are, how their moods change from moment to moment, and how little can be deduced from their existence regarding the real mentality of a people.”<sup>8</sup>

Available online is the article “By the Time We Got to Woodstock: Vatican II and ‘the Spirit of Woodstock’” which offers an outstanding commentary on the falsity of the mob mentality, in particular on the part of those who seek to use it as proof of the Church’s vigor. I will only borrow a few citations, but the article warrants a full reading:

“At World Youth Day 2000, Cardinal Stafford pointed to the throngs of youngsters gathered in Saint Peter’s Square and declared: ‘Here are the children of Vatican II!’ Here indeed they are. But how many of these ‘children of Vatican II’ could answer correctly ten basic questions about the Catholic faith?...Such questions do not trouble the promoters of these spectacles. For them, the emotion engendered by cheering crowds who make the Pope happy is sufficient evidence of ecclesial well-being.”<sup>9</sup> The World Youth Day in Paris left the church there with a five million dollar debt, as only one in five attendees paid the registration fee. Also, the collection taken up netted about 33 cents per person; these are the Christians who prove the “New Springtime?”

- His volumes of writings are often invoked as a sign of his greatness; yet, why? Is mere writing a virtue? Could it not even be a sign of weakness, as the time spent sequestered working on writings which only repeat what has already been written could be used in the active governance of the Church, something perhaps needed much more urgently than yet more documents? Yet, apart from “*Humanae Vitae*,” most conservative Catholics have read comparatively little, if anything, of former popes. Once one does this, one discovers writings much more clear, concrete, and honest; former popes called evil evil and miscreants miscreants. Everything was not lost and watered down in a verbose haze.
- “Great” by what comparison? Again, it is the sometimes insufficient data of the conservative Catholic which wins John Paul such high marks. He is the only Pope many have experienced, this experience is permeated by the emotionalism of his energetic events, his character towers above that of so many churchmen who have dominated these past forty years, his personal goodness is conceded even by his enemies, and his firmness on all things Catholic seemed absolute on so many occasions.

Yet, as a Catholic reads the lives of the other Popes at a meaningful level, not just the blurbs afforded them in anemic history books, he discovers what true greatness is. The admirable qualities possessed by John Paul (which he certainly had) are the rule, not the exception. The vast majority of popes have been exactly what you would expect a pope to be: holy, hard-working, and overflowing with genuine charity. Even Alexander VI, oftentimes cast as “The Worst Pope,” was in fact a tragic Shakespearian figure, not lacking in good qualities. John Paul is championed as “The People’s Pope,” yet, do these people realize that former popes held “open court” one day a week, when even the lowliest peasant could come directly before the Vicar of Christ and plead his case? John Paul is hailed as “great” because he bravely opposed world

leaders. Yes, with his words. Are these people not aware of the popes, even beyond the Roman martyrdoms, who were exiled, tortured, imprisoned and martyred because they opposed men far less evil in comparison to the ones John Paul embraced and honored? John Paul is “Great” because of his devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and reverence at Mass; then why is Pope Pius VII not “Great” who was repeatedly witnessed *levitating* before the Sacred Host at Mass?

I could argue the case forever, and I am sorry if I have already belabored it too long; yet, it is crucial to the final segment. So many popes excelled above and beyond John Paul in so many ways, without having ever praised heretics, committed acts of syncretism, denied the essence of both the Church and their own office, given Holy Communion to non-Catholics, and raising manifest heretics and apostates to the ranks of bishop and cardinal. It may even be that they did all of these positive things with even superior charisma and crowd-working skills, but that they did not have cameras to capture and replay these actions as though they had never been done before the age of technology. But no, somehow despite all of his suspect words and actions, he is “John Paul the Great.” He is the standard-bearer of orthodoxy and the prototype of what every Pope should be, and perhaps that is why “even the elect will be led astray.”

### **The Scenario**

The future can be learned from the past, as this scenario has been played out time and again in the Church’s history. Every time a secular power has sought to place the Church under its dominion, a schismatic church was formed along national lines. The choice given to Catholics was to accept allegiance to their substitute church, or suffer persecution for remaining loyal to the true one. However, the “national” borders of the next rival church are in fact the entire world, as the current apostasy is driving towards a one-world-religion. Unlike every other apostasy, there will be no place in the world for the Church to find refuge, as the whole world will be the battle field.

The forces of godless globalism are winning, and there is no one left to stop them; the Church was the only potential adversary, but surrendered to these forces decades ago. In whatever form, the goal of the Masons and United Nations will be realized, and this one world supra-religion, under which all others are combined, even if maintaining a superficial pretense of autonomy, will be brought to fulfillment. All religions will be invited to join, and any holdouts will be persecuted. This persecution may at first only take the form of exclusion from public life and the systematic shutting down of the religion’s institutions, but will not end there. All of these converging elements are built on mass murder, and they will not relent once their goal is so near.

Given the state of the Church today, it is not difficult to imagine that the greater number would swiftly apostatize once their material or financial lives were threatened in any way shape or form. Most would sooner surrender their faith than their cell phone. In fact, when the “alternative church” is proposed, the



one described by Pius X a century ago without morality, discipline, doctrines or an authoritative hierarchy, most Catholics would say “that’s what I already believe. What’s the problem?”

Yet, many will want to resist, and pray for the grace to accept their martyrdom, be it instant or the “white” martyrdom of protracted hardships. Still, how is it that these elect could be led astray? Not give in, mind you, but actually be led to believe that accepting their place in this new global “church of humanity” is not an abandoning of the Church of Christ? Could not the myth of “John Paul the Great” help lead toward this end?

The faithful Catholic says to the inquisitor of this global entity: “The Catholic Church is the only true religion; your church can not bring me to salvation.” The inquisitor replies: “You are mistaken. John Paul the Great said other religions are a means of salvation.”

The faithful Catholic says: “The only true Church is built on the Pope; I cannot accept yours.” The inquisitor replies: “John Paul the Great said otherwise, and conceded that those who reject the Papacy likewise form that one true Church.”

The faithful Catholic says: “We are not the enemies of humanity you portray us to be; we love humanity and for that reason want to see all of it gathered in the unity of the One Church and find salvation.” The inquisitor replies: “But the unity of your Church is meant to be a part of the greater unity of all mankind, which is ours to create. John Paul the Great said so.”

The faithful Catholic says: “Acquiescence to your threats would mean worshipping with non-believers and giving Holy Communion to anyone who desires it. My religion forbids these things.” The inquisitor replies, “You are mistaken. Pope John Paul the Great did these very things, and encouraged you to do the same.”

The inquisitor concludes: “Don’t you see, you have won. We have both won; we both had the same end in mind: the unity of all mankind in a world that will never again know war. Your own ‘Great Pope’ said that it was for *this* unity that your Jesus died! Your own popes paid us homage and prayed that our authority increase, and so it has. Your own popes called us the obligatory path for humanity, and so we are. Your own Popes said we must have the authority and power to impose our laws on you, and so we have come to do just that. But why should force be necessary? In joining us, you are fulfilling the wishes, dare we say, the prophecies, of your ‘Great Pope.’ To not join us would be to disobey him! We are the fulfillment of the ‘future church’ which your ‘Great Pope’ and his successor said they were working towards! Pray your rosaries, keep your holy cards, read your Bible, minus the intolerant verses we have expunged, you will still have a Pope, minus the obnoxious authoritarian claims of the past, which even ‘The Great Pope’ acknowledged as not true. None of these things will be taken from you. Simply offer us this act of love and fraternity, and you will be left in peace...”

Indeed, it was an offer made during every persecution, an offer apostates accepted and martyrs refused. Yet, given the weakness of human nature, or just simple prudence, who would not welcome the chance to retain both his faith and his life? Even if the elect still heard a faint echo from the depths of their conscience compelling them to resist, could not any lingering doubt be stifled by so seemingly Catholic a justification? In what element of the apostasy could one not look to John Paul and the Vatican II apparatus and cite their own words and actions as support, just as they now can for denying the foundation of the papacy? Given all the mutilations of our religion over the past four decades that we have endured, what would one more matter? We have swallowed the camel of the Masonic Novus Ordo, why would we all of the sudden strain the gnat of throwing a hand full of incense to the United Nations? And so, perhaps even the elect will be led astray since, in going astray, they are only following the words and examples of the man they are convinced is the greatest Pope who ever lived.

***“There are tyrannical weaknesses, evil deficiencies, and  
conquered ones deserving of being so.”***

***-Charles Maurras***

---

<sup>1</sup> Gregory XVI, Pope. Encyclical Letter “Mirari vos.” Vatican City: Aug. 15, 1832

<sup>2</sup> Villa, “John XXIII,” p. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Wiltgen, p. 141.

<sup>4</sup> Villa, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Amerio, p. 175.

<sup>6</sup> Jones, Kenneth C. “Index of Leading Catholic Indicators.” Roman Catholic Books, 2003.

<sup>7</sup> Amerio, p. 176, note 116.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 741.

<sup>9</sup> Ferrara, Christopher. “By the Time We Got to Woodstock: Vatican II and the Spirit of Woodstock.” Remnant Newspaper, August, 1999.

## Chapter XX

### **Triumph: God's Turn**

#### **The Gates of Hell Shall Not Prevail**

If all that has been related in these preceding chapters is true, and if I believe something along the lines of my future hypothesis is coming, then why stay? Because there is nowhere else to be. Just as schismatics can separate themselves from the Church but never divide her, the Church can't lose; her members can quit, but not be defeated. Even as the Church is so permeated by her own enemies and infested with so much error and seemingly dissolved in every aspect of her life, she remains the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church and the gates of Hell will not prevail. Our Lady's apparitions at Fatima guide us on our way, as Mr. Socci related words spoken by Sr. Lucy about what we are to do in the meantime, as the Church languishes and shepherds and faithful alike falter:

“Father, we should not wait for an appeal to the world to come from Rome on the part of the Holy Father to do penance. Nor should we wait for the call to penance to come from our bishops in our diocese, nor from the religious congregations. No! Our Lord has already very often used these means, and the world has not paid attention. That is why now it is necessary for each one of us to begin to reform himself spiritually. Each person must not only save his own soul but also help all the souls that God has placed on our path. ..She said to my cousins as well as to myself that God is giving two last remedies to the world. These are the Holy Rosary and devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. These are the last two remedies, which signify that there will be no others.”<sup>1</sup>

***“Fight, children of the light, you, the few who can see.  
For now is the time of all times, the end of all ends.”  
Our Lady of LaSalette***

#### **Before Jesus returns, Peter will return**

*“And when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren.”  
-Jesus to St. Peter (Luke 22:32)*

*“It is marvelous, my lord ambassador, how this Holy See has maintained  
its existence, although our predecessors have done all in their  
power to destroy it.” - Pope Paul IV*

Before the end, we will once more have a pope who speaks like a pope. He will call evil by name, uphold the true Faith, insist on the utter singularity of the Roman Catholic Church, and his own responsibility for the salvation of the human race as Christ's Vicar on Earth. He will proclaim, *for the true love of humanity*, that Jesus Christ is the only Savior of mankind, and only in the Church He founded can His salvation be achieved. In short, he will sound like two hundred and sixty popes before

Vatican II. Yet, his rediscovery of lost convictions will sound repugnant to the world, and even strange to most Catholics, as the simple truths of Catholicism will sound decidedly unfamiliar in comparison to the indifferentism that has replaced faith, the “tolerance” that has replaced truth, and the mandate for death that is “diversity.”

Perhaps, as with the partial graces of the partial fulfillments of the commands of Fatima, Peter has slowly been making his way back all this time. The See of Peter has witnessed a strange history since the death of Pius XII. Pope John’s openness to masons and communists began the Church’s dissolution, and Paul VI made it complete by surrendering the Mass. In John Paul II there was a tragic quality; a good man who seemed genuinely Catholic in so many ways, yet seemed to believe he could reconcile “the table of God with the table of Belial,” and ended up exhausted and spent in the unavoidable futility of so incoherent an enterprise. Even he had to concede that his New Springtime was in fact a “silent apostasy.”

Pope Benedict is more enigmatic still; a suspected modernist theologian with enough outrageous statements to his credit, yet who was also among the first to sound the alarm bells and openly declare that all was not well. So often a protagonist in the advancement of modernism, yet many times the defender of the Faith against modernists, now admitting that the promises of modernism have failed. The same Cardinal who echoed DeChardin’s assertion that more technology means more Christianity has conceded that, instead, it was a progress towards destruction. The Cardinal who belittled visits to the Blessed Sacrament became the Pope who leads Corpus Christi processions as reverent as the Church has ever seen. The Cardinal who played a key role in discrediting the events of Fatima became the Pope who told the faithful “Whoever thinks that the prophetic mission of Fatima is over is deceived.”<sup>2</sup> Articulate and intelligent in his defense of the ancient Mass, blunt and critical in his assessment of the Novus Ordo, and now insisting that anyone who receives Communion from his hand do so on their knees and on their tongue. And, yes, five years after having it removed, once again the image of the tiara has been restored to its rightful place on his coat of arms. (Please God, we will live to see the actual tiara restored to its rightful place on a Pope’s head). Could this man who has taken this strange journey (does he even see it as such?) be the final half-step to a full return of Catholicism? Even the small steps he has taken have required courage, as the relentless beatings he takes in the media and from his liberal bishops must weigh heavily on his soul; yet, these measures, while giving hope to the down-trodden remnant, are not enough. Too much ground has been lost to ever be recovered by so gradual a trajectory. In what manner and in what time Peter returns in all his vigor I can’t hazard to guess; I only know he will. He has to; this is the Roman Catholic Church, and She will not die. Yet, the Pope who “closes the circle” will learn to the bitter dregs a lesson his predecessors learned only in a measured dose:

### **How the Devil Treats His Friends**

Jesus said to His disciples, “Do not give what is holy to dogs, nor cast your pearls before swine. They will trample them underfoot, at best,

and perhaps even tear you to shreds.”

Cardinal Carafa (later Pope Paul IV) once wisely counseled Pope Clement VII thus: “A heretic must be treated as such; the Pope lowers himself if he writes him and flatters him or even allows graces to be procured for him; it is, indeed, possible that in this or that instance some good results may follow, but as a rule the recipients of such favors are only made more obdurate and gain fresh adherents.”<sup>3</sup>

The future Pope understood well this admonition from Jesus; it seems the Vatican II popes did not. They dreamed that surrendering all we held sacred would win us their esteem (hearken back to John XXIII), yet it only emboldened them in their contempt, and convinced them of our own weakness. Time and again we cast our pearls before swine and surrendered to dogs what is holy. All that has been documented here: the tiara and all it symbolized, our faith in the Church and even Jesus, the Mass, all of our rituals, the souls of our children, our sanctuaries, our beliefs, our traditions, our dignity – all surrendered in hopes that the swine would like us; they don’t, as Jesus tried to warn us. Once the swine have tired of our pearls, or we have no more pearls to cast, the swine will turn on us. The Vatican II popes have already discovered this, each in his own way; and the entire Church will soon discover as well, how the devil treats his friends.

- Pope John XXIII: A lifelong friend of communists, he promoted their meetings, helped them win elections, gave them control over an ecumenical council and silenced the Mother of God when She sought to convert them. Surely, that would win him their respect; not quite. They accepted him for what he was; the long-awaited dupe Pope to be exploited as much as possible. Fr. Villa recounts the sad episode at the end of his life in which the swine turned on him. The Communists awarded him the “Balzan Prize” for peace. Even in all of his leftist leanings, John intended to decline so brazen a trumpeting of his communist sympathies. Instead, “He was literally dragged out of his bed, dressed up in his papal vestments and hoisted into the Sistine Chapel, as it was impossible to carry him into St. Peter’s, given his dreadful conditions. He was pale, distraught, his lifeless eyes fastened onto the emptiness; and, as he was placed on the throne, he quivered a long time, shaken by shivers. But there were the others to smile, namely, the representatives of that “award,” put together with the monies of the slain under the lead of the “reds” in 1945, and there was his secretary, Monsignor Capovilla, with his large funeral shades, continuously smiling to the paparazzi. When he was back in his apartment, John XXIII refused any other visit. On the eve of his death he had, I am certain, an atonement, as it were. Some heard his voice moan in despair for what he had done.”<sup>4</sup>

If John was disheartened that the swine to whom he had consigned so many pearls would take advantage of his near-death state in such a way, he had no cause for being surprised. Even when he conceded the terms of the council to them in a “secret meeting,” they immediately published the arrangement, gloating over the Church’s admitted weakness. “Because the world socialist system is showing its superiority in an incontestable fashion, and is strong through the support of hundreds and hundreds of millions of men, the Church can no longer be content with crude anti-communism.”<sup>5</sup>

- Did the liberals love Paul for destroying the Mass? Of course not; they saw him for what he was; weak, intellectually compromised, willing to do anything to be accepted by the “illuminati,” and easy to exploit when he resisted. This has already been demonstrated the manner in which he was ignored in his decree on Communion in the hand; the Pope who made so many concessions to the swine, when he tried to draw the line, was roundly ignored by those he was so desperate to please.

The story is told of Paul appearing to vest for Mass, and telling his attendants that they had set out the wrong colored vestments. His attendants corrected him, telling the Pope that it was he himself who had eliminated the days of Pentecost. He broke down in tears, realizing that the swine had indeed turned on him; no longer even waiting for the Pope to cast them pearls, they simply seized them at will, and the Pope did nothing.

The issuance of *Humanae Vitae* is another example. All of the liberal elements to whom Paul had surrendered the Church were hoping that the Pope would endorse the evil of contraception. When he did not they were not friends saying, “We understand, Holy Father. You have done so much for our cause already; we appreciate that even a Pope has some frontiers he cannot cross.” Of course not; the swine turned on him and the Pope was on the receiving end of a beating within the “Catholic” media and academia that was unprecedented. Yes, Pope Paul learned how the Devil treats his friends, and how the swine react when you withhold but a single pearl. He never again wrote an encyclical, and spent the last decade of his papacy in an ever-increasing isolation and irrelevance, paralyzed by a growing consciousness of the destruction he had unleashed.

- Pope John Paul discovered this in many ways as well. So eager to sacrifice his own dignity and the honor of our fathers in faith through his incessant groveling apologies, and what did he ever get in return? More insults. After offering the Patriarch of Constantinople, Archbishop Christodoulos, an apology for every conceivable historical “offense” imaginable, the Patriarch announced that the Pope had not gone far enough, and that many more apologies were in order. The Patriarch spoke with open contempt, not even willing to address the Pope with basic civility, displaying all of the social graces of a genuine miscreant; John Paul actually believed he would make a friend instead of emboldening an enemy. No matter how many times the cycle was repeated, the lesson went unlearned.<sup>6</sup>

The most literal example of giving what is holy to dogs was the Communion he gave to Tony Blair. Mr. Blair’s subsequent “conversion” could be viewed as proof of the wisdom of the concession, but it only validated the warning of Jesus and demonstrated the indifferentism and relativism prevailing in the Church today. Mr. Blair now feels it his place to tell the Pope the ways in which he should change doctrine, stating that the Church is wrong in his stance on homosexuality. As though any more proof was necessary, the Church shows how feeble the notion of “conversion” is in the Vatican II era of indifferentism, as Mr. Blair was welcomed, heresies and all.

- There is a Pope in the Church’s future to learn this more bitterly than the rest. It is he, not John Paul, who was seen by the visionaries of Fatima, slain among a trail of martyred corpses. Likewise

we will see in him the confirmation of the prophecy of St. John Bosco; the Pope is shot once and arises (Pope John Paul), but the second time he remains fallen in death.

It is this martyred Pope who will drink the bitter dregs of the chalice his predecessors prepared by their disobedience of Our Lady and their betrayal of the Church's very soul. When the Pope ascends the Throne of Peter and declares that she once again believes in her divine charter and discards the dross of a half century of compromise, cowardice, apostasy, error, heterodoxy, irreverence, and self-inflicted death, he will find out how well esteemed the Church is by those she sought to please by denying herself.

Be it ever so meekly, when this Pope begins to speak as the Popes of old, the Popes of eternity, he will not be told, "We understand, friend, you must be true to yourself." He will not be accorded the "freedom of conscience" that his predecessors said was the right of every heretic and idolater and devil-worshipper. Once Peter has ceased to throw the pearls of the Faith to the swine of liberalism, they will turn on him and tear him to shreds, as Jesus promised, and His Mother tried to prevent.

"Therefore, harlot, hear the word of the Lord! I will now gather together all your lovers whom you tried to please, whether you loved them or loved them not. They shall lead an assembly against you to stone you and hack you with your swords" (Ezek. 16:35ff).

***"It is time; the sun is darkening; only faith will survive."  
-Our Lady of LaSalette***

"I saw one of my successors by name fleeing over the corpses of his brethren. He will flee to a place where he is unknown, but after a short retirement he himself will die a cruel death"<sup>7</sup> (Pope St. Pius X). Yes, Holy Father, this is how the Devil treats his friends. It is not our destiny to take our seat at the United Nations' banquet of the unholy in the satanic New World Order. It is our destiny to follow Christ to Calvary, and to the eternal order which only His Holy Roman Catholic Church can bring; whoever you are, thank God you believed this and rescued Her from Her present darkness.

### **"I Will Receive His Sacrifice"**

Perhaps it is a tragic but fitting manner in which Christ is to be imitated by His Vicar. Only God could offer to God an acceptable sacrifice to expiate offenses against Him, yet, it was man as man who owed this sacrifice since he was the culprit. Therefore, only the God Made Man could offer the acceptable sacrifice for our salvation. Perhaps this is why His vicar is destined to die this way; it was the disobedience and negligence of popes who brought the Church so low, and it may be that only the sacrifice of a pope can make this right in the sight of Heaven, and win the Church the reprieve she could have had with such merciful ease a century ago. And so Our Lady of LaSalette foretold, "The Holy Father will suffer a great deal. I will be with him until the end and receive his sacrifice." Could this sacrifice and the one witnessed by the seers of Fatima, St. John Bosco and St. Pius X be one and the same? Only time will tell; until then, the faithful have been told what to do, that our sacrifice may be

received as well and, in union with this future Pope, partake of Mary's promise at Fatima, "In the end, My Immaculate Heart will triumph."

*"The righteous will suffer greatly. Their prayers, their penances, and their tears will rise up to Heaven, and all of God's people will beg for forgiveness and mercy, and will plead for my help and intercession. And then Jesus Christ, in an act of His justice and His great mercy will command His angels to have all his enemies put to death [do you think bishops will break out their placards and organize a protest?...]I call on the true disciples of the living God who reigns in Heaven; I call on the true followers of Christ made man, the only Savior of men; I call on my children, the true faithful, those who have given themselves to me so that I may lead them to my divine Son, those whom I carry in my arms, so to speak, those who have lived on my spirit. Finally, I call on the Apostles of the Last Days, the faithful disciples of Jesus Christ who have lived in scorn for the world and for themselves, in poverty and humility, in scorn and in silence, in prayer and mortification, in chastity and in union with God, in suffering and unknown to the world." - Our Lady of LaSalette*

## **The Last Word**

Whatever the form of this last persecution, whoever the antichrist turns out to be, and through whatever entity he gains global power and wages his battle against Christ and His Church, his victory will never be complete, although it will seem to be. Our Lady of LaSalette warned us that "only Faith will survive," as the enemies of God will rest secure that the Church has been sent to her grave, as was Her Founder. Yet, His Mystical Body will resurrect, just as His physical one did. As Mary promised to St. Catherine Laboure, "The moment will come, the danger will be great, it will be thought that all is lost. Then I will be with you." As the Pope's sacrifice will be received, so will that of all faithful Catholics who trust and persevere; soon, and the Church will have no more pearls to offer the swine, and they will turn and tear us to pieces, yet it is in this sacrifice that victory will be achieved. "The time will come, dear children, when there will be rich and abundant harvests; the earth, bathed in tears, will smile with pearls of love and, watered by the blood of martyrs, will bring forth Christians" (Pius XII, March 19, 1958, in words many have believed are revealing of the complete contents of the Secret of Fatima).<sup>8</sup>

***"The Antichrist will be destroyed and the Church will sing forth with unprecedented glory, and the victims of the great error will throng to return to the fold."***

***- St. Hildegard of Bingen***

Dear reader, it would seem that I have come to the conclusion of this work. Unfortunately, I have not come to the conclusion of my now fifteen year exploration into the "frightful crisis" (LaSalette) now



besetting the Church. I still have the outlines of many additional chapters that are relevant to the task, along with the countless excerpts and hypotheses. While I did seek to remain loosely systematic and logical in addressing the topics, I had no choice but to conclude with a little guesswork about what is to come. Of course, it will come, as Mary foretold, and the Scriptures long before her. Yet, what form and in what time frame, I would not hazard to guess. I am sure that more than one faithful Catholic, upon seeing sanctuaries destroyed, priests dressed as clowns offering Mass, and the apostasy of virtually every institution within the Church, would not have believed that decades later the same crisis would be unfolding. Yet, this is only proof of the strength of the Church they set out to destroy. The Vatican II Church can point to little as its own, as it is so largely parasitical upon the Church it despised and from which sought to distance herself and whose essence they thought was theirs to change. The fact that the vulture is still feeding off the same body only proves how vigorous that body once was. Please God, we will see the day foreseen by Hildegard when it will be again.

Some say that the fact that the most egregious abuses have subsided and traces of traditional Catholicism are emerging from the catacombs into which they were driven is a sign that the crisis is abating. I hope they are right, but I am inclined to disagree. The distinction between an invasion and an occupation is, I believe, fitting. When invaders seize a city, there is chaos, violence, blood, and a crescendo of breaking glass and terrified screams. Firmly in control, a sense of normalcy<sup>9</sup> takes hold; people walk the streets, the rubble is sifted through and removed, and the conquered come to terms with the “new routine” of their vanquished existence. So it is that a Church so thoroughly un-Catholic, the Church dreamed of by our enemies, can seem to be improving; only because it is superficially more tranquil than the night the invaders took charge do we want to believe it is an improvement. Yet, in every measurable way, the dissolution continues. There is scarcely a Catholic school to speak of, bishops and priests still speak heresy openly, and most religious orders are simply dying socialist welfare organs. In most dioceses the only mandate is a type of hospice care for the former Roman Catholic Church. Schools close, parishes combine, the number of priests plummets, as does the number of churchgoers; there is no more talk of how to turn it around, only how to manage the death so that it is as painless as possible. There is only one solution, and as with the long history of hypocrisy in the Church of “dialogue” and “openness,” it is the one solution that will never be considered until all the futile ones have been exhausted: Roman Catholicism. In closing, I will plagiarize Mr. Amerio in the conclusion of his monumental work:

“Half dying of poverty and persecution, and despised by the world, the Church will share the fate of Thomas Mann’s *Elect*: while the world goes down into barbarism, he takes refuge in penance and devotion in the inhuman solitude of an inaccessible retreat; there he lives in the wild, he is reduced to eating grass and earth, he becomes a living creature that is human but can hardly be recognized as such. Then, in a decisive moment for Christendom, Providence seeks out the semihuman creature, Roman legates carry him off to the City, raise him to the pontifical throne, and consecrate him to the renewal of the Church and the salvation of the human race.”

“The last certitude is that the very warp and weave of history is constituted by the mystery of predestination, and that here, as Manzoni sublimely wrote, human thought must fold its wings and come

to earth. It must seem that our considerations have come to a conclusion that amounts to a negative, hypothetical, shadowy and twilight understanding, if not indeed to a knowledge that is night. And so it is. The veil cannot be pierced; we feel our way beneath a darkling light. ‘*Custos quid de nocte? Custos quid de nocte? Dixit custos: Venit mane et nox. Si quaeritis, quaerite, convertimini, venite*’” (Isaiah, 21:11 – 12). “Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night? The watchman says: Morning comes, and with it the night. If you seek, seek on; come back and ask again.”<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Socci, p. 71.

<sup>2</sup> Benedict XVI, Pope. Sermon given at Fatima, May 13, 2010.

<sup>3</sup> Pastor, Vol. 10, p. 311.

<sup>4</sup> Villa, “John XXIII,” p. 28.

<sup>5</sup> Bulletin of the French Communist Party, Jan. 16 – 22, 1963.

<sup>6</sup> Ferrara, Christopher. “It Does No Good for the Pope to Grovel.” *Fatima Perspectives*.

<sup>7</sup> Culleton, Rev. R. Gerald. “The Prophets and Our Times.” Rockford, ILL: Tan Books and Publishers, reprinted in 1974, p. 216.

<sup>8</sup> Socci, p. 64.

<sup>9</sup> The Soviet term for this phase was “normalization,” habituating people to a new definition of normal after a crisis. This was the desired result of the “Hegelian dialect” from the start. The radical crisis was not meant to endure, but to lead to a new “center” which would have never before been accepted, but now seems desirable when juxtaposed to the recent events.

<sup>10</sup> Amerio, pp. 760 – 63.